

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, June 21, 2006**

---

**MINUTES**

---

<b>Present:</b>	S. Friars, Chair – ADP A. Hii D. Rose R. Spencer R. Vesely D. Lee Councillor R. Fearnley	S. Peters, Chair - HAC M. Curtis, Vice-Chair H. Goodland C. Moorhead D. Porter Councillor B. Perrault
<b>Staff:</b>	G. Penway, City Planner K. Russell, Development Planner E. Maillie, Committee Secretary C. Perry, Technical Assistant G. Venczel	J. Piercey – Planning Tech L. Gorrie – Committee Sec.
<b>Guests:</b>	N. Hotson – Architect I. Gordon – Waterfront Director L. Orr – Waterfront Project Manager D. Purdie – Consultant D. Siegreest – Architect R. Yamamar - Landscape Architect F. Connolly – Developer M. Mills - Arborist C. Moorhead – Architect D. Rose – Landscape Architect J. King - Developer M. Bruckner - Architect C. Dixon – Architect P. Kreuk – Landscape Architect	
<b>Absent:</b>	N. Paul B. Dabiri A. Malczyk, Vice Chair – ADP P. Winterburn	J. Young

---

A quorum being present, the Development Planner called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. and outlined the process for the joint presentation of The National Heritage Centre to members of the ADP and HAC.

**1. National Heritage Centre – Parcels 9 & 10 The Pier**

The Development Planner introduced I. Gordon, Project Director and N. Hotson – Architect.

Mr. Hotson reviewed the revised Planning and Design Principles for the National Heritage Centre following the initial review by the ADP. The major revision since the last presentation is the reduction of the maximum building height of the infill structure to 20 metres (66 feet) from 30 metres (100 feet) and the addition of cupolas to allow encroachments through the roof for tall displays.

There was discussion of the nature of the space and it was clarified that in terms of heritage overlay on the site, the ADP requested that there be recognition of site patterns, such as existing buildings or railway tracks along with the new.

Councillor Perrault and R. Vesely entered the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

The Architect advised that consideration may be given to relocating the Flamborough Head to the north side of the building which would free the pedestrian area at the waterfront and strengthen the connection of the project to the City. An operational space for an active small boat building area is among many uses being considered on the site to address its history.

It was noted that the City of Vancouver has agreed to having the City of North Vancouver undertake a study on the possible relocation of the St. Roch to this site.

**Questions from the members included, but were not limited to:**

- Impact on roadway of relocation of front entrance to the north.
- Type of artefacts and materials to be displayed at the NMC.
- Articulation of the public realm and detail around the buildings.
- Identification of type of interface and uses that would interact with the street and impact on the heritage character.
- Compatibility of working boatyard area with other retail uses on the site.
- Interface between commercial activity and industrial.
- Availability of financial assistance to cottage industries to locate on the site.
- Need for Design Principles to provide for encouragement of lean-tos to maintain the original character of the building and for functional reasons.

Mr. Friars read the resolution passed by the Advisory Planning Commission following their review of the revised Planning and Design Principles.

Members of the Heritage Advisory Commission left the joint meeting at 6:25 p.m.

Councillor Fearnley left the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

**Comments of the ADP on the revisions to the Planning and Design Principles included, but were not limited to:**

- Previous height concerns have been addressed.
- There was consensus that site access at Esplanade is covered within Point 9 of the Planning and Design Principles.
- Principles should address reinstatement of elements of the original buildings that have been removed.
- Support height change.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the revised Planning and Design Principles for the National Heritage Centre – Parcels 9 and 10 The Pier (Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden Architects) and thanks the delegation for the presentation. The ADP supports the project and reduction of the infill building height.**

**FURTHER, the ADP recommends that a reference be added to the guidelines for the potential reinstating of elements from the original building that have previously been removed.**

**Unanimously Carried**

**2. 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street : United Lodge – Rezoning**

G. Venczel, Development Planner/Urban Designer, gave an overview of the development location which falls within the Western Avenue Study area. Council has given approval for this proposal to proceed independently of that study.

D. Siegrest – Architect, F. Connolly - Developer, R. Yamamar – Landscape Architect and M. Mills – Arborist were introduced and the Architect reviewed the context of the site and neighbouring developments.

The Architect displayed a photograph of the heritage house in its original form and one after an addition made in the 1970's. It is proposed that the heritage house be relocated to the south west corner of the site and that a 29-unit residential development be built to the north with access from 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. Two large trees on the site will be maintained and the one at the entry will be replaced. The display board with colours and material samples was displayed. The stone and rail finishes and heavy overhangs of the new building will compliment the heritage house.

The Panel was advised that several neighbourhood meetings have been held and a traffic study is being undertaken.

The Sustainability Statement dated May 11, 2006 was reviewed.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the revisions to the landscape plan -

- Modification of entrance and main courtyard area at 23rd Street to allow wheelchair access.
- Addition of sitting and viewing area off 23<sup>rd</sup> Street.
- Relocation of entries to the patios opposite the sitting area and additional patio screening.
- Permeable pavers at outdoor areas and walkways.
- Dry creek system with absorptive materials and integration with boulder dry creek.
- Entrance off Western Avenue changed to create smaller sitting area.
- Planting and hedging at patios on the north side to provide privacy from the street.

The Arborist advised that there is a significant English Oak tree on the corner which is considered to be a heritage tree and will be protected during construction and maintained. A dry creek bed will funnel water to meet the needs of the tree.

The Panel had questions on:

- The structural soundness of the trees to be maintained.
- Consideration of options for alternate vehicular access.

**Comments of the Panel included:**

- The new building mimics the character of the original building, but it may benefit from lighter approach.
- Colour palette and shingling materials shown on the rendering should be reviewed with heritage consultant.
- New building seems to overpower the heritage building.
- Support massing but treatment does not fit - old should be old and new should present as new.
- Much of this vernacular happening already in this area and this project brings richness.
- Like the project and how the emphasis is on the old. A more contemporary expression and different materials may be beneficial rather than imitate the heritage building.
- Bay windows and the way they are treated can be simpler rather than mimic old heritage bay windows.
- Responds to local context and the new building has a modern look to it.
- Understand palette and materials to differentiate the old and new buildings but don't believe it presents as heritage.
- Gables have different pitch and heritage building is a lighter colour and darker would be better.
- Support the project.
- Commend stormwater management programme and tree retentions.
- Method of laying of rima pavers should address safety.
- Support trellis feature and chess board and consideration of more native planting at stormwater area.

**Applicant**

The Architect stated that he recognized the points made. Parking access concerns will be addressed. Project offers some contemporary and some traditionalism but applicant does not want contemporary.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 116 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street – United Lodge (Newport Consultants / Integra Architecture Inc.) and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.**

**Unanimously Carried**

D. Rose declared a conflict of interest, due to his professional participation in the following presentation, and he left the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

### **3. 276 East Keith Road – Heritage & Duplex Infill**

The Development Planner advised that the existing house is listed on the Heritage Register and the OCP allows for more density on the site through a rezoning. The original home has been rehabilitated by the owners who now wish to convert it to two dwelling units and add an infill at the rear.

C. Moorhead – Architect, J. King - Applicant, and D. Rose - Landscape Architect were introduced and the Architect reviewed the context of the neighbourhood and gave a brief history of the family ownership and restoration of the home and garden.

The Architect reviewed the properties along the streetfront, front and rear elevations of the house and the lanescape. The applicant wishes to remove existing fire stairs and restore the back of the house.

The site development plan, as noted in the information package dated June 2006, was reviewed and the following explained:

- Main entries to the two units in the heritage house are from a veranda and accessed by a common stairway.
- Unit layouts.
- Massing of the buildings.
- View lines from neighbouring properties.
- Use of skylights rather than dormers in the infill to minimize mass.

Exterior materials and colours of the infill will match the existing house. Original wood windows will be retained in the house with asphalt shingles.

The Landscape Architect advised that the front yard landscape will be maintained and existing plantings will be maximized and recycled on the site as necessary. One mature tree on the site will be removed and all others will be retained and protected during construction.

An opening will be created in the hedge at the street to make a walkway to the infill. Existing pavers will be used in the courtyard between the two buildings and to the garage and open parking at the rear will have grasscrete with gravel infill. Efforts will be made to retain the tree by the covered parking.

#### **Questions from the Panel included:**

- Is there a window in the bedroom in bottom of heritage house or skylight only.
- Extent of upgrading of the house.
- Impact of addressing upper floor unit where it crosses over unit below – building code issues such as sprinkler, sound attenuation and fire separation.

It was noted that the garage is to be associated with the original house and one parking space will be assigned to the infill. Garbage and recycling areas will be at the lane in the same manner as a single family home.

D. Rose left the meeting at 8:25 p.m.

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

- Support the project.
- Good scheme.
- North elevation on garage needs further consideration.
- Like how the heritage buildings melds with more modern building.
- Opportunity to have window in bedroom at bottom of house should be explored.
- North elevation does not work 3-dimensionally and may not present well at completion. Beneficial to consider shifting gable to the left to match garage doors.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 276 East Keith Road – Heritage & Duplex Infill (Charles Moorhead Architect) and recommends approval. The ADP commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.**

**Unanimously Carried**

The Architect stated that the rear elevation will be reviewed to address concerns noted.

D. Rose returned to the Panel at 8:45 p.m.

**4. The Pier Parcel 5 : Hotel – OCP Amendment & Rezoning**

M. DeCotiis - M. Bruckner and C. Dixon – Architects, P. Kreuk – Landscape Architect, and B. Martin and M. DeCotiis – Pinnacle International were introduced.

The Architect reviewed the revisions from the previous presentation as set out in the design package dated June 15, 2006, including:

- Addition of French balconies at hotel units
- Unification of hotel and residential through reinforcement of corner element and green tint of glazing
- Green tint glazing at Level 3 on the south façade
- Brick at retail has been replaced with metal and glass, and concrete columns
- Glazing at east elevation and stairwell
- Mechanical equipment screening
- Building has horizontal lines of a ship using maritime colour
- Separate entries to each of the residential, hotel and conference components.
- Overview of design and sign materials.

The Landscape Architect gave an overview of the landscape detail in this area:

- Extension of railway tracks beyond the hotel.
- Railing details at stairways.

- Benches.
- Retaining wall system at Plate Shop escarpment feature.
- Children's play area located at the north of the site.
- Private roof decks at the hotel and residences and public terraces at the hotel.
- Stairs and ramp entry at corner entry to the hotel from Lonsdale.
- Curved handrails designed to depict metal work on the historic site.

**Questions from the Panel included:**

- Access between levels at the convention centre.
- Is façade at roof at Esplanade & Lonsdale used to screen equipment.
- Rationale supporting the curved canopy at the corner and how it relates to the corner tower above.
- Treatment at entrance to residential lobby
- Are bollards to be used at laneway on south side?
- How are balconies accessed from living rooms?

**Comments from the Panel included:**

- Corner of Esplanade and Lonsdale is too subtle and hotel signage may help strengthen this corner.
- Improvement from previous presentation – proposal feels lighter and more cohesive.
- Like how the angular corner breaks up the massing.
- Greater depth at the corner would be beneficial.
- Corner element at roof should be stronger.
- Like whimsy of landscaping with green wall and curved rails.
- Simplification of facades is an improvement over earlier scheme.
- Corner element should come to the ground rather than terminate at plinth level on Lonsdale.
- Escalator, instead of feature stairway, or an elevator in a more convenient location would facilitate access to the ballroom from south lower entry and would better address access for aging population and handicapped guidelines.
- Like how the east end is addressed but detail at vertical concrete needs some reveals.
- Balconies on the corner are distracting and detract from the corner.
- Mast at the roof corner is weak, to the point where it could even be deleted.
- Corner base is still weak and could be improved.
- Curved canopy could be a better transition to the tower at the top.
- Entrance to the residential lobby at Esplanade is weak.
- Corner mast is very tentative – needs to overlap and carry down the building to read more like an integration of extension of the corner.
- Revisions address most issues raised previously.
- Corner needs strengthening and may benefit from removing balconies.
- Surrounding landscape has been clarified and is an interesting package.
- Balconies extend out as they go up and could offer residents great views but would reflect noise back into the suites.
- Entries to convention centre and residential areas could be strengthened and increase letter size for signage.

- Sloped parapet on the corner tower roof should be raked more and emphasized.
- Flagpole on the roof is weak
- Strong contrast between different windows areas, as represented in presentation drawings, is not likely to be achieved in real building using just window tinting. Mirrored glazing would create better differentiation of windows than tinting, but is often not considered appropriate in residential type of use.

**Applicant's response:**

The applicant thanked the Panel for their comments and will consider their integration into the final design. Points noted for information were:

- The flagpole can come down the façade and attach to the corner.
- Guests entering the conference area are expected to arrive from Esplanade where there is a bank of elevators through the lobby or from the underground parking.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the OCP Amendment and Rezoning application for the Pier Parcel 5 – Hotel (Pinnacle International Inc. / IBI/HB Architecture Inc.) and recommends approval of the proposal. The ADP recommends that the following be addressed:**

- Appearance of the residential tower form to extend to the ground;
- Stronger treatment of the flagpole;
- Strengthening of the visual impact of the front canopy at Esplanade and Lonsdale Avenue;
- Reinforcement of the residential entrance from Esplanade.

**Unanimously Carried**

**5. Adoption of Minutes of Meetings of May 24 and June 7, -2006**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the minutes of the Joint Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel and Advisory Planning Commission held May 24, 2006, and the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held June 7, 2006 be adopted.**

**Unanimously Carried**

**6. Business Arising**

None

**7. Staff Update**

None



**8. Other Business**

None

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, July 19, 2006.

---

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2006\2006 06 21.doc