

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, January 17, 2007**

MINUTES

Present:	S. Friars – Chair A. Malczyk – Vice Chair N. Paul A. Hii D. Lee D. Rose R. Spencer R Vesely P. Winterburn
Staff:	G. Venczel, Development Planner J. Hnachuk, Temporary Committee Secretary C. Perry, Technical Assistant
Guests:	A. Fekri and B. Monadzadeh, Rock-Arc Dev Corp P. Stanley, Pattison Sign Group
Absent:	B. Dabiri

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

The Chair welcomed Mr. Bob Heywood as Councillor Representative to the ADP for the current year.

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held December 6, 2006

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held December 6, 2006 be adopted.

Unanimously Carried

2. Business Arising

None.

3. Staff Update

(a) 338 East 12th Street

Council gave this proposal third reading and now there is a covenant. This project will proceed to a new Building Permit.

(b) 784 East 15th Street

This project was approved by Council.

(c) 335 East 11th Street

This project was reconsidered by Council. Council would like to see the RT-1 size as well as a covenant restricting a secondary suite use. Some other minor changes were required.

(d) Rental Apartment Housing

This item is going to a Policy Committee in January.

(e) Western Avenue Planning Study

The recommendations from the Policy Committee were adopted by Council. This item had gone to the January 2007 APC.

(f) 276 E Keith Road

This project was adopted by Council.

(g) 123 East Keith Road

A Public Hearing for this project was waived. Council gave second and third readings to this bylaw allowing the balcony enclosures.

(h) 272 West 4th Street

Council gave second and third readings to this bylaw.

(i) 334 W 13th Street

This project was defeated by Council.

(j) 2233 Alden Lane

This coach house application was approved by Council.

4. 350 East 10th Street – Rezoning

Mr. B. Monadzadeh and Mr. A. Fekri introduced themselves as developers of Rock Arc Development. The developers reviewed the proposed duplex development. It was noted the OCP designation changed from a Level 1, Low Density designation to a Level 2, Low Density designation. They are seeking a rezoning from RS-1 to an RT zone.

The proposed development is in a heritage character area and the applicants have met with the Heritage Advisory Commission (HAC) on December 12, 2006. The Chair read the resolution of the Heritage Advisory Commission.

- Revisions reflecting heritage character have been made, such as the separation between the two entrances at the front, the 45-degree high pitched sloped front elevations, the gables at front with emphasis on the triangle similar to that at 216-218 East 10th Street, the first floor is elevated from the ground, wood railing, a balcony on the second floor, double-hung or casement windows. The setback on the second floor of the master bedroom has also been changed from 5' 0 to 6' 6". Front setbacks are consistent with the neighbouring buildings.

Following the HAC meeting, the applicants met with City staff and it was agreed changes would not be made to the proposed siding and shingles on the roof.

Comments and questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The pitch of the gables in the front and back of the building are not consistent, nor does the design vernacular carry through for the entirety of the duplex.
- Grading in the front and the public realm needs better definition.
- Back grade elevations need to address how the garbage could be stored and wheeled out the back lane-stairs are not acceptable.
- How do the proposed materials and their colour, including the area under the front veranda, relate to the heritage guidelines?
- How have the applicants responded to the CNV HAC recommendations?
- Are the windows overlooking neighbouring properties designed in such a way as to provide privacy?
- A better developed landscaping and site plan, while not required to be done by a professional, would be required when applicants return for the next ADP meeting.
- It was suggested to use a permeable treatment for walkways.

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

- This proposed development will go to a Public Hearing.
- A garbage and recycling component is necessary. Space for vehicles could be reduced to accommodate garbage/recycling areas.
- Front of building looks fine, suits the character of the area.
- Good development in principle.
- Like the front elevation.
- Front and back of building could be better resolved. Changes made to the front of the building work, but changes have not followed through to the back of the building.
- Further refinement is needed on the roof, too many different types.
- The site plan needs refinement. All grass is not sensitive to site planning. The planter in front is problematic.
- Grading issue in the backyard.
- Street trees and stormwater management practices will be requested by Engineering Dept.
- A Context Plan is missing. It is difficult to understand the relationship between the stairs and the city sidewalk. Property lines between east and west side are not shown on the plan as well as the fencing and retaining wall.
- Council previously approved basement exclusions to include: (1) powder room plumbing for one toilet and one sink; (2) half of the cellar area should be unfinished; and (3) the window wells should be minimal. A door and outside stair access is allowed.
- On the front elevation, the side lights at the front doors do not balance with the gable.
- The post in the middle of the veranda is a bit awkward, however is not critical for design.

Applicant's response:

- The pitch of the gables at the back of the building is consistent with the backyard and complies with the garage; the garage cannot go higher than 15'. Also, having a lower building in the back helped sink more penetration into the yard.
- The elevation in the front will not change, but will be levelled. The back elevation is flat and drains will be installed where needed.
- The garage area will be revised to provide enough space for a garbage area.
- A landscape layout will be provided and will include plantings at sidewalks.

- Fences will be included on the plans and usually new wood fences are installed.
- The elevations at the back of the house should be managed.
- A different shape of roof is a matter of taste. The applicant chose to use all the recommendations for heritage character. The roof will be revised.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 350 East 10th Street (Rock-Arc Development Corp.) and does not recommend approval at this time pending resolution of the following revisions:

- **Further simplification of the roof plan, particularly the rear of the building whose character should reflect vernacular at the front;**
- **Further development of the site plan to include elements such as fences, development to retaining wall and include the public street environment on the plan;**
- **Further incorporating permeable pavement;**
- **Providing garbage and recycling access to the lane from the rear yards; and**
- **Further clarification of materials on the high foundation wall (porches).**

Unanimously Carried

P. Winterburn left the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

5. 901 West 3rd Street – Development Variance Permit

A Report to Council dated January 10, 2007 outlining staff recommendations for the existing Nucasa signage was distributed to the Panel for background information by City staff.

P. Stanley with Jim Pattison Sign Group introduced himself as a representative for their client, Nucasa Milling Company, and briefly explained the steps that lead to the miscommunication of the signage approval.

Questions from the Panel included:

- How would the applicant respond to the staff recommendations as per the bylaws?

Comments from the Panel included:

- This is an unusual situation.
- Attractive sign. A little overpowering on the corner, looks like it covers a lot of the building.
- Whoever upgraded the building did a great job.
- Chop down some of the slats from the top of the sign.
- Transportation staff have no issues underground or with site lines.
- It is the nicest corner in that neighbourhood.
- The sign does not have detrimental effect on the corner.
- Think this application should be considered. In light of fairness, if other signs are really higher, then this should be allowed to stay.
- If three feet is knocked off height of the signs, it is going to look weird because of change of proportions relative to the lettering.

- The report does not say it has to comply and staff are supporting a variance for the other signs.
- The site, originally zoned similar to the areas of the other yards, was changed for a dental building. Finishing Touch applied for rezoning to its original state. There was opposition from the lumber companies. Council voted it down. Finishing Touch deals with mouldings only marginally dealt with at the other businesses, so Finishing Touch is there on a wholesale business.

Applicant's response:

- In response to staff recommendation to reduce the height of the sign from 15' to 12', steel poles are on the outside of the sign and a steel plate at the bottom. The sign could be removed and three feet taken off, repainted and reinstalled. Dicks and Rona signage is beyond the 15' allowable maximum height (20'). Nucasa requested something in between. Nucasa would prefer to not change the sign.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Variance Permit for 901 West 3rd Street (Pattison Sign Group / Nucasa Milling Company) and supports the recommendation of the staff report dated January 10, 2007.

Defeated
- 1 in favour
- 4 opposed

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Variance Permit for 901 West 3rd Street (Pattison Sign Group / Nucasa Milling Company) and supports the design of the existing signage package, including the aesthetic content, size and proportions, but has no comment on compliance with signage bylaw requirements.

Unanimously Carried

6. Other Business

(a) Acknowledgment of Retiring Directors

G. Venczel thanked S. Friars, A. Malczyk and R. Vesely for their time spent on the ADP and contributions they have made. There efforts have been much appreciated and they will be missed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:32 pm.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, February 21, 2007.

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2007\2007 01 17.doc