

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

**Meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission
Held at City Hall, 141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, B.C.
in Conference Room A on Wednesday, September 11, 2013**

MINUTES

Present: B. Curtis
D. Farley
J. Jensen (Chair)
B. Phillips
J. Plato
M. Rahbar
M. Robinson
C. Sacre
Councillor Bell
Councillor Buchanan

Staff: S. Smith, Planner 2, Community Development
B. Cross, Research Assistant
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk

Guests: **101-149 Lonsdale Avenue**
Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill & Associates
Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Ltd.
Steve Henderson, Staburn Property Group
Alex Wren, Staburn Property Group

161 East Keith Road
Michael Katz, Katz Architecture Ltd.
Janet Corne, Katz Architecture Ltd.

Absent: P. McCann
B. Watt

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission held July 10th, 2013

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission held July 10th, 2013 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. Business Arising

S. Smith reminded members about the waterfront visioning public information meeting on Monday, September 16th.

3. Staff Update

S. Smith reviewed relevant planning development, project and policy items from the July 15th, 22nd and September 9th Council meetings.

4. 101-149 Lonsdale Avenue (Rezoning Application)

Staff provided background on the application to build 70 residential units, 11,428 sq. ft. of commercial office space and 13,553 sq. ft. of retail space within a six-storey built form.

Staff requested the Commission's input on the density bonusing proposal as presented, the size and massing of development in relation to surrounding context, and, the public realm activation and vibrancy based on the proposed uses, with particular focus on the mews.

Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects, presented the project to the Commission:

- The project includes five non-market residential units to be run by the Vancouver Resource Society, heritage preservation of the heritage building, strong design sensitivity to the local area, significant adaptable design features, the inclusion of office space, environmental considerations, and community amenities.
- The proposal involves a complex site surrounded by new developments and overlooked from the north and north-west by taller buildings. The proposed building is L- shaped and low scale relative to the other buildings and will not block their views.
- The north south lane and L-shaped (mews) lane will be retained. The mews lane will be publicly accessible and will be landscaped and well lit.
- The brick portion of the building along Lonsdale meets the height guideline except the setback top level is above the 60 foot height.
- There are different uses on the site providing jobs.

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

- The design encourages small terraces and patios at the street level.

- There is a comprehensive streetscape design for Lonsdale Avenue and the corners of 1st and 2nd Streets which uses the Lonsdale Streetscape Design Guidelines to create an animated ground plane.
- New, more upright, street trees will replace the existing trees.
- Different awnings on the commercial retail units will add variety.
- The mews through the building will make the project special; it will be used to access Jack Loucks Park or the CRU's on Lonsdale Avenue. It will have a grand archway and interesting lighting, perhaps footstep activated lights, and public art to make it as inviting and bright and cheery as possible.
- The L-shaped building allows for the creation of a green garden with outdoor terraces in the upper levels. The rooftop garden will have a Persian theme which will be carried through the rooftop landscaping which will look very attractive from the towers above.
- There will be pop up exits to private patios.
- There will be plantings to shield the mechanical equipment on the roof to make it more attractive and give a noise buffer.

Questions from the APC included, but were not limited to:

- Can you talk about the heritage building? **A:** Don Luxton was retained to create a conservation plan for the building which was built in 1904. The building will be rehabilitated and restored from the outside by removing the stucco and matching original paint colours. It is impossible to meet life safety requirements from a residential point of view so it will be 100% commercial. The chamfered corner will remain but does not meet accessibility requirements so a second entrance will be provided on West 1st Street. The cedar shingle roof will meet fire code requirements. The southerly wall of the new building will be concrete with the heritage building tied to it.
- Will any of the CRU's open to the mews? **A:** The northern CRU #7 will have some access at the back of the space. It is difficult; we had to remove an outward facing door due to code requirements. There is an opportunity to provide seating or a café in that CRU. The southern CRU is below the mews due to the grade.
- The nice work on materials does not go round the building to the back. It seems to have lost the great treatments on Lonsdale Avenue and 2nd Street. **A:** This façade is more contemporary; it does not have to harken back to the heritage on that side.
- How have you responded to the Design Panel's comments re the mews? **A:** We have not made a decision but are paying attention to those comments, especially from the RCMP. The seating in the L-shaped corner has been removed. There will be a lot of lighting into the mews. There may be some gates that will be closed at night to address any concerns.
- Was it required by the City to keep the heritage building? **A:** It was on the Heritage Register and was considered an asset by the City.
- What is the rationale for the heritage revival for the buildings to the north of the heritage building? **A:** The Heritage Commission supported it, and there was lots of support from the neighbourhood for it. We drew inspiration from the previous heritage building; it is a heritage character area.
- There is a lot of glazing on the west elevation; is there conflict in the Building Code with the adjacent building? They will not change during the working drawings?

- If the mews becomes just a walk through and if there is no animation, it will not function. It would be good if doors to a coffee shop opened into it, or it spilled into the street. **A:** There will be animation in the lane. We were encouraged to either be static or create a walk through so have gone with the walk through. The Design Panel encouraged us to make the mews the focal point for public art.
- Are you deficient in parking for the commercial and residential? **A:** We have more parking than required. Bunt and Associates are doing a traffic demand management plan. We have mixed residential visitor and commercial in the upper parking due to time of use. 45 parking stalls meet the retail office and visitor parking standards.
- How will the rental units be secured? **A:** There will be a covenant placed on the units to keep them in perpetuity. Vancouver Resource Society will purchase and operate them.
- Who will maintain the mews? **A:** It will be private, but there will be a restrictive covenant on it.

Comments from the APC included, but were not limited to:

- I am concerned with the western elevation.
- I am concerned about mimicking heritage. The different facades give the wrong look. As the heritage building is very small it may not be worth keeping it.
- I was present when the building was presented to a Lower Lonsdale community group; the group as a whole supported the development. They liked the heritage building retention and the fact it includes parking, residential, affordable housing and office space.
- I support the height changes and think it would be interesting to make the heritage building a community amenity space even if just for the residents of the building.
- I have heard from some residents that they would prefer keeping the Moodyville Café the way it is.
- I support the heritage aspects; the idea of breaking up the façade and keeping the rhythm of the existing store fronts and having it appear as a number of buildings. It is happening all over Lower Lonsdale e.g. Paine's Hardware.
- The green roof aspects are good.
- I am not concerned about the parking; the project is on a transit corridor and near the SeaBus. We have a lot of parking but it is not used; we need to identify where the parking is and do a better job of utilizing what we have because it is expensive to create it.
- I really like the building design; it is a lot more interesting than just concrete and glass. It fits well in the area.
- I think it's a great project; I like the design, I like the mews. Perhaps CPTED issues can be ameliorated. A little more setback on the upper floor would be better.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 101-149 Lonsdale Avenue and recommends approval of the project, subject to the following, to the satisfaction of staff:

- Continuation of the architectural treatment and character of the Lonsdale elevation to the west elevation of the building;
- Consideration of a more prominent role for the heritage building in the approach to amenities for the project;
- Confirmation that the provision of parking meets City standards.

The Commission is supportive of the height and density proposed in the project.

The Commission commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.

Carried Unanimously

5. 161 East Keith Road (Rezoning Application)

Staff provided background on the project which is a proposal to build a 17 storey residential building containing 58 strata units and 40 rental units, for a total of 98 one-bed and two-bed residential units. It is located in Victoria Park; the area contributes a fair amount to the rental stock. The building itself is oriented north south with sensitivity to the narrow nature of the lot. A transfer of density from the City boulevard is being sought. The bonus will ensure the replacement of the existing rental units.

Staff requested the Commission's comments on the density bonusing package and boulevard acquisition, the contextual fit of the proposed building and its uses, and, the elements of sustainable design incorporated into the project.

Michael Katz, Michael Katz Architecture Ltd, presented the project to the Commission:

- The applicant envisions it as a rental property for the foreseeable future with the ability to stratify 58 of the units in the future.
- The proposal includes connection to Lonsdale Energy Corporation including space for a transfer station to act as a bridge to connect the Lower and Central Lonsdale District Energy loops.
- A small height variance is being sought. The adjacent building is a little lower.
- It is a beautiful site with Victoria Park and Keith Road in front of it; there is a piano-shaped property owned by the City on Keith Road which we will purchase to reduce the FSR to 3.9. The boulevard will then be given back to the City. At the Information Meeting the public told us they like the boulevard property as it is, so we will not be making many changes and will leave the trees.
- It is a challenging site at 90 foot wide so we plan to build a very narrow, three unit wide tower moving the building east to the lane.
- The lane only serves one building and is a favourite pedestrian way.

- The City and client have agreed in principle to pay \$2.8 million for the density on City land and to landscape it and pedestrianize the lane by paving and lighting it.
- Our main request is to reduce the building separation to the adjacent building from 80 feet to 68 feet.
- Our second request is for the FSR of 2.3 with bonus FSR for rental units for a total FSR of 3.9 at the maximum height allowed by the Official Community Plan.
- All units will be cross-ventilated.
- The stairs are exterior for a safe fire escape system.

Questions from the APC included, but were not limited to:

- What is the width of the building? **A:** 46 feet with three one-bedroom and two-bedroom units each side. Of the six units four have two-sided windows. There are also seven foot deep balconies on all units which are not shown on the model.
- All units are cross ventilated? **A:** Yes, they have operable windows.
- What are the tenant amenities? **A:** A large gym and hobby room and a plaza on 6th Street.
- Have you thought about units with more than two bedrooms? **A:** The units are very adaptable to that but would be expensive to rent. We may do that. It is a very high quality market rental building. It is being built by the client to keep. It is all triple glazed curtain wall; window walls in other buildings are starting to fail. We are trying to create a 100 year building
- How will you achieve the energy efficiency you are aiming for? **A:** This building is being designed to ASHRAE 90.3 2010. It is only 40% glass because of the core. We are waiting to see if we can use vacuum glass.
- What about comfort inside the units; will it be very hot because of the glass, triple glazing? **A:** Triple glazing and a tinted coating on the west will make it very comfortable. We are talking about exterior blinds. It is essential that it be comfortable, the cross ventilation will help with triple sliding doors across the balcony.
- Have you thought about the experience of walking by the blank side of the building on the east wall where there is nothing to animate it? **A:** There is some landscaping, but it will be close to the lane as we need to create the distance to the adjacent building.
- Question to staff: How big a concern is the setback to the adjacent building? **Staff:** Ideally 80 feet is the separation however the building has been oriented north south and is quite transparent in design which are mitigating factors. The alternative is a much smaller building and this proposal includes the retention and increase of rental units.
- How about sliding the building north? **A:** We have to be careful with the City-owned property. There is a public sense of ownership. We have gone as far as we dare to go.
- Are the exterior stairwells safe? **A:** They will be very safe; we want them to be as open as possible but they will be safe.
- Can you describe the entranceways? **A:** The two entrances are an elegant solution because Keith Road is so much higher than 6th Street. There is a nice entrance off Keith Road or you can drive in along 6th Street and enter at a lower level.

- The public amenity is the retention of the boulevard? **A:** The \$2.8 million will be used by the City for public amenities in other areas.
- Question to staff: Are there any precedents for selling boulevards? **Staff:** Yes, there are. I believe there are examples elsewhere in Victoria Park as well.
- Will the lane be paved? **A:** Yes, brushed concrete.
- Looking at the east west elevations some bedrooms are all glazing; what is the size of the operable windows? Can they be made bigger? **A:** We will make more operable windows.
- Blinds could be very untidy when viewed from the street because of all the glass. **A:** We are thinking of a fixed metal shading system. It will look very clean.
- I am concerned that the vast majority of units seem to be one-bedroom. **A:** It is not a very big building and we cannot push northwards. I am going to discuss with client about combining some of the units. Three units could become two.

Comments from the APC included, but were not limited to:

- I really like it, I like the design a lot; it is like an art piece itself.
- I had some concerns, but have confidence in your cross ventilation system. It will be really nice getting out of the elevator into an open space.
- Some of the proposed three-bedroom units should be lower down.
- I commend you for the building.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 161 East Keith Road and recommends approval, subject to the following, to the satisfaction of staff:

- Consideration of three-bedroom units at various locations in the building;
- Satisfy concerns related to glazing including energy consumption, comfort level for occupants, the size of operable windows, and solar shading.

The Commission commends the applicant on their approach to cross-ventilation involving the configuration of the central stairway and elevator and the exterior stairwell.

The Commission supports the proposed decreased separation to the adjacent building due to the quality of the project, the increase in rental units, and the rehabilitation of the boulevard and lane.

The Commission commends the applicant for an excellent presentation.

Carried Unanimously

Councillor Bell left the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

6. CityShaping Draft OCP – Policy Discussion

B. Cross, Research Assistant, Engineering, Parks and Environment reviewed the Climate Change Adaptation in the City of North Vancouver discussion paper.

- Major changes will be:
 - Increases in temperature with more warming at certain times of year: summer, winter nights, higher elevations, and more extreme heat days.
 - Wetter in the fall and winter, with more intense rainfall, and drier in the spring and summer. There will be less snow in the winter and spring.
 - Much more frequent extreme heat and storms.
 - Higher sea levels and storm surges.
- Less snow could have big impacts for water storage over summer.
- Climate Change will need to be addressed with mitigation (preventing change), adaptation (responding to climate change) and resilience (the capacity to respond to change by resisting damage and recovering quickly).

Comments and questions from the APC included, but were not limited to:

- How will this be folded into the OCP? **Staff:** CityShaping has included a climate lens in the development of content to date. Since the adaptation work began both of the projects have evolved in parallel with crossover. The final results will be integrated throughout the OCP.
- The cost of replacing infrastructure will be a problem; it has been built with federal grants. The costs for the City will be very high. We have to do a better job of making sure we provide leadership and data to the community.
- It is a big step to integrate into the OCP. It does need consideration for investment and planning.
- It has major implications for priority planning.
- Density bonusing helps to pay for infrastructure.
- Make data charts so that ordinary people can understand it.
- What is the cost of not adapting?
- It is a complex matter and people do not want to pay attention.
- Sometimes people think it is too simple and that something is being hidden from them.
- In the US papers on this topic are very heavily footnoted; I would recommend that for this as it goes forward.
- It could be high risk with low impact; we need to come up with impact statements. **Staff:** The risk is risk plus likelihood, so we have that information.
- It is difficult to find out what ICLEI stands for. **Staff:** They like to use the abbreviation.
- Do we have what individuals should do personally for adaptation e.g. use of grey water for irrigation?
- This is a lot to place on Council members. It is hard when you are looking so far in the future. How do you reach a consensus on what the priorities are?
- There is no argument about the data but about the source of the data.
- Is Vancouver Coastal Health a stakeholder? **A:** Yes.
- Many people do not want to talk about global warming.
- It is a global issue; there should be a national or provincial body directing it. There are so many different stakeholders on the North Shore. We are a tiny community in the middle of Metro Vancouver. **A:** Mitigation is a global effort, adaptation is a local effort. It is all about addressing things at the right level. So adaptation is usually brought down as low as possible.

S. Smith then gave a presentation on the top 10 changes to the 2002 Official Community Plan:

- Longer time horizon
- Sustainability Framework
- Approachability/ Readability
- New policy components
- Focus on corridors
- New capacity – strengthening existing; adding new areas; gentle densification
- New small commercial nodes
- New Development Permit Areas
- New Approach - Density Bonus
- Monitoring – Indicators

Comments and questions from the APC included, but were not limited to:

- We need to explain climate change and how it relates to each area of community capacity we are trying to improve.
- Will there be a place in the new OCP to show the links to the other plans and targets i.e. what are the layers under each chapter? For example a home page connecting all the dots. **A:** Yes.
- How do you want citizens to approach the document: bottom up or top down?
- Will you introduce it differently to different groups of people e.g. public, developers, community associations? **A:** Yes.

7. Sustainable City Awards

S. Smith asked members if there were any nominations for the Sustainable City Awards which should be presented on November 4th. The group will make a selection from the nominees at the October meeting. It is up to the group to decide how many awards to give.

Action: Members volunteered to complete nomination forms for different projects.

8. Density Bonus Update Report

S. Smith asked members if they had any questions on the Density Bonus Report.

9. Other

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission will be held on Wednesday, October 9th, 2013.



Chair