

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, October 15th, 2014**

---

**MINUTES**

---

**Present:** B. Allen  
H. Besharat  
K. Bracewell, R.C.M.P  
A. Epp  
B. Harrison  
A. Larigakis  
P. Maltby  
M. Messer  
M. Saii  
D. Siegrist  
Councillor Bell

**Staff:** M. Epp, City Planner  
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Servicing  
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk

**Guests:** **377 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street (Development Variance Permit Application)**  
Steven Petersson, Petersson Planning Consulting  
Shida Neshat-Behzadi, SNB Architecture and Planning Inc.  
Tina Barouti, SNB Architecture and Planning Inc.  
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd.  
Masoud Siadat, DBM Studio Inc.  
Morez Adilipour, DBM Studio Inc.

**Absent:**

---

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. H. Besharat took the Chair in B. Harrison's absence

**1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held September 17th, 2014**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held September 17th, 2014 be adopted as amended.

**Carried Unanimously**

## 2. Staff Update

M. Epp reviewed the status of the Marlborough II projects previously reviewed by the Panel. The applicant modified the design to address some of the Panel's comments.

*B. Harrison entered the meeting at 5:40 p.m.*

*D. Bell entered the meeting at 5:43 p.m.*

*D. Siegrist entered the meeting at 5:45 p.m.*

H. Besharat relinquished the Chair to B. Harrison.

## 3. Business Arising

Staff reminded members that the December meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for December 10<sup>th</sup>.

*There was a short break at 5:50 p.m.*

*The meeting reconvened at 5:55 p.m.*

## 4. 377 East 2nd Street (Development Variance Permit Application)

This application is seeking a relaxation to setbacks and lot coverage in order to redevelop the site with seven townhomes within the existing RM-1 Medium Density Apartment Residential 1 zone at 1.6 FSR.

Staff asked for the Panel's input on the transition between public and private space, the outdoor space and roof top deck areas, the proximity and relationship to the adjacent buildings, and the parking configuration and circulation.

Steven Petersson, Petersson Planning Consulting, introduced the project:

- The building will replace a building built in 1957.
- The design uses traditional materials with a modern aesthetic.
- The site is a transition area between higher density uses to the west and lower density to the north.
- The townhouse units will be relatively affordable for larger families.
- Variances are sought for the front, rear and side setbacks, a site coverage increase from 50% to 54.3%, and variances to adaptable design requirements.
- A customized adaptable design approach for townhouses is proposed; all units will be Level 1 adaptable and two units will incorporate aspects of Level 2.
- A 15 foot setback from East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and a six foot setback from St. Patrick's Avenue are proposed. The building area is shifted closer to St. Patrick's Avenue to increase the set back to the neighbour to the west.
- The new design will result in a more attractive interface with the lane.
- CPTED principles used include no hidden areas in the lane, clear sight lines to the front entrances, large windows contribute to "eyes on the street" and individual garages rather than a shared parkade, and a "safe" landscape design is safer.
- Adaptable design is challenging for the three floor townhouse form so adaptability will be maximised on the ground floor of two of the units with an accessible bedroom and bathroom and office on the main floor, and ramps to enter the unit.

Shida Neshat-Behzadi, SNB Architecture and Planning Inc. described the design:

- The proposed building steps down the slope which reduces the sense of height when seen from the lane.
- The façade materials are a mixture of stained wood and stone accents articulated in a way to emphasize the individual units with contrast between the textures of the warm wood and cold cementitious board.
- The flat roof minimizes intrusions into the viewscape for adjacent residents and is lined and drained to provide rooftop decks for the residents.
- The building will meet a minimum of EnerGuide 80.
- Efficient floor layouts allow for liveability and affordability.

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

- The plan is limited by the setbacks and does not include greening along the back of the property as it is a narrow space with no room for a planter. However, the rest of the design compensates for it.
- There is a strong frame of street trees around the property, but the power line down St. Patrick's Avenue has limited the size of the street trees in that location.
- There is a low to medium high screen of plants along St. Patrick's Avenue.
- The BC Hydro kiosk at the north west corner is screened.
- There is a semi-enclosed yard for the end unit on East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street.
- There is an interesting roofscape complemented by lined timber planters.

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

- Is the garbage/recycling area gated? **A:** No.
- The building has a 2<sup>nd</sup> Street address; how will you define the other locations on St. Patrick's Avenue for first responders? **A:** We are hoping to have addresses on St. Patrick's Avenue. We need to discuss the civic addresses with the City.
- Are there any treatments to define the territoriality to the garages? **A:** There will be a gate and a sign.
- Why is the access to the roof a hatch? **A:** We prefer to have a hatch for the look and height of the building.
- Is the lot coverage the biggest horizontal level? **A:** Yes, it takes into account the projection of the floors above.
- It is a wood frame building? **A:** The lower floor is concrete, the upper ones wood.
- What are the energy savings for the roof? **A:** 50%.
- Are the windows triple or double glazed? **A:** Double glazed.
- What is the heating system? **A:** Electrical panels for each room. There will be a heat recovery system.
- Have you moved the sidewalk out? **Staff:** The sidewalk is pushed away from the street and bordered by a green strip.
- What is the wood? **A:** It is kayu wood; a very hard wood.
- Is it an endangered hardwood; is it certified? **A:** We can ask.
- Have you thought about improving the permeability on the site? **A:** There are some permeable paving areas.  
You do not want a thermal bridge in your building. Are the R values effective R values?
- What is the material of the window frames? **A:** vinyl.

- The front yard setback is a dramatic change, are there other buildings with a similar setback?
- The entrance to the parking seems tight to manoeuvre vehicles. **A:** We will review as per the feedback received from the City of North Vancouver.
- How do the units achieve privacy on the roof? **A:** There will be flower boxes at the edges.
- What is the joint between the materials? **A:** There will be reveals. It will be crisp.
- Will the garbage trucks be able to access the garbage, the loading arm will not hit the building? **A:** We have to relocate the garbage closer to the lane.
- Will you do something about the large concrete wall at the end of the parking area? **A:** It will be changed; perhaps to a stepped landscape.
- Why did you choose wood for the planters? **A:** It is pressure treated wood. It was chosen for cost effectiveness and ease of getting it up there.
- How do occupants of the accessible units access the kitchen and living areas which are on the third floor, where do they eat? **A:** The layout is intended mainly for guests, but could be adapted for the buyers.
- The ramp to the parking is quite steep and there is no visibility, you need a hammerhead. **A:** We have to work on that and, at least, install a mirror.
- For safety, you need some transparency in the front door so that people can see who is out there. **A:** That is a good point.
- Can you walk through the design rationale? **A:** We are trying to make a pleasant façade with contrast between the textures of the materials: rough versus smooth, cold stone and warm wood, etc. It is different to what is seen in the neighbourhood. It will be pleasant on a cold, grey day. We thought individual unit identity was appropriate in the neighbourhood context.
- With regard to the relationship between the west property line and the grade, what is the rationale for not moving the cars underground? **A:** We are revising the whole lower floor and may have to push the wall out.
- Why is the dining room separated from the kitchen by the living room? **A:** To make the space more attractive for the living room and give more privacy.
- What about accessibility on the stairs? **A:** They would have to be strengthened to hold a riding mechanism.
- Is there any way to do a green wall application on the west side of the building?
- Was there ever a consideration to go to six units instead of seven to minimize the variances? **A:** We explored the number of units with the owner. We were told six units would not work economically on the site.
- The roofs are flat; what is your strategy for capturing rainwater? **A:** There will be a slope towards a drain with a connection through the walls to the storm water drain.
- You are not treating any of the water on the site? **A:** No.

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

- I thank the applicant for a very thorough presentation in the package and the boards. It is appreciated. I would add the context to the package.
- I am supportive of the project. It is a tough site; you are going down the right road. There is an opportunity for strong shifts which need to happen at the garage level. There is cost involved which should be spent on achieving better parking and better parking access and maneuverability.
- I am supportive of the setback variances.

- The projected elevation of the west building, lends itself to be partially covered which would allow patio spaces to span over top. It is not economic to do but would allow you to get a better design approach to the auto court.
- I like the palette, the colours work well, it is residential modern. It is more like a row house; good to be close to the street, 15 feet is right. It needs a careful ordering of the façade. I appreciate the individuality; you should look at row house projects. You need to give a sense of order in how it meets the street. It is a bookend defining the end of the block. Keep the palette and the look and find a sense of order. Express the individuality in a different way.
- The roof planters should not be wood; they will deteriorate.
- The overlook does not drop off much. It would be a good idea to make taller planters. You may catch some water on the permeable surface, but I think the slope is too steep to catch much.
- Spend a little more time looking at privacy issues. Look at planters and railings and climbability issues. I agree that concrete planters make more sense on the roof.
- There is potential to have another look at the storm water coming off the roof and make the project more sustainable.
- It is an interesting project. The east elevation is playful; could you bring some of that character to the west side? It is not as strong as the other three sides.
- Using the stone high up seems heavy.
- I like the idea of adaptability; it is very important.
- Overall I like the modern theme of the design. I like the adaptability components and proximity of the front doors to the sidewalk. I am struggling with the bedrooms and windows which are quite close to each other: consider privacy. You have maxed out what you can considering the restraints. I compliment you on your layout and design.
- I am a huge fan of row house development. There are too many materials; maybe limiting the palette would improve the look of the project. More order in the elevations would be preferable. Variations should come out in more subtle ways; I would like to see it simplified.
- It is a thorough package but the site plan is frustrating. We need to see setbacks in relation to other blocks. We need more information on the adjacent properties.
- I think that with the amount of glazing and vinyl window frames there is an opportunity to do a very energy efficient building; getting effective R values, eliminating thermal bridges, and heat recovery will be very important.
- The design package is well prepared and put together; my compliments. The landscape is well handled. I support the variances. The bike stalls will resolve themselves; there is nothing wrong with vertical bike racks.
- I do support some variation in the adaptable design; it needs to be well thought e.g. the width of stairs, preparation of meals, location of bedrooms etc.
- I also like the proximity of the project to the property line to give eyes on the street.
- I do not think a six foot closet is sufficient for a master bedroom.
- It is a good start for a very playful and interesting modern architecture but the building is crowded; there are discrepancies between elevations and 3D pictures. I am more supportive of the direction and colour and material palette on the 3D package. There is a lot going on. I do not know how you are going to detail and make it a successful project with all the different materials. I am worried that some of the surfaces with reveal joints are unresolved. It will be successful if it is well treated. You show reveal joints that do not respect the modules of the fibre cement siding planks and boards.
- You need to look at windows and window operation. Which modules will be operable windows? That will help the architecture.

- The vocabulary you have chosen is exciting, but it needs more work. You need to make the corner a more public corner; it is important and visible from all directions.
- You need to put thought into storm water management and passive energy saving measures. There are all kinds of opportunities e.g. operable windows and cross ventilation. There may be some Code issues in the distance between town houses 6 and 7, and 4 and 5. It is ok not to provide balconies but give a lot of thought into ventilation and how you will introduce more ventilation. Passive and active energy measures need to be revisited.
- I like the fact that you included a CPTED portion in your presentation. Natural surveillance is good. The address issue needs to be resolved for first responders. Give consideration to defining the private space of the parking from the public space of the lane. Garbage should be enclosed to prevent trespassing.
- The manoeuvrability of the last parking space is a problem. I would suggest 9 ft. 6 in. garage doors.

**Presenter's comments:**

Thank you for the detailed and thoughtful comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Variance Permit Application for 377 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and supports the site development concept, strong contemporary architectural design and requested variances. The ADP feels the following have not been adequately resolved and requests the applicants consider the ADP comments and revise their plans for review at a future ADP meeting including:

- Simplifying the façade and materials;
- Considering passive and active energy efficiency design measures; and
- Resolving parking access and maneuverability.

The Panel commends the applicant for the quality of the presentation and supporting material.

**Carried Unanimously**

**5. Other Business**

None.

**6. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, November 19<sup>th</sup> 2014.

Chair