

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 19th, 2011**

---

**MINUTES**

---

**Present:** T. Cailles  
K. Hanvey (Chair)  
B. Spencer  
S. Standfield  
K. Kristensen  
Y. Khalighi  
C. Taylor  
K. Terriss

**Staff:** J. Piercey, Planner, Community Development  
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Servicing, Engineering Services  
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk

**Guests:** Ravi Khakh, City Line Developments Ltd.  
Amrik Thandi, Builder

**Absent:** J. Bitar  
Councillor Trentadue

---

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m.

**1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held December 15th, 2010**

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held December 15th, 2010 be adopted as amended.

**Carried Unanimously**

**2. Business Arising**

J. Piercey responded to ADP's concern about staff not sending the 788 Copping project back to ADP for a second review. Discussion ensued. The Panel felt that Advisory Bodies' authority is undermined when requests are ignored and asked for further feedback from Community Development management.

### 3. Staff Update

J. Piercey gave the staff update.

222-238 Lonsdale: The Public Hearing scheduled for January 17<sup>th</sup> was postponed due concerns expressed by neighbours to the north concerning the height of the building. A view study will be carried out.

415 West 16<sup>th</sup>: First Reading at Council on December 13<sup>th</sup>. Referred to Public Hearing which was held January 17<sup>th</sup>. The proposal was modified to remove the roof top decks from the rear building following comments about privacy and noise issues from the neighbour at the back.

Harry Jerome Redevelopment Proposal: A delegation from the Courthouse Area Resident's Association spoke at the January 10<sup>th</sup> Council meeting.

Pedestrian & Cyclist Improvements on Lynn Valley Road between 21<sup>st</sup> and Westbound on ramp: resolved at January 10<sup>th</sup> Council that the City partner with the Ministry of Transportation and the District of North Vancouver to design and fund the improvements to increase safety and encourage walking and cycling trips.

ICBC Signage: DVP to vary the sign bylaw was defeated. A revised proposal will be presented to Council at a later date.

1308 Lonsdale: The Onni Group made a presentation to Council. The recommendation to process the development application was approved subject to several conditions including: further justification of the proposed amenity bonus, inclusion of a new North Vancouver Museum, design revisions e.g. massing of podium and towers, streetscape and amenity use/configuration.

788 Copping: Final adoption of the Zoning Bylaw at January 17<sup>th</sup> Council meeting.

225-235 East Third/Anavets: Final adoption of the OCP Amendment and Zoning Amendment Bylaw at January 17<sup>th</sup> Council meeting.

212 Brooksbank: Mountain Equipment Co-op will be presenting the revised design to ADP in February.

The Density Provisions for Higher Energy Performance Bylaw: This came into effect January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011. Applicants will have to hire a certified energy consultant.

1250 Lonsdale Avenue: There is an issue over pedestrian access through the laneway.

Kevin Hanvey thanked everyone who helped and served during his time on the Panel and as Chair.

#### 4. 306 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street (Rezoning)

C. Miller gave the staff overview. The project is in the midblock area on the north side of East 9<sup>th</sup>. It is zoned RS-1 and the applicants wish to rezone to RT-1. Houses in the area are a mixture of duplex and single family homes. The depth of the cellar, 8 ft, is a concern; the attic is 8 feet high.

Ravi Khakh, City Line Developments Ltd., reviewed the project:

- It is a side by side duplex with one main door in the middle and one on the side to give the appearance of a single family home with one dominant door.

#### **Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- Are any overlook issues with the adjacent buildings? A: The building on one side is the same height; none of the windows are in line with the neighbours. Windows.
- The cedar will be painted blue? A: Yes.
- Are duplexes allowed in the area? Does there have to be an architectural merit for rezoning? Staff: No OCP amendment is required.
- Have you considered the heritage building to the east of it? A: Our design resembles the duplex across the street but we feel ours has more of a heritage feel; only a few of the buildings on the street have a heritage feel.
- No landscape architect? A: No, but we know what we are planting.
- There are light wells to the windows in the cellar; how do you get one in a 5ft side yard? A: 2.6 inches is what is required.
- Can the light wells be used for exiting? A: Yes, the grid is made of lightweight aluminum which can be pushed up from the well.
- Are there any regulations in terms of massing, color schemes? Staff: There are no design guidelines in place for duplexes.
- What about the staff recommendation to raise the buildings? A: With the height envelope we cannot raise it out of the ground any more.
- Staff: are you putting in a non-powered pump due to the depth? A: We prefer a battery-powered backup.
- The main roof pitch is 5 and 12? A: We cannot do 3 and 12 with a duroid roof, 4 and 12 is the minimum.
- There is no habitable space in the roof? A: No.
- Are you intending to put a suite in the cellar? A: No plans to put a suite in the cellar.

#### **Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- I find the character of the building overwhelming relative to the scale of the neighbourhood. It has a cookie cutter look and does not respond to some of the older elegant homes on the street. I do not see the merit or sensitivity to the site in context. You are maximizing to the rezoning with little sensitivity to the neighbourhood.
- It would help to have a landscape architect involved. The whole entry should be redesigned not just be straight lines.
- I would tone down the navy blue.
- The scale and contextual relationship with adjacent buildings bothers me. A perspective view would help looking at it from a three quarter angle so that one can really see the scale relationship between this project and the adjacent ones.

- The issue of putting this building in is about scale; the two gables on the front of the house achieve that to a certain degree but the big roof form at the back does not. I think anything you can do to break up the bulk of the big roof would be helpful and be beneficial to the neighbours at the rear.
- The liveability of the basement would benefit greatly from raising the building using a 4 and 12 roof which would provide additional light.
- I do not like the idea of a cellar environment having a grate but it achieves the functional result.
- The side elevation needs more composition and thought.
- If you are applying for rezoning you should be adding something to the city and streetscape.
- It needs some more work architecturally. The proliferation of gables looks overdone. You could eliminate one of the gables as they do not actually do anything. Make the building less aggressive.
- You could raise the building a little and get a few more steps at the front which would emulate the heritage character of the street.
- The access is good.
- I support the direction of the bold and dark colour. It is a mistake to use a full hide stain on the cedar.

**Applicant's comments:**

- We would like to see the house out of the ground but there is a limit on the third floor ceiling. It is easier to build houses above ground but due to the guidelines we cannot pull it out any further.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 306 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the following issues:

- that the proponents review opportunities to simplify the façade to reduce the bulk of the building with particular attention to respecting the scale and heritage qualities of the existing buildings on the street;
- that a landscape plan be developed for the site to help the integration of the project into the neighbourhood and to try to optimize the accessibility of the house;
- that the proponents provide a perspective view of the project so that it can be better understood in context (a physical model is an acceptable alternative approach but it must include (at least) the homes on either side of the proposal);
- reconsideration of the application of colour on the building and expressing the natural qualities of the cedar;
- that the applicants consider further articulation of the roof to break up the appearance of a large, single continuous volume;
- the applicants should further develop the rear elevation to enhance the character of the rear yard.

**Carried Unanimously**

*There was a short break.*

*The meeting was called back to order at 6:55 p.m.*

#### **5. 352 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street (Rezoning)**

C. Miller gave the staff input – many of the issues are the same as those for 306 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street. The two projects are separated by eight blocks. A lane dedication is sought. There is an access issue; the applicants are planning to seek access from the lane, but it is only eight feet from Ridgeway Avenue and 9<sup>th</sup> Street; there is a standard of a 10 foot minimum.

Ravi Khakh, City Line Developments Ltd., reviewed the project:

- They are applying to rezone from RS-1 to RT-1.
- The design matches duplexes on the same street.

#### **Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- The lots are long? Staff: As lots developed lanes were built. Currently there is an eight foot lane across the first lot which narrows. The City does not support lanes that are 10 foot so an eight foot lane is not appropriate.
- Is there anything governing front yard setbacks? The neighbouring projects seem to sit further forward than this one. Staff: The setback can be 25 feet from the front lot line.
- Can we assume our questions on 306 East 9<sup>th</sup> as the same as for this project? They are essentially the same? A: The front elevation is different.
- The buildings are 40 ft wide? A: Yes.
- Is there outside access to the basement?
- There is a steep slope on the driveways. Staff: Engineering staff will review the garage and make sure the slab will work if the lane is built.

#### **Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:**

- I think the project should be kept at the 25 foot setback so that it recedes from the other facades given its relative scale and mass.
- If you could slide the two units it could help reduce the scale from the street.
- It sits in its context a little better than the other one given the neighbouring buildings but overall concerns apply.
- Homes with big verandas should have a special status in North Vancouver and try to protect them. This house will not help the veranda home look better or add anything.

#### **Presenter's comments:**

- No comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 352 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the following issues:

- that the proponents review opportunities to simplify the façade to reduce the bulk of the building with particular attention to respecting the scale and heritage qualities of the existing buildings on the street;
- that a landscape plan be developed for the site to help the integration of the project into the neighbourhood and to try to optimize the accessibility of the house;
- that the proponents provide a perspective view of the project so that it can be better understood in context (a physical model is an acceptable alternative approach but it must include (at least) the homes on either side of the proposal);
- reconsideration of the application of colour on the building and expressing the natural qualities of the cedar;
- that the applicants consider further articulation of the roof to break up the appearance of a large, single continuous volume;
- the applicants should further develop the rear elevation to enhance the character of the rear yard

**Carried Unanimously**

Discussion ensued on the idea that it would be beneficial for staff to compile a catalogue of successful examples of duplex developments to show to applicants.

## **6. Other Business**

Copies of the Marine Drive Streetscape Guidelines and OCP 2021 and Beyond Discussion Paper: Social and Cultural Trends, which were approved by Council on December 13<sup>th</sup>, were distributed to the Panel members for their information.

J. Piercey thanked the outgoing members, Kevin Hanvey, Shira Standfield, Kenneth Terriss, for the use of their time and expertise. Craig Taylor seconded the thanks.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

Chair

