

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

**Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel
at City Hall, 141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, B.C.
in Conference Room A on Wednesday, September 24, 2008**

MINUTES

- Present:** K. Hanvey, Chair
A. Hii, Vice Chair
T. Cailles
J. Heilman
K. Kristensen
N. Paul
R. Spencer
K. Terriss
P. Winterburn-Chilton
- Staff:** G. Venczel, Development Planner
E. Maillie, Committee Secretary
C. Perry, Development Services
- Guests:** M. Cusano – Owner
M. Cusano - Owner
P. Lee – Engineer / Architect
M. Rahbar – Designer
- Absent:** J. Bitar
Councillor B. Fearnley
-

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held September 17, 2008

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held September 17, 2008 be adopted.

Unanimously Carried

2. Business Arising

(a) Clarification of Resolution Process

There was a brief discussion of the process for members making resolutions. Making note of any items to be addressed is helpful to the member volunteering

to make the motion. Other members may ask to make 'friendly' amendments or additions to include issues they wish to have included. It is at the pleasure of the member making the motion if these points are added.

3. Staff Update

None

4. 353 East 13th Street – Rezoning

The Development Planner gave an overview of the project which is located in the mid-block area. The site is currently zoned RS-1 and the applicant is requesting a change to a CD zoning.

M. and M. Cusano, Owners, and P. Lee, Engineer & Architect were introduced. Mr. Cusano advised this is a proposed change from single family to duplex with an envelope exclusion of 7.5' on the south west corner. The interior layout was reviewed and it was noted that the basement has a 2-piece bathroom. Exterior finishing materials were displayed and include hardiplank, rock under the veranda and asphalt roof shingles. Samples of exterior finishing materials and colour board were displayed. Raised entry and veranda design conforms with other development on the street. The context of the surrounding area was reviewed and fenestration of the neighbouring houses at the property line was explained.

Sustainability will be addressed and include low-e glass, energy efficient appliances and low flush toilets. Permeable paving will be used throughout the site.

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

- Have building grades been calculated?
- Explain window forms?
- Will plastic muntins be used?
- Is there an encroachment at the gable ends of the main roof? - No
- Rationale for hip roof?
- Consideration of opening railing on upper balcony?
- Is there a corner post at rear balcony on second floor?
- Is consideration being given to removing the veranda? - Only if required by Council.

The Development Planner explained that it is City policy to encourage asymmetric design in duplexes.

- Size of posts and bases?
- Has consideration been given to borrowing the design of roof gables and hip from neighbouring houses?
- Why is this duplex coming to ADP? - Council has directed that all duplex applications in the mid-block area be reviewed by ADP.
- Is storm water management proposed on this site? - Yes
- Location of garbage/recycling? - Considering relocating it to garage or shed.
- Landscaping at edges of the site?
- Is there an overhang at the front of the building?
- Will tree in the middle of the site be retained? - Engineering will address trees.

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

- Close to being an absolute mirror design but it has two entries at the front.
- Engineering will require street trees.
- If building is asymmetrical then the landscape should address this.
- Like the design.
- Construction details on garage makes it difficult to build, particularly the back.
- May need retaining wall under stone wall at decks.
- Suggest wood railings on the veranda
- Forms and character seem appropriate for the neighbourhood
- Suggest applicant reconsider detailing - ambiguity and inconsistency in plans and elevations. Urge applicant to review proportion of the columns.
- Appreciate notion of asymmetrical design at the front but have difficulty with hip versus gable at the front.
- Support craftsman style but have concerns with proportions and proposed windows with plastic muntins should be reconsidered and replaced with solid windows.
- May be appropriate to consider mono pitch roof.

Applicants' comments:

Agree with comments on windows with muntins and likely to go with clear glass. Understand comment on gables but were directed by staff in this direction. Appreciate comments from the Panel and will address them.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 353 East 13th Street (A2M Developments Corp.) and recommends approval subject to approval by the Development Planner of the following:

- **Design refinements addressing the roof form and fenestration.**
- **Further attention to the landscape to support the asymmetrical design of the street facade.**
- **Refinement of the details, colour studies, etc.**
- **Review of access to, as well as further study of, the form and character of the storage units for garbage and recycling.**

Unanimously Carried

5. 654 West 15th Street - Rezoning

The Chair read the APC resolution of September 10, 2008.

The Development Planner advised that this site is currently zoned RS-1 and applicant is requesting RT-1 zone. Separate buildings are proposed to meet duplex requirement.

M. Rahbar, Designer, was introduced and explained that the term 'Smart Home' conveys a form of affordable housing. This proposal went to Council for input and Council agreed that the application could proceed.

Two challenges for the project were:

- Addition of a secondary suite in the house presently on the lot.
- Reduction of construction costs which are addressed by minimal interior. The shell will be completed and insulated and plumbing and electrical will be roughed in. The applicant is in discussion with the Building Department on additional requirements to get an Occupancy Permit. This will allow owners to finish the house as needed and as they can afford. The exterior will be completely finished.

It is estimated that this will reduce the purchase price by approximately 15%.

Infill unit will be built on slab and sold with minimal interior finishing also. Plumbing and electrical will be roughed in.

Sustainability statement was reviewed. Solar heating and power has been considered and it has been decided that solar heating only will be addressed. Crushed gravel will be used at pathways and patios. Existing plantings will be retained or relocated. New plantings will be native plants for easy maintenance.

To avoid speculation and that purchaser does not finish the interior and sell it a few months later for an inflated price, a covenant process is proposed. It is anticipated that this type of project will encourage small builders to participate in development. It has been indicated that some current residents are forced into selling their homes to developers and relocating for financial reasons.

The applicant advised that exterior changes will include:

- o Retain and repair the stucco on the existing house.
- o Veranda will be added at the south side.
- o Addition of exposed columns at the front and new galvanized steel rails with wood handrail.
- o Thermal windows will be installed.
- o Asphalt roof shingles will be replaced.

The infill house will be new with horizontal hardi-plank siding in traditional/modern design.

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

- Will tree in the front yard be retained? - No – too close to the house.
- Will secondary suite be included in existing house? - Yes
- Will central stairs be retained in existing house?
- Are roof slopes suitable for installation of solar panels? - Yes
- Assume it will be solar hot water?
- Will veranda be waterproofed? - Yes
- Imprint of footprint building at rear is it identical? - Yes with some variation.

- Upper windows on the south elevation seem compressed – is this an architectural function?
- How many parking spaces are required ?
- Will the two units be stratified? - Yes
- If this is affordable housing and construction costs are reduced, there is no way to control the price of the houses and purchaser may have to pay market price plus the cost of finishing the house – how can you ensure that it remains affordable rather than market pricing? - Perhaps explore how co-ops do it?
- Is a saving of only 15% appropriate if no interior finishing is to be done?
 - Want to have secondary suite
- Why is the interior being gutted and refinished, why not retain it as is?
 - Do not want to sacrifice sustainability for affordability.
- Existing house is larger than the one next door but from a liveability point, what are the benefits of allowing this development?

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

- Difficulty in understanding the affordability of this project – front roof has major intervention and veranda and lesser adjustment could be made. If family then need to spend money immediately, simplification of roof would provide core savings than gutting interior.
- Inherent problem with garages is that proportion of upper floor to lower floor is skewed – normally upper and lower floors are relatively equal.
- Plans as presented do not address future plumbing and not convenience.
- Don't understand where is stair from main floor going.
- As designer of an adjacent property to the east, there comes a duty to show more complete streetscape in a true context from the lane and other perspective.
- House on the street is under construction and it would have been helpful to show it in the context.
- Applaud concept but sceptical as to who will benefit from savings – house will not be very liveable and people will want to spend a considerable amount of money.
- Cross sections on the porch industrial looking.
- Applaud concept – great idea and fills a need.
- Support as pilot project and provide results.
- Admire what is presented – visionary project. Not easy at all and many comments have been expressed with doubt and concern but no reason not to try. Taking on a lot of risk and work instead of taking on regular project. Interested in seeing results and commend for taking it on.

Applicant

- Some people do want to finish the house by themselves. Have spoken with Rona and Home Depot to create finishing packages. It's a pilot project and want to try it.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 654 West 15th Street (Vernacular Design Inc.) and recommends approval of the project subject to the approval by the Development Planner of the following:

- **Redesign of upper bay window fenestration and consideration of windows on south and north elevations generally.**
- **Review of the re-planting of areas where trees are to be removed to ensure a good fit in the neighbourhood.**

**Carried
2 Opposed**

6. Other Business

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, October 15, 2008

Chair

Q:\ADP\Drafts\2008 09 24 E.doc