

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, September 19, 2007**

MINUTES

- Present:** D. Lee, Chair
A. Hii, Vice Chair
K. Terris
K. Hanvey
A. Macintosh
R. Spencer
P. Winterburn-Chilton
N. Paul
Councillor R. Heywood
- Staff:** G. Venczel, Development Planner
E. Maillie, Committee Secretary
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Services
- Guests:** C. Maltby – Owner/Designer M. Rahbar – Designer
M. Hamilton – Architect J. and D. Sawa - Owners
- Absent:** D. Rose
B. Dabiri
-

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held August 15, 2007

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel of August 15, 2007 be adopted with the revision noting that A. Hii and A. Macintosh were absent.

Unanimously Carried

2. Business Arising

None

3. Staff Update

(a) Workshop with Director, Community Development

Richard White, recently appointed Director, Community Development, wishes to meet with the Design Panel and participate in a workshop. A date will be set that fits with the agenda of an upcoming meeting.

Sustainability and role of the ADP will be part of the workshop discussion.

Councillor Heywood entered the meeting at 5:43 p.m.

4. 142 West 23rd Street - Rezoning: Duplex with Secondary Suite

C. Maltby, Designer and Owner, was introduced and referred to Western Avenue Study which resulted in increasing the density for the area. The zoning for the subject property went from RT-1 to Level 4 with this OCP amendment.

This proposal to build a front to back duplex with basement suite at the front was reviewed. The duplex units will each have two bedrooms for use by family members and the basement one-bedroom suite will be rented. FSR is .789.

Ten feet of the lot will be turned over to the City for laneway dedication. Setbacks were reviewed. Three parking stalls are located on the site. The context of the area and surrounding buildings were reviewed. Exterior materials and colours were displayed.

The retaining wall will be replaced. Unit entries were explained. Front entry to basement suite and entries to the duplex units were explained. Outdoor areas were reviewed. Existing landscape will be used on the site whenever possible to create a low maintenance garden area with rain barrels to be used for irrigation. A street tree will be planted as requested by the City.

Questions:

- Front setback compared with that of neighbouring properties?
- Explain the treatment at base of elevation on 23rd Street?
- Architectural drawings for rear yard indicate a fence separation at covered and gravel areas but no fence indicated at the rear of the site – what happens there?
- Will gate at garbage enclosure meet with the fence at retaining wall?
- What measures will be undertaken to ameliorate traffic noise?

Comments:

- Like direct straight forward approach but slight canting of the facia to respond to drainage is worrying.
- Clear, legible, well described proposal.
- Commend the applicant. This is a model of what can be done in this type of project.
- Symmetrical approach to the project with one unit facing north and one facing south – could have been angled to make better use of light.
- Gradewise site is difficult but lacking elevations at parking pads and drainage at lane and may impact height of retaining wall.
- Drawings are very small and difficult to read.
- Windows not shown on floor plans but like the natural palette of the project.
- Feel that the project is pushing to the street and should consider moving it back.
- Cellar at the rear in the basement with no exterior access is a concern.
- Well thought out scheme.

- Appreciate that effort made in landscape plan to use permeable surfaces throughout, especially on a lot this size.
- Very compact and massing and modulation well handled.
- Cannot maximise FSR on this site.
- It is Council's intent that underground parking be accommodated where a land assembly is possible but that is not possible in this case.
- Landscape well thought out with garden rooms and spaces.
- Support the scheme.
- Existing garage appears to encroach on City laneway dedication and on neighbour's home.

Applicant's comments:

- Considering facia and will explore this further before going forward for Building Permit.
- Waiting for a new survey to address grading at parking.
- Building pushing to street – Planning advice was to do what thought to be reasonable.
- Fire exits from basement provided at window and meets code. Providing door at basement cuts into rear yard. Direct access is not required but could be done if City requires.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 142 West 23rd Street (Cameron Maltby Design) and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Unanimously Carried

5. 2601 Westview Drive – Development Variance Permit

M. Hamilton, Architect, was introduced and outlined the proposed project for the renovation of Safeway store of an existing store including enclosing existing open areas at each end of the storefront and addition of a mezzanine at the rear of the store for staff amenities. The colour and materials board for the exterior of the building was reviewed.

The Panel was advised that Safeway has recently negotiated a new long term lease on this property and wishes to bring the property up to current standards. Owners of the mall support the proposal.

Questions:

- How does Safeway fit into the scope of the strip mall?
- Mezzanine at back of the building – is the footprint of the building changing?
- Is this still within the FSR with additional space at front and mezzanine?
- Are there any proposed site improvements – landscaping, improvements on site?
- Where is the head of the glazing in the proposed building?
- Will parking remain the same?
- Any natural light penetration into staff quarters at mezzanine?

- Is bicycle storage included on this site?
- Existing sidewalk at the front of the building between the entries very narrow can this be expanded?
- Mansard roof at building now and needs to be consistent and more fully integrated into the building.
- Colour of mansard roof?
- Existing store entries light and airy but new entries seem dark - is this the planned atmosphere?
- From the rendering it seems the towers at the entries are at different heights and angles.
- Parking scheme has two crosswalk approaches – how does this impact of honing into parking area?
- Existing roof height 34' at top of peak roof – is the roof stepped up?
- With enclosing of the loggias and enlarging store – where will shopping carts be located?
- Two entries but the store does not appear to have a foyer.
- Understand need for fire access but could a wider sidewalk flush with the street and bollards that can be raised and lowered meet Fire requirements?
- Canopies are lower than a fire truck.

Comments:

- Drawings do not adequately portray project for the ADP:
 - can't tell what the architectural geometry is from the front.
 - not appropriate for consideration of the project.
 - not adequate to understand.
- Area on north end very busy and is a high traffic area. Pushing pedestrians into this area is not appropriate. Not sufficient space for people to walk.
- Most of the traffic coming to parking lot turns into north lane and is very difficult.
- Plans are not large enough to review.
- At this time of year many seasonal goods go into loggias and this space is being lost here.
- Sidewalk is very narrow and has little separation.
- Do not see why additions are needed at the entries and are not suitable for this location.
- Facia between towers looks to be almost as high as glazing.
- Corner is no longer open south east to the parking lot.
- Design is not a satisfactory solution in this location.
- Store now aggressively pushing pedestrians into the parking lot.
- Covered areas for waiting useful in this climate and now being removed.
- Need to do something special when looking for a variance.
- Facia needs to be looked at. Proposal is heavy and a mean solution to the situation.
- Feels boxy – but big improvement to the plaza. Believe other stores will follow suit and result in upgrade of the plaza.
- Visual quality of wraparound on north side can be fixed by wrapping it round to the back.
- Storage of grocery carts immediately to the side at main entry doors – difficult to get a cart out if there are lots of carts in the storage area and will slow access.

- Coming out of the doorway at existing loggia there is a view of the street to see traffic but this is lost with the new tower entries.
- From a functionality, visual surveillance point of view plan requires further thought.
- From an architectural point need to ensure that this fits the tone of Westview and set a standard for future development. Stores can have an individual look that responds to local conditions and the architect should respond to climatic conditions.
- Can't compare Westview site with other local Safeway stores which are more contextual in design.

Applicant's comments:

- Part of the problem due to existing site and cannot enlarge store other than what is proposed.
- Changes make it possible to make better use of space and update features.
- Earth tones are corporate standard colours.
- Parking is tight due to age of the property and applicant cannot change it.
- Contextual nature of the architecture difficult to understand – believe this fits.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Variance Permit for 2601 Westview Drive (Safeway Canada / MQN Architects) and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the following issues:

- **Further development of the building facade treatment to reflect more contextual response;**
- **Further development of the ground plane to enhance the pedestrian experience in front of the building;**
- **Consider whether it is necessary to fully enclose existing loggias and explore whether more space can be returned to open area.**
- **Analysis of pedestrian safety in relation to traffic circulation.**

Unanimously Carried

6. 123 East 3rd Street – Rezoning

M. Rahbar, Designer, and J. Sawa and D Sawa, Owners were introduced and the designer referred to the proposal to renovate the Law Block which was designed and built in 1913 as a mixed use building with office on main with apartments on upper floors. This is now a secondary building on the City's Heritage Inventory.

Location of the site and context of the area were reviewed. The proposal conforms with the LL-3 zoning of the property.

Currently the building has seven apartments and applicant wishes to convert the use on the main floor to restaurant use and proposes to extend the building 350 sq. ft. to the south on the main floor. The second floor is proposed for office space and

live/work on the third floor. Returning this building to its original which was mixed use.

Exterior materials will be retained as far as possible. The front entrance door will be replaced by folding French doors with glazing at the top and awning and the existing stucco will be removed. The Design Rationale states that any intervention will respect the guidelines of the Historic Society.

Questions:

- Roof design inconsistent in presentation material.
- Drawings do not reflect actual condition of the roof - new dormers are shown.
- Is the main floor addition enclosed?
- Is the alcove on the west side of the main floor being enclosed?
- What type of restaurant will this be?
- General layout – washroom requirements do not appear to be enough?
- Has this been reviewed by the Heritage Advisory Commission?
 - The Chair read the resolutions of the Heritage Advisory Commission and the Advisory Planning Commission.
- How much floor space is being added to the building?
- How will the space under the addition be used?
- Are you contemplating, or would the City consider, a patio area in front of the French doors?
- Building has been insensitively renovated at some point – what was the original material used at stucco area?
- With added floor area and change of use – is staff in agreement with parking on site having to address multiple use?
- Do folding doors open onto sidewalk?
- Rationale for limiting to a 4 foot canopy at front?
- Colour being considered for canopy?
- Colour boards were reviewed and explained.
- Is rear staircase considered an exit stair?

Comments:

- Like the proposal but don't think roof resembles what is there.
- Would prefer a single mono pitch if dormers are to be included.
- Fabulous proposal thank you for worthwhile project.
- In favour of the project – thoughtful, well considered and takes an interesting building suffering from neglect and restore it to former glory and this should be celebrated.
- Support comments on dormers – out of scale with elements of the roof. If needed, there should only be single dormer extending over the roof.
- Addition at rear very strong and will work well but is not heritage and not a discreet addition to the building.
- Rear addition needs more glass and be an obvious contemporary addition to a heritage building and needs to be more distinct in character.
- Three apartment buildings located across the lane and open addition might fishbowl into these apartments.

- Reducing parking from three and bringing increased number of people on a busy street is a concern.
- Drawings need more development in showing more detail.
- Concern with chain link enclosure and impact on neighbours looking onto it.
- Like addition of restaurant in this area – need for smaller, cosier atmosphere.
- Concern that back looks busy and staircases are massive – looks chopped up and needs work.
- Very worthwhile effort and by the time get through code consultants won't work the way it is – difficult to meet requirements.
- Like revitalising street and proposal.
- Concern with addition – will be expensive to build. Suggest that a terraced patio leading to parking would fit building better.
- Design works and support mixed use.
- Stairs running down in front of window a concern.
- Flex space under extension could be opportunity to meet further parking needs.

C. Perry left the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Applicant:

- Cannot entertain additional parking.
- East wall changed to address stair.
- Glass guard rail is used at roof garden.
- Tried to maximize rear patio windows.
- Compatibility of addition with heritage building is addressed in material selection.
- Fence under addition will be mesh with steel bars not chain link.
- Exits will be addressed further.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 123 East 3rd Street (Vernacular Design) and although supporting the development concept believes the following have not been adequately resolved:

- **Architectural resolution of the roof forms including proposed additions;**
- **Architectural form and character of the restaurant addition at the south façade;**
- **Refinement of egress in accordance with Code requirements.**

Unanimously Carried

7. Transportation Plan for the City – Interim Report

The Development Planner referred to the Interim Report on the City's Transportation Plan distributed to members in June. The Panel was asked to provide input that can be incorporated into the Plan being developed for presentation to Council.

Comments:

- Seems like there is no awareness of the neighbouring municipality, the District of North Vancouver, in this Plan.

- Railway hardly appears in this report except as a barrier to the waterfront and ignores use of the rail track as a commuter facility.
- CN rail runs under Lonsdale and consideration should be given to having a station in that area.
- Regional planning needs to be addressed to address conflicts with truck routes and inconsistencies in District and City. Need to have one master plan for the City and District.
- Lower Road is incomplete to get trucks off Marine Drive through to the 2nd Narrows Bridge.
- Growth in Lynn Valley leads to traffic congestion in the City.
- Maps need to be in colour to be of use to understand the detail of the report.
- Who sets the bus routes and does the City have any input into these decisions?
- Need to plan for the longer term rather than waiting until demand is justified.
- Need density and population base with smaller buses to serve neighbourhoods.
- Needs to be addressed North Shore wide rather than the City on its own.
- Attitude needs to be unanimous throughout the report – is hub and spoke system efficient?

8. Rental Housing Working Group

The Development Planner referred to the report of the Community Planner dated July 25, 2007 and advised that ADP is being asked to provide input for preparation of the final report going for consideration by the Policy Committee on November 19, 2007.

Comments:

- Are there housing forms that are more efficient?
- Can the ADP help to determine how to address housing forms?
- How to create density and remain a livable City?
- How to deal with retention of rental buildings while costs to maintain them are increasing?
- Consider providing mix of affordable housing with market housing.
- Would like to know the number of rental units and the number of strata units in the City.

The Development Planner invited ADP members to the Central Lonsdale Study Open House to be held Wednesday, October 3rd at City Hall. Rental housing will be dealt with in this study. Neighbourhood residents are being invited.

9. Other Business

(a) Presentation Requirements

Concern was expressed that requirements for submissions may not be necessary for smaller developments, e.g. shadow analysis, unless there is a strong issue. If there is no opportunity for the project to change, then there is no point in asking for additional work to be undertaken. There was consensus that a massing model needs to include the neighbouring properties.

(b) Public Art Committee

The Public Art representative on the Panel advise that the Horse at the Trough art feature at Victoria Park was knocked over and dragged. The Horse was damaged but can be repaired.

A brochure of recent public art will be distributed to ADP next month.

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, October 17, 2006.

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2007\2007 09 19.doc