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, October 17th, 2012

M I N U T E S

Present: B. Allen
         K. Bracewell, R.C.M.P
         B. Harrison
         K. Kallweit Graham
         Y. Khalighi
         J. Marshall
         M. Messer
         M. Saii
         Councillor Bell

Staff: C. Purvis, Development Planner
       C. Perry, Supervisor, Engineering Services
       S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk
       S. Smith, Planner, Community Development

Guests: 330 West 14th (Rezoning Application)
         Augustine Hii, Augustine Hii Architecture
         Bill Curtis, Bill Curtis & Associates Design Ltd.
         Spartak Kirov, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd.
         Norman Yu, Owner

Absent: J. O'Brien
        S. McFarlane

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held September 19th, 2012

   It was regularly moved and seconded

   THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held September 19th, 2012
   be adopted.

   Carried Unanimously

2. Business Arising

   Design Awards on the agenda.
3. Staff Update

S. Smith gave the staff update in C. Purvis' absence:

Projects

320 Tempe Crescent, Bow Residence: This DVP request to realign the property line was reviewed at the September 17th Council meeting. The Bow Residence, a heritage building, will be preserved and relocated on the lot. The Public Meeting was waived on October 15th. It was adopted on October 15th.

420 Tempe Crescent: This application for a coach house added to a property with a two bedroom bed and breakfast in the principal dwelling (1912) had First Reading on September 17th and the Public Hearing on October 15th when it received Second and Third Hearing.

Harry Jerome: On October 1st Council direct staff to present options for Harry Jerome to the community by November 30th including approximately 350,000 sq. ft. of private development to assist in paying for the project.

127-133 East 3rd Street: This had its Public Hearing on October 15th and had Second and Third Readings.

243 East 18th Street: On October 15th a staff report requesting guidance on how to proceed was reviewed by Council. The original Rezoning Application was to retain the Vickery Residence Supplemental Heritage Building and add a new infill building. The applicant now wishes to demolish the Vickery Residence and build a duplex per the existing RT-1 zone. Council directed staff to continue processing the original Rezoning Application.

Canadian Downtowns Project: On October 1st Council directed staff to proceed with the Downtowns Project. Undertaken by Canadian Urban Institute, a Toronto based non-profit organization focussed on improving urban regions. It will highlight trends, changes and attitudes towards Canadian downtowns overtime and establish benchmarks to assess performance.

Municipal WiFi Vision and Shaw Exo Proposal: On October 15th Council directed staff to negotiate an agreement with Shaw Communications to allow the Shaw EXO service to be implemented on City infrastructure, and that staff develop a long term Municipal WiFi Vision for consideration by Council.

Central Waterfront: On October 15th Council directed staff to proceed with the Foot of Lonsdale soils stabilization/deck replacement project based on the anticipated removal/relocation/replacement of the existing Cates Shed, and to release the Central Waterfront Stakeholders Workshop Notes and resulting Concept Plans to the public for review and to advisory bodies for comment.

Funding Appropriations: On October 15th Council did not approve the appropriation of $140,000 from the General Reserve Fund to fund the construction of beach volleyball courts on Lot 5, and funds for the review of RFPs for the business case and exhibit design work for the ongoing study on the concept of a new museum at Site 8. Fund appropriations were approved for a project engineer to work on the Low Level Road and Foot of Lonsdale.
projects, and funds to complete the design and commence remediation of the Foot of Lonsdale Deck.

Councillor Bell added that the $75,000 has already been advanced to the museum commission but that the consultants engaged for the business and exhibition plans may cost more so it was suggested that whole amount be transferred with monies not being spent being returned.

**Policies:**

**Mechanical Insulation and Passive Design Best Practices:** On October 1st the Deputy Director, Community Development submitted a report to Council recommending that mechanical insulation best practices continued to be encouraged for all construction projects in the City, and that the Sustainable Development Guidelines be revised to encourage mechanical insulation and passive design best practices, and that a North Shore passive Design Users Guide be developed if outside funding was secured.

**Council Activity**

**Seniors Taking Action:** On October 1st, a Delegation from Seniors Taking Action and the Lionsview Seniors Planning Society presented the key findings from the North Shore Seniors Today Survey. Council directed staff to include a section on age-friendly planning in the draft OCP and provided some goals and objectives, reporting back to Council.

**Food System Design and Implementation Plan for SW BC:** On October 1st a Delegation presented the Food System Design and Implementation Plan for SW BC. A staff rep will work with them and Council gave $12,000 from the council contingency fund to support it.

**NV Aquatics Users Group:** On October 1st a Delegation from the NV Aquatic Users Group presented their business case for a 50 m pool at the Harry Jerome Recreation Complex. Staff were directed to explore this option and report back to Council, with the incremental capital and operating cost of a 50m pool (v 25m) be met by non-city sources.

**2012 Climate and Energy Action Award:** The Public Sector Collaboration award was presented to the City at the October 15th Council meeting. This award was for the LEC and School District 44 Education Service Centre/Arts for Kids project, which showcases a geothermal heat pump system and recycling of surplus heat.

The City also was awarded an Honorable mention for its energy efficient buildings density bonussing initiative. This is the first time a municipality has won two awards in the same year.

* M. Messer joined the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

4. **CityShaping Update**

S. Smith gave an update on the CityShaping process. Urban design is a key component of the “sense of places” section in the Official Community Plan. The Panel was encouraged to attend the upcoming CityShaping events.

**Action:** Panel members to provide feedback on the CityShaping reports and on any events they attend.
C. Purvis joined the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

5. 330 West 14th Street – Rezoning Application

Staff provided background on the presentation which proposes a three unit residential unit. It will be the first three-unit building on the north side of the block; there are others on the southern side. Staff asked for the Panel’s input on the interface with the adjacent heritage building, the massing and the landscaping integration with the architecture.

Augustine Hii, Augustine Hii Architecture, presented the project to the Panel:

- The project is in an area which is changing from single family to multi-use and is on the periphery of a low density area as designated by the OCP.
- It is next to a dominant heritage building.
- The site is 50 x 140 feet with a gentle slope.
- The proposal is for a three unit two-storey building with a cellar facing West 14th Street.
- All units have outdoor living space with a three-car garage at the rear plus two surface parking stalls as well as a bicycle storage and recycling area.
- The front elevation is consistent with the neighbouring buildings.
- The design does not compete with the heritage building but respects its scale.
- Durable materials in a neutral colour scheme with an accent colour are used.
- The neighbouring building to the west does not have any windows, the heritage building does have windows facing the project but there is a distance of 20 feet.

Spartak Kirov, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd., spoke to the landscape plan:

- The frontage planting is low with mid height patio screening.
- Predominately native plants and species with drought tolerance are used.
- The existing fence to the east of the property will be retained; a fence will be installed on the west of the property.
- Visibility from the street to the rear unit is maintained.
- Side yards are configured to minimise the impact on the existing two trees.
- Storm water management includes permeable paving parking stalls and a rain garden in the lower portion of the site.
- The rear of the development is enclosed by hedging and shrubs with access through a gated trellis.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- What is the setback from the heritage building? A: More than 25 feet.
- Did you address the look of the heritage building? A: We wanted to respect the building and took cues from other buildings keeping the massing and scale consistent with the rest of the streetscape.
- How does the circulation work from the garage and parking areas to the individual units, particularly to the front unit? A: Along the side.
- How will ferns discourage access to the cellars and main floor windows? A: It is low ground cover and low shrubs; the density of the planting will help.
- Why did you choose compact fluorescent lights rather than LED lights? A: I think we have chosen LED lights.
- How will you monitor separation in the garage? A: It will depend on how the units are marketed. The requirement is for 4.5 parking stalls which we provide.
- Are both the existing trees hemlocks? A: One fir and one hemlock.
- Will you be able to retain the trees with the excavation? A: Yes, that is why the building is set back.
- Is there a survey for the project? There are no elevations in the plan. A: We have a survey so can provide them.
- Do you have building grades? A: Yes.

Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:

- There is no context plan provided per ADP requirements.
- There is a liveability issue; the bedrooms do not have much natural light as they are in shadow from the heritage building. There is a lot of shadow on the east elevation.
- I am concerned about the roots of the hemlock during construction.
- I am not convinced that the site has enough grade for the rain garden. How will it work with the infiltration areas? It is important to provide storm water management plan.
- I like the design and am not opposed to the form and character but there are liveability issues: it is tight. It is cramped with a three-plex. Circulation is tight. The existing trees will die during construction. Staff: Would an arborists report before and after help? A: It will not save the hemlock, perhaps the fir; they should be replaced with appropriate trees.
- Access from parking to the first unit will be a problem. Three cars sharing the garage will be challenging.
- The materials are a little bit industrial.
- The powder room off the kitchen is awkward. The interior is tightly planned. I struggle with the planning of the long narrow unit.
- I like the three decent-sized outdoor terraces.
- The project does meet CPTED guidelines for natural surveillance and territoriality.
- To summarize there are concerns about liveability, the tightness of the planning, storm water management, grading issues, tree retention, circulation, window placement. The project is trying too hard. There is positive support around general landscaping and the patios.
- A duplex and coach house would give more ease to the units and better unit plans.
- You have done a fairly good job with the massing but there is too much going on in terms of materials and an awkward resolution of roofs. The neighbouring property is more simple. I support the aesthetic. There are real concerns around forms and massing and whether the concept is the right one for the site.

There was a question from Staff to the Panel about the front setback and planting and less generous lawn at the front. It was noted that the layout would probably be replicated in future developments as it is private space for the front unit. Less lawn is good. A lot of the planting is deciduous so there will not be privacy in the winter, should it be hedging or a fence?

Presenter's comments:

- Concerning liveability: we really worked with setbacks on the east side and have pulled back quite significantly.
- When we were developing the project we did consider alternatives. It is important to keep the two trees and we were quite sensitive of the proximity of the building to those trees even to the extent of hand digging to do our best to retain them. Three units is in keeping with what is happening in the area.
It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 330 West 14th Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the following issues:

- The liveability of the individual units;
- A reassessment of the site planning concept;
- Reconsidering the landscape viability in terms of the trees, grading and the appropriateness of the plant selection;
- Reconsidering the number and nature of façade materials.

The Panel requests that the applicant consider providing information on neighbourhood context in elevation and plan view, and a 3D representation as part of their re-submission.

Carried Unanimously

S. Smith, K. Bracewell and C. Perry left the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

There was a short break at 7:05 p.m.
The meeting reconvened at 7:15 p.m.

6. **2012 Design Awards**

A Panel member suggested that in the future there could be an item on the agenda as to whether a project had the potential of a design award. The package could then be retained for consideration.

The Panel then reviewed the shortlist of projects and removed several from consideration.

Action: Staff to gather further information on the shortlisted projects.

7. **Other Business**

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, November 21st, 2012.