

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, April 16, 2008**

MINUTES

Present:	K. Hanvey, Chair A. Hii, Vice Chair J. Bitar – RCMP Rep T. Cailes J. Heilman K. Kristensen N. Paul Councillor B. Fearnley	
Staff:	G. Venczel, Development Planner E. Maillie, Committee Secretary C. Perry, Development Services	
Guests:	K. Halex Lutz Architect R. Ciccozzi R. Woodstock C Kovaks R. Maruyama M. Thomson	M. Fatemi R. Vrooman S. Seefeldt L. Kesler B. Heaslip P. Grant I. Abercrombie
Absent:	K. Terris P. Winterburn-Chilton R. Spencer	

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:38 p.m.

1. New Member

Constable Julia Bitar was welcomed as the RCMP representative to the Panel.

2. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held March 19, 2008

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held March 19, 2008 be adopted.

Unanimously Carried

3. **Business Arising**

None

4. **Staff Update**

(a) **Public Hearing and Final Adoption**

- **142 West 23rd Street** – This project went to Council for a second time and was adopted.
- **316 West 14th** – Duplex and 180 West Esplanade went to Public Hearing and received Final Adoption.

(b) **CLPS – Joint Advisory**

The Central Lonsdale Planning Study is now underway and a Joint Advisory meeting for APC and ADP is scheduled for Wednesday, May 9th so that staff can receive input from these groups. The stakeholder group is in place and has started its review.

Councillor Fearnley entered the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

5. **2324 Western Avenue – Rezoning**

The Chair read the draft resolution passed by the APC on April 9th.

The Development Planner gave an overview of the proposed project which is in the area of the Western Avenue Planning Study. Zoning permits .8 fsr in this location and the applicant is requesting a variance to have .92 fsr.

The Chair asked for clarification and it was determined that K. Halex, Architect, is representing Formwerks Architectural on this project.

K. Halex introduced M. Fatemi, owner, and D. Rose, Landscape Architect. The Architect reviewed the location of the site and context of the area and confirmed that setbacks and height conform with the zoning bylaw. The Architect reviewed the plan to have 6 units with secured underground parking for residents and visitor parking at the lane. Parking access was explained. Two units face the street and four are located at the rear of the site.

Exterior finishing materials were stated to be stained wood siding with metal panels, and stucco at the top floor and entry areas. Revised elevations were distributed and it was noted that glazing has been reduced to conform with requirements for non-sprinklered units. Outdoor areas were explained. In response to the APC request, a revised statement of sustainability commitments was provided and explained.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the landscape detail for the site. The existing hedge on north side will be retained and an arborist will review the existing trees at the front of the site to determine their condition. If they need to be removed they will be replaced with conifers. Street trees will be planted and hedging will be planted at the patios to create privacy. Use of rain barrels is being considered but locations have not been determined. As APC requested, additional planting will be made at the lane but has not been determined at this time. Lighting through the site is being

addressed. Tumbled concrete paving will be used at the main walkways and patios will be of scored concrete. Compost will be located on the north side close to patios and the garbage and recycling enclosure in the north east corner.

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

- Total square footage of rear units?
- Is there a gate at the top of the stairs?
- Location of security gate for the parking?
- Lighting detail?
- Type of gutter system?
- Any units to be accessible?
- Window materials?
- Scheme is conforming in all respects but asking for additional density – why is additional benefit needed and what is benefit statement?
- Building to the south is large - has solar access study been undertaken?
- Is noise attenuation being addressed because of proximity to highway?
- How is overlook from building to the south being addressed?

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

- Doors at garage seem to be necessary.
- Good scheme with clarity in presentation materials and design compact and rational.
- Puzzled that windows have been reduced in order not to sprinkler units.
- Some concern with livability of Units D and E.
- Overall great scheme and support for livability and affordability.
- Planning clear – nice materials on elevations and fit lots of good accommodation on small lot. Applicant should be congratulated for this.
- Pedestrian movement and traffic separate successfully.
- Might want to do a solar access study to ensure solar access during the year and unit F from mid-year to spring might see little sunshine.
- Great scheme and look forward to seeing it realised.

Applicant's comments:

- NV is low crime municipality however parking garages are infamous for break-ins, particularly garages of this size. Applicant can consider further and decide if the gates are necessary but roll-up door at actual parking stalls are last obstacle to thieves.
- Windows and sprinklering – Reasonably expensive to sprinkler. After 5 units sprinklering is required and code consultant has determined that Unit F can have a fire wall to separate it and remove it from the unit mix. Plan originally exceeded window area and elevations.
- Happy to undertake solar access study to get adequate light into the courtyard.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 2324 Western Avenue (Formwerks Architectural) and recommends approval subject to the following:

- **Further review of the parkade security;**
- **Further review by the Development Planner of the solar access study;**
- **Applicant to consider maximizing glazing on the north elevation of Unit A.**

Carried

6. 1415 Chesterfield Avenue - Rezoning

The Development Planner gave an overview of the project to add nine units in a new building beside an existing apartment building owned and operated by Chesterfield Housing Society for residents with mental disabilities.

Lutz Architect's representative reviewed the location and context of the site. The applicant has acquired this building and wishes to add nine studio apartments to the south west of the existing building with an outdoor common area between the buildings. Variances are being asked to extend the units out to the lane and to have a second outdoor area at the 2nd floor. Residents will be people with mental disabilities and the close proximity to Central Lonsdale with shopping and transit access meets their needs since they do not drive. The existing building will be retained and exterior colour changes will be made. All units will be Level 2. The applicant is requesting a variance to reduce the parking requirement to 7 spaces. It is anticipated that there will be two vehicles on the property and grass grid will be installed to increase green space. Laneway dedication will be done as requested by the City.

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

- Open air courtyard is not completely open to the sky?
- Would there be access from common space to courtyard?
- Height of the peak of the skylight over existing building?
- Rationale for keeping the same style for new building and old?
- Have opportunities to bring more light into the units been considered?
- Are energy saving opportunities being addressed?
- Cedar siding at doors?
- Is perspective correct?

The overgrown landscape, including tree at the laneway, will be removed and street trees planted. Low maintenance landscape will be planted through the site and will provide privacy for the units. Pavers will be laid at the walkway. Materials and colour board were circulated.

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

- Like project and location is good for residents.
- Cedar siding at decks could be problem for water ingress.

- Wood railings at deck can be difficult to seal – consider aluminum.
- South façade seems to have less glazing.
- Many of these buildings in the community and not the most attractive. Would benefit from stronger detail and colour.
- Seems old could be improved by updating details.
- Expression of the architectural details does not have to mimic existing building.
- Sensitive and intelligently planned scheme and acknowledge significant challenges with construction budget.
- Have some of the misgivings expressed earlier.
- Basic planning moves and massing make sense. Agree that project would benefit from more sensitivity and design emphasis with simple elements – door and window surrounds, balcony railings, cornice line, treatment of the base, stair and railings and treatment of the skylight (not a pyramid) can allow to be part of existing building but not copy.
- Inconsistency of 3 dimensional pictures and 3 dimensional view of the project – planting at the west elevation of the addition whereas on 3 dimensional shows asphalt. Hope there will be planting below ground floor units
- Garbage storage device is rendered and hope budget will extend to sensitive design for garbage enclosure.
- Push further on design but recognize it is a challenging project
- Open space open to the sun applauded – can be pushed further.

Applicant's comments

- Inconsistencies - landscape plan shown will be what is done - garbage enclosures are required.
- Desire was to keep the new building interesting and less busy. Shape of skylight – only will be seen by residents in towers adjacent – not a design statement but to drain water and can be looked at.
- Colour massing and placement – one of the directions was considering style. Colour blocking is illusionary and wanted it to read as a block but will consider comment.
- Building decks and joists have been checked and are in good condition.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 1415 Chesterfield Avenue (Lutz Architects) and recommends approval subject to approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:

- **Consideration of further architectural detail and treatment of the addition to distinguish it subtly from the existing building;**
- **Consideration of alternate form for skylight above public space;**
- **Consideration of an alternate colour scheme to differentiate the addition from the existing building;**
- **Consideration of window allocation and window proportions to further differentiate the addition from the existing building;**
- **Consideration that the garbage enclosure in the lane be screened.**

Carried

7. NVSD #44: Former Lonsdale School Site – OCP Amendment & Rezoning

G. Penway reviewed development process to date and clarified the Ray Sargent Park will fall under the design control of the City and the City's direction is reflected in the current presentation. Chair read draft APC resolution from April 9th.

I. Abercrombie introduced the delegation - R. Vrooman, R.Ciccozzi, S. Seefeldt, R. Woodstock, L. Kesler, C Kovaks, B. Heaslip, R. Maruyama, and P. Grant, and M. Thomson.

In response to the ADP comments of last month, the following issues have been addressed for the NVSD Education Services Building -

- Sustainability -commitment to LEED Silver.
- Public Art - Main floor of Gallery space committed to the Artists for Kids Gallery.
- Asking the City to consider a Sculpture Garden in Ray Sargent Park, treatment of the granite archway; permanent commemorative display of Lonsdale School in lobby of ED Services building.
- Use of recycled building materials.
- Traffic Study: Indicated that a single driveway is adequate for entire project, with minimal impact on 21st Street and intersections.

Landscape Design

The Landscape Architect advised that the landscape design now included input from City staff and that the main change is to Ray Sargent Park. The Arborist's report has confirmed that the Black Locust trees are healthy and most will be retained. The Park will be a passive area with a hierarchy of pedestrian walkways and play areas. The wall along Lonsdale and 21st forms the edge to the street. Access into the site is provided in several areas from Lonsdale and a ramp /and steps are located at the entry into the building. Consideration is being given to having a granite archway at the entry to the park or incorporating it into the play structure.

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

- Grass at play area?
- Why did Parks decide on this program?
- Will the water feature be playful?
- Purple pathways are inaccessible?
- Are you contemplating vegetative roofs on the buildings?
- Will urban agriculture to be addressed on the site?
- Site wide stormwater management plan?
- Site area on structure – why would you not contemplate vegetative grooves as part of stormwater management strategy?

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

- Kids areas are important and need to add structures at rock.
- Soundproofing needs to be addressed at children's play area by residential buildings. Path at north side of the bridge crosses grass and may be a problem.
- Interesting and layering – like general direction.

- Concern that plaza is sunken and may feel dark and wet.
- Like the direction and attention to bio swales and lots of play and experience.
- With coming senior population wheelchair dead-ends may be a problem.
- Sunken area south facing and good solution.
- Preferred the previous landscape scheme.
- Generally landscape rich overall.
- Not sure CPTED issues dealt with and they should be looked into closely.
- Great – heading in the right direction.
- At next evolution would like to see more information on points raised.
- Need to see sections – complex site so we can see how the site works plus complete stormwater management and how stormwater works on structures.

Applicant’s comments:

Comments can be dealt with and look forward to responding.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the landscape plan for 2151 Lonsdale Avenue (NVSD #44 / Maruyama & Associates Landscape Architects) and, while supporting the site development concept, makes the following additional comments:

- **Look forward to seeing large scale sections showing grading and detailed information on landscape;**
- **Consideration to be given for opportunities for urban agriculture;**
- **Development of a comprehensive stormwater management plan to**
- **Review circulation and movement through the site for wheelchairs**
- **Consideration of vegetated roofs;**
- **Further elaboration of the entrance to Artists for Kids’ Gallery;**
- **Illustrations to show path flow, structures and kids play area;**
- **Sound attenuation at play area by residential buildings.**
- **Proposals for the provision of Public Art including the reuse of components of the Lonsdale school**

Unanimously Carried

NVSD #44 – Education Services Building

P. Grant, Architect, reviewed design revisions since the last presentation to the Panel. These include:

- Creation of an Artists’ Walk to present a more urban edge to the building. Rather than creating a hard edge in this area, consideration is being given to using undulating granite and adding a ramp area for handicapped access.
- Introduction of fritted glass element on the western façade to address solar impact.
- Introduction of timber element at building entry.
- Middle portion of the skylight and celestory at roof is opaque to address heat issue.
- Park provides opportunity for art in the community

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

- Since these are public buildings all entrances need strong identification why are they hidden?
- Will top floor have accessible deck?
- How will the public know that this is the Artist for Kids' Gallery and what is on?
- Detail of sun shading?
- Grill on west elevation?
- Aesthetic rationale for brick wall on Lonsdale frontage?
- Has signage on the building been considered?
- Appears that curtain wall cladding on 2, 3 and 4 stand proud from stone base – what is the detail?
- Material of soffit under curtain wall?

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

- Realise trees add complexity at the street and also recognize that this is a public building and elements must be emphasized dramatically – concerned that identification this will be a problem
- Like granite but not convinced that architecture is interesting enough.
- Like the building form and it will be handsome addition to Lonsdale.
- Believe that this will be an easily recognizable building.
- First reaction looked like an office bldg – love gashes of red and would love to incorporate more and advertise what the building is in a bolder way.
- Crave something that says Kids Art here.
- Concerned with the waterproofing of the curved details and would like to see more detail.
- Overall east façade is well articulated and would to have more emphasis on the horizontal rather than the vertical. New modelling shows convincing but other areas need to be further resolved – how the cubes meet the cylindrical edge and how it flows through the canopy
- Treatment on the west façade will be very visible to residents and needs to be addressed.
- Project has matured and improved since last time.
- Resolution with two columns puncturing the canopy needs to be reconsidered.
- Not same concern with emphasis on entry – base is generally heading in the right direction – like the stone verticals without headers and the way the curtain wall slips over them.
- Penthouse with gray metal panel is still weak – haphazard pattern of openings need to be addressed.
- Clipped on at roof needs to be integrated with architecture.
- West elevation is a prominent elevation in courtyard of development and is very much back of the building.
- Thank you for acknowledging and trying to treat solar expectations but not a fan of fritted glass – problem is still there just dealing in another way. Solar orientation, façade should reflect solar glazing - how it is framed in the wall needs to be considered uniquely in regard to solar orientation.
- Will there be accessible public facilities 24 hours a day?

Applicant's comments:

Heartened that the Panel liked red. Will continue to strive to develop more colour and interest along Lonsdale.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the OCP Amendment and rezoning application for 2151 Lonsdale Avenue - Artists for Kids' Gallery / Education Services Building – (NVSD #44 / Grant & Sinclair Architects Ltd.) and although supporting the site development concept and massing, the Panel makes the following additional comments:

- **Further consideration of the treatment of the west elevation facing the residential development;**
- **Further consideration of semi-circle canopy integration with the building mass over;**
- **Further consideration of penthouse elements – fenestration and sunshading elements;**
- **Further consideration of glazing on floors 2, 3, and 4 to reflect each façade's unique solar orientation;**
- **Further consideration of means of signifying building entry locations;**
- **Provision of a signage plan for the building and architectural treatment to announce the purpose of the building;**
- **Proposals for the provision of Public Art including the reuse of components of the Lonsdale school.**

Unanimously Carried

HYAD

It was noted that two level 3 units have been added at the ground level since the last review. The applicant still intends to go for LEED Gold certification.

Landscape changes include:

- Increased setbacks
- Relocation of inside amenity space to facilitate access to outdoor space
- Level 3 front and back door

Materials from Lonsdale School identified for possible use in this development include:

- Tongue and groove wood from the gym ceiling for installation at the base of the building.
- Trellis and woodwork, including timbers from the school.
- Reclaiming existing stone from the school for the ground wall on the project.
- Gym floor from Sutherland School may be available for office floors.

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

- Has more interesting colour palette been considered for north side?

- Windows to be vinyl?
- Rationale for 3 storey building rather than 4 storey?
- Rationale for why some parts of the building have parapet and others overhang?

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

- Concerned with lack of overhangs – building envelope consultant should be involved.
- Like the building but it would benefit from brighter colours.
- Like the building – fun and lots of articulation and friendly.
- 3-storey building is well articulated.
- Believe it would benefit from being taller.
- Like project – improved since last time.
- Recognize the rationale on how mass responds to solar orientation.
- Building is highly articulated for small building and if it is to be successful needs to be done well.
- Ask that you consider carefully quality of the ground floor spaces shadowed by the building. Lots of space at ground floor that is below building above and if facing north they will be cool, damp, shady spaces and will not bring value to the project.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the OCP amendment and rezoning application for 2151 Lonsdale Avenue / HYAD (NVSD #44 / Via Architecture) and commends the applicant on the presentation. The Panel recommends approval subject to approval by the Development Planner, of the following:

- **Review of roof overhangs and shading;**
- **Further exploration and consideration of the spaces on the ground floor that are “shadowed” by building above;**
- **Consideration of a more vibrant colour palette.**

Unanimously Carried

Amacon

R. Ciccozzi, Architect, explained the articulation and materials around the building, especially at 22nd and Chesterfield.

The four unit block of townhouses at Chesterfield have individual entries from sidewalk, while the others have a single stairway up from the street. North elevation is driven by the trees and has a granite canopy at the entry. Eight 3 bedroom units have been introduced since the last presentation. Using some materials from the school to create arch entry and trellis on the site.

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

- Width of townhouse units?
- Unit at mid-block unit is partially buried how many windows will it have?

- Nature of space behind mid-block at entry?
- Formal edge at townhouses to create privacy - how is the street edge treated along 22nd Street to address privacy?
- Are roofs accessible?
- Is there any communal amenity space?
- Has consideration been given to treating a portion of the façade differently from the rest of the development?

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

- Can't divorce the original site from the development – need something that families can grow into.
- Care and attention to the colour palette and crave some differentiation.
- So relentless – same material, element, treatment throughout and needs a break.
- Like project – nice job.
- Project has come some way since last time especially a richer palette of materials.
- Comfortable with uniform housing type but these buildings will be largely obscured by trees and not troubled by uniformity of the buildings but don't know nearly enough about the scheme. Scale of drawings leaves much to be resolved and want to see more materials before having a level of comfort that project will be successful.
- View from 22nd Street apartments look like townhouses – windows show one unit but are actually 3 apartments.
- Roofs confusing – don't need solar shading on the north.
- Need to get a lot more information next time we see the project – bigger scale, sections and palettes and lots more 3-D views that really show how the architecture will look and feel.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the OCP amendment and rezoning application for 2151 Lonsdale Avenue (Amacon Development/Robert Ciccozzi Architecture Inc.) and supports the general concept and massing. The Panel makes the following additional comments:

- **Provide further exploration and elaboration of the building elevations, material palette, fenestration, and roof profile through large scale elevations and section drawings so that the project can be adequately assessed;**
- **Further consideration and elaboration of how the project meets the perimeter of the site along its various conditions and is elaborated through large scale drawings and views of the project;**
- **There should be emphasis on the next iteration of the project on providing 3-dimensional views of the project from the pedestrian viewpoint so that the impact of the project on the surrounding streetscape can be adequately assessed;**
- **Details of proposed owners' amenity space;**
- **Clarification and resolution of parkade exiting and circulation relative to the ground plane of the project.**

8. NVSD #44: Queen Mary School – OCP Amendment & Rezoning

The Landscape Architect advised that following the Panel's comments at their last review, the issues were raised with City staff and walkways to townhouses and site landscape has been refined.

The Architect described the location of the four townhouses added to the site – 3 face onto Keith road and one faces onto Chesterfield. Exterior finishes were explained.

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

- Will school parking be made available for church?
- Have you considered how to mitigate the view of the gravel field?
- Site plan and 3-dimensional show wall – has this plan been changed?
- Townhouses typically have immediate relationship to street frontage whereas these units front triangular park and will be most often used through parking garage. Will the stairs be used?
- Why do you collectively feel the material palette and articulation of these buildings are very similar to the ones on the Lonsdale school site?
- South elevation of Parcel C – wood cladding at the top uncomfortable?
- Wood or vinyl windows?
- Was consolidation of driveways considered?
- 3-dimensional view – are units furthest to the north depressed?
- Front yard of the townhouse units is nicely detailed – could it be extended along the street to the north?
- Is it possible to have access to the ground floor units from the outside rather than the lobby?
- Would you consider installing a wall to allow more usable space in front of those units?

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

- 80% of building has overhangs.
- Unfortunate that a bigger building cannot be located on this site.
- Unfortunate that portion of units is not priced for school aged families.
- Would like to see some connection to the playing field from the site.
- Architecture is nicely detailed but building is not big enough.
- Articulation is appropriate.
- Appreciate the treatment along the south façade.
- Entrance to the building facing Chesterfield is weak.
- Overall a good project.
- Project has improved, including the way of dealing with townhouse units but feel that they should face the street.
- Driveway location by building entry is unfortunate and suggest that screening be considered.
- Need greater level of detail – overhang roofs – detail of balconies, corners and need to see bigger sections.

- Extend articulation of the landscape wall to the north to take it to the corner of the property.

Applicant's response:

Townhouse units connect to the park.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the OCP amendment and rezoning application for Queen Mary School (NVSD #44 / Amacon / Robert Ciccozzi Architecture Inc) and supports the site development. The Panel makes the following additional comments:

- **Consideration of further elaboration of the parkade entry to screen it from the building's pedestrian entry;**
- **Consideration of continuing the garden wall and fencing assembly to the north along Chesterfield to the property line;**
- **Provision of further large scale sections and elevations of the project so that it can be adequately assessed at its next review;**
- **Provision of a 3-dimensional view of the project from a pedestrian viewpoint at various points around the site;**
- **Further consideration of roofscape to provide maximum protection of the building envelope.**

Unanimously Carried

J. Bitar left the meeting at 10:30 p.m.

8. Frequency of Committee Meetings

There was a brief discussion around a letter from the City Clerk asking that advisory bodies consider if the number of meetings could be reduced. There was consensus that since ADP meetings are project driven and timelines around Council meetings must be considered, the number of meetings cannot be reduced at this time.

Action: Committee Clerk

9. Youth Involvement Review and Directions

Discussion of this item was deferred to a future meeting.

10. Other Business

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, May 21, 2008

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2008\2008 04 16.doc