

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

**Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel
Held at City Hall, 141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, B.C.
in Conference Room A on Wednesday, November 21, 2007**

MINUTES

Present:	D. Lee, Chair A. Hii D. Rose R. Spencer K. Terriss P. Winterburn-Chilton Councillor R. Heywood														
Staff:	G. Venczel, Development Planner E. Maillie, Committee Secretary C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Services														
Guests:	<table><tr><td>C. Rowe - Architect</td><td>P.J. Mallen - Project Designer</td></tr><tr><td>R. Artis - Project Manager</td><td>M. Vaughan – Landscape Architect</td></tr><tr><td>F. Halle – Vancouver Coastal Health</td><td>M. McMains - Designer</td></tr><tr><td>K. McKillop - Landscape Architect</td><td>I. McDonald - Designer</td></tr><tr><td>A. Hii - Architect</td><td>M. McKenzie - Landscape Architect</td></tr><tr><td>B. Curtis – Designer</td><td>M. Rahbar - Designer</td></tr><tr><td>T. Berrettoni – Owner</td><td></td></tr></table>	C. Rowe - Architect	P.J. Mallen - Project Designer	R. Artis - Project Manager	M. Vaughan – Landscape Architect	F. Halle – Vancouver Coastal Health	M. McMains - Designer	K. McKillop - Landscape Architect	I. McDonald - Designer	A. Hii - Architect	M. McKenzie - Landscape Architect	B. Curtis – Designer	M. Rahbar - Designer	T. Berrettoni – Owner	
C. Rowe - Architect	P.J. Mallen - Project Designer														
R. Artis - Project Manager	M. Vaughan – Landscape Architect														
F. Halle – Vancouver Coastal Health	M. McMains - Designer														
K. McKillop - Landscape Architect	I. McDonald - Designer														
A. Hii - Architect	M. McKenzie - Landscape Architect														
B. Curtis – Designer	M. Rahbar - Designer														
T. Berrettoni – Owner															
Absent:	B. Dabiri K. Hanvey A. Macintosh N. Paul														

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:38 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held October 17, 2007

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held October 17, 2007 be adopted with amendments to show to that I. MacDonald and M. McMains are Designers, and that the resolution under Item 7 was Carried with 1 – Opposed.

Unanimously Carried

2. Business Arising

None

3. Staff Update

(a) 1400 Bewicke Avenue

Council deferred this proposal at Public Hearing and directed that staff liaise with the developer on changes to be made and report back. Staff will take this report to Council on November 26th for decision.

A. Hii and Councillor Heywood entered the meeting at 5:42 p.m.

(b) Town Hall Meeting – Site 8 / Foot of Lonsdale

The turnout for this meeting was much larger than anticipated and most speakers during the evening opposed the project. Comments received at City Hall have been even both for and against. View blockage and reduction of property values was a strong concern from residents to the north of the site. A second public meeting will be planned.

4. Lions Gate Hospice – Rezoning

The Development Planner gave an overview of the zoning and project to build a 15-bed hospice on hospital lands in the 300 block West 14th Street. No major exceptions to the zoning are being sought.

A. Rowe - Architect, R. Artis - Project Manager, F Halle – Vancouver Coastal Health, and K. McKillop - Landscape Architect, were introduced and Roger Artis advised it has been decided to relocate the hospice from 13th Street to 14th Street. This is a quieter location and allows better balance in future development of the remainder of the hospital lands, Block 59.

C. Rowe reviewed the location of the site which is zoned School and Institutional and explained the context of the surrounding area. Four houses to the south of the hospice site will be demolished and will be used in future hospital development. Photographs of homes along 14th Street by the location of the hospice were shown.

Vehicle access to the hospice site will be from the lane off 13th Street with parking to the south off the lane. This parking will be shared with Shakespeare House.

Interior layout of the hospice was explained – 15-bed patient rooms, administration and service areas, sacred space, and gardens with public and private areas at the rear. South elevations have large overhangs to provide shading. Exterior finishing material is heavy rock stucco. Colours were explained. Garbage and recycling are screened and located off the lane. Elevations were reviewed. Setbacks conform to single family homes to the east.

The Landscape Architect stated that the garden areas were designed to provide private, well composed vistas from each patient room. Plants have been selected to create visual access to the garden while maintaining privacy for patients. Patient / visitor access to the garden was explained. The garden outside the sacred space has a water feature and is

designed to be a private area. The staff lounge and grief counselling office will each have an outdoor area; this will be separated from the private area.

Permeable paving is used at the walkways and entrances throughout the site. Other features through the gardens include raised planters for a herb garden outside the kitchen, and outdoor fireplace area at the north side. The pedestrian entrance will be off 14th Street. Existing lawn and trees at Shakespeare House to the west will be maintained.

Sustainable design features include stormwater retention, passive design for shading, natural ventilation and day lighting. The project will not be going for official LEED certification but will follow LEED guidelines.

Questions from the Panel included, but were not limited to:

- Why single storey building?
- Is building 'future-proofed' to expand upward? - Yes
- Two foot hedges shown but Landscape Architect said 6 foot hedge would be used to screen – which will be used?
- Does the access lane to the site need to be upgraded?
- What is the type of development to the east?
- Do setbacks at 14th Street comply with the street?
- Height of the main roof compared to Shakespeare House?
- Any significant trees on the site of the hospice?
- Does parking at lane impact properties to the south?
- Has area west of the site been considered from a CPTED point of view?
- Can hedge plantings or fence be selected to address security on 14th?
- Is landscape lighting to be included?
- Is there access from the rear into the private garden?

Comments from the Panel included, but were not limited to:

- Good project.
- North elevation handled well.
- Elevation to the west tries to mimic the Shakespeare House but other side has no response to single family house next door.
- Support project – useful facility for the City.
- Horizontal design reflects peace and calm.
- Landscape thoroughly thought out.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for Lions Gate Hospice (Cannon Design) and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Unanimously Carried

A. Hii declared a conflict of interest and left the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

5. 602 – 608 Forbes Avenue - Rezoning

A. Hii entered the meeting as a member of the delegation at 6:48 p.m.

The Development Planner gave an overview of the proposal to consolidate two existing sites, currently zoned RT-1, and change to a CD-zone in order to add a fifth unit which will be built to Level 3 Adaptable Design.

The Chair read the resolution passed by the Advisory Planning Commission on November 14, 2007 in support of this proposal. Levels 1, 2 and 3 Adaptable Design were outlined.

A. Hii - Architect, B. Curtis - Designer and, T. Berrettoni – Owner, were introduced and the Architect reviewed the location and context of the area. Currently two duplexes sit on these adjoining lots with a shared central courtyard and parking underneath the buildings. Landscaping through the site and in the courtyard was described.

The applicant wishes to consolidate the properties and build an additional unit at the rear of the site. Vehicle access to the garage adjoining the new unit will be from the lane. Landscape modifications will provide handicapped access from the front of the site with weather protection along the walkway through the courtyard. Exterior finishing material for the new unit will be cement board but colours have not been determined at this point.

Questions from the Panel included, but were not limited to:

- Materials to be used at columns?
- Could an elevator be added to provide underground parking for this unit to allow creation of an open space rather than having the garage attached to the accessible unit. – could an elevator be added at underground parking and create open space?
- Finish on existing units?
- What is current condition of rear yard and soil depth at slab?
- Is it more appropriate to have low planting rather than trees?
- Do double doors from the garage open 180 degrees?
- Are any changes planned for existing units?
- What is the purpose of “open to parking below”?
- Will exhaust from parking impact on opening windows in east unit?
- Are the existing units stratified rental?

Comments from the Panel included, but were not limited to:

- Interesting project – well thought out.
- Bay window in bedroom not needed for light – could be a projecting window with sidelights.
- Positive addition, particularly the enhanced entry into courtyard.
- Recommend that type and size of planting on the slab receive careful consideration.
- Unit is tightly squeezed in.
- Making to changes to other building bays at northeast compromises the new unit and change would make it better scheme.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 602 – 608 Forbes Avenue (A. Hii, Architect) and recommends approval, subject to approval by the Development Planner, of the architectural response to the overlook between the bedroom of the new unit to the living room of the existing unit 608B;

AND THAT the Development Planner ensure that appropriate planting depth is addressed and clear landscape approach is maintained.

Unanimously Carried

6. 180 West Esplanade – Rezoning

The Development Planner gave an overview of the development proposal at the southwest of the Time development.

P.J. Mallen, Project Designer, and M Vaughan, Landscape Architect were introduced and the Designer advised that the applicant proposes to demolish the existing building and build a two storey build on the site with two small retail units on the east side of the building, with a bank at the corner of Esplanade and Chesterfield and restaurant with patio on the second level. Building design addresses the Time development to the north with use of glass, stone and concrete and greys, blacks and browns to create muted tone.

Five parking stalls are located off the lane to the north but additional parking will be available at the Time development. Roof is a light/heat design rather than a full green roof and overhang and glazing will address shading

Mark Vaughan, who was also the Landscape Architect for The Time project, explained how the design for the new building addresses the green roof at the plaza level on Time Building. The street treatment will be maintained.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- How does landscape design come to the edge?
- Depth of the soil at roofscape?
- Parking – lane is one way for trucks to loading area – is this acceptable?
- Where do patrons park?
- Why not add another storey to this building?

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Like rock crop design on the roof – good transition to project at Time roof.
- Steep grade and resolution may be a challenge.
- Works with existing Time building.
- Colouring too architecturally cool.
- Big improvement to that corner and the area.
- Good to see architects and developers treat the roof – good for residents and nice way to end the block.
- Nice subtle gesture to the corner.
- Support the scheme – good solution to the corner and like the roof treatment.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 180 West Esplanade (Mallen Architecture Inc) and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Unanimously Carried

7. 346 East 8th Street - Rezoning (Heritage with Infill)

The Chair read the resolution passed by the ADP at the previous presentation and asked the delegation to address the points raised by the Panel. It was noted that the existing house is listed on the City's secondary heritage register.

M. McMains and I. McDonald, Designers, and M. McKenzie, Landscape Designer, were introduced. It was noted that the lane issue has not yet been resolved.

M. McMains explained the revisions which addressed the Panel's earlier comments:

- At the front door the door entry has been recessed to provide weather protection and create presence and a lighter and brighter colour has been selected.
- Garbage and recycling is located to the back of the building with pavers down the side to the driveway for pick-up.
- Materials board circulated to the Panel – natural stain for lower area and darker for above with dark green for trim and sage green for door.
- Displayed PowerPoint renderings of project from :
 - deck of existing house
 - street at East 8th
 - neighbouring house
 - from properties to the east
- Articulation of east façade addressed by addition of small window and taller window in master closet.

Landscape Designer reviewed the revisions which address:

- delineation of the two sites by use of native plantings.
- addition of ground level lighting along the path, and
- light post acting as unit marker and entry to the rear unit.

The applicant will be applying for a variance for two parking spots rather than 1.5 required. At the present time there is no parking on the site.

Questions from the Panel included, but were not limited to:

- Like the minimalist design but have concern with recessed gutter and ventilation of roof space. Invites problems with water over roof space.
- Is a structural engineer involved in this project – concern with north/south section.
- Can significant retaining wall supporting driveway be done without encroaching on City property?

- Is entrance to the rear unit from the front street through the driveway?
- Is there a suite in the existing house?
- This is in 300 block – is it zoned for duplex?
- Is this a concrete chimney ?

Comments from the Panel included, but were not limited to:

- Two storey infill at the lane can be difficult.
- Deck is at the north side and may create water problems. If building is rotated at upper floor it would be beneficial to residents and maintain views.
- Earlier comments of the ADP have been addressed.
- Excited about this project.
- Details at parapet need close attention.
- Like the composition with the two elements and the juxtaposition of the levels.
- Gutters will need to be addressed carefully.
- Addressed comments – support project.
- Parking is an issue now. Parking could go further into the site, by reducing deck and making parking spaces.

Applicant's Comments:

The neighbour to the west is opposed to having a driveway next to his deck at the back. Parking at the rear would impact on privacy between the two units.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 346 East 8th Street (I.R. McDonald & M. McMains) and recommends approval. The Panel commends the applicant for the presentation and manner in which previous concerns have been addressed, including the addition of a digital model and materials board.

Carried
- 1 Opposed

8. 648 West 15th Street

The Development Planner advised that a previous development proposal for this property was rejected by Council. Comments at that Public Hearing indicated that neighbours did not like the design and the lot was too small for a duplex since it is 40' wide rather than 50'.

M. Rahbar referred to the site and the existing house and advised that the owner has decided to proceed with another project to build a detached house at the front of the site and an infill at the rear. Have discussed conceptual design with neighbours to build a small house at the front with infill at the rear. A variance for setbacks is being requested.

The Designer advised that the architectural character and massing conforms with the original house. The house at the front of the lot is approximately 1,500 sq. ft on two levels plus a cellar. There is a 5 foot setback on the east side and an 8 foot on west side which will also provide access to the rear unit. The front unit has an outdoor patio to the south and garden area at the rear and the rear infill has a south facing patio with landscaping to

address privacy. Entry to the rear unit is from the side. Three parking spaces are provided at the lane. One space will be assigned to each unit and There will be one visitor stall.

Interior layouts were explained and it was noted that no exterior cellar access is provided. A proposed stone face retaining wall at the street to conforms with walls on neighbouring sites. Garages are set back 5 feet from the lane.

Questions from the Panel included, but were not limited to:

- Exterior finishes on infill south elevation?
- What is meant by “heavy weight or equal” asphalt - 40 years?
- Access on the east side of the infill appears to be coming through rear yard of unit - how does this work?
- Landscape plan shows pavers – will path be sloped or stepped?
- How do people walk past the garbage area – very narrow?
- Would concrete curbing around the perimeter of crushed gravel parking be considered?
- Could each path be dedicated to a particular unit?

Comments from the Panel included, but were not limited to:

- Front unit south elevation – doors and windows seem oddly proportioned.
- Drawings are challenging – consider alternate drafting plan.
- Building would benefit from trim band around the building to tidy elements.
- Rationale for projecting beams at roof overhangs is unclear.
- Massaging window placements and other elements would benefit balance.
- Main entrance to infill and window do not seem to be in line with the gable.
- Overall have no problem with massing and forms but problem with clarity of drawings.
- Not sure if you are having window trim - size of trim is not clear. Some inconsistencies :
 - Window detail inconsistent,
 - fascia boards some have second layer of trim and others do not,
 - three different pitches at roof.
- Grades for access at garages need to be adjusted.
- Looks like a group of different buildings joined together – inconsistent.
- Needs cohesion.

Applicant's comments:

Agree that double fascia trim board should be used.

Bathroom windows at infill will be addressed.

Middle parking accesses directly into the rear unit. Will address access for visitors.

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 648 West 15th Street (Vernacular Design) and thanks the applicant for the resubmission. The Panel feels that the following concerns have not been adequately resolved or explained:

- **Detail and massing;**
- **Architectural consistency;**
- **Allow better separation and access to front unit.**

Unanimously Carried

The Designer asked for clarification of the point on massing raised in the resolution. The Panel discussed this further and a second resolution was made.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 648 West 15th Street (Vernacular Design) and recommends approval, subject to approval by the Development Planner, of:

- **The treatment of the elevations of both buildings;**
- **Consistent treatment of windows, trim, and roof pitch.**

**Carried
4 for / 2 Opposed**

9. Other Business

(a) Meeting of Joint Advisory Bodies – ADP / APC / HAC

The meeting was reminded of the Joint Advisory Body meeting to be held on Wednesday, December 5, 2007 at 5:30 p.m. at City Hall to receive a presentation and prepare recommendations to Council on Lower Lonsdale Site 8 / Foot of Lonsdale.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, December 12, 2007.

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2007\2007 11 21.doc