

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 20th, 2011**

MINUTES

Present:

T. Cailles
K. Kallweit Graham
K. Kristensen
M. Messer
M. Saii
B. Spencer
C. Taylor

Staff:

C. Laing, Development Planner
C. Perry, Supervisor, Engineering Services
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk

Guests:

250-252 East 10th Street

Kevin Butler, Kd.B. Design Studio Ltd.

Denis Accili, Owner

721 Chesterfield Avenue

Raymond Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.

Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Inc.

Hugh Ker, Polygon Development 246 Ltd.

318 East 12th Street

Don Nunn, Karl Wein & Associates

313 East 8th Street

Carman Kwan, Hearth Architectural Inc.

Joe Muego, Hearth Architectural Inc.

Ravi Khakh, City Line Developments

Amrik Thandi, Builder

Absent:

P. Kennedy
Y. Khalighi
S. McFarlane
Councillor Trentadue

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

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held date

It was regularly moved and seconded

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

Carried Unanimously

2. Business Arising

C. Laing told the Panel that, due to the number of projects being presented at the meeting, Richard White would be coming to the August or September ADP meeting to discuss density bonussing.

C. Laing reported back to ADP on the discussion on canopies during the Lonsdale Streetscape Guidelines presentation at the June ADP meeting. There are no written guidelines for canopies, just some notes in the Marine Drive Streetscape Guidelines from December 2010 in which fabric canopies are discouraged, however staff are not supportive of this direction. Discussion ensued. Should the Panel make a recommendation on this topic?

3. Staff Update

Low Level Improvement Project: The Port proposal for the detailed design phase was reviewed and approved at the July 18th Council meeting. A public meeting will be held after the design phase is completed.

1250 Lonsdale Avenue: The bylaws had first reading at the July 4th Council meeting. A Public Hearing is scheduled for July 25th.

720 West 2nd Street (City Works Yard): On July 4th an OCP Bylaw was passed to generally permit wood frame residential buildings throughout the City up to six stories (from four stories).

1857 Chesterfield Avenue: There was a Public Hearing on June 20th and Second and Third readings were adopted, with final adoption on July 11th.

1860 Lonsdale Avenue: The Public Hearing was on June 20th and lasted approximately two and a half hours. Second and Third reading were adopted.

Harbourside OCP Amendment: At the July 18th Council meeting Council passed a motion directing staff to establish a task force to review material produced to date with respect to the proposed OCP amendment.

758 and 788 Copping Street, Text Amendment: a request to allow the owner to change the existing designated areas for Service Commercial Use within each of the three buildings, as well as to allow "Accessory One-Unit Residential Use" within the list of permitted use, was carried unanimously at the June 27th Council meeting.

140-150 West 15th: Had first reading at the July 4th Council and will go to Public Hearing on July 25th. Staff are comfortable with the changes in the form and massing and the changes

to the entrance. The primary parkade entrance is now off the side lane due to neighbours' concerns.

1308 Lonsdale Avenue: A member of the Grande Advocacy Group presented their views on the proposed development to Council on July 11th. They support the two tower option and access to Stella Jo Dean Park and question the value of the amenities offered by the developer for the bonus density. The project will go to Public Hearing in September. Onni is hoping to come to ADP in August.

Space Needs and Operating Costs for a New North Vancouver Museum: This report was reviewed at the July 18th Council meeting. Council endorsed the recommended size of approximately 20,000 to 23,000 sq. ft. but did not support including the museum in the 1308 Lonsdale Avenue development due to concerns on density bonussing and the fact that the developer is only including space for a 10,000 sq. ft. museum. There are several potential locations including at the waterfront.

129-141 West 2nd Street (Bishop): A report on this project was reviewed at the July 18th Council meeting. Some Council members felt that the parking should be reduced. The project will go to Public Hearing on September 19th.

213-217 West 1st Street: This OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application which will include rental housing, community service office space with a density bonus and an OCP height increase was approved by Council on July 18th. This project has not yet been reviewed by ADP. Floor affordable rental housing and strata units not approved by Council.

Civic Amenity Reserve Fund: The Civic Amenity Reserve Fund Bylaw had its introduction and first three Readings at the July 18th Council meeting. Funds for density bonussing will be held in this fund and will be expended at Council's direction.

Location of Staircases and Elevators: Council passed a motion at the July 18th meeting to direct staff to investigate zoning tools to encourage developers to install staircase access adjacent to all elevator locations to encourage residents to use the stairs.

4. CityShaping Demonstration and Opportunity

S. Smith, Community Development demonstrated the new CityShaping website and discussed how members could be involved in the process. Council have endorsed an extensive community engagement strategy that aims to engage the community more effectively using different tools rather than just workshops and open houses, especially the hard-to-reach groups e.g. immigrants, youth, minorities, renters. There is a discussion forum on the website and staff are attending community events to raise awareness and get input.

5. 250-252 East 10th Street (Rezoning Application)

The Chair read the resolutions from the June 14th ADP meeting.

Kevin Butler, Kd.B. Design Studio Ltd., outlined the design response to the motions passed at the June 14th ADP meeting.

- The changes apply to both infill buildings. With respect to the massing of the infill units the hip roof has been changed to a gable roof over the main point of the house. The

overall massing of the roof has been reduced with two shed dormers on each side to provide light.

- With respect to overlook of the back alley, the bedroom windows were reduced and changed to bay windows on the north elevation; there are smaller, higher windows on the east and west sides.
- The pathway was widened and straightened. The width of the walkways for the two main homes was also widened.
- Each infill has a sunken patio off the main living room area to define their outdoor space.
- The proposed new home has a covered deck at the back area.
- The new house has a covered deck with lawn space.
- Skylights have been added to the covered porch for more light.
- There are entrance trellises for the houses.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Is the landscaping going to be irrigated? A: There will be rain barrels. The applicant advised they would look into irrigation.
- The size of the trees? The applicant could not provide an answer.
- Re garbage handling; how will you be able to work in that tight space with the doors open? A: There is 8 ft between the two units and the garages but perhaps a sliding door would work better.
- The site coverage? Staff: It is about 12 sq. ft. over.
- Does the rear porch sit directly over the entry into the cellar? A: Yes
- Is that a deck on the south elevation of the infill buildings? A: It was going to be, but the neighbours have a real concern about privacy.

Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The lawn areas in the back will not get much light; and they are low so they will be very mushy: perhaps a larger patio or planting space would be better.
- The elevation facing the lane looks a lot more comfortable and it has more balance north/south.
- The outdoor spaces will be really shady and you should plan for that. It is tight. The maples in the central area will crowd the space eventually.
- The jog on the walkways should be longer: 6 ft rather than 4 ft; for visual comfort it should not be same width as the walk.
- The new building is more heritage than the heritage house. Should have some contemporary expression.
- The dining room window should be bigger.
- On the whole you have addressed a lot of the issues discussed at the last meeting. One minor thing would suggest that the infill units still feel a little bit unbalanced especially with regard to the flat roof which looks like a deck. The infills address the lane a lot better than they did previously. You could draw some clues from the side elevations of the existing heritage building.

Presenter's comments:

- The dining room windows were kept small for privacy issues with the neighbour. The south facing window could be larger.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 250 East 10th Street and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Carried with one opposed.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 252 East 10th Street and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Carried with one opposed

6. 721 Chesterfield Avenue (Development Variance Permit)

C. Laing provided the background on the project. The Applicant wishes to vary the front setback of one of the two four-storey residential buildings from 13 feet to 12.2 feet. The property has a covenant registered on it which requires it to be developed in accordance with plans approved in July 2008. The new design eliminates parkade access off Chesterfield Avenue.

Hugh Ker, Polygon, reviewed the model.

- There are two buildings of 40 units and 36 units. The Variance is requested so that there is consistency between the two buildings with similar sized units. There used to be 87 units in the previous design but now there are 76 larger units. Height and density are within the permitted range.

Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Inc talked about the overall site planning:

- The corner of Keith Road and Chesterfield Avenue is designed as a continuation of the residential landscape. There is bench seating with small pathway, a grove of crab-apple trees to echo the idea of urban agriculture, and a rain garden.
- The urban realm expression along Chesterfield breaks the scale of the block with entrances to patios, metal fencing, ornamental shrubs and brick pier marking the front doors. The Parkade exit becomes part of the rhythm.
- The rear yards are stepped down and sloped creating a buffer and edge to the landscaping resulting in a residential expression ringing the playing field.

Raymond Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc., presented the proposed changes to the Panel.

- There is one parkade entrance for both buildings due to an easement negotiated with the School Board; this improves the elevation on Chesterfield Avenue.
- The buildings are smaller than the previous design.
- One variance of about one foot is requested on 8th Street.

- The character of the building is drawn from the use and colour of the brick used in Queen Mary School but with a more contemporary expression. The white windows echo the white trim in the school and the stone element at the entries echo the school.
- There is a butterfly roof with wood soffit at the entrance.
- There is a simple roof line around the building
- Recesses will be grey Hardi panelling.
- There will be some three bedroom units in the mix of unit types.
- Chesterfield slopes so the end units have a higher ceiling.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The allocation of parking? A: 1.32 overall. Each unit has one stall which leaves 7 or 8 stalls over..
- Is the property line along the school grounds going to be fenced? A: There is a grade change so there is a metal picket 42" fence to keep people from falling over the wall.
- The interface with the school? A: The transition from the playfield to the residential buildings is a soft buffer which will be planted by the Queen Mary landscape architect.
- Contrast the use of materials in the two projects. A: We have a similar amount of brick; the previous design was more historical in appearance. We have more stone on the Chesterfield Avenue elevation.
- The building doesn't step down? A: The building length has been reduced by about 11 ft so it does not step down.
- Has the overall landscape plan changed from the previous application? A: We will be complying with all the conditions of the previous application. Staff: Extra work around the site is required due to the subdivision of the site.
- How tall is the building? A: Four stories; it is not as tall as the original application. What is the grade along Chesterfield? A: About 2 metres.
- The type of roof. A: It is a torchon roof.
- What about children climbing up from the playfield? A: They would have to climb up on the wall and then over the guard rail.
- What is the material on the wall between the school and the patios? A: Concrete walls; the bump out pieces are clad in stone.

Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:

- I miss the texture of the older building. This design is flatter than the previous design and not as varied in texture. The detail needs to be well done.
- The south Corner will be very important in the community; the stairwell feels scary; make sure there is enough light in there and not blank concrete wall. CPTED issues need to be addressed.
- This seems a comfortable, conservative form and design; it could be more exciting with more contrast to the school. It feels almost hospital-like, institutional.
- It is an improvement from the previous design. I like the reduction in the width of the building.
- There is an improvement in the treatment of the base and in the public realm. I like the rhythm of the landscape and the elimination of the additional vehicle access. My Biggest concern is the use of the amount of white on the building- care should be taken on how it is detailed; it is all about how the panels come together. It is lacking warmth and finesse; this could be alleviated by accentuating the contrast between the two different Hardi boards, grey and white are very close to each other; avoid it blending together. I like the entry and the warmth of the wood on the soffits and the eaves; it should be used in the balconies as well. I like the thin fascias.

- The way the south east corner addressed Chesterfield Avenue in the previous design was better; more interesting

Presenter's comments:

- It is a very different building from the previous application. It is a relatively short building so we wanted it to hang together in a very simple way and not detract from the roof line.
- We wanted to use the stone effectively at the entry. High forms of stone create technical difficulties with expansion joints etc.
- It is a good comment about the contrast; it would give the design more animation.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Variance Permit Application for 721 Chesterfield Avenue and supports the site development concept, massing and all of the proposed variances that have been requested. The Panel makes the following additional comments and would like the applicant to return to ADP for further review:

- That the exterior materials palette be enriched by adding more contrast and more wood, particularly to the soffits under the balconies and the roof soffit;
- That more attention be paid to the south east corner and facade of the building in order to create a softer transition to the landscape;
- That there be further clarification of the egress from the parkade at the south east corner with regard to CPTED issues;
- That the landscaping from the Queen Mary School play area be incorporated into the landscape plan.

Carried Unanimously

7. 318 East 12th Street (Rezoning Application)

This project had previously been reviewed at ADP.

Don Nunn, Karl Wein & Associates, outlined the applicant's response to the ADP motion passed at the June 14th meeting:

- The sequoia trees have been replaced by dwarf sequoiadendron pendula trees and the landscaping in the side yards reduced to crushed gravel.
- The roof pitch on the front porches has been changed to match the gables on the front elevation of the building. Earth toned material is used instead of the brighter colours.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- How does pedestrian access work with the crushed gravel on the side?
- Has replacing the sequoias addressed the light problems in the yard?

Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The replacement tree is about 25 ft high. The trees in the centre are not the right tree and will be problematic; they should be replaced with large shrubs.
- Sorbus aucuparia is a messy tree and should be replaced by large shrubs or smaller trees. They are located too close to the power lines and utilities.

- The sequoia at the back will interfere with the overhang of the garage and needs to be moved away from it.
- It is a little disappointing that the landscape architect is not here.

Presenter's comments:

- I agree that the larger trees should be removed.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 318 East 12th Street and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- A revised landscape plan that substitutes the thuja plicata excelsea cedars with small shrubs, substitutes the sorbus aucuparia (mountain ash) trees along the sidewalk with smaller trees set further from the utility corridors, and moves the dwarf sequoiadendron pendula and the planter south away from the garage overhang;
- Provide for pedestrian access around the sides of the building.

Carried Unanimously

Karen Kallweit Graham declared a conflict of interest due to a previous professional association with the presenter and left the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

8. 313 East 8th Street (Rezoning Application)

C. Laing reviewed the staff memo on this project. The proposal is to rezone the lot from RS-1 (One Unit Residential) to RT-1 (Two-Unit Residential). The site is located in the mid block area. The irregular shape of the lot makes it difficult to have a consistent relationship with the existing neighbouring buildings. Staff have no real issues with the project

Carman Kwan, Hearth Architecture, presented the proposed design to ADP:

- There are different types of zones in the area from RS-1 and RT-1 to CD Zones.
- The current building is undersized for the size of the lot and set far back on the site.
- The garages are small to increase permeable surface and rainwater management.
- The colour scheme is olive and light yellow with off-white trim, doors accented with black.
- There is a 6 ft deep porch entry space with columns.
- There is cedar shingle on the upper portion with Hardi plank on the lower.
- There is a uniform landscape plan at the front to integrate the frontage.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Did you contemplate an asymmetrical design because of the oblique nature of the front lot line? A: There was difficulty in making the roofline work with the volume. We tried to keep the existing trees and balanced the design of the building with the site conditions.
- Are you using real muntins in the windows? A: Yes.
- In Duplex 1 – the window faces the other house; does it look into windows in the other house? A: I do not think so, but will check. .

Comments of the Panel included but were not limited to:

- I appreciate the quality and like the detail and texture. I like the scale of the garages. I have no concerns.
- It is a really nice job. Sensitive development. I would have done an asymmetrical design but it's not necessary. More historical than I would have done but is done well.
- I congratulate the client on promoting quality in the project.
- I would slide the building forward a little to improve liveability at the back if guidelines allow it.
- The sketch up model was very helpful

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 313 East 8th Street and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Carried Unanimously

9. Other Business

C. Laing told the group that there would be several projects for review in August. S. Kimm-Jones will check for quorum.

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, August 17th, 2011.

Chair



