

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 20th, 2016

---

**MINUTES**

---

**Present:** K. Bracewell, RCMP  
K. England  
S. Gushe  
A. Larigakis  
P. Maltby

**Staff:** D. Johnson, Development Planner  
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk  
C. Wilkinson, Planner 1, Community Development

**Guests:** 711 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Aleem Ahamed, Owner  
Tomas Wolf, Studio One Architecture Inc.  
Shoghig Tutunjian-Attal, Studio One Architecture Inc.  
Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Ltd. Landscape Architecture

364 West Keith Road  
Tom Grimwood, Grimwood Deutscher Architects  
Chris Nugent, Grimwood Deutscher Architects  
Bill Curtis, Bill Curtis Design  
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Inc.

365 East 14th Street  
Marco M. De Cotis, Owner  
Karla Castellanos, KCC architecture and design ltd.  
Karl Wein, Karl Wein Associates

233 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
Karla Castellanos, KCC architecture and design ltd.  
Karl Wein, Karl Wein Associates  
Harry Haggard, Landscape Architect

**Absent:** B. Allen  
J. Boyce  
A. Epp  
J. Geluch  
M. Tsai

---

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

**1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held December 9<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held December 9th, 2015 be adopted.

**Carried Unanimously**

**2. Minutes of Workshop of the Advisory Design Panel held January 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the workshop of the Advisory Design Panel held January 7th, 2016 be adopted.

**Carried Unanimously**

**3. Business Arising**

None.

**4. Staff Update**

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

**5. 711 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street (Rezoning Application)**

This is a development application proposing to rezone 711 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street to allow for the construction of a four storey, mixed use building.

Staff asked for comments from the Panel on the relationship between the commercial and residential exterior materials, the residential lobby expression, the articulation of the CRU frontage, the proposed signage, the landscaping of common and private space, the design of the outdoor amenity areas considering CPTED principles, the consistency with the Marine Drive Guidelines Sub-Area #6 goal to encourage a pedestrian-friendly village-like node with small scale commercial, and the functionality of parking access.

Tomas Wolf, Studio One Architecture Inc., described the project to the Panel:

- Planning requested that they build to a zero lot line to have a continuous streetscape in the case of future development of the neighbouring site.
- The design has courtyards in the centre of the building.
- The ground floor has six commercial retail units (CRU's) facing West 14<sup>th</sup> Street.
- The residential lobby also faces West 14<sup>th</sup> Street.
- The proposed amenity space is twice the required size.
- The ground floor amenity space is adult-oriented indoor-outdoor space and is visually connected with the corridor and lobby.
- Garbage and commercial parking is at the back of the building.
- Underground parking is on the west side so that the building to the east, if redeveloped, can use the ramp to access their parking.
- The fourth floor has four units and steps back on the north side of the building.

- There is a rooftop amenity space containing a community garden, lounge and picnic area, and a children's play area.
- The ground level has a strong commercial base which relates to the design of the building to the west.
- There is a metal screen on the lane to hide the commercial parking.
- Units at the back have views to the courtyard.
- The design uses high density cementitious boards with brick facing on the ground floor; the soffits are aluminium with a woodgrain.

Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Ltd. Landscape Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan:

- In the laneway landscaping is limited to raised planters due to lack of space.
- The metal screen in front of the parking will have vertical planting on it.
- The wide pathway on the side is slightly articulated with mass plantings at the corner.
- Japanese maples are planted in front of the ground floor outdoor amenity space for privacy and shade.
- Private / public space will be delineated with a metal screen.
- There will be bollards to prevent people driving down the pathway.
- There are raised curved planters with built-in seating along West 14<sup>th</sup> Street in front of the CRU's.
- There is a big grade change on the sidewalk when it reaches the neighbouring site.
- Pavers are used on the decks as well as built-in planters to screen between the units.
- The rooftop will have raised vegetable plots as it receives plenty of sun. The eastern half of the rooftop space will have built-in furniture, a bbq, chairs which will be separated from the childrens' play area by colourful planters.

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

- Will you be doing onsite drainage? **A:** There will be onsite storage because of the high water table.
- What about the existing tree? **A:** It is an old cherry tree in total failure; it will be removed.
- To staff: Are internal bedrooms allowed with no external windows? **Staff:** They have glass partitions that move. The Building Department did not note conflicts with Code.
- How will you fasten the boards? **A:** With hidden screws.
- Will there be a conflict between pedestrians and traffic on the eastern walkway?
- To staff: What is the future zoning with the neighbouring building? **Staff:** The overlook has been considered for the east-facing units looking at the commercial building. The overlook is consistent with what we see elsewhere in the City.
- What type of windows are you using? **A:** Aluminium; they are better quality than vinyl.
- Is the ground floor aligned with both adjacent buildings? **Staff:** The setback off the northern property line is in keeping with the Remix building.
- Staff: There seems to be an inconsistency in how the building grades are transposed; is it easy to adjust the design to meet the actual building grades? **A:** They are from the civil engineer.
- Is there landscaping and a screen on the east side of the building? **A:** You will be able to see through it but it will be difficult to climb over. There is no access to the amenity area.

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

- The first floor colours are a bit gloomy in our weather.

- The residential lobby might be enhanced if the hallway was recessed.
- The CRU signage could be given more prominence; the store front expression east to west should be considered
- Security along the Right of Way will be an important consideration at night.
- The commercial parking and loading seems remote from the CRU's themselves. It seems complicated to access the commercial units.
- I really like the rooftop use; it is wonderful and very well done.
- I really like the project and think it will fit in the neighbourhood really well.
- There should be a continuous canopy along the CRU frontage for weather protection.
- The colours of the exterior materials are very sombre and grey given our climate. Use a bit of colour somewhere - perhaps in the indentation or at the lobby.
- I like the masonry; the cementitious board is hard to detail; it is hard to get clean edges. If you use pre-painted screws the colour of the boards it helps.
- People are going to have a hard time getting their bikes out through the two doors; make the vestibule a little deeper. Is there another way to exit with bikes rather than through the front door?
- Parking on the east side is a bit tight with an 18 foot turning radius.
- One elevator for 45 units sounds minimal; open up the two sets of stairs to make them more visible and welcoming to encourage active stair use.
- The project maximizes every possible inch at the lane. The units at the lane look like they are really pushed up; maybe get bigger trees to screen them.
- The south facing units will be really hot in the summer; there will be a lot of solar heat gain. They will have to have their blinds down.
- It would be good to use more of a climber at the entry. The planters could be centred at the main entry for a focal point. Circular forms of planters can be hard to plant.
- Look into public art possibilities for the residential entry.
- The rooftop amenity uses are great but the design could be more sophisticated. The design is very linear; invite a bit more complexity into the design e.g. the way you separate the children's play area from the bbq area.
- The rail at the podium is probably dangerous; someone could stand on a bench and fall.
- The planter strip at the lane is very thin; it will be very hard to get things to grow.
- The lobby needs more differentiation from the CRU's and should be more welcoming perhaps with more colour.
- The CRU's should be more articulated to create a distinction between commercial and residential.
- The design is well thought out in its response to the site and orientation. It is a good solid fabric building; the H form works well. The units seem to work. It looks quite nice; I commend you.
- You could be more ambitious on sustainability; your proposal is Code minimum with respect to energy consumption. You have the potential to do a really energy efficient building as there are not too many windows. You can eliminate thermal bridging.
- Covering the CRU's would enhance the pedestrian experience.
- You have a nice clear base but the top at the two corners does not seem to be fully resolved and could do with further development.

**Presenter's comments:**

Thank you for the comments. We will take them away for consideration. The retail spaces will be more service-orientated as it is not a strong retail street

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 711 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner. The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for the quality of their presentation.

- Install a continuous canopy above the commercial retail units;
- Introduce some colour into the palate;
- Further accentuate the residential lobby entry and review the planter locations and design;
- Enlarge the vestibule to facilitate easier bike exit or provide an alternative access to the bike lockers;
- Add glazing to the interior stairs to encourage use;
- Integrate public art;
- Broaden the planting strip along the east side;
- Introduce solar control for the south facing units e.g. exterior shading; and
- Review the rear yard setback at the second through fourth levels.

The Panel encourages the applicant to be ambitious beyond code minimum with respect to energy efficiency. With the simple application of some Passive House design principles such as high levels of air tightness, elimination of thermal bridging, and efficient windows, this could be a very efficient building.

**Carried Unanimously**

#### **6. 364-366 West Keith (Rezoning Application)**

This is a Rezoning Application to support the development a two level, four unit townhouse complex consisting of two duplex buildings facing Jones Avenue. The development would replace an existing duplex.

Staff asked for comments from the Panel on the overall context of the proposed lot with the surrounding neighbourhood, the interface of Jones Avenue frontage and its link to the Green Necklace trail scheme, the colour scheme and the application of materials, and the appropriateness of the proposed landscaping plan.

Tom Grimwood, Grimwood Deutscher Architects, described the project to the Panel:

- The existing house orientates itself north south; the proposal is to reorient it to run east west and face Jones Avenue which seems to be the most natural way and ties in nicely with the Green Necklace.
- Each unit has an entrance looking west; the corner unit has an entry off West Keith Road and Jones Avenue.
- The form and character complements the existing neighbourhood houses.
- The building will define the edge; the patios and stoops give eyes on the street.
- The development will be at 0.75 FSR and is very close to conforming but the new orientation means there may be a relaxation on the height envelope as the tips of the gables conflict slightly.
- The lot slopes six feet from one side to the other. The southern units sit on the same elevation as the curb; the units terrace as the site slopes to the south.

David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Inc. reviewed the landscape plan:

- The project caters to people who do not want large gardens but all have useable space; the smallest of which is about 6 x 13 feet.
- The end unit to the south has a sizable yard wrapping the corner.
- The rear pathway is gated to discourage unwanted access.
- Permeable paving is used on the pathways and open parking stalls.

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

- The swale is interrupted by walkways; how will it handle storm water? **A:** Water will flow from the north east of the site to the south west; the expectation is that the permeable paving will retain and infiltrate it with the overflow going into the swale.
- I would be concerned that the storm water will not infiltrate. **A:** There is a rain garden to collect water at the low part of the site.
- Where is the trash collected; do residents have to carry it up steps? **A:** Yes.
- Is the bus stop staying? **Staff:** That is up to TransLink.
- How do you maximise the openings on the east elevation vis-a-vis the Building Code, it looks meagre? **A:** It is close.
- Are the basements, suites? **A:** They are not intended to be suites; there is an interconnected stairwell on the inside. The outside stairwell is just for access.
- Are the roof dormers expressed within the house? **A:** They are intended to daylight the bedrooms at the top.
- Could the roofs over the front entrances be incorporated in the design; they look tacked on? **A:** Yes.
- Staff: The sidewalk on Jones Avenue will be changing to accommodate the Green Necklace; will the street trees fit? **A:** I think we were under the impression that there is a boulevard strip.
- What is the storage box? **A:** It is intended to be bike storage.

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

- The presentation package was clear and concise.
- Unit A fronts onto Keith Road and I think this elevation should be developed further to reflect the adjacent context of homes fronting Keith.
- I suspect the valleys between the roofs will become a maintenance problem.
- I like the simplicity and openness of the floor plans.
- There appears to be a minimum of private space on the east side.
- You have the right orientation.
- I am not a fan of faux heritage; if you build this style it can be done better with a bit more richness. It is very spare. You have shutters on some windows. The design is very homogenous especially the east and south façades.
- The balconies are a bit odd with the vertical railing and shingle sides. They look tacked on.
- The roofs over the doors could be bigger.
- The massing could be more elegant.
- The site could lend itself better to a modern treatment which could fit better than a pared down heritage look.
- The windows in the south and west elevations are very small, not generous.
- You are stylistically halfway to a heritage building. It would work better in a more modern vernacular

- You could reduce the amount of paving and hard spaces. A unit could have two small patios without the walkway. Add foundation planting.
- Improve the articulation of the building bases; they look stark and bleak.
- Make sure the plant species are adapted for low water use and providing habitat value
- The box storage needs to be developed and integrated with the building; it is on the street and greenway. You need to design and develop it.

**Presenter's comments:**

Thank you for your comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 364-366 West Keith Road and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below. The Panel looks forward to reviewing the applicant's response at a future meeting.

- Concern that the faux heritage expression is not fully realized;
- Windows are meagre in size and placement; fenestration should be reconsidered;
- The balconies are not integrated well with the design;
- There needs to be another level of detail in the development of the design;
- Include plants for low water and habitat in the landscape design;
- The storage box needs to be developed as a design element;
- There should be a reduction of hardscaping on the West Keith Road side;
- Coordination with the design of the Green Necklace and transit needs to occur on the Jones Avenue edge;
- The location of garbage and recycling is awkward and needs resolving; and
- Rain protection at the entry is not sufficiently generous.

**Carried Unanimously**

**7. 365 East 14<sup>th</sup> Street (Rezoning Application)**

This is an application to rezone 365 East 14<sup>th</sup> Street to support the addition of a new detached duplex building at the rear of the lot containing an existing Single Family Home.

Staff asked for comments from the Panel on the overall context of the proposed lot with the surrounding neighbourhood, the relationship of the proposed duplex with the existing single family dwelling, the colour scheme and the application of façade materials, and the proposed landscaping plan, including the extent of proposed pavers.

As the landscape architect was unable to be present, the Panel did a preliminary review of the project and made comments.

Karla Castellanos, described the project to the Panel:

- It is a corner lot; there is a charming character house on the north side of the lot which will be retained.
- The aim is to design a simple building that will not conflict with the heritage house.
- Both residences have private entries.
- The landscape plan defines private areas.

- The landscape around the heritage home will be improved with a proper entrance to the house with a semi private entrance to the home and a private space on the east side of the property.
- The new development will be lower than the heritage home.
- There will be five parking spots on the lane.
- The materials palette is very simple: horizontal cementitious boarding, black shingles and entries accented with river rock.
- The applicant is proposing the preliminary installation for solar panels.

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

- How are you dealing with storm water on the site? **A:** We will have to look at it; we will probably use retention tanks, we do not have enough space for a raingarden.
- To Staff: How many parking stalls are required? **Staff:** Five.
- The access to the westerly unit is along the west property line, can you see it from the street? **A:** Yes, there is signage at the street.
- Where is the laundry? **A:** There is a utility room in the basement.
- How do the windows open? **A:** They are double hung.
- Can you explain how a first responder will be able to identify where they are going and how they get there, especially at night? **A:** The address on East 14<sup>th</sup> Street will be lit. The new building will have a Ridgeway address.
- How does the signage relate to the high shrubs? **A:** We will make sure it will be visible.
- To Staff: What about all the planting at the corner of the lane? **Staff:** There needs to be unimpeded vision for 15 feet.
- What is the shed by the existing house? We need to see context and design.

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

- There is too much hardscape at the front; you do not need two patios for the front.
- You need to show storm water management.
- Beware of the ultimate size of the plant material.
- The landscaper has shown a climbing vine that does not twine.
- The landscape does not show grades to see how the planting works.
- You should show landscape plans on elevations.
- The stairs at the shed and stairs from the heritage house are different dimensions which is a safety issue.
- The rear unit has poor access from the street.
- It seems that the way the duplex is oriented on the site has one unit completely blocked off; it has no presence, visibility or access.
- It is a very basic volume. The windows seem very small in relationship to the walls.
- Is there a possibility of creating a stronger presence to both buildings by working with the entry and verandah roof? It looks like they want to be one porch.
- You can add detail to the building which seems a bit spare.
- The building is not as detailed or rich as it could be to echo the heritage house; is there a way to create a base that the house sits on?
- The westerly duplex is short-changed in outdoor amenity space.
- The tapered stone columns do not seem to fit very well in the design.
- If you raised the storage units to the roof, it might give more useful storage
- Signage needs to be obvious and clear.
- Setbacks are not shown.



- The units would be more attractive if they were more like townhouses facing on to Ridgeway Avenue.
- The windows do seem small; they should be more generous, perhaps taller.
- The roofs at the lower level seem a bit disjointed, unresolved. The roof stuck on the side does not really do anything; increase the storage and get rid of the second roof.
- The entrance roofs do not seem to talk to each other and do not seem to belong.
- The fence around the porch looks weird; it blocks the integration of landscape and house.
- In front of the heritage building the plan shows a tall conifer and evergreen hedge which will block the window.
- A base might give you some kind of articulation.

**Presenter's comments:**

If the duplex was moved to face Ridgeway Avenue, the heritage house would have to be moved and the outdoor spaces would not work.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the preliminary drawings for 365 East 14<sup>th</sup> Street and recommends the applicant considers the following comments prior to returning to the Panel for a formal review:

- Make the windows bigger;
- The portico at the front door needs to be further developed;
- Investigate having both duplex entries off Ridgeway Avenue;
- Roofs over the recycling areas could be better integrated with the overall design;
- Show the existing shed on the plans;
- Show grades and slopes on landscape plan;
- There is too much hardscape in front of the existing building;
- Do not block windows with tall shrubs;
- Choose appropriate vines for the trellis i.e. twining;
- Show grades and elevations through the landscape including site sections;
- Look at adding a base to the new building;
- Look at deleting the fencing around the ground level patio;
- The massing is too simple and would improve with greater articulation; and
- Ensure consistency on the external stairs for safety reasons.

**Carried Unanimously**

**8. 233 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street (Rezoning Application)**

This application was given a preliminary review at the December 9<sup>th</sup> Design Panel meeting. The proposal is to replace an existing single detached dwelling with a three unit townhouse project contained within one building, and a detached garage.

Staff asked for comments from the Panel on the site design and the orientation of the proposed building, the massing and articulation of the proposed buildings, the colour scheme and the application of façade materials, and the proposed landscaping plan, including the rear yard design.

Karla Castellanos, KCC architecture and design ltd., described the project to the Panel:

- In response to ADP's comments at the previous meeting the materials have been simplified keeping the cementitious panels and brick on the ground floor.
- The main door was centred.
- Windows have been added to the master bedroom and other bedrooms for cross ventilation.
- The roof was simplified and the post removed for a cleaner look.
- The pavers were changed to permeable pavers.
- The address numbers for all units will be put on the retaining wall facing West 5<sup>th</sup> Street.

Harry Haggard, Landscape Architect, reviewed the landscape plan:

- The rain gardens were simplified and moved away from the patios.
- The patios were enlarged by removing the lawn.
- Artificial turf will not be used on the garage.
- Planters added to delineate private vs public space.

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

- Do the windows open at the top? **A:** Yes.
- Is the roof sloped? **A:** It is about 2% to allow water to run off.
- The stone material is still being used? **A:** Yes, at the front door.
- Why do you have so many trees and do not show them at 75% growth? **A:** To make it lush and full. The trees are set at a spacing suggested by nurseries to accommodate growth; residents should not have to remove them. I prefer to use plants that maintain their optimum size without pruning.

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

- I thought the hump in the middle was odd but the model proves out the idea.
- The washers and dryers are still shown on the main floor in two units and none in the other? You should think about the laundry; perhaps it should be on the second floor.
- I like the permeable paving and replacement of the artificial turf.
- You have pulled one rain garden away but there is still one against the patio on the north side so there is soil against hardscape.
- Magnolia grandifloras will shade the patios and nothing will grow under them. Perhaps change them to a more forgiving species such as Magnolia Kobus.
- As you move around the building you are using the Hardi panel like a panel product but the joints are not aligned with doors, windows etc. It is not in sync. Trying to panelize where there is no geometry means it does not coordinate around the building with joints mid-window, mid-sill. It is distracting and will be hard to detail. The material can be run in horizontal strips which would work better than the large panels and might calm the design down.
- The garages are small and could be more easily accessible by adding doors at the rear.
- You have very narrow stairs; if you increased the stairs from the lot line to the wall it would simplify the landscape.
- If the decks on the south end projected a little to the south, it might be more interesting.
- The country lane red colour is a bit dark.
- I agree the joint lines are not coordinating with anything; these needs to be looked at; horizontal would work better.

- The 2% degree on the roofs; you have a step between the two roofs on the side, why do not you eliminate it and make it more elegant? The side elevation is a bit messy.
- The panel above the door is a bit odd; it does not fit in very well. It does not work for me. You could daylight the stairwell.
- I find the raised central garden strange.
- Replace the vertical metal standing seam above the front door with stone to create a stronger impression.
- Introduce stone material at the rear to provide more interest.

**Presenter's comments:**

The washer and dryers have been moved to the second floor. We will take a second look at the reveals; the vertical lines make the building look higher. We will look at the man doors at the back of the garage to make access to the house easier.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 233 West 5th Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner. The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation:

- The relationship of the reveals and the fenestration needs to be revisited and coordinated;
- Further development of the panel above the front door and eliminate the metal panel;
- Change the magnolia grandiflora to a small deciduous tree such as Magnolia kobus;
- The colour palette feels traditional for a contemporary design;
- Install man doors at the back of the garages; and
- There should be a continuous roofline along the length of the building.

**Carried Unanimously**

**9. Other Business**

David thanked the outgoing members for their contributions to the Panel.

**10. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

Chair



