

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 18, 2008**

---

**MINUTES**

---

<b>Present:</b>	K. Hanvey, Chair T. Cailles J. Heilman N. Paul B. Spencer K. Terriss P. Winterburn-Chilton Councillor B. Fearnley
<b>Staff:</b>	G. Venczel, Development Planner E. Maillie, Committee Secretary C. Perry, Development Services
<b>Guests:</b>	R. Hulbert, Architect J. Losee, Landscape Architect F. Yadegari, Architect C. Vollan, Anthem Properties D. Weingarreck, Loblaws V. Tam, Project Manager M. Saii, Developer D. Rose, Landscape Arch. F. Rafii, Architect J. Farquarson, Traffic Cons.
<b>Absent:</b>	A. Hi K. Kristensen

---

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m.

**1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel  
held May 21, 2008 and June 4, 2008**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the minutes of the meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held May 21,  
2008 an June 4, 2008 be adopted.**

**Unanimously Carried**

**2. Business Arising**

None

**3. Staff Update**

**256 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street :**

This application for relocation of a heritage house and new industrial development on the site received final adoption at Council. Heritage designation of the house relocated on the site was not supported by Council.

**1400 Bewicke Avenue :**

This application was revised to remove the secondary suites and geothermal application and was adopted by Council in June.

**4. 210 West 13<sup>th</sup> Street - Rezoning**

The Development Planner gave an overview of the proposal for construction of a 53-unit condominium building with provision for some non-market housing. Setback variances are requested. The Panel is being asked to comment on building design and density bonusing for provision of non-market housing.

The Chair read the resolution passed by APC at their review of the project on June 4, 2008.

R. Hulbert, Architect. Christina – Losee Architecture, Victor Tam, client representative, and C. Meradian were introduced. The Architect reviewed the site and existing building and advised that the project is for market condominium with some non-market units to LEED Certified standard. It was noted that the applicant had originally considered a tower option but this was modified when advised that area residents have opposed high-rise development west of Chesterfield.

The Panel received a PowerPoint presentation which addressed integration of affordable and market housing units, relocation strategy for residents, sustainability, and the offer for the City to purchase up to 8 units. Market unit prices are anticipated to start at under \$350,000.

Design detail as described in the package dated distributed to the Panel was reviewed and shadow studies and setback variances were explained. Roof decks will be landscaped and accessible to residents on the top floor. A materials board was circulated.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the planting concept and advised that lighting is being addressed.

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

- Has a survey been undertaken?
- Will stormwater management be undertaken? - Yes
- Could corner at Chesterfield & 13<sup>th</sup> be reconfigured to maintain view corridors?
- How will access to garbage and recycling be addressed?
- Material used for soffits?
- Is an envelope consultant being retained?
- Will there be mechanical equipment on the roof ?
- Will all units have air conditioning?
  - o Penthouses will have ac but it has been decided if the rest of the units will.
- City project next door has public art – is this being considered?
  - o Open to recommendation if art is functional and usable.

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

- Recognize variance requests but like articulation of the facade and the strong corner, particularly in the context of the large tower opposite.
- Wish there could be common space on the roof but overall it is a handsome building and good addition to the corner.
- Unfortunate that this building cannot be taller.
- Good to have roof overhang all around the building, especially brick façade.
- Handsome building on this corner – good height for transition down the hill and improvement in the area.
- Setbacks will not improve sound attenuation.
- Colours are bland on this important civic corner and urge reconsideration.
- Strong proposal and thank the applicant for walking through thought process for site constraints and explaining the approach to urban planning.
- Strongly encourage that mechanical cooling systems not be pursued since it is contrary to the concept of sustainability and not necessary in this climate.
- Strong project and don't share concerns with additional site coverage and fsr in light of what the City is gaining in affordable housing. Those development pinch points are mitigated through good design.
- Support comment that colour palette bland and needs to be more interesting with stronger colour brick and something that speaks to new library.
- South east corner is busy and agree with intention to move mass to the corner of 13<sup>th</sup> and Chesterfield but it seems odd to have corner with balconies that will be very public. Suggest consider flipping balconies to inside of the building.

**Applicant's comments:**

Appreciate the helpful comments from the Panel.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 210 West 13<sup>th</sup> Street (The Hulbert Group) and recommends approval subject to approval by the Development Planner, of the following:**

- **Consideration of the architectural massing at the corner at 13<sup>th</sup> & Chesterfield (specifically the location of the balcony);**
- **Reconsider the proposal to provide mechanical cooling in light of the project's sustainability objectives;**
- **Review with Development Planner the best planning principles for CPTED;**
- **Consideration of public art;**
- **Consideration of a more vibrant, interesting colour palette;**
- **Review of window partitions/patterns;**
- **Review of roof overhang.**

**Carried**

**5. 265-267 East 5<sup>th</sup> Street - Rezoning**

The Chair read the resolution of the APC at their review of this proposal on June 4, 2008.

The Development Planner advised that this is a rezoning from RS-1 to RT-1 with four units at the street and 5 units at the rear of the site.

F. Yadegari – Architect, and M. Saii – Developer, were introduced and the Architect reviewed the site and context of the area. The project is designed to complement a neighbouring development. Parking will be underground with access from the lane and direct access to the units from the parking area. Hardi plank and hardi shingles will be used for exterior finishes.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the landscape plan. Each of the front units has separate entries with archways at the street. Rear units are accessed from a centre walkway at the street to a courtyard in the middle of the site. Hedges create privacy screens at the rear patios. A common garden for residents is located at the lane. Each side of the site will be landscaped.

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

- Is the interior courtyard a public space only?
  - o Yes – with trellis structure and seating area at each end.
- Type of pavers used in the courtyard?
- Can units have different treatments in colours and materials?
- How will residents access the garden?
- Are storage areas with windows included in fsr?
- Has a surveyor been retained?
- Do rear units have lane access?
- How will shadowing from existing development impact the project?
- Access for garbage and recycling pick-up?
- Are 3-dimensional muntins being used?
- Detail on trellis structure at roof?

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

- This type of development is well established and has worked well.
- Concern with access to the rear gardens from the units.
- Concerns of usability of decks at front entry. Two adjacent to courtyard structure and very small and question how many people would use them.
- Suggest more exploration of the lane access from the units to promote lane culture.
- Middle space in courtyard is labelled community space and should have a feature element or paving treatment should be different.
- Need to resolve issue of storage at rear units and need to make units accessible to rear garden to populate the lane and be an asset to the project.
- Recommend that treated wood not be used for retaining walls at vegetable garden at the lane.
- Overall well resolved scheme and follows established pattern for densifying housing.

- Very difficult to adequately evaluate projects when all drawings stop at the property line and do not show the context around the site.
- Access to gardens at the lane is odd and doesn't help an otherwise a strong scheme.
- Recommend greater lane separation between the lane and units, i.e. raise them up and have stairs at the private gardens. This would mitigate the odd relationship between garden, storage area and lane.

**Applicant's comments:**

Tried not to have large retaining wall at the lane so that there would be better connection to the lane. Steps can be added.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 265-267 East 5<sup>th</sup> Street (Farzin Yadegari Architect) and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:**

- **Further design development of the private gardens adjacent to the lane. Consider raising the elevation of the gardens and providing direct access to them from the units above via staircases.;**
- **Addition of a landscape feature in the courtyard;**
- **Further design development of the decks on the units on the north side to make the balconies/terraces more useable.**

**Unanimously Carried**

**6. 365 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street – Rezoning**

The Development Planner stated that this is an application for rezoning to allow four units in the mid-block area. Variances are requested to address the design in this heritage character area.

F. Yadegari, architect, reviewed the context of the site and surrounding area. The design of the four new units addresses the heritage nature of the neighbourhood in a simpler style. One unit will be accessible on the main floor.

The landscape design addresses the integration of the units with the existing heritage gardens in the area with a combination of hedging, picket fences, modern finishing and outdoor spaces. A play area and garden space is to be shared by residents. Street trees to be planted will be determined with Engineering.

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

- Why is there no sidewalk?
  - o Engineering will require a gutter and sidewalk all around.
- Is there access between the houses, e.g. in case of fire?
- Useful to have paving stones as walkway?
- Is there a deck behind the trellis at the gable over the entry?

- Could the space between the houses be used by residents in the style of single family houses?
- Are wood railings being used at decks?
- How will they be mounted?
- Exterior materials?
- Type of drains for decks?
- Do windows provide daylight to rooms on habitable floor?
  - o Third floor is not habitable space.

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

- Drawings show roof of the parking structure but landscape plans show substantial trees above. Relationship of building to grade and roof of parking garage don't mesh technically.
- Don't understand how the project will look in this location - needs further consideration.
- Believe this project would overwhelm neighbours along East 9<sup>th</sup> and recommend that project be reviewed.
- Need to create access through the area between the houses.
- Mid-block zoning has only been extended to Ridgeway in the last 2-3 years and it was a close vote when it happened. Believe that four units is asking for too much density in the neighbourhood.
- Floor plans are barely legible.
- Would like to see windows on Ridgeway side on upper floor in the larger scale to the floors below.
- Agree with honouring the heritage houses but, from neighbourhood standpoint, cannot support this density.
- Trellises seem to be a problem for water and should be removed.
- Angle attaching to the roofline seems awkward.
- Recommend that aluminum be considered for rails.
- Rafter tails at the end is water catch.
- Like design but busy.
- Project is more interesting than seeing two duplex units on the site.
- Form and character of the buildings interesting.
- Not as troubled by 9<sup>th</sup> Street elevations as others – buildings do not slavishly copy heritage buildings.
- Windows are boring and would benefit from mullion pattern.
- Landscape is well done but some informal access from front to rear yards is needed.
- Very strong scheme
- Saving grace for this project they are going to considerable expense with garages underground and counterbalancing issues that would make this acceptable to the neighbourhood.
- FSR and heritage character is appropriate to Ridgeway Avenue.
- Capital intensive undertaking to put in expensive parking.
- How are the patios accessed from the interior?
- No third floor plan shown.

**Applicant's comment:**

No request is being made for additional density.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 365 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street (Farzin Yadegari Architect) and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:**

- **Provision of further details of the north façade of the 9<sup>th</sup> Street elevation (unit “D”);**
- **Provide access to the rear patios via the landscaping between the units;**
- **Provide access from within the units to the rear gardens;**
- **Further development of the fenestration generally with a more developed design for dividing lights/mullions, etc. Also, provide further details of the fenestration in the gables and provide assurance that the windows are only providing daylight to attic space not habitable area;**
- **Resolve the street trees and property edge condition (sidewalk, letdowns, etc) in consultation with the Planning and Engineering Departments;**
- **Further consideration of the materials proposed for the railings and pergolas.**

**Carried  
2 Opposed**

**K. Hanvey declared a conflict of interest and left the meeting at 8:15 p.m.**

**R.A. Spencer took over as chair of the meeting.**

**7. Lonsdale & 17<sup>th</sup> Street – Rezoning Application & OCP Amendment**

The Chair read resolutions from APC of June 11, 2008 and ADP meeting of June 4, 2008.

C. Vollan – Anthem Properties, J. Farquarson – Traffic Consultant, F. Rafii – Architect, P. Kreuk – Landscape Architect, E. Carlson – Anthem Properties, G. Steeves - Engineer, Dallas Weingarreck - Loblaws, and S. Kerr - Anthem Properties were introduced.

Chris Vollan gave a brief overview of past process and that in response to previous comments from the Panel noted that the revised proposal addressed landscape detail and traffic study. The applicant has undertaken to carry out a safety analysis of the Lonsdale parking access and will also carry out a safety audit after completion of the project to determine its impact on pedestrians and determine whether or not the access should be retained in accordance with the recommendations of the audit.

J. Farquarson – Traffic Consultant advised that the City has received the draft traffic study and the study will be finalized after their comments have been addressed. The main issue raised by the City, ADP and APC is the parking access on Lonsdale. The study supports this access and the rationale for this support was explained. The City

is reviewing the rationale and Loblaws has agreed to undertake a safety study and later an audit to address the safety of the access.

The Architect displayed detailed elevations of the buildings and explained the exterior materials and sample board. It was noted that the depth of the CRUs has been increased to 38' (35" at the interior).

The City is now reviewing the density in the area and the applicant is unsure of the ADP comment in the resolution from the June 4<sup>th</sup> meeting "... to fit with character of the neighbourhood", since this design direction was taken at the direction of City Council.

Sustainability issues addressed include:

- Sun shading : Units in the tower will get cross ventilation at corner suites. The west side has extensive shading to address cooling and glazing selected for west and south will reduce the solar heat gain.
- Recovering heat from equipment in the store and from hot water and tying into the Lonsdale Energy Corporation (LEC).
- Looking at connecting the store with LEC to capture heat from the equipment.
- Landscape: Working with staff to address the City streetscape. 4,000 sq. ft plaza at 17<sup>th</sup> & Lonsdale has entry to Loblaws, community space and a coffee shop and public space along 17<sup>th</sup> Street. Public art is being addressed.
- Green roof on top of Loblaws.
- Signage will be available when store name is determined.
- Row of parking removed to increase depth of CRUs.

In discussions with the City about amenities to be included in this project.

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

- How is rooftop equipment handled to minimize impact on green roof?
- Is this an increase from 18 to 25 storeys?
- Is there a density bonus from 2.6 fsr to 2.95 fsr?
- Is there still an amenity space off 17<sup>th</sup>?
  - o 8,000 sq. ft. (8 units) is being offered to the City or cash in lieu.
- Are security systems being considered?
- Is Safety Study separate from Traffic Study?
- Number of cars up and down Lonsdale at peak time?
- Can people shopping at Loblaws leave their cars and shop on Lonsdale generally?
- Will there be a ticketing system at parking?
- Are there plans for public art to be included on this keystone project?
  - o Yes - To be established with staff.
- How will organic landscape scheme be protected from pedestrians?

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

- The concern on parking access is not only the safety issue, but the quality of the street. From an urban design point, a 24' wide hole that looks into cars is detrimental to the street.



- Relatively happy with project but proposed traffic access limits pedestrian use.
- Support the project but question the outdoor area on north side.
- Project has evolved in a good way – handsome form.
- Happy with the street frontage and increased size of CRUs.
- Support landscape design.
- Don't need kerb cuts on Lonsdale which is becoming a vibrant pedestrian street; otherwise good project.
- Applaud presentation - improvement to this corner.
- Favour organic treatment of Lonsdale.
- Concrete arches at roofline on east façade may not be necessary.
- Façade shows high level of maturity.
- Don't support the vehicle access at Lonsdale but understand the rationale.
- Photograph does not do justice to what entry could be and may benefit from public art.
- Interested in seeing the safety study.

**Applicant's comments:**

The applicant thanked the Panel for positive input. Understand that the biggest issue is the Lonsdale vehicle access. Loblaw's will have safety audit reviewed by an independent traffic consultant and access would be closed if that is recommended. Neighbours on Eastern and 17<sup>th</sup> were concerned about traffic. Recognize that street ambience and rhythm is important but if the curb cut goes, Loblaw's will decide how to respond. It is proposed to ask if right-in access only is more acceptable or, is there zero tolerance to traffic access on Lonsdale?

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application and OCP amendment (Anthem Properties / Loblaw's / Rafii Architects Inc.) and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner and Engineering Department, of the Lonsdale traffic access. The Panel is evenly split on providing the Lonsdale traffic access.**

**Carried  
- 1 Opposed**

**8. Other Business**

**(a) Mural Review Committee**

The meeting was advised that Bob Spencer and Tony Cailles have volunteered to participate on this committee as the ADP representatives.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, August 20, 2008.

---

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2008\2008 06 18.doc

---

Chair