

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, July 19, 2006**

MINUTES

- Present:** S. Friars, Chair
A. Malczyk, Vice Chair
D. Rose
P. Winterburn
R. Spencer
N. Paul
D. Lee
B. Dabiri
R. Vesely
Councillor B. Fearnley
- Staff:** K. Russell, Development Planner
G. Venczel, Development Planner
E. Maillie, Committee Secretary
C. Perry, Technical Assistant
- Guests:** L. McCarthy, Youth Dev Worker
L. Calvin
K. Halex – Architect
B. McLean – Developer
D. Rose – Landscape Architect
M. Rahbar – Designer
B. Gordon – Architect
P. Kreuk – Landscape Architect
R. Brown – Sustainability Consultant
T. Bunting – Architect
A. Whitchelo – Concert Properties
- Absent:** A. Hii
-

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 June 21, 2006

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held June 21, 2006 be adopted.

Unanimously Carried

2. Business Arising

None

3. Staff Update

(a) Public Hearings

Three nights of Public Hearings have been scheduled for July before Council takes a summer break during August. The first fall meeting of Council will be September 11.

- **On July 10th** Council approved 970 Marine Drive;
- **On July 17th** Council approved and commended the project at 250 West 17th Street , and approved the 9-unit development at 215 & 221 East 4th Street. 714 West 14th was held over until all members of Council are present after concern was expressed that the proposal does not meet the Marine Drive Task Force height recommendations.
- **On July 24th** the rezoning and OCP amendment for the Holy Trinity School site will go forward to Public Hearing.

4. Other Business

Councillor Fearnley asked that the Panel consider having a design charrette for the open civic space on Block 62. His concern is not with the Library building design itself, but rather with the design of the public space and how it may develop as a significant civic amenity over time

5:45 pm B. Dabiri and A. Malczyk entered the meeting.

The Development Planner advised that, if the Panel is interested in proceeding with the design charrette process, a recommendation should be made to Council for direction.

There was discussion of the Panel's role in reviewing projects on behalf of the City and other parties who should be invited to participate if another charrette is to be held. It was noted that the landscape architect is proceeding with planning the civic space after receiving input from the Panel in June and the Panel will receive a second presentation in September.

The Panel will review the Design Guidelines for this project at the August meeting in preparation for the September presentation of the project and to ensure that the intent of the guidelines is understood and being addressed.

5. Youth Art Projects

Lisa McCarthy, Youth Development Worker, gave an overview of the City's programme – Studio in the City – and background of community art projects undertaken and completed over the last three years. Two new art projects are now underway and the Panel was asked for their input.

Queen Mary School Mural:

One of the current projects is a mural at Queen Mary Elementary School and the members of the group were introduced. Katarina and Anna are Coordinators of the project and Anna reviewed the theme of the mural. This mural addresses a Centennial theme for the City of North Vancouver and illustrates the history of the community. This project is a collaborative effort with the North Vancouver School District #44.

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

- Impressed with the quality of the work in the project.
- Art work is beautiful.
- Colours should blend with area.
- Type of paint to be used and how the mural surface will be protected.
- Treatment of existing trees.
- Beautiful project – use anti graffiti coating on the surface.
- Mural will mark the boundary between the City and School District land.
- Consider wrapping the trees for protection while painting the mural.

The Chair noted that there is consensus that this is a very good project.

Lonsdale Quay Mosaic

Liz Calvin, mentor, and members of the mosaic programme were introduced. The Panel was advised that the current project is to design and build a seating area by the fountain at Lonsdale Quay that was completed two years ago.

The artists explained the design development and refinement leading to the mosaic design and colour selection. A portion of the mosaic will be recessed to allow access through it and the mosaic design will be carried to ground level at that recessed point to create continuity of design. The design and colours for the mosaic seating area tie in with the fountain mosaic already completed and have an aquatic theme. Skateboarding on the structure will be discouraged by the edge treatment and large bolts. A structural engineer will be involved with the project to determine weight factor on the deck in this location.

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

- Treatment on tile face.
- So many good ideas in initial sketches but final one reflects all of the initial designs.
- Consideration of using a bull nose tile at the edge to make it more comfortable for sitting.
- Would be useful to have a section of this project to make sure that it is well designed.

Staff advised that both the mural and mosaic will be completed over the summer.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the proposed Mural at Queen Mary School and Mosaic at Lonsdale Quay and supports the projects as presented. The Panel commends the artists for a very good presentation.

Unanimously Carried

D. Rose declared a conflict of interest and left the meeting at 7:10 p.m. due to his professional participation in the following project.

4. 240 & 244 West 17th Street - Rezoning

The Development Planner gave an overview of the proposal to build a triplex on each of two neighbouring lots. It was noted that the project may need to change from the proposed because of staff and APC comments and concerns.

The Chair read the resolution passed by the Advisory Planning Commission at their review of the project on July 12, 2006.

K. Halex – Architect, B MacLean – Developer, and D. Rose – Landscape Architect were introduced and the architect reviewed the site context and location.

The Architect gave an overview of the project as provided in the information material dated July 6, 2006 and noted –

- Exterior finishing materials and building height with three floors plus roofdeck.
- Sustainability issues identified following the request by APC during their review.
- Site context and development around the site.
- Exterior doorway at rear cellar to address safety issues and introduce light.
- Exterior finishes of wood and vinyl siding and metal windows and trellising on buildings at decks and roofdeck.

The Landscape Architect advised that the materials try to maintain as much permeable surface as possible. The central pathway will be concrete slabs on crushed rock and the open parking area will have a crushed rock surface. Front units will have sunken patios. Grade differences and building heights were noted. Plant selection and location allows for visibility to the front doors of the rear units. Planting detail and street trees were explained.

The Chair noted the issues raised by staff around the FSR and zoning guidelines. The Architect stated that no radical design changes were anticipated to reduce the FSR from .66 to .62.

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

- Building envelope projections.
- Building grades need to be established – especially at the garage.
- Drop to patio at front has 4.6 foot drop and only six steps are shown.
- Width of parking garage
- Availability of street parking.
- Are parking garages over height.
- Finishing detail.

- Depth of overhangs.
- Depth and finish of mid-level overhang.
- Have the exposing building face calculations been done to determine allowable extent of windows.
- Location and handling of garbage and recycling areas.
- Have privacy issues at roof decks been reviewed in response to APC.
- Would this project benefit from reduced setback.

D. Rose left the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

Comments of the Panel included, but were not limited to:

- Need to apply for building grades.
- Survey information provided by the applicant is not sufficient information to calculate the grades.
- Grades at garage do not appear to work.
- Privacy issues at windows between the units.
- Would prefer pitch roof in this context.
- Sunken patio and elevation could be alleviated by raising patios which would make it a more comfortable space to use.
- Layout works well.
- Garbage needs to be addressed.
- Many issues are still to be addressed which raises a concern that the building may not end up being the same as is presented.
- Too tight on the lot – duplex would be better fit.
- Project needs relaxations and presentation does not make compelling statement in support.
- Not prepared to support with information presented.
- Would support increased density but would like to see stronger arguments and stronger documentation to support this benefit.
- Size of parking stalls is a concern.
- Privacy issues from proximity of buildings.
- Need to see sustainability statement that includes strategies to be implemented.
- Flat roof on garage needs to be a green roof.

Applicant's comments

Believe that it is possible to address FSR changes without changing the building in a significant way. Side elevations are not seen and window changes would be minor. Buildings could be offset by varying the setback. The LEED program was considered before potential sustainability initiatives were selected.

The LEED program was considered before being presented and it is recognized that this is important in marketing units. Landscape is 85% permeable. The applicant asked that the Panel to support the project with provision that the issues be addressed.

The Chair stated that the project must be able to speak for itself when presented, and respectfully noted that it cannot be presumed that a .62 FSR will be acceptable, notwithstanding the precedent of an earlier approved development.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 240 & 244 West 17th Street (B. MacLean/Kent Halex Architect) and although supporting the site development concept feels the following have not been adequately resolved:

- **Building grades**
- **Garage height**
- **Site context plan to show relationship to adjacent buildings**
- **Amount of windows in exposing building faces**
- **FSR calculation, in discussion with Planning**
- **Consideration of the overlook issues between the two subject lots**
- **Garbage and recycling location**
- **Configuration of parking and garages at the lane**
- **More clearly defined sustainability statement.**

The Panel supports a reduction of the front yard setback, and recommends that level of sunken patios be raised.

The Panel looks forward to a revised submission.

Unanimously Carried

5. 339 East 8th Street – Rezoning

The Development Planner gave an overview of the site and context of the area.

M. Rahbar, Designer, noted that this property is in the mid-block area. The existing development in the area and the heritage house on the neighbouring site were explained.

The proposed duplex is symmetrical in design. The design detail, as noted in the information package dated June 15, 2006 was explained with details noted including:

- One enclosed and one open parking space for each unit.
- Rima pavers for parking surfaces.
- Garbage and recycling areas.
- Sustainability issues identified were lighting, dual flush toilets, energy star windows, rima pavers, use of native and drought resistant plantings.
- Steep pitch roofs relate to the house on the neighbouring property.
- Materials board with exterior colours and finishes were displayed.

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

- Type of hedging along the front of the property;
- Paving materials at walkways.
- Type of retaining walls.

Comments of the Panel included, but were not limited to:

- Prefer asymmetrical design in this neighbourhood to be more consistent with existing homes.
- Need to reconsider tree selection to avoid disease.
- May be beneficial to relocate pathways to the centre.
- Pavers on side of the building should be shown on the plan.
- Consider expanded plant selection at the rear.
- Support the project but prefer original plan with entries in the middle for internal circulation. Entrances are now apart but revised door location creates privacy issue with neighbour on one side
- Support the asymmetry of the building and like the project.

D. Rose returned to the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 339 East 8th Street (Vernacular Design) and recommends approval subject to resolution by the Development Planner of the following issues:

- **Further consideration of plant material selection**
- **More detail on material composition on side pathway**
- **Use of Rima pavers on the walkways instead of under carports**
- **Relocation of paths at front, away from side property lines, to create a buffer.**

**Carried
– 2 Opposed**

6. Block 62 – Site 3 – Building Permit

The Development Planner advised that this is a preliminary presentation for the proposed residential towers on Site 3 of Block 62. It was noted that the revised locations of parkade entries have not been approved by Engineering.

B. Worden, Architect, reviewed the streetscape on 13th Street with townhouses facing the street and the interior courtyard. The applicant proposes varying from the design guidelines by:

- Relocating parkade entry from the inner courtyard to West 13th Street.
- Locating the residents' amenity space to north east corner of the east building.
- Changing the massing on the site by using a rectangular building form with the narrower tower on the west side. This provides greater separation between City Hall and the tower.
- LEED is addressed by using smaller windows and core insulated wall at north and more glass and shade provision for south side.

P. Kreuk, Landscape Architect, advised that the design presented is generally in compliance with the Design Guidelines prescribed to ensure that the site is

pedestrian friendly. There is some variance by the amenity space. Features noted included:

- Use of water elements and trees being considered to create a strong linkage with City Hall.
- Pedestrian accesses at lane from Chesterfield and from 14th Street.
- Edge of the building facing onto City Hall courtyard would be treated as a street edge.
- Paving at central area at auto court will be pedestrian friendly.
- Courtyard has grass area between the walkways and water element at City Hall entrance hall plaza.

Other issues now being developed include:

- Site lighting.
- Further planting to soften street edge.
- Working with Public Art Committee for public art feature in the courtyard area.
- Outdoor green terraces for penthouses.
- Green roof at bridge components and lower roof spaces.

R. Brown, Sustainability Consultant, advised that this project will be registered with Canada Green Building and will go through the process for LEED Silver. An energy consultant will be retained. A summary of sustainability issues identified to be addressed in this project include:

- Stormwater management at grade and on roofs to deal with water flow on site, dealing with water at grade level and excess run-off.
- Energy and ventilation to reach a target of below 25% National Energy Code standards.
- Connection to Lonsdale Energy Corporation.
- Water efficiency on exterior and internally for 40-50% reduction of potable water.
- Waste management plan to optimize recycling opportunities, improved interior ventilation and specifying low off-gassing materials

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

- Density, FSR and height in regard to guidelines.
- Access control to residential buildings.
- Has the required soil depth for trees been taken into consideration on parkade slab.
- Type of amenities to be provided, including children's area.

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

- Parking needs to be resolved to respond to the needs of City Hall and visitors to the residential tower.
- Concern that north-facing townhouse units and amenity area will never get sunlight
- Shadow study required.

- Relocation of parking entry is big departure from guidelines and would like to see design study to illustrate that this is better option.
- One-way in / one way out for vehicles exacerbates concerns with locating of parkade entry on West 13th.
- Need to demonstrate that intended parkade entry off the mews is not workable
- Corner of building at entry to City Hall turns its back on the entry – architectural treatment at this tower corner needs to signal that this is an entry to City Hall, particularly at ground level.
- Access concerns and safety issues to address Police and Fire requirements.
- Like courtyard design.
- Water feature could work with stormwater management.
- Need analysis for reason for making parking access change.
- Like direction – concerns with treatment of turnaround space and whether the traffic element should be downplayed further to give more pedestrian feel and add to pedestrian connection to City Hall.
- Like the urban development.
- Future plan for the south east corner of the site will be for future civic use, which may include daycare.
- Like the direction and character suggested.
- Energy analysis should be done soon and may allow extension of glazing on north.
- Hope opportunities for outdoor play areas will not be lost.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the preliminary concept for Block 62 – Site 3 (Intracorp / Ramsay Worden Architects) and thanks the applicant for an excellent presentation and looks forward to further resolution of the following issues:

- **Amenity space and children’s play space**
- **Livability of townhouse units facing north**
- **Residential parking access and egress**
- **Shadow study be undertaken for next presentation**
- **Reconciliation of designated City Hall parking with shared visitor parking.**

The Panel supports the conceptual proposal for building portions with five storeys.

Unanimously Carried

D. Lee left at 10:10 p.m.

7. Lot 43/44 Harbourside Drive – Rezoning & Development Proposal

The Development Planner advised that this is a two phase proposal with Phase I being presented at this time. The Chair read the resolution passed by the Advisory Planning Commission after their review on July 12, 2006.

A.Whitchelo, Concert Properties, reviewed existing developments within Harbourside Business Park and commented on the changes in the requirements of businesses looking for commercial and office space. Current markets indicate that the two smaller buildings proposed for this site better address these business requirements with no additional density required. The applicant also proposes to build a parkade on the north of the site to alleviate parking difficulties in the business park. Zoning changes are requested to:

- Permit two buildings with reduced floor plates.
- Increase in height to one building with 5-storeys and one with 7-storeys.
- Exclusion of the parkade from the floor space ratio.
- Reduced setback at Fell Avenue.

The applicant is in contact with TransLink to discuss possible increase in transit service in the area.

T. Bunting, Architect, reviewed the proposal for the two buildings to be located on the south of the site and parkade to the north. It is proposed that a separation between the two buildings will connect with the park to south and improve the pedestrian experience in the area. The applicant is in contact with a party wishing to build a hotel on the site to the east and this is anticipated to be built after completion of soil remediation work now underway. View studies from residences to the north were displayed.

The applicant noted that the City encouraged consideration of a Phase II development in the future. A Phase II would require a second application for OCP amendment and rezoning but would not include additional parking.

Details of the building design and exterior finishes and colours as contained in the Information Package dated July 19, 2006 were explained.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the landscape design and explained the planting around and through the site. Stormwater management will be addressed. A double row of shade trees at the street edges complies with the Business Park Design Guidelines. The open space within the pedestrian precinct and park entry will have seating areas and will retain a connection to the park to the south.

The developer is working with a hotel chain and it is anticipated that the proposed hotel on the site to the east will go ahead as soon as the remediation of the site is completed.

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

- Is OCP amendment required to change height to 100', when application only shows 90'?
- Is it likely that the hotel on the neighbouring site will proceed?
- Does the City support the height increase?
- Who is likely to use the park area?

Comments:

- Height likely to be problematic in this proposal.
- Support extra parking and height.
- If height is increased would not support reduced setback.
- This is a popular waterfront walkway and should be enhanced with additional landscape and treatment at the street edge.
- Concerns with how parkade will affect Harbourside Drive and may benefit from treatment in more pedestrian scale.
- Good plan.
- Support reduced setback on Fell Avenue.
- In favour of taller and slimmer buildings but parkade needs to be more transparent.
- Like the project but would prefer relocation of parkade further south and allowance for storefront space along the street but this may impact density.
- Key streets in this area are Fell Avenue and Harbourside Place.
- Design allows view down Fell to be retained

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the preliminary OCP amendment and rezoning application for Lot 43/44 Harbourside Drive (Concert Properties / Bunting Coady Architects) and supports the height increase and setback reduction.

It was requested that the Motion be separated.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the OCP amendment and rezoning application for Lots 43 / 44 Harbourside Drive (Concert Properties Ltd. / Bunting Coady Architects) and supports the proposed height increase.

Unanimously Carried

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the OCP amendment and rezoning application for Lots 43 / 44 Harbourside Drive (Concert Properties Ltd. / Bunting Coady Architects) and supports the parkade floor area exclusion from FSR.

**Carried
– 2 Opposed**

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the OCP amendment and rezoning application for Lots 43 / 44 Harbourside Drive (Concert Properties Ltd. / Bunting Coady Architects) and supports the proposed reduction of setback.

**Carried
- 1 Opposed**

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the OCP amendment and rezoning application for Lots 43 / 44 Harbourside Drive (Concert Properties Ltd. / Bunting Coady Architects) and generally supports the project . The Panel looks forward to further design development addressing the following:

- **Further development of design of the parkade, particularly as it relates to Harbourside Drive**
- **Addressing the possibility of more active uses along Harbourside Drive and Fell Avenue.**

Unanimously Carried

Applicant's comments:

Height increase, parkade and exclusion of parkade from FSR are critical to the success of the proposal but setback is not.

Believe that there is a demand for this type of office space in North Vancouver to make a vibrant business areas and need to build what market wants. The applicant would prefer not to build a parkade because of the construction costs, but there is no bus service in this area which creates the need to build the parkade.

8. Other Business

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, August 16, 2006.

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2006\2006 07 19.doc