

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

**Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel
Held via WebEx on Wednesday, September 15th, 2021**

MINUTES

- Present:** N. Petrie
S. Mitchell
M. Rahbar
K. Blomkamp
D. Burns
K. Bracewell, RCMP
M. Muljiani
K. Ross
Councillor A. Girard
- Staff:** M. Menzel, Planner
D. Johnson, Development Planner
B. van der Heijden, Planner
E. Macdonald, Planner
R. Fish, Committee Clerk
T. Huckell, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** 1540 St. Georges Avenue and 215-235 East 16th Street (Rezoning Application)
Shamus Sachs, Integra Architecture
Rhys Leitch, Integra Architecture
Jessyca Fan, Integra Architecture
Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates
Sarah Bingham, Adera
Ali Cervienka, Adera
Tim Pershick, Adera
- Absent:** M. Tashakor
M. Messer
-

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:32 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held August 11th, 2021

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held August 11th, 2021 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. Business Arising

None.

3. Staff Update

D. Johnson will be temporarily stepping aside from the Advisory Design Panel. M. Menzel will be taking over in the meantime and will shadow tonight's meeting.

There are no additional updates for ongoing development projects as Council has been recessed over the summer.

4. Coach House Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw Update

Staff presented on the Accessory Coach House Guidelines. The main points included but were not limited to the following:

- Planning staff have undertaken a review of the current Coach House Development Permit Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw requirements and have prepared proposed amendments to both to help with streamlining the application and review process.
- Coach houses have become an increasingly popular development but have a relatively long processing time.
- Staff recommended changes include:
 - The maximum lot coverage will be increased from 15% to 17% to make it easier to build a single-storey coach house.
 - The maximum floor areas of the second-storey floor will be increased from 60% to 70%.
 - The setbacks to side streets for corner lots will be reduced to 1.5 metres.
 - Maximum setbacks from laneways are introduced.
 - Instead of the requirement of the coach house to be located in the rear 25% of the lot, an increased setback to the primary building is proposed for larger lots. Additionally a maximum setback from the rear lot line is proposed.
 - Although most site design requirements will be removed, the new guidelines will still have requirements:
 - to ensure the coach house is identifiable from the street;
 - to ensure frontage to a side street (if applicable);
 - to ensure a private outdoor amenity space;
 - to ensure a maximum fence height of 4 feet along the lane and side street frontages;
 - to have a landscape buffer along the rear and exterior side property line.
 - Most building design requirements will be removed, but the following guidelines will still be included:
 - frontage to the lane and side street by requiring a door and window facing the lane/street;
 - fire and emergency access as per the current guidelines;
 - no overlook towards the neighbours, achieved by requiring balconies to face the lane and window on the second floor to have a minimum sill height or be opaque below that same height.
 - Parking requirements remain the same with the exception that there will be a maximum setback for parking spaces to avoid parking spaces located far away from the rear property line.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Has the increase in site coverage been factored in for covering GFA for garbage and recycling as well? **A:** Those structures could be built; wouldn't really change anything except that the coach house can cover a slightly larger portion of the site.
- Had you planned to put in any exclusions for those items? **A:** No, not for those items. There are some exclusions as far as sustainability but there isn't one for lot coverage. There are certain aspects stipulated in the current zoning bylaw but are largely related to the building envelope.
- When you factor in digging, drainage, foundation, etc., the costs per square footage can be quite high; so there may be an appetite to exclude items like recycling/garbage areas, bike storage, from both FSR and lot coverage. Any possibility of considering? **A:** What we gathered from stakeholders is that accommodating those has not really been much of an issue. In combination with a coach house you're allowed a 10 square metres storage building, assuming you don't exceed the overall lot coverage of 40%.
- Outdoor ground oriented area is required. Where would that be situated? **A:** Depends on the shape of the lot. On a narrower lot, it faces the principal building. On wider lots, it tends to be beside the coach house.
- If parking cannot be situated on the main side, the outdoor amenity area is potentially facing the principal building. Foresee a potential delay in processing if there are further restrictions such as privacy issues. Is that discussed in the guidelines? **A:** The new guidelines do not specify where it should go; rather, specify that direct access is required. Outdoor amenity space could also be a balcony, or outdoor deck, but need not necessarily be on the ground floor.
- If the new guidelines require a door or window facing a lane or street, would it be allowed or discouraged to have entry facing the existing, primary property? **A:** We do require that a door is towards a lane or street, to activate the lane. That concept gets lost if we allow the main entrance to face the primary house. However, many are designed with two doors, one of which could be facing the primary house.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed and considered the overview of changes to the Coach House Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw Requirements and recommends approval;

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

Carried Unanimously

5. Rooftop Antenna Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw Update

Staff presented on the Rooftop Antenna Design Guidelines. The main points included but were not limited to the following:

- The City's Rooftop Antenna Guidelines apply to development applications for third part rooftop antenna system installations. Industry Canada regulates the location; installation and health and safety aspects of antenna systems, including masts, towers, and other antenna-supporting structures are regulated by the *Radiocommunication Act* which

mandates that local governments should provide concurrence with proposed cell sites and that proponents shall address any concerns from local governments.

- The City's Rooftop Antenna Development Permit Guidelines are intended to provide a framework to ensure rooftop cell sites are installed in a desirable manner. Though proponents of a rooftop antenna development should comply with the guidelines when possible, technical constraints might limit compliance. In these cases flexibility in the guidelines is required.
- The current guidelines have height and setback requirements that make it essentially impossible to establish cell sites on rooftops. The goals of this update are to ensure that the development of antennas is not hindered by the current guidelines and zoning bylaw, as well as to remove any requirements for specific height, setback, and dimensions.
- Staff recommended changes include:
 - No setback requirements (setbacks require a greater height of antennas).
 - No maximum height, but a requirement to minimize height.
 - Allow antennas to be mounted on the façade of a building.
 - The number of unscreened antennas to be determined by the perimeter of the roof.
 - New guidelines would ensure the installation of rooftop antennas would occur in a uniform manner.
 - If antennas are screened, there would be no maximum number.
 - Up to 40% of the roof edge may be screened.
 - Antennas on top of a penthouse should be fully screened.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Are these only on private properties? **A:** Yes this relates to private properties. We have a separate policy for cell phone towers; this is strictly for rooftop antennas.
- For putting devices attached to the face of a building, are the guidelines and regulations similar to signage bylaws? **A:** No, we would require that they are spaced evenly.
- How would you deal with sloped roofs? **A:** In the proposed guidelines, we would not recommend placing on a sloped roof. We would ask that antenna placement be avoided in those instances. As a municipality we can't really dictate where antennas might go; can only provide feedback to a proponent.
- If the applications coming in for these antennas are from private providers, do they need to obtain approval from the property owner? **A:** Yes.
- Since private owners are receiving a benefit, are they expected to pay a fee to the property owner for that air space? **A:** It is basically a lease, a contract between the owner and the carrier. They would need to provide evidence that an agreement is in place before they make their application to the City. There is no requirement for compensation.
- Appreciate the City wants to accommodate these applications, but it can be challenging when residents express concern. How can we justify? **A:** Since the issue is regulated federally, the engagement with the municipality is optional for the carrier. By having strict guidelines, we are running the risk that the municipality isn't engaged at all.
- Will this be applicable to residential buildings? **A:** Apartment buildings over a certain height could be considered. In the guidelines we've proposed, we are asking providers to avoid lower height areas, as well as schools and institutional buildings. Some larger apartment buildings could still be considered.

- Does the Strata Property Act allow for property owners to put one up? **A:** The application would be to add the antenna to common property. Would require a vote of the owners at an AGM or SGM of the strata corporation.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Notice an increasing amount of these around the City of Vancouver; can look very cluttered. A lot of aesthetic concerns should be addressed for providers to follow. This appears to be providing carte blanche; not creating stricter standards because the organization is concerned applicants won't engage with the City isn't a good argument for lax standards.
- Doesn't sound like the City ultimately has much power over the providers; not in a great position from a negotiation point of view. Might be better to be stricter and allow providers to request variances.
- Don't think we should be prescriptive about where on buildings to allow; it's really a case by case situation. Better that staff aren't limited at the outset and have flexibility of position when an application comes in.

Presenter's comments:

- These guidelines do give staff a fair bit of leeway to work with when a proposal is submitted; can look at the building and decide what works best on that building. Think they'll be an improvement on the current framework and staff won't simply approve without some discussion and consideration on appearance. Want to ensure that providers continue to work with the City voluntarily.
- Since the current guidelines were adopted in 2018, they've been so restrictive that Planning hasn't been able to issue any development permits. Instead, they have had to go to Council for a variance. These proposed guidelines remove a lot of the "must" and "shall" language and replace with should, to allow more flexibility.
- Additionally, the way the proposed guidelines are written, any variance could be given by the Director of Planning.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed and considered the overview of changes to the Rooftop Antennas Design Guidelines and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning:

- Proposed Guidelines should emphasize the importance of creating a high-quality public realm and should guide the design of Rooftop Antenna installations to mitigate potential visual impacts within the public realm;

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

Carried Unanimously

E. Macdonald and B. van der Heijden left the meeting at 6:56pm.

6. 1540 St. Georges and 215-235 East 16th Street (Rezoning Application)

The City has received and is reviewing a rezoning application for 1540 St. Georges Avenue and 215-235 East 16th Street. The application proposes two separate six-storey buildings with a common courtyard separating the two buildings. Each building is proposing to accommodate 93 units for a total of 186 units, and is situated over one level of underground parking for 117 vehicle stalls and 280 secured bike parking stalls.

Staff would like to receive feedback on the proposal with respect to the following:

- Design and functionality of the courtyard between the two buildings;
- Design and functionality of the ground level courtyards behind each building as well as the rooftop decks;
- Presentation along the street and lane;
- The inclusion of CPTED principles in the design.
- Distinctiveness of the design and the buildings' contribution to the urban realm;
- Presentation along the two street fronts;
- Presentation along the rear lane;
- Prominence and distinctiveness of the main building entrances;
- Effectiveness of the design of the central courtyard as well as the south facing courtyards behind each building;
- Effectiveness of street-level landscaping separating the building edge;
- Presentation and choice of the proposed vegetation;
- Planting plan;
- Accessibility.

Shamus Sachs and Rhys Leitch, Integra Architecture Inc., described the project to the Panel:

- The area is currently designated at level 5 in the OCP, medium density residential. The immediate neighbourhood currently has 3 and 4 storey multi-family residences, high-rise mixed-use developments along Lonsdale and the Lions Gate Hospital complex to the south. The property flanks the level 6 OCP designation to the south.
- We're meeting the 2.6 FSR as allowed by the OCP. Achieving 30,000+ square feet in coverage, with 186 units. We are oversupplying our level 2 adaptability units, with 56 units. Are requesting a minor height variance.
- The neighbourhood is starting to fill up with a lot of rental projects and we understand indoor and outdoor amenities are critical to this project.
- Site is deceptively steep with a grade of over 23 feet from the northeast to the southwest corners. Navigating that was one of the main focuses of the design. Designed two buildings with centrally located lobbies, flanked by a central courtyard. The lobbies are both located at grade.
- Will be achieving the Step 3 requirement for sustainability. 100% EV ready on all parkade stalls.
- Various CPTED issues addressed; the parkade exit has a direct line of sight with no hidden corners. Everything is well lit. Good natural surveillance, with overlook from suites above into the amenity areas.
- Outdoor bike wash area feeds directly into the mezzanine.
- Two outdoor roof areas with a range of amenities (yoga, dining, turf areas for play). Tried to be equal in distributing the amenities across both buildings; anticipate cross-usage between the two.

- Understand that this is a transitional area, between medium and high density. Want to bring a pedestrian scale frontage to the lower two floors and ensure a pedestrian friendly realm. Terracing the landscape walls, to soften the height of the building.

Michael Patterson, P&A Landscape Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan:

- The landscape design is intended to complement the west coast architecture.
- Grade on this site is one of the key challenges.
- The building lobbies located at 16th, at grade, easily accessible. The ground floor design seeks to respond to the residential character of the neighbourhood.
- Intent that the central courtyard is a shared space between the two buildings. Have located a water feature as a prominent element; plan is to ultimately add a public art piece.
- Key feature of each building: each has a south facing courtyard space, to provide some animation to the lane.
- Public realm improvements include new sidewalks along both streets with new street trees.
- Large roofdeck on each building, provides opportunities for both small and large group activities.
- CNV encourages the use of native plants in the planting palette; have done our best to accommodate that.
- Have provided integrated lighting into the trellis above.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Will the area between the two buildings be private, or semi-private? Will the public be allowed to walk through? **A:** Semi-private. Technically, someone from the public could walk through although the intent is to have it feel private.
- What are you doing to highlight the lobby areas for emergency responders? **A:** Will have prominent Fire Detection Centre (FDCs) and an annunciator panel.
- Assuming that resident parking is separated from visitor parking by overhead doors? **A:** Yes. Two gates at each end, separating visitor from residential.
- Is the public art piece a requirement? Would it go through a public art process? **A:** it would go through a public art screening process.
- Will the two buildings share amenities or operate independently? **A:** Vision is that the indoor amenity provision is almost equal between the two buildings. The west has the greater indoor common room and children's amenities, while the east has the guest suite. The outdoor areas are mirrored. Residents in either building could use the amenities in either side. The rooftops are nearly identical and could operate independently.
- How many units are on the street that are being replaced? **A:** 63.
- The buildings are being built in two phases; what's the rationale/timeline? **A:** The intention is to be able to build straight through, without stopping. Past experience has shown that projects with more than one building work best when designed to allow for phasing (to account for potential construction, market interruptions).
- Are these units all rental? **A:** Some will be dedicated rental, some market.
- Any reason for the contrast between the front and rear of the building (rear looks more monotonous/crowded)? **A:** This design allowed us to provide more rental units. Also, further development potential across the lane, could be twice the height of our building. Felt less important to break down the vertical height.

- Main entrance does seem a little discreet. Any way to bring increased visibility to these main buildings? **A:** There will be signage, wasn't obvious from the project renders.
- Would you consider having two slightly different colour palettes? **A:** We did initially consider this. After looking at a couple of variations, we found this ended up being a stronger response for the symmetry of the buildings.
- Understand there are 116 1-bedroom units, 46 2-bedroom units, and 24 3-bedroom units. How did you determine those numbers? A newer building on East 12th had a surprising amount of interest in the 3-bedroom units. **A:** We do have a department that researches that type of predicted interest; not against changing the breakdown but it currently reflects what our research shows.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Thank you for the thorough presentation. Coming from a mental health and community perspective, this project has really had contemplation on so many aspects. Commend you on that; from the amenity spaces, cycling, support for recycling, guest suites, water features, feels like you've really done a lot of consideration for so many aspects.
- As the buildings look so similar, you will have to make your lobbies easily identifiable from the street, especially in dark hours / early morning / inclement weather. Can define your territoriality in the garden piece between the two buildings, to indicate it is semi-private. Also appreciate that the bike storage is accessible primarily from the residential parking.
- Appreciate how the two buildings interact with each other.
- Good use of difficult topography.
- Would like to see more "nature" on the roofs. Use of furniture space has been well considered, but could add additional small trees in potted planters, and some natural grass areas.
- Very glad to see the use of CLT in the design. Agree it would be nice if the rooftop amenity was a little larger.
- Consider solar shading or coatings on the west face, to reduce the solar glare. Excellent overhangs on the southern face.
- Lots of strong points, active elements. Congratulate the team on a well-executed design.
- Main entrances of both need more articulation; too subtle and hidden away. Could easily be more prominently articulated with change of colours, which are predominantly blue; the remainder is white and wood. Encourage you to change the colours; it is a long block with enough other elements that tie the project together.
- Perhaps use more operable windows, to increase ventilation.
- Consider gazebos, trellises on the south; would allow people to sit outside even on rainy days.
- Beautiful project, well designed for the scale and size along 16th. Perhaps consider increasing the number of 3-bedroom units.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 1540 St. Georges Avenue and 215-235 East 16th Street and recommends approval of the project;

AND THAT the Panel commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal and their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

7. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:19 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, October 20th, 2021.

"Scott Mitchell"
Chair

"October 20, 2021"
Date