

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 the Atrium Meeting Room on Wednesday, October 17th, 2018**

MINUTES

- Present:** B. Harrison
N. Petrie
K. Bracewell, RCMP
M. Messer
J-P. Mahé
B. Jones
B. Phillips
- Staff:** J. Braithwaite, Development Technician
M. Friesen, Planner
B. Hurley, Planner
R. Fish, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** 519 East 1st Street – Moodyville Phase 3
Padraig McMorro, IBI Group
Smitha Vidyasagar, IBI Group
Martin Bruckner, IBI Group
Sofie MacNeill, PWL
Grant Brumpton, PWL
Edmund Siqueira, Wall Financial
- 339-349 East 13th Street (Rezoning Application)
Joe Muego, Hearth Architectural Inc.
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd.
Marco De Cotiis, Cobblestone Fina Development Group
- Absent:** C. McLeod
W. Chong
K. Yushmanova
-

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:34 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held September 19th, 2018

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held September 19th, 2018 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. Business Arising

None.

3. Staff Update

None.

4. 519 East 1st Street – Moodyville Phase 3

This application at 519 East 1st Street for a development permit under the East 3rd Street Area (Moodyville) DPA Guidelines is returning to the panel for review with requested changes and with a shift in typology to its eastern-most building. The project was seen by this panel on July 18th 2018, where the applicant team was asked to return with changes based on the following resolution:

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the development permit application for 519 East 1st Street – Moodyville Phase 3 and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below:

- Consideration towards additional separation between Buildings B+F and C+E and align with the lane as much as possible;
- Step back the façade of Building D at eastern property edge per the Design Guidelines;
- Further design development of the exterior access stairs;
- Consider using battered and angled landscape walls where possible to soften the stepping down of the site, creating more variety and interest;
- Encouraged to bring down the edges at the west side if possible;
- Consider providing more amenity space and family orientated programming, or enhance current amenities to connect to the rest of the site and be readily shared;
- Further development of the amenity areas and the stairs and suites that flank and access them. Consider the fenestration of the hallway and suites adjacent to the central amenity area;
- Ensure the visitor parking is separate from the residential parking while including a safe route to the bike storage room;
- Include a well laid out and clear unit identification plan with attention to the needs of emergency responders;
- Ensure all public spaces are well lit and have clear lines of sight to reflect CPTED principles;
- Consider adding natural light into the service areas, parking areas, stairwells as well as garbage and recycling rooms;
- Encourage working with the City to retain large onsite trees;
- Consider a wider variety of colour in the planting selection;
- Introducing more shade elements on the south facing glazing and identify appropriate rain protection overhangs elsewhere;
- Consider shared roof access to the greenspaces on Building A; and
- Present the silos in the context of the site to demonstrate the relationship of the grain elevators with the buildings.

The Panel looks forward to reviewing the applicant's response at a future meeting.

Carried Unanimously

There has been a change to the 6 building development's density from 1.40 to 1.46 FSR. The proposed number of units has also increased to 143 from 134. A number of shifts have occurred to the landscape and building expressions, particularly on the centre of the site. However, the primary change that has occurred is that the 3 unit townhouse set on the eastern end of the site is now a 5 storey 10 unit apartment stack.

Staff is seeking the Panel's input regarding the following:

- The quality and effectiveness of the revised design in terms of its responses to the Resolutions and comments provided at the July 18th ADP Meeting;
- Specific care and responses regarding the form, character, access, and impact of the proposed New Building D;
- The design, façade, and architectural vernacular of each of the buildings with their new orientations and configuration;
- The overall massing and form of each building as it relates to both the street edge, greenway edges, and the internal spaces of the proposed development;
- Quality of the overall landscape plan, pedestrian circulation, as well as, transitions between common and private outdoor spaces, with particular comment on the quality and effectiveness of the responses towards the interior courtyards and shared open spaces;
- The interface with the neighbouring house to the East and properties across the lane to the West;
- The design quality of the proposed 3-level parking structure on this development and the landscape;
- Design regarding sustainability and energy performance goals; and the
- Quality of livability and CPTED responses for the townhouses and apartments in this proposal.

Staff asked the Panel for feedback on how well the applicant responded to the July 18th motion and if the changes introduce additional comments.

Martin Bruckner, IBI Group, reviewed the response to the resolution:

- Buildings F and E are parallel to the lane to create space between the buildings.
- Accessible walkway through site to Spirit Trail.
- Created a focus with the landscaping.
- Creating identity and visual interest with colours and textures.
- We increased the side yard of Building D to 12ft.
- Creating more variety of what's offered regarding building type with a four level building.
- Materiality is similar to metal panel and fiber cement panel.
- Large windows for natural light are introduced in the staircases to enhance and encourage active use of stairs.
- Greater sense of transparency.
- Additional amenity space on the roof of level 3, Building A.
- Created a play space to the west of the greenway and within view of the Spirit Trail.
- Provided security separation for visitor parking.

Grant Brumpton, PWL Partnership, reviewed the landscape plan:

- Diversified the plant material and included native plants.
- 16 flowering plants, 9 shrubs.
- We identified areas where we could include a stone finish accent and battered walls without using up valuable space to enhance the character of the walls.
- We added two different types of wayfinding and a series of elements to help find friends and wayfinding columns.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- If someone parks in the parkade, how do they get to their unit? Is there only one elevator? **A:** Yes, then they walk across.
- Was there any consideration given to illuminating access from the bottom floor creating less of a dark narrow corridor? **A:** We can look at this.
- Are the roofs on the south townhouse accessible? **A:** There is stair access.
- Buildings B, C, E and F all have rooftop patio access.
- What is the extent of the battered and angled landscape walls? **A:** We tried to keep them as feature elements in prominent focal areas. We want to be space efficient.
- What are you doing with passive shading and reducing thermal load? **A:** The buildings are designed to a high thermal standard with high performing walls and windows. We introduced overhangs at the top and eyebrow features.
- Building D upper floor is larger than it's supposed to be. Is there a setback on the 5th floor? **A:** The mass of the building is set back further than the setback requirement.
- Staff: Any building over 4 stories is required that after a 4 storey frontage, it steps in. The upper south east unit would have setback guidelines to ensure that it doesn't express as a 5 storey building on the south.
- What is the grade change in the back of Building E? Is it a full storey to the north on the south side of Building C? **A:** It's close to 2 storeys.
- What is the use of the space between Buildings D and C? **A:** This is a flexible use area that can support light activities, kids play and is a community gathering space.
- Staff: We haven't done a review of the space and greenway. We are looking to have that space seem more public. There will be changes to this.
- Can you comment on the intention of the open spaces between the massing of Building A? **A:** It offers a direct connection to the interior amenity space and a second space that is semi-public and private. There are shared connections to the buildings, it is a circulation space with gathering areas and a connection to the Spirit Trail.
- Can you talk about the materiality and how interfaces work between panels and windows? How the edges work? **A:** Flat face and painted to match recess trim to make the background colours lighter. Accent colours are corrugated metal and we added more neutral colours with a larger variety in the massing and form. Apartment materiality is vertical brick with red accenting and silver coloured panels at the higher level. Building D picks up similar colours, light and dark defines the corners.
- To staff: what is the final outcome of the public art plan, is there one? **A:** For Moodyville in general it is associated with the parks group. The general response is that it is external from this development.
- Is there an opportunity to put glazing in that is screened by the vines where the parking and storage is? **A:** Yes.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Responses to our resolution were well handled but the richness of the landscape could be looked at further with the treatment of the walls.
- Staircases in Building A are concerning in their verticality.
- There will be a lot of solar heat gain, incorporate some kind of passive shade technique.
- Density translating in to livability is a concern. Internal circulation needs to be looked at; how to get from parking to unit. Consider adding more elevators.
- You can fill in the “ravine” at the pinch point, there will be a huge wall on the north side. Address this issue to address livability and CPTED issues.
- Consider the programming of outdoor spaces, getting people out of their units and at grade, to the street.
- Create a reason to go to the public open space. It could be a piece of public art.
- Make sure all stairwells are a minimum of 4.5ft wide to make them feel open.
- There’s a concern with the pinch point. Change the grading to flip the units to have access on the second floor instead of first floor.
- Concern Building D is massive in scale and relationship to the building beside it.
- The walkway between Building B, C, D and E need to be looked at. Ensure appropriate lighting in the “ravine”, pay attention to lighting the areas at night.
- Adding some windows in the parkade wall will help enhance the utilitarian areas. At night the light coming through will help illuminate those spaces at night.

Presenter’s comments:

- Thank you for all the comments.
- We will look at the top floor of Building D.
- The circle yard area is made for the view, there needs to be more programming.
- We can make the narrow space better and improve security and fenestration.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 519 East 1st Street – Moodyville Phase 3 and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Review the ‘ravine’ between buildings B-C and E-F at their pinch point either through elevating the grade, adding more planting and/or varying a combination of elements to reduce the overall effect of the tall flanking façades;
- Include appropriate nighttime lighting in the ‘ravine’;
- Include integrated lighting along the pathways;
- Encourage exit stairway width dimensions to be wider. E.g. 1.2 - 1.4m (4 - 4.5ft) to ensure a more public character and use;
- Review exterior landscape wall and parking garage exterior wall treatments;
- Explore the potential use of glazing on these walls to bring natural light into the parking areas which in turn will provide lighting from the parking areas to the public space beyond at night;
- Consider the addition of more elevators to mitigate internal circulation issues when travelling from areas of the parkade to the units and work towards clarifying vertical circulation from parkade to units above;
- Consider reducing the overall massing of Building D;

- Further resolve potential overlook and massing issues to Building D's neighbouring property;
- Review the Moodyville Guidelines with respect to Building Ds top floor setback requirement;
- Further design development to consider programming of public, semi-public, and shared open spaces;
- Incorporate more texture in the walls close to grade so to be more tactile and battered at the focal points; and
- Review the use of passive solar shading techniques on south facing windows.

AND THAT the Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

**Carried
5 in favour
1 against**

B. Jones joined the meeting at 6:57 p.m.

5. 339-349 East 13th Street (Rezoning Application)

The proposed applicant is returning to the Advisory Design Panel. The applicant presented their proposal on June 20th, 2018. At that time the panel determined that approval of the application was not recommended, and the following resolution was carried unanimously:

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 339-349 East 13th Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below:

- Develop circulation around the site for increased CPTED considerations regarding territoriality, lighting and clear unit identification for first responders;
- Inclusion of a comprehensive grading and lighting plan;
- Review of the narrow walkway between west and central garages;
- Consider the separation of the properties with a fence or plant material to address territoriality issues;
- Review opportunities for overlook and privacy issues between units;
- Further design development of scale and sense of place with consideration of a common community area for gathering;
- Address site planning and floorplan layout issues around livability, including room size and access of basements;
- Further definition of street presence and how the buildings work in tandem as well as individually;
- Explore varying colour options and detailing of the façades;
- Consider the removal of exterior access stairs to the basements, or better defend their inclusion;
- Review the landscape plan thoroughly with respect to circulation, lighting and plant material;
- Ensure all plants are legible on the landscape plan;
- Include tree management report;
- Consider the use of pavers for the pathways;
- Include a storm water management plan;
- Review building placement in response to the removal of the trees;
- Develop a more detailed sketch up model; and

- Ensure the overall submission package is presented cohesively.

AND THAT The Panel looks forward to reviewing the applicant's response at a future meeting.

Staff asked the Panel for feedback on how well the applicant responded to the June 20th motion and if the changes introduce additional comments.

Joe Muego, Hearth Architectural Inc., reviewed the response to the resolution:

- We looked at internal planning issues, materiality and colours.
- We did a complete change with the landscape and developed it to accentuate the placements of the buildings.
- There was more value to push the buildings forward to 22ft to East 13th.
- We separated the parking area for a more shared sense of ownership with the parking garage.
- We refined the models and differentiated them with materials and colours.
- We re-planned the bedrooms and populated them with double beds with enough space for drawers.
- We closed the narrow space between the two infill buildings with a gate.
- We added delineated boxwoods down the main path between the two buildings for territoriality.

David Rose PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd., reviewed the landscape plan:

- There are overhead lines at the frontage so we had to put in smaller trees.
- We added another layer of tree planting on the side to define the entries.
- Stormwater management works from north to south. There are stormwater retention tanks and two raingardens.
- Community garden arrangement is split into the three triplexes with benches.
- The patios for the back units are slightly elevated to help with privacy issues.
- Mix of native and ornamental planting.
- Lighting bollards highlight the main walkways and step lights add to safety aspects.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Have you thought to have the two infill at the west brought together to have a shared wall? **A:** We had considered this. The only loss would be the natural light. The four walls gives it a sense of a stand alone house.
- How big are the overhangs? **A:** 2ft. We have to be wary of overhangs too close to the property line.
- Are there any concerns about moisture working its way in? **A:** If we cap the top of the wall we should be okay with choosing durable cladding.
- What insulation technique are you using? **A:** Step Code 3, using conventional fibreglass.
- Have you considered reorienting some of the detached laneway houses to give them more variation? **A:** There's a reduced fenestration on the site, we internalized a lot of the windows facing the courtyard for indirect ambient light.
- To staff: the 23ft setback on north on 13th Street has gone to 20? **A:** Yes.
- Will the street trees have to be moved? Will bike lanes take up that zone? **A:** Yes.

- Do the stone pavers start at the front, go to the sides then end there? **A:** We have pavers at the front of the house then we went into a regular pre-finished concrete to highlight the entrances.
- Can you use more pavers? **A:** We've used the rain gardens as the permeable area.
- At the grade change between 349-345, is there a wall there? **A:** Yes, with a fence but not through the rain garden.
- Was there any thought to giving more landscape between the buildings? **A:** We felt the side yards were useful for external storage, they could be planted.
- Is the garbage recycling enclosed? **A:** There are two different enclosures which allow for a passage way between them.
- Are they locked? **A:** They are gated doors. The owner can decide to lock them.
- The narrow laneway between the garages is now solid wall and gated at the other end, what is the purpose? **A:** Exterior storage.
- Is the walkthrough landscaped? **A:** Yes, it's a definition of territoriality.
- Have you thought to illuminate the unit identification? **A:** There are LED lights ovetop.
- On the plans there are rooms noted as a solar conduit? **A:** It's for the potential for future solar panels on the roof and needs to be continuous to the mechanical room.
- Could that be a sky lit stairwell? **A:** Yes, that could be done.
- Could the front entries of the duplexes have a porch/veranda access from the living room and access the lawn better? **A:** We could do this but we are limited on the amount of partially closed areas.
- To staff: could there be a zero lot line? **A:** Technically, yes.
- Could the slots between the garages be zero lot line? **A:** Yes, but by building standards there may be complications, its more of a code question.
- Is there an opportunity to bring the roofline down and add dormers at the second floor bedrooms? **A:** That's possible, they were designed with the old zoning bylaw in mind.
- These are market homes rather than rental, can you consider using real wood as opposed to cement board? **A:** Yes, it makes sense for the context.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The lighting of the unit identification will need to have more luminescence so it's apparent in the identification.
- Consider using more pavers in the project and planting in the community garden.
- The common open space is well done and the outside access to the lower part of the units is a good idea.
- Need to consider getting rid of the street trees, borrow part of the front yard into the 1m setback zone.
- There isn't any change to the middle unit.
- Adding exterior insulation will change the life expectancy of the units.
- Bring light into the lower suite, get a window in next to the door of the infill suite.
- The plans for the front houses to have french doors will create a lot of overlook into the main living space, consider a single door.
- Push garages together, tighten up the gap between the two houses for more of a sense of entry.
- Consider patios out front of the main houses. Access to the front lawn with a front porch will make some connection to the lawn.
- Concern about the slots between infill houses, consider widening it.

- Consider a way to heighten the ceilings in the rooms upstairs and put in a peak to create some extra volume in the bedroom areas.
- In the roofscape, put in clerestory dormers to get light into the stairs.
- The rear houses aren't visible from the street. Simplify the back houses more in the detailing.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for all the comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 339-349 East 13th Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Further exploration of the usefulness of the space between the two infill units on the west side;
- Consider the potential for the duplex units' living room access to the front porch and front lawns;
- Utilize these changes to help define variation amongst the street frontage;
- Consider front verandas for more interface with the street and pedestrians;
- Reconsider the 13th street streetscape interface in consideration of accommodating future street designs like a bike lane;
- Break down the overall massing of the roofscape for the duplexes by potentially adding ceiling height in the bedrooms and expressing that on the exterior;
- Ensure adequate lighting on address posts and paths for visibility and CPTED impacts;
- Investigate the potential for skylights or windows over the generous three storey stairwells in the duplexes to bring natural light into the units;
- Consider increasing the use of pavers for permeability and esthetics;
- Applicant to review response to Step Code 3 requirements overall with durability of the exterior cladding; and
- Consider the use of a more natural material palette.

AND THAT the Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation

**Carried
6 in favour
1 against**

7. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, November 21st, 2018.

Chair

