

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, February 15th, 2012

MINUTES

Present: B. Allen
B. Harrison
Y. Khalighi
J. Marshall
S. McFarlane
M. Messer
J. O'Brien
M. Saii
Councillor Bell

Staff: G. Penway, Director, Community Development
C. Purvis, Development Planner
C. Perry, Supervisor, Engineering Services
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk

Guests: 1835 Lonsdale Avenue
Bert Chase, HSCA Inc.
Karl Wein, Karl Wein and Associates (representing the owner)
Hope Centre, Lions Gate Hospital
Tony Gill, IBI/HB Architects
Saniye Karacabeyli, IBI/HB Architects
Cameron Owen, IBI/HB Architects

Absent: K. Kallweit Graham
Peter Kennedy, R.C.M.P

A quorum being present, the C. Purvis, the Development Planner, took the chair called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

1. Meeting Procedures

G. Penway, Director, Community Development, welcomed the new members to the Advisory Design Panel and gave an overview of the role of advisory bodies in the City of North Vancouver.

The City has the third highest population density in the region. Larger development projects, usually three or more units are sent to ADP for review, although the Panel will occasionally see duplexes planned for heritage areas.

As the City made the decision not to pre-zone up to the limits of the Official Community Plan (OCP) applicants have to ask for rezoning to reach OCP limits.

The City has advisory bodies like ADP to get better buildings built; to evaluate good quality design at different price levels. Members of the Panel may or may not like the designs offered; the City encourages the Panel to communicate that fact. ADP's task is to comment on design; is it a good high rise, townhouses? Some proposals will only be seen once by ADP, others will be at a preliminary stage looking for direction, and will come back to ADP further along in the design process. It is important that ADP functions as part of the development process.

The main purpose of ADP is to pass a resolution on a project to give input to Council; members should be thinking about the wording of the resolution during the evaluation period.

The advice from ADP is a recommendation not approval, and always helps Council make a decision even if it is not accepted. Resolutions passed at ADP are used in reports to Council.

A member of the Panel commented that often applicants do not provide enough information on context. Staff: You have the right to say that there is not enough context and ask the applicant to return at a later date.

A member asked about conflict of interest. Staff: Conflict of interest is generally if a member lives in a one block radius of the development or is working on the project. A member having a conflict of interest should declare it before the presentation and excuse themselves from the meeting. If a member is working on the project, they then enter with the delegation.

A member asked whether it was a conflict of interest if the applicant was a client but the member was not working on the proposal. Staff: The City has not defined the relationship as a conflict.

There was a question on whether models should be required for all presentations.

Action: A discussion on the level at which a model would be required will be discussed at a future meeting of the ADP.

Action: the wording of resolution 1b will be changed to be consistent with the other suggested resolutions.

2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

The meeting proceeded to the election of Chair and Vice Chair for the period February 2012 to January 31 2013. The Panel agreed to election by a show of hands.

Nominations for the position of Chair were requested. S. Macfarlane was nominated for the position of Chair and accepted the nomination. There being no further nominations, S. Macfarlane was elected Chair by acclamation.

Nominations for the position of Vice Chair were requested. J. Marshall was nominated and accepted. M. Messer was nominated but refused the nomination. There being no further nominations, J. Marshall was elected Vice Chair by acclamation.

S. McFarlane took the Chair at 5:50 p.m.

3. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held December 14th, 2011

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held December 14th, 2011 be adopted.

**Carried
One abstention due to conflict of interest.**

4. Business Arising

None from the minutes.

5. CityShaping Phase 2: Critical Issues Update and Workshop

S. Smith gave a presentation on "CityShaping Stage 2: Critical Issues and Community Engagement" and reviewed Phase One results.

Critical issues were distilled into three integrating topics/themes: 1. Achieving environmental and financial security, 2. Integrating transportation and land uses. 3. Achieving a healthy and liveable community.

The new OCP will take into account the recently adopted Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy which states employment, dwelling unit and population trends to 2041 for each municipality, as well as the context of the City on the North Shore e.g. with regard to the emerging North Shore transportation corridor. The new District of North Vancouver OCP will also have an impact on the City.

There will be small group presentations and focus groups to get feedback from the hard-to-reach members of the population e.g. youth, seniors, ethnic communities. There will also be an online discussion forum, small group presentations and self-directed workbooks.

Questions and comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- How is the work seen around the framework of a greater north shore entity? Staff: The City has been on our own for 100 years. There is no formal process but from a planning perspective we liaise with the District of North Vancouver. The transit area plan is quite new. Amalgamation is not being pursued at a political level.
- I am surprised not to see clean and ecological businesses; it can be an engine that drives jobs. Staff: Under our economic development strategy there is some support for green business. There is a place to add comments in the related workbook.
- This can be two views: visionary or task oriented tasks; I would hate to see visionary items pushed off the table.
- Some items are driven by need, and some will require more discussion than others.

S. Smith led an exercise on Workbook 3 "Achieving a Healthy and Livable Community". Two policy options were discussed:

Comments on "Monitor, adapt and revitalize community facilities (eg: recreation centres, playing fields and playgrounds) and services in response to changing community needs, the populations being served, and urban form" included:

- There should also be new facilities where required, not just renovated.
- The concept of hubs is key as it creates synergy.
- The population has changed; the placement and nature of facilities no longer serve communities.
- Schools could be adapted for community needs.
- Some of the options overlap; a hub is essential because it is linked to transportation.
- The Lower Lonsdale area is an area that will be going through changes and it needs to be done right because of the waterfront, the businesses need an identity and TransLink will be renovating the seabus terminal. Tourism is important to Lower Lonsdale.

Comments on "Recognize the broad role played by cultural and recreational centres in providing community services and acting as neighbourhood hub" included:

- It is important because it gives a reason for social gathering.
- It adds vibrancy to a community e.g. Edgemont Village is a very vibrant centre; people want to be there and want to be seen there.
- There is a need to attract families so we need space for children.

At the end of the discussion copies of the workbooks were left for members to complete. The Panel were encouraged to attend the kickoff event and two workshops.

*There was a short break at 7:25 pm.
The meeting reconvened at 7:30 pm.*

6. 1835 Lonsdale Avenue (Rezoning Application)

Staff provided background on the project which a proposal to replace an existing structure consisting of one storey of retail and two levels of residential containing four rental units with a new four storey building. The new building will house two at grade retail units with office space on the second and third floors, and three new residential units on the fourth floor.

Variances required are a height of 49.5 ft rather than the 40 ft allowed and 16 commercial parking stalls instead of 21 stalls.

Bert Chase, HSCA Inc., reviewed the project for the Panel:

- The project is on the west side of Lonsdale Avenue where there has not been much development; it will be first new development and the major building on the block.
- The design approach respects the scale of the existing buildings. The design addresses the exposed north and south walls which have recesses accented with colour.
- The design creates inner penetration of street and interior spaces using a glass wall so that the activity of the street takes precedence over a strong architectural statement.
- There are simple east and west elevations with a glass facade with vertical and horizontal glazed mullions with horizontal banding running around the sides.
- The elevator on the main facade has a glass wall and is open to the street.

- The glass is shaded for hottest part of the day to conserve energy. The owner is encouraging the office floors to be let as one unit to encourage cross ventilation.
- There is the possibility of photovoltaic panels on the roof.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- What greenery is there? A: There may be planter boxes with vines on the upper balconies which could be guided over the sunscreen lattice.
- Did you think about installing a green roof? A: No.
- Would you be adding another street tree? A: There are already established trees.
- Staff: Are you aware of the Lonsdale Streetscape Plan and that you will have to redo the frontage? The existing trees are creating havoc for the public realm due to roots. There is a new standard which will be sought to improve the street in front of the building.
- Staff: Are you aware that you will be connecting to Lonsdale Energy Corp.? A: Yes.
- Is there any public art component to this? A: No. Staff: The policy asks for a 1% contribution but it is not a requirement.
- What is the rationale for the reduction in parking stalls? A: The City's strong desire to maintain the residential units and the addition of the fourth floor. The parking was calculated on the square footage for the building rather than the commercial requirement.
- Commercial parking is a problem where people work. A: We are considering having the residential parking available to commercial customers during the day and available for the residents after business hours.
- Do you have a sign strategy? A: Not yet.
- There is no gathering area for the residents? Have you thought about having a common area on the roof top? A: Not at the moment; the issue is access to the roof which would raise the proposed building height.
- Can you provide rationale around the material choices? A: At the street level we wanted an open relationship between the exterior and interior and have chosen a honed granite for the base of the building and picked out complementary colours in the granite.
- The proportions of the building seem to change in the different depictions. A: The elevations are more accurate representations.

Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:

- It is an amazing opportunity to incorporate sustainable green initiatives and set a precedent; leading the way before other redevelopment happens. All Lonsdale roofs are tar and gravel.
- Make the roof green and usable; put in a room that be used as a community room.
- The outdoor living space could be incorporated much better; a three and half foot balcony is not very liveable; it is too narrow.
- I would encourage making the street more liveable with paving, adding another tree.
- There should be less cars; perhaps have a co-op car, more bike parking.
- I am trying to come to terms about the facade and the unrelenting disregard for the different natures of the floors. Perhaps you could have no columns on the ground floor and bigger glass windows and use the column expression to define the building.
- Think about signage during the design process.
- It is a wise massing move to set top of building back.
- The site plan has all impervious surfaces, not a single living thing. Could the back be paved with pavers and have a more courtyard feel with permeability?
- Unit Two has two spaces with no light or air; this should be solved to be considered liveable.

- Council will be looking for something that will set a high standard.
- It is not a soft look; the introduction of some greenery and distinguishing between the different floors would help.
- I am concerned about the liveability and usability. It is important to get pots, benches or something to create more interest and create vibrancy for people going past.
- I question the usability of the narrow balconies; could you realign the spaces to get more space on the outside? Use skylights to bring more light into the units.
- You could add hanging planters along the back walkway.
- You could introduce wood soffits to soften and add warmth: perhaps on the top roof.
- The project should pursue design development to enhance the amount of green area, enhance the liveability of the units. The narrowness of the balconies should be reconsidered.
- The potential the project has to reward the experience of pedestrians at the street level is not fully exploited at this stage.
- I find the coolness of the palette inappropriate for this project.
- The overriding concern is finding a way to differentiate between the floors. The uniformity of the three levels is not enhancing the project. There are good clues on successful businesses on Lonsdale. The residential layer on top lacks coherence with the rest of the scheme.

Presenter's comments:

- The comments were helpful.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 1835 Lonsdale Avenue and, although supporting the site development concept, feels the following have not been adequately resolved:

- Further design development of the architectural expression and articulation of the facades is recommended;
- Liveability issues in the residential units including light penetration, accessibility to the roof and unit layouts should be addressed;
- Green initiatives possibly around the roofscape, streetscape, the rear of the building including greenery and permeability;
- The permeability of the site with regard to storm water management be reviewed;
- Further development of the architectural treatment at street level and its relationship to the streetscape.

Carried with one abstention

7. HOpe Centre, Lions Gate Hospital (Development Variance Permit)

Staff provided background on the project which is for a four storey psychiatry and community mental health services building at 240 East 13th Street and 253 East 14th Street. The site is zoned as public use and assembly.

Tony Gill, IBI/HB Architects, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the project:

- The ambulance station will be in the basement; it will consist of nine vehicles, sleeping quarters and a lounge area.
- A tunnel will connect the building to the main hospital building.
- There will be different services offered on each floor: the main floor will have a drop off and pick up zone and a coffee shop run by patients and a donor recognition wall at the main entrance, Level 1 will have outpatient services, level 2 community health services such as an art room, lounge, UBC academics spaces, conference rooms, a library etc., Level 3 is shell space to be used for future expansion of programs, Level 4 will be the inpatient floor with a secured entrance, support services and private rooms in four pods and living spaces and some outdoor space.
- Wood composite panel will be used on the facades.

Cameron Owen, IBI/HB Architects, described the landscape plan

- There are terraced landings to the secondary entrance and semi-public space with benches and seating opportunities.
- There is a courtyard for outdoor activities for the residents
- Street trees per City standards are planned.
- An extensive green roof covers the entrance to the parkade.
- The landscape features mainly native plants

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Where is the patient intake area? A: Patients will mostly be admitted through the hospital.
- The donor wall will be outside? A: Yes, it will be etched glass in the wall.
- How does the tunnel work; does it connect to an existing tunnel? A: Yes.
- Explain the vision around the outdoor courtyard garden? A: It is a tight courtyard space; there is a retaining wall against the existing building. There will be a number of benches. It will be a quiet, cool space for people, planted simply with ferns.
- Could the top floor roof be green? It will be a heat island. A: It will be a light coloured roof not green.
- What is the sculptural art feature? A: We will be looking at an opportunity for artwork from the patients.
- The trellis entrance to the parkade? A: To control the change in light from light to dark.
- What is the big design idea? How does it support the use of the building? A: One of the important things is it is driven by program. We wanted to break the stereotype of mental health and fight the stigma of mental health. The building is lifted off the ground with glazing on the ground floor so that it is transparent. We have carving out parts of the building. The use of wood and concrete echoes the North Shore. We are trying to get people to embrace the building and come in.
- What is the maximum number of patients? A: 26 beds for the inpatient beds which is more capacity than they currently have. They can bring more patients through the interview rooms. It is a new model for the hospital so they are not sure.
- What role will the outside area will play in therapy? A: This has been designed in conjunction with the master plan.
- is there a similar facility to this? A: It is one of a kind. Programs are very scattered at the moment.
- What is the height of the building on the west side? A: One storey: 18 feet.

- How tall is the courtyard wall? A: It is a transition space; the building to the west will eventually be demolished. The western space will open up into a larger green space as part of the master plan.
- Are there opportunities for patients to garden? A: No. There is space to exercise, an art room, badminton, general play. Patients are generally there for 12 days so are not long term.
- The courtyard is a dark sunken space; how long before the green space is more therapeutic and restorative: Is there any opportunity in the short term to have a better sense of the therapeutic nature of the green space? A: Some patients will have daypasses. Doctors were involved in the discussions. There are eight new facilities being built which will have big outdoor spaces; long term patients will go to one of the other buildings. It will come in time. Fundraising will be a catalyst.
- The entry area is a bold statement; will daypass patients use that facility? A: The clients were involved in the process; patients will probably use it.
- Why is a green roof not possible for other buildings to look down on it? A: There are not the funds.
- Is there a way to plan for a green roof? A: It is an all concrete structure, the roof load is capable of taking it.
- What is the colour scheme? A: It is more of an orange than red and a lot of earth tones.

Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:

- It is very good, I like it. It is in good hands.
- I like it, but would love a green roof.
- It is a well thought-out presentation which makes our job easier.
- I support the idea of a warm palette and opening up the building. It redefines what a big box can be; there is an architecture of compassion in relationship.
- Could the steel trellis be used in other elements? A: there is a trellis in the coffee shop; there is a weaving that is happening.
- I really think the carving is a good start but seems a little bit tentative.
- It would be good to provide sections of the "crack" garden.
- I hope that there is an opportunity to sit outside on a rainy day.
- I would like to see the public art developed.
- There is general support for the scheme with a resounding request for investing energy in a green roof in response to the neighbouring context.
- You should carry through with greater levels of commitment to the architectural intent. There is a skilful team at work on the project.
- I would have gained more understanding with more information on the context. The absence of the context information is disconcerting. It would have enhanced the presentation considerably. I applaud the attitude that you have tried to infuse in the building design.

Presenter's comments:

- We appreciate the comments and will take them back to see what we can do.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Variance Permit Application for the HOpe Centre, Lions Gate Hospital and recommends approval of the project subject to the approval, by the Development Planner of the following:

- The investigation of the possibility of having a green roof for aesthetic and environmental purposes.

The Panel supports the architectural expression and the direction of boldness and clarity.

Carried Unanimously

Colleen Perry left the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

8. Staff Update

332 East 10th Street: The Public Hearing was on January 16th; the rezoning received Second and Third Reading. The project received Final Adoption on January 23rd.

CityShaping Stage 2: Critical Issues and Community Engagement: Council endorsed the report on January 16th. Also, a reminder of the kickoff event tomorrow night from 7-9 pm.

East 29th Street Speed and Pedestrian Review: At the January 23rd meeting Council passed a motion endorsing the installation of two zebra crossings and three curb bulges on East 29th Street to improve pedestrian safety.

East 6th and St. David's Right of Way: Council directed staff to proceed with public consultation and a neighbourhood meeting to determine the level of community support for various uses of this open space. Staff favour planting an orchard.

Harbourside OCP Amendment: On January 23rd Council approved the Terms of Reference for a Harbourside Task Force. This decision was rescinded at the February 6th Council Meeting and a public consultation process was endorsed.

506 East 19th Street: Due to neighbourhood opposition, the proposal to retain the heritage home was withdrawn by the applicant and on January 23rd Council passed a motion to allow the demolition of the home and construction of two single family homes.

North Vancouver Museum: A resolution was passed at the February 6th Council meeting for Lot 4 on the waterfront to be considered for the museum.

BC Building Code Renewal: on February 6th Council resolved to send a letter to the Provincial Government expressing the City's disappointment that proposed changes to the BC Building Code do not address improvements in energy performance in a meaningful way. Staff were directed to report back to Council with options for public consultation to consider options for further increasing the energy efficiency of new buildings in the City in 2013, should the Province fail to enact substantive energy performance improvements in the BC Building Code.

M4 Commercial Zoning Bylaw: This bylaw was introduced and had first reading at the January 9th Council meeting.

9. Other Business

S. Kimm-Jones reminded the group that the March meeting of the Advisory Design Panel was scheduled during Spring Break and that she would be checking for quorum early in March.

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, March 21st, 2012.


Chair