

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, August 20, 2003**

---

**MINUTES**

---

- Present:** P. Kernan, Chair  
S. Friars, Vice Chair  
A. Malczyk  
M. Rahbar  
D. Rose  
K. McKillop  
D. Storey  
Councillor R. Clark
- Staff:** K. Russell, Development Planner  
E. Maillie, Committee Clerk  
C. Perry, Development Officer
- Absent:** P. Johnston  
R. Vesely
- Guests:** C. Moorhead, Architect  
B. Shigatomi
- 

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

**1. Minutes of Advisory Design Panel Meeting dated July 16, 2003**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting held on July 16, 2003 be adopted as circulated.**

**Carried**

**2. Business Arising**

None

**3. Staff Update**

**(a) Youth Group Art Projects**

The project for re-tiling the fountain at Lonsdale Quay is almost complete and members were invited to go and view the project.

This group will now be undertaking a project to design and install metal sculptures in Mosquito Creek Park. Due to timing restrictions, the ADP will not have an opportunity to review the proposal before it is undertaken; however, Patricia Johnston, Public Art representative on the Panel, has agreed to work with the Youth Group on behalf of the Panel and she will report on the project to the Panel at the September meeting.

M. Rahbar and D. Rose declared a conflict of interest due to their involvement in the next development and left the meeting.

M. Rahbar and D. Rose re-entered the meeting at 5:07 p.m. with C. Moorhead, Architect, as members of the delegation representing the project at 83 Chesterfield Avenue.

#### **4. 83 Chesterfield Avenue – Preliminary Rezoning**

The Development Planner gave background on this site which contained a Heritage House – Gross House – until it was destroyed by fire a few years ago. The owners were expected to reconstruct the Gross House but when a development proposal was presented last year, the Advisory Planning Commission recommended that the heritage house not be replaced on this site because it restricted development options, and that the owner make a contribution to the City's heritage fund instead. This recommendation was approved by Council and a revised development is now being planned.

The Project Architect advised that this is a preliminary presentation of a development proposal and design detail has not yet been considered. The proposed design is considerably different from the presentation submitted last year and the Architect reviewed and explained development in the surrounding area. The building, to be located on the south west corner of 1<sup>st</sup> Street and Chesterfield, has been designed to minimize view impact of buildings to the north.

The building will have a two-storey podium with the second floor stepped back to include a roof garden. The development will include two floors of retail / office space and five upper floors of residential, 20% of which will be Level 2 of the Adaptable Design Guidelines. A parking garage with approximately 40 parking spaces will be built under the building, 10 of which will be designated visitor parking. Consideration may be given to decreasing parking spaces and make payment in lieu to the City. It was noted that the proposed building height is within the OCP limits.

The Architect reviewed the preliminary building details as contained on the plans dated August 2003, and distributed to the Panel. Landscape detail will be addressed later in the design development.

It was noted that these will be rental units and the developer will be requesting a 10% bonus from the City in this regard. This will be separate from the developer's contribution to the heritage fund to be agreed upon with the City. The owner also wishes to make a public art contribution on this site but location and style of the art have not been decided.

The owner of this site has approached the neighbour to the west but they have been unable to reach any agreement on a joint or cooperative development.

### **Questions from the Panel included:**

- Location of service entry;
- Impact of west setback on future development of the site to the west;
- Location of storage space for residents;
- Extent of glazing and impact on livability and heat gain / winter cold;
- Shaft design for restaurant air exhaust exits at the roof may be problematic for residents.

M. Rahbar and D. Rose left the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

### **Comments and concerns of the Panel included:**

- Access to the elevator must be addressed for service to businesses;
- Elevator and mechanical design needs to be addressed at the next stage of design;
- Building envelope, materials and skin need to be addressed, especially around livability and functionality;
- Need to address design or finishes to discourage skateboarders at the entry and stairs off Chesterfield;
- Support green roof element but need further development;
- Design supports location of the building in the middle of the site and would benefit from being moved to the east to create greater setback to the west;
- Retaining zero lot line on the west would impact livability of west units if neighbouring property were developed to zero lot line;
- Need to consider how to minimize impact of blank wall to the south on residents on the upper floors;
- Doors into the lane must be recessed to meet Engineering standards;

There was general discussion around west setback of the building and how it may impact on future site development to the west. This setback issue may be raised at Council and reasons for doing this may need to be addressed at that time.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the preliminary presentation For 83 Chesterfield and supports the concept in principle and looks forward to future additional details that address:**

- **Service access for the commercial restaurant use;**
- **Configuration of the tower roof and elevator mechanical penthouse;**
- **More detail on the building skin, particularly the fenestration;**
- **Consideration to tower location relative to the west property line with the suggestion that it be relocated further to the east;**
- **More detail on the green roof concept;**
- **Consideration of the paving design on the steps to deter skateboarders;**
- **More detail on storage;**
- **Provision of more context drawings and more detail on adherence to the adaptable design guidelines.**

**Unanimously Carried**

K. McKillop left at 5:55 p.m.

M. Rahbar and D. Rose returned to the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

## **5. 122 East Third Street – Revision to Proposal**

The Development Planner advised that this presentation relates to revisions to a rezoning application reviewed by the Panel in 2002. Changes do not impact the zoning bylaw, but the change in the exterior cladding is of particular note to the ADP. Planning staff believe that the change in cladding material is an upgrade in the development.

B. Shigatomi, Architect, entered the meeting and the chair requested that only revisions be addressed in this presentation.

The Architect advised that this is a mixed use development with commercial at grade and residential above. Changes noted were:

- Reduction of residential units from 47 to 41
- Reduction of commercial units from 6 to 5
- Reduction in FSR to 2.54
- Enclosed balconies facing 3<sup>rd</sup> Street have been maintained but will now have a window system to allow balconies to be opened. Enclosed balconies facing north have been changed to open balconies.
- Exterior cladding changed to composite panels with limestone finish, instead of sandblasted concrete, and panelled metal cladding with vertical joints, instead of corrugated metal cladding.
- Balcony railings changed to horizontal railings with tempered glass behind.
- Painted metal over the bay windows to give cover over windows and create an eyebrow on the building

A display board with samples of materials and colours was circulated to the Panel for information.

### **The Panel had questions relating to:**

- Design and installation of the metal cladding panel;
- Concrete block style;
- Construction of eyebrow detail;
- Landscape changes and spacing of trees at the street;
- Design details of water feature at residential entry;
- Functions of the two entrances;
- Differences in plans of North elevation (DP-11) distributed to the Panel and elevations on the architect's display board.

The architect explained the differences on DP-11 that are of concern to the Panel and advised that the display boards illustrate the current design.

### **Comments**

- Recessed entry may be dark and front door far removed from street. Lighting needs to be addressed in this area.
- May be appropriate to consider opening the CRUs into the entry.

- Technical issue around pattern of metal cladding – series of new materials and elements may be risky – detail design is very important in this project.
- Balcony guardrails on the outside of the glass create cleaning problems for residents.
- Important that trees are set back behind the curb line so they are not disturbed if the road is widened in the future.
- Brise soleil needs to be consistent on both sides of the building.
- Further detail on the gate at the main entry needs to be addressed.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the proposed revisions to the existing rezoning drawings and recommends approval with subject to approval by the Development Planner of the following:**

- Further development and design of the outdoor entry vestibule;
- Relocation of the trees relative to the proposed road alignment.

**Unanimously Carried**

**6. Other Business**

None

**7. Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

**Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting will be held Wednesday, September 17, 2003 at 5 p.m.

---

Chair