

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 17, 2007**

---

**MINUTES**

---

- Present:** D. Lee, Chair  
N. Paul  
D. Rose  
R. Spencer  
P. Winterburn-Chilton
- Staff:** G. Venczel, Development Planner  
E. Maillie, Committee Secretary
- Guests:** T. Billinger – Arca Design Studio Inc  
D. Luce – CDM Lightworks  
I. MacDonald – Designer  
M. McMains – Designer  
D. Wolstenhome – Owner  
M. Rahbar - Designer  
J. Sawa – Owner
- Absent:** K. Terris  
A. Hii, Vice Chair  
A. MacIntosh  
K. Hanvey  
B. Dabiri  
Councillor R. Heywood
- 

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

**1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held September 19, 2007**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held September 19, 2007 be adopted.**

**Unanimously Carried**

**2. Business Arising**

None

**3.**

## **Staff Update**

### **(a) 1400 Bewicke Avenue**

Council deferred this application until all members of Council are present.

#### **4. 200 W. Esplanade – Cladding Revision**

The Development Planner gave an overview of the proposed changes to the building cladding and exterior lighting.

T. Billinger, Arca Design, advised that the owner wishes to update the building, particularly around the major tenant, a theatre company. D. Luce, of CDM Lightworks, is designing the lighting system for the project.

Mr. Billinger reviewed photographs of the existing building exterior and advised that the owner proposes to mount 8' x 5' sheets of perforated stainless steel on the concrete face of the building and the concrete columns at the street. The existing stucco will be painted. Materials and colour boards were reviewed. It was explained that the stainless steel banding at the base and columns will minimize graffiti.

The proposed LED lighting system meets LEED standard. This system does not burn out, is energy efficient, fully programmable and minimizes glare onto surrounding sites. The lighting application was demonstrated and it was confirmed that colour change feature will be limited to use at the face of the building with static lighting at the canopy.

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

- How many rope lights will there be in a series?
- Will transformer boxes be visible?
- Has scheme been reviewed by other tenants on the main floor?
- Will existing signage on face of the building be removed and relocated?
- Will existing glazing remain?
- Stainless steel perforations – possible for oil canning?
- Is there a plan for the North wall which is blank?
- Does flashing need to be black; could it match the stainless steel?

#### **Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- Like the use of lighting to upgrade the building.
- East and south elevations are primarily office space and should not have much impact on neighbours.
- Not convinced with plan. Rendering showing yellow on top and green on bottom is surreal and could look great or tacky. Building is not outstanding.
- If theatre comes in with different marquee or signage it could impair the project.
- LED lighting can be changed to address colours and saturations.
- Would be useful to see other applications of this nature.
- Lighting is interesting and believe it will work well.
- Lighting is expected at a theatre.
- Recommend that north elevation at recess be painted with vibrant colours.

- Support the project.
- Believe that the proposal respects the existing architecture and will make it more interesting.
- Support the proposal but concerned with comment that this is the least profitable theatre which may be attributable to lack of parking in this area.
- Concerned that sign is being prepared independently of the cladding.

The Development Planner advised that if a Development Variance Permit is required for the new theatre signage the Panel will have an opportunity to review the proposal.

**Applicant's comments:**

- Owner is considering the purchase of the lot behind for parking and other uses.
- North elevation ugly and will consider recommendation to paint it.
- Not aware of any other building in the City that has used this lighting system but lighting system is used extensively in other areas and is subtle.
- Panels conceal lighting and wires and epoxy is used to mount them on the concrete walls.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the cladding revision for 200 West Esplanade (Arca Design Studio Incorporated) and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for the presentation.**

**The Panel also recommends that the black flashing be change to a colour complementary to the stainless steel panels.**

**Unanimously Carried**

**5. 346 East 8<sup>th</sup> Street – Rezoning (Heritage with Infill)**

The Development Planner gave an overview of the infill project and context of the area. The existing house on the site is listed on the City's Secondary Heritage List. There is no rear access to the site and no existing parking. The applicant is proposing tandem parking with street access on the west side of the existing heritage house.

I. MacDonald and M. McMains – Designers, and D. Wolstenhome – owner were introduced. Mr. MacDonald reviewed the location of the existing house on the lot and proposed infill project. The location of the site and its proximity to public transit makes increased density appropriate in this area. The elevations of the infill project were explained. Massing and height of the building are designed to reflect the existing house. Outdoor deck areas were explained.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the planting detail along the pathway and at the berm which provide separation and privacy between the houses. Sustainability is addressed through use of native plantings, permeable pavers and gravel at the rear walkways. Landscaping design emphasizes delineation between the lots.

No materials board was provided but the applicant advised that a natural siding will be used. A green building product is being sought for the roof.

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

- How will construction access and protection of the large trees be handled?
- Distance between trees?
- Are architectural elevations complete?
- Style of glazing?
- How will tandem parking work?
- How is the second floor deck on infill screened to the north and west?
- Exterior finishes – cladding, colour scheme?
- Why are there no windows on east elevation?
- Location of garbage and recycling area?
- Will there be pathway lighting to the rear of the site?
- Do kitchen and living room only have north/south windows?

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

- Need fenestration on the east elevation to introduce natural light.
- House does not seem to be resolved.
- Having no windows on east elevation is acceptable.
- Front door should have more elaborate treatment to create a sense of presence.
- Skylights at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor – may accommodate a vaulted ceiling and provide more floor space.
- Address markers needed at the street entry.
- Like simplicity of the building and landscape and believe a lot of thought has gone into it.
- Parking appropriate for this site to create usable outdoor space for residents.
- Understand the concept but uncomfortable that no sample board is available and drawings are incomplete.
- Peaked roof with box on bottom appear as two architectural styles.
- Need to see more detail on the design.
- Chimneys are off-set and may present better if they are aligned.

**Applicant's comments included:**

- Windows can be added on east elevation.
- Vaulted space is planned over the main floor and master bedroom at skylights.
- Recognize shortcomings with parking location.
- Didn't realize material board was a requirement.
- Front door will be addressed – planter being considered at entry to front door.
- Renderings of houses from front and rear were circulated to the Panel.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 316 East 8<sup>th</sup> Street (I.R. McDonald / M. McMains) and, although supporting the site development concept, feels the following have not been adequately resolved:**

- **Architectural treatment of the building, including the treatment of the front entrance;**
- **Garbage and recycling handling;**
- **Approach access lighting to the rear property;**
- **Material and colour board.**

**Unanimously Carried**

**6. 123 East 3rd Street - Rezoning**

M. Rahbar, Designer, and J. Sawa – Owner, referred to the issues raised at the previous presentation and noted that the following have been addressed:

A Code Consultant was retained and the following actions taken:

- Lower level – no code changes required
- Main floor – exiting addressed
- Exit at addition
- 3<sup>rd</sup> floor – changed to one 2 bedroom suite
- 2<sup>nd</sup> floor – will be converted to one large office
- Seismic upgrades
- Exterior exit stairs
- New guardrails at top floor and stairs to the rear
- Dormers removed
- Roof garden – deck area reduced by pulling it back and planting increased to create a screen

Exterior finishing materials at addition have been revised to reflect finishes on the original building.

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

- Will gooseneck lighting and fabric awning be used at the street?
- Did Code Consultant have any issues with exterior rear stair?
- Will people enter from the rear stair?

There was discussion around the requirement of disability access. It was confirmed that accessibility is difficult to address in heritage buildings and maintaining the heritage value supersedes the disability requirements.

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

- East and west elevations on pages 14 and 15 are different from drawings in presentation material – one shows an overhang and one does not.
- Lack of washrooms for number of seats do not seem to have been addressed.
- Support rezoning to restaurant in this area but don't think the addition is necessary - smaller, intimate restaurant would be appropriate in this location.
- Some issues raised at last meeting have not been addressed.
- Support rear addition.

- Like shade canopies at the back – but may benefit from tension cable effect as used below.
- Landscaping cascading down or climbing up the building is good.
- Support project.
- Support proposal on the assumption that roof does not change other than to be refurbished.
- Brise soleil needs further consideration.
- Drafting issues need to be resolved.
- Washroom requirements will have to be addressed and met.

**Applicant's comments:**

- Washrooms will be on the basement floor with one disability washroom on main.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 123 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street (Vernacular Design) and recommends approval subject to approval by the Development Planner of the following:**

- Further development of the second storey shade structure, noting that it is a shade structure;
- Resolution of the existing roof elevations;
- Confirmation that washroom numbers are adequate.

**Unanimously Carried**

**7. 309 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street – Rezoning**

The Development Planner noted that this is a second presentation in response to ADP concerns. The Heritage Advisory Commission supports the proposal. Staff concerns with the building treatment in a heritage area are being addressed.

M. Rahbar reviewed the changes made:

- Relocation of bedrooms to reduce massing.
- Roof and form revised to reduce massing.
- Single gable facing north for the building to present as single family home.
- Windows will push out to access window boxes.
- Roof form responds to others in the area.
- Roof garden has been reduced.
- Setbacks have been increased from 5 feet to 8.5 feet on each side.
- Den has been added at the third floor.
- Bedroom on main floor relocated to second floor.

Landscape overview –

- Wide entry porches
- Removal of existing trees and new trees planted

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

- Is rendering from previous presentation available?
- What heritage guidelines are being contravened?
- Overarching rooflines have other rooflines tucked underneath – why?
- Bay needs its own overhang.
- Rear has similar issues – windows punched forward with middle arch set back.
- Back seems busy with three peaks – is there an opportunity to reduce roof arches with flat element?
- Location of garbage and recycling enclosure?

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

- Works well – interesting.
- Resolving projections at roof might require revision of the floor plan.
- Roofline angle - asymmetry works well.
- Two trees at the west property line are being retained.
- Do not favour retaining diseased trees or trees too large for the site but it would be good to include deciduous trees at the rear.
- Garage doors open onto lawn - needs hard landscaping to pathway.

**Applicant’s comments:**

- Comments on gables and trees well taken.
- Larger trees will be used

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 309 East 10<sup>th</sup> Street (Vernacular Design) and recommends approval subject to approval by the Development Planner of the following:**

- **Resolution of roof overhangs on the north side;**
- **Resolution of the roof at the rear;**
- **Provision of additional trees;**
- **Provision of walkways leading to the garage.**

**Carried  
1-Opposed**

**8. Other Business**

**(a) Walkabout**

The meeting was reminded of the walkabout scheduled for Saturday, October 20. The group will meet at 9:30 a.m. at the PGE station at the foot of Lonsdale.

**(b) Public Art Update**

The Public Art Representative distributed an information update on the City's Public Art Program.

**(c) Development Planner**

The Panel confirmed that they appreciate the Development Planner giving an overview of the process of the project.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, November 21, 2007.

---

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2007\2007 10 17 E.doc