

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 18th, 2015**

---

**MINUTES**

---

<b>Present:</b>	B. Allen J. Boyce A. Epp J. Geluch S. Gushe P. Maltby M. Tsai
<b>Staff:</b>	D. Johnson, Development Planner S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk C. Miller, Planner 1, Community Development
<b>Guests:</b>	<u>119-131 West Esplanade/120 Carrie Cates Court</u> Rene Rose, Polygon Development 304 Ltd. Lorne Wolinsky, Polygon Development 304 Ltd. Nigel Baldwin, Nigel Baldwin Architects Colin Shrubbs, DYS Architecture Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Troy Glasner, E3ecogroup
<b>Absent:</b>	K. Bracewell, RCMP K. England A. Larigakis

---

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

The Chair, A. Larigakis, was absent from the meeting due to a conflict of interest with the application being reviewed; in the absence of the Chair, A. Epp, chaired the meeting.

**1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held October 21st, 2015**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held October 21<sup>st</sup>, 2015 be adopted as amended: to reword the resolution for the 362-368 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Rezoning Application and delete the phrase:

“Further resolution of the proposal to have bio-treatment of greywater onsite.” from the resolution.

**Carried Unanimously**

## 2. Business Arising

None

## 3. Moodyville Design Guidelines

C. Miller, Planner 1, gave an overview of the proposed Moodyville draft Zoning Bylaw amendments and Development Permit Area Guidelines.

### **Questions and comments from the Commission included but were not limited to:**

- Are the heights top of parapet? **A:** We will allow limited projections to allow access to the rooftop. There is a significant setback at the top floor, etc. Contemporary forms typically have flat or low slope roofs. We are looking at language allowing limited increases.
- Achieving reasonable ceiling height but achieving fire separation and other construction will make it hard to get a nine foot height; it will be pinched from a liveable perspective and will limit daylight access. Look at it from an ideal form from the inside out and set a height to work from that. **A:** We have defined floor to floor for anticipated forms of construction to accommodate it. It would be useful to know if the proposed height is problematic.
- Should “rowhouse” have a different name? Are you looking for a detailed response to this from the Design Panel? I would like to read the 41 pages quite carefully as the document is very detailed. It would be a great opportunity to workshop it.
- Thank you for your presentation. I would like clarification on the streetscapes portion. **A:** There are some existing 50 foot Right of Ways east of St. David’s; we are not narrowing them but looking to have a sidewalk and boulevard to meet current standards on East 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> Streets. There will be significant development on East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street so we are looking to have the 100 foot transit corridor width dedicated.
- **Staff:** Traffic calming consultation has been done throughout City which will lead to some measures being instituted.
- Re building height; we have had many conversations re solar panels etc. on roof tops is there a bylaw addressing that? **A:** The bylaw already excludes that sort of infrastructure. We do not see a lot of uptake at the moment.
- Will the 1.0 density bonus be available for the 1.6 buildings? **A:** That would be part of a site-specific rezoning process. There are limited circumstances such as large consolidations where an applicant could address the contextual concerns. It is not a permissive envelope taking the 15 feet ROW into account.
- It cannot be done in four stories? **A:** They would be constrained.
- Once in place the guidelines will be part of an amendment to the Official Community Plan (OCP)? **A:** The areas are in the OCP and the guidelines are adopted as part of the Zoning Bylaw.
- Once the zonings are in place, is rezoning required? **A:** There would be provisions that have to be met in the Zoning Bylaw, although the Province discourages municipalities from putting some conditions on zoning. In terms of consideration of individual projects, the end goal is that the zoning is in place. It will still be a two-step process: applying for a Development Permit and then a Building Permit. A Development Permit would not require a Public Hearing or Council approval.
- We have seen developments that have not given quality outdoor space to residents. Do you have guidelines re the quality of the outdoor space within developments? **A:** We have attached a minimum area. We could make the guidelines more directed.

- It almost forces the use of the roof for outdoor space.
- At what juncture are you encouraging smaller more affordable units?
- Staff: The City does not have an extensive Development Permit process. Having a process will give us a more concrete method of enforcing the guidelines.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the draft Moodyville Zoning and Development Permit Guidelines and recommends that a workshop be conducted to provide further detailed feedback.

**Carried : 6 in favour, 1 opposed**

**4. 119-131 West Esplanade / 120 Carrie Cates Court (OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application)**

D. Johnson, Development Planner, outlined the project which is an application to build an 11 storey residential tower with 110 residential units over one level of commercial on the West Esplanade side and two stories of commercial on the Carrie Cates Court side.

The Official Community Plan (OCP) designates the site as Mixed Use with an FSR of 2.6 and a height of 23 metres. The site is also designated as a Special Study Area which may include consideration towards density transfer and building height.

The applicant is seeking an amendment to the OCP to support a building height of 37.4 metres.

The commercial podium is oriented to the western side of the site to open up the eastern edge of the site creating a 40 foot wide pedestrian mews that would connect Carrie Cates Court with West Esplanade.

Staff asked for comments from the Panel on the site design and orientation of the commercial podium and tower location, the massing of the residential tower, the colour scheme and the application of façade materials, the design of the amenity space, both commercial and residential, and the open space fronting Carrie Cates Court and the public mews to the east of the building.

Nigel Baldwin, Nigel Baldwin Architects, described the project to the Panel:

- The mews and front of the building is an opportunity for semi-public open space sheltered from the wind.
- The project has commercial units opposite “restaurant row” which is to the east. Anatoli’s, for instance, has a patio on the mews.
- The mews allows view access from the north.
- There is an open space on the south side to accommodate the Spirit Trail.
- Steps up to the building to accommodate the flood plain create seating opportunities overlooking the Spirit Trail.
- The residential lobby is off Carrie Cates Court; it is the shortest route to transit and animates the space at night.
- Parking is provided onsite for three external users: replacing 41 stalls on Carrie Cates Court, replacing 40 stalls for 119 West Esplanade and adding 16 stalls for the Polygon Gallery.

- The height of the building matches the corner of the Pinnacle Hotel so the two buildings act as bookends to Lower Lonsdale.
- The light colour is similar to Pinnacle suites. Wood panels add colour and texture.
- Long slim buildings oriented to the water are very common on waterfront lots.
- The advantage of the slab form is that it gives the least view blockage from the north.
- The base steps down with the contour of the land.
- Masonry towers add verticality to the north elevation. Two fins add verticality to the south elevation.
- The podium on the mews is broken into three sections to break down the scale.
- The building has a straightforward, direct, modern character.

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Inc., reviewed the landscape plan:

- Lower Lonsdale has quite a varied landscape with themes of marine, marine industrial, an urban feel. The Polygon Gallery will have a clean urban feel.
- The plan does not attempt to replicate Lonsdale Quay and The Shipyards.
- The use of a long linear landscape expression with pavement, benches and parking to reflect the building creates an expression unique to the building.
- Planting will be very important in the scheme. The public areas will have a loose, messy feel. The Residential level will have more of a clean look, an industrial feel with manicured planting using stone, concrete and wood. The indoor amenity space will connect to the outdoor patio where residents can engage with the street below.
- The paving treatment has an industrial look with granite cobbles and steps in a warm colour, benches with a wooden element similar to the Polygon Gallery.
- The bollards and lighting in the mews will have a modern feel.
- The Spirit Trail is a linear movement system; the stairs on the south face of the building will be “seat steps” to provide an opportunity for people to sit and engage with it.
- Pedestrians will be under cover on the west side of the mews and under trees on the restaurant side where bollards will protect them from vehicles.
- There will be an open patio on the second floor office level.
- Water will be collected on the south west corner perhaps with rain gardens.

*The Panel viewed the model and asked questions.*

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

- Do you see any conflict with the Spirit Trail with people trying to get into the building using the stairs on the south side of the building? **A:** The entry is just past the Spirit Trail. The Spirit Trail guidelines do not address how can it become part of the plaza space and not have conflicts happen. There is design work yet to come. We are following The City’s guidance.
- People will cut across the Spirit Trail coming from the transit hub. **A:** The combination of bikes and people needs to be considered.
- There are stairs and a ramp? **A:** Yes, due to the existing grade change; it is positive. It gives you another place to sit. The ramp is long and connects to the sidewalk edge.
- Explain the circulation on the second level from the inside to the outside patio; it seems very narrow? **A:** It is difficult to say how the office space will be divided for access to the outdoor patio; there is a good chance everyone will be able to use it. Once the space is leased, doors will be put in.

- Is the wood panel, wood? **A:** We have not decided.
- You say you will achieve LEED Silver for the building, could you get to Gold? **A:** We are comfortably Silver, with a bit of work we may achieve Gold.
- To Staff: How is “restaurant row” designated? **A:** It has a strict height restriction. The restaurants have long term leases so there may not be much change to the site.
- Are three elevators enough to service 11 residential floors? **A:** The residential elevators are completely separate. There is one elevator for commercial use; we are trying to encourage people to use the stairs.
- Has the City increased the width of parking stalls? **A:** Yes. The design complies with the new width of 8.2 inches.
- Will the balconies increase thermal bridging? **A:** The preliminary model has not been done yet. We will have to look at it.
- Will there be Silva cells to help with irrigation? **Staff:** There will be cells all around the site. We will be looking to put cuts to drain into the Silva cells.
- Is there an option to have a rolled curb at the mews to allow them to roll loads up from a layby and make the mews pedestrian-only? **A:** It would be great if we could get it work as a pedestrian zone only. **Staff:** It is fire access for all the restaurants. The landscaping does not work for fire trucks.
- Could you do something interesting for public art e.g. a fine grain pedestrian experience? **A:** Polygon is very committed to public art but the process will take a while.
- What CPTED measures are there to mitigate dark corners etc? **A:** Laneway lighting, the height of plant material, for visual connection,
- Is the roof just for mechanical purposes? **A:** Two of our roofs have activities.
- There is a lot of glass, are you satisfied with energy performance? **A:** Yes.
- Is there a roof treatment for the top roof to make it interesting for the people looking down on it? **A:** There can be.

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

- I really like the height and the context. I am very impressed with the view studies.
- I really like the colour scheme, especially the indigo.
- Be more authentic to place-making in the public art e.g. First Nations, street conditions; it is not just an industrial area.
- Be environmental in the landscaping.
- I would like to see seating and benching as part of the landscape plan for the amenity space around the Spirit Trail, rather than tables and chairs that will be locked away. Have fixed elements for moments of pause rather than relying on a coffee shop. Program the outdoor space.
- It would be good to do something dynamic like public art on the two north towers; they are the front face for the rest of North Vancouver.
- I like the waves. I hope they stay as frameless glass not aluminium frame or the wave will get lost. It is very powerful at the moment. I hope it stays.
- It is a really good animated space with a strong public amenity; the front door to Lonsdale Quay.
- It will create a new hub in the area and revitalize commercial space in the area. The building height fits well into the area. You have done an excellent job of portraying it.
- I definitely think the public art should make a statement.
- I agree built-in seating would be nicer than loose chairs.
- Could the north elevation be softened a bit like the south elevation? It is very strong.
- Could the building could benefit from an amenity space on the main roof?

- I like the placement of the building on the site and the thought that went into it.
- The massing is sensitive to the surroundings and in keeping with the way North Vancouver is growing. It will be a credit to North Vancouver.
- The amenity spaces are wonderful; I like the covered area for the pedestrian precinct.
- Thank you for a concise and clear presentation with high quality renderings.
- The density and scale of the building is appropriate to the site with mixed use at a transit terminal. It is the right orientation and sitting in the right spot to the east.
- The east and west facades are tricky in terms of solar heat gain; maybe pull out facades to get shading for the units.
- Solar shading for the office on the south vertical might not be the most effective.
- Parking is on the right side of the building.
- The mews is wonderful. I Support keeping loading off the mews.
- The entrances to the tower and office are in the right locations.
- The treatment of the public realm is very positive for rain protection but the west façade is a little forgotten, extend the canopy over that side for pedestrians using Rogers Avenue. Humanizing Rogers Avenue as much as possible will just add to it.
- The massing is elegant: long and skinny. I am not a fan of the balconies; the wave seems a little bit whimsical and not as timeless as the building itself.
- I like the glass on the podium and differentiation of masonry on second storey. The glazing is like a lot of what we see; is there another way for it to look less of a checkerboard? Perhaps introduce another panel to get away from the grid.
- I would like the wood to be real. The element seems a little isolated; find opportunities to user wood elsewhere.
- I would love to see it do more than LEED silver; getting away from spandrels would help.
- I look forward to further development of ideas for the main entrance and the interface with the Spirit Trail. There is an opportunity to something unique and interesting.
- I am interested in seeing the relationship between offices and their outdoor patio space is resolved. Hopefully everyone will have access to the space.
- I agree that the west side of the building has been left as the back of the building; it will be visible for people coming from the west. Perhaps something could be done to have the same impact that the other three sides have for pedestrians or drivers.

**Presenter's comments:**

Thank you for your excellent comments. The towers on the south do need more work. We agree with the comments on public art. With reference to orientation and sun shading, the building is almost south west, north west.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the proposed OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application for 119-131 West Esplanade/120 Carrie Cates Court and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Ensure creativity in the public art component;
- Evoke a sense of place with places to pause and linger built into the landscape design rather than freestanding tables and chairs;
- Consider more animation of the brick masses on the northern façade;
- Remove loading access from the mews and make it a pedestrian only precinct;
- Add rain protection on the west side of the site;
- Consider a community amenity on the main roof;
- Soften the design of the north east corner;
- Further consideration of solar shading on the west façade;
- The project should do better than LEED Silver energy efficiency;
- Integrate wood in a more meaningful way in the façade;
- Resolution of the function of the main entry and its relationship with the Spirit Trail to avoid conflict between cyclists and pedestrians;
- Resolution of how the two outdoor amenity spaces interface with the indoor spaces;

The Panel is very supportive of the integrated environmental landscaping.

The Panel commends the applicant on the quality of the application package and presentation.

**Carried Unanimously**

*M. Tasi left the meeting at 8:00 p.m.*

## **5. Staff Update**

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

## **6. Other Business**

There was a discussion on the criteria for the Design Awards.

**Action:** Staff to report back to the Panel at the December 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **7. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, December 9th, 2015.

Chair



