

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 15, 2009**

---

**MINUTES**

---

- Present:** K. Hanvey, Chair  
A. Hii, Vice Chair  
S. Golden  
K. Kristensen  
K. Terriss  
R. Spencer
- Staff:** G. Venczel, Development Planner  
C. Perry, Development Services  
J. Hnachuk, Auxiliary Clerk  
C. Jackson, Environmental Coordinator
- Guests:** L. Krohn, LiveSmart BC Outreach Specialist  
M. Ehman, DA Architects & Partners  
J. Kao, DA Architects & Partners  
R. Lemmon, Architect & Heritage Consultant  
R. Maruyama, Landscape Architect  
K. Anderson, CJ Anderson, Civil Engineer  
I. Abercrombie, School District #44  
A. Boby, Cornerstone Architecture  
M. Steele, Cornerstone Architecture  
S. Kennedy, Cornerstone Architecture  
S. Pendl, Forma Design, Landscape Architect  
M. Rahbar, Designer  
R. Changizi
- Absent:** J. Bitar  
P. Winterburn-Chilton  
G. Carlson  
T. Cailes  
Councillor Trentadue
- 

A quorum being present, the Vice Chair called the meeting to order at 5:52 p.m.

**1. LiveSmart BC**

Caroline Jackson, Environmental Coordinator, and Laura Krohn, LiveSmart BC Outreach Specialist, introduced themselves. C. Jackson provided a Powerpoint presentation on the City's environmental initiatives.

Some highlights included:

- The City of North Vancouver was one of the first municipalities to take part in, “Partners for Climate Protection”, a federal government program, and the first to adopt an action plan under such program. This program has 5 milestones and the City is in the final milestone.
- In 2006, the City is slightly over its emissions target for 2010.
- The Transportation Plan prioritized pedestrians and public transit as modes of getting around the City.
- Community initiatives include the LiveSmart BC Home efficiency assessments as well as workshops and, just recently, Earth Hour.
- Provincial initiatives include a climate action charter where, within compact communities, the City will be able to measure and report on greenhouse gas emissions. As well, Green Communities includes green city awards, and a number of provincial funding programs.
- Some greenhouse gas reduction targets set for the province include 6% decrease by 2012, 18% decrease by 2016 and 80% decrease for 2050.

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

- How are the numbers measured?
- Are the trains that run through the City part of the City’s greenhouse gas statistics?
- How do you sustain criteria?

**Comments from the Presenter:**

- Transportation is measured using statistics from ICBC and assumptions. Natural gas is measured by a conversion factor. Electricity is measured through an overall conversion factor published by BC Hydro.
- Trains, airplanes and cruise ships operating within the City are not included in the statistics.
- National protocols are at various stages of development. The BC Government is working with the Western Climate Initiative. The EU has adopted good measures and standards. To be consistent, North America is looking at the same measures and standards.

L. Krohn provided a Powerpoint presentation on the LiveSmart BC Program.

Some highlights included:

- Heat loss in houses occurs through walls, ceilings and windows as well as electrical outlets, pot lights and vent fans.
- LiveSmart BC is a \$60M program run by the provincial government, launched last April. Effective January 2009, a home renovation tax credit was also applied.
- The Incentive Guide shows both the federal and provincial rebates. Add the two columns together with the 25% increase of the federal portion, for the total rebate to homeowners. Rebates are not a percentage of how much you spend on an upgrade. To be entitled to the rebate, the homeowner just needs to meet the item on the Adviser’s assessment.

**S. Golden arrived at 6:18pm.**

- Three steps to the program:
  - Assessment – call an adviser to come to the home to do an assessment. Cost is \$150, which is refunded if some upgrades are done.
  - Upgrades – 18 months to make any upgrades suggested in the Advisor’s report.

- Post Assessment – An adviser will perform a post assessment, complete the grant applications and send the paperwork to the government on the homeowner's behalf. Cheques will be mailed to directly the homeowner.
- The adviser will also provide the homeowner with the Energuide Rating. In 2012, Energuide ratings will be incorporated into the MLS listings.
- Information on the LiveSmart BC program is available on the City website.

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

- Is LiveSmart BC also available for residents in the District of North Vancouver?
- What about window replacements?

**Comments from the Presenter:**

- The LiveSmart BC program is offered to all B.C. homeowners.
- Any number of windows can be replaced. Rebates are \$60 per window, depending on the zone you live in. Rebates for Energy Star windows are \$70 per window for Zone A, B or C. A number of window manufacturers are offering bonuses/discounts through the BC Hydro website.

**K. Hanvey entered the meeting at 6:40 pm and chaired the remainder of the meeting.**

**2. Ridgeway School – Heritage Alteration Permit**

**K. Russell, Development Planner, arrived with the delegation at 6:45 pm.**

James Kao, Mark Ehman, Robert Lemmon, Rod Maruyama and Ken Anderson were welcomed to the meeting.

The Development Planner provided the context and background of the project.

Mr. Ehman, architect, reviewed the history of the project. The proposal is preliminary and includes an upgrade and renovation through a Heritage Alteration Permit application.

The student population is currently 350 students and could increase by another 75 students with the possible closure of Ridgeway Annex. The package before the ADP included both options. The larger option was reviewed during the meeting.

The building is in poor condition and requires a seismic upgrade. Three of four heritage facades will be rehabilitated, as well as part of the fourth façade.

**Ian Abercrombie, School District #44, arrived at 7:00 pm.**

The existing roof is an undersized wood structure that will be removed and rebuilt in the same form as the historic form. The interior concrete floors, columns and beams will be removed with new construction. The basement has a low ceiling height and the slab will be lowered one foot to add to the height.

The proposed floor plan was reviewed. The entrance to the building is the existing main entrance, with two sets of stairs leading up to the atrium space on the second floor.

A 3-D model was circulated to the Panel members.

The Refuge area, currently situated between the gymnasium and the addition, will be moved to the south side of the gymnasium area.

Architectural features were reviewed. The proposal includes a lighter treatment. Massing is axial with some slight variations. An indent on each side where the stairs are, divides old and new construction.

Elevations and colours were reviewed. The colour scheme will match that of the original school. A red paint similar to the brick is proposed, materials to be used is undecided.

Sustainability features were reviewed. The School District has asked for a LEED Gold certificate. Because of the heritage aspects, could be Silver level.

Mr. Lemmon reviewed the heritage aspects of the main building's exterior. Different materials were used. It is proposed to retain and repair the wood windows with a thermal window glazing on the inside. The shiny exterior coating may be removed. Details of the interior of the main building will be presented at a future presentation.

Mr. Maruyama reviewed the preliminary landscaping plan. Within the middle of the block is the new parking lot to be accessed off 9<sup>th</sup> Street. The fire access will remain. The rest of the area will be softened. The field is an all-weather field. Trees shown in green on the plan will remain, trees identified in darker green are proposed new trees. Some trees may be removed. Trees within the precinct area will be removed. Trees in the Refuge will be assessed. Stormwater will be captured into rain gardens.

Site circulation was reviewed. The parking lot is staff parking. Students are dropped off on 8<sup>th</sup> Street. The sidewalk on 9<sup>th</sup> Street will be improved. Curve extensions in the middle of the street will help promote the pedestrian entrance.

## **S. Golden left the meeting at 7:15 pm.**

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

- What will the style of the interior be?
- Can doorways and porticos be saved?
- Was additional space into the new wing considered?
- Does the geotechnical conditions allow for the proposed changes?
- What is the rationale for the gymnasium having more wall space than windows?

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

- Interesting project. Like the approach and respect for heritage.
- The connection of the two classrooms against the gymnasium needs more study.
- The design of the gymnasium needs more attention, including colour proportions.
- The roof should be simple and less imposing.
- Support storm water approach for the site and suggest even more permeable materials.
- Agree with internal planning, including retaining the main entry.

### **Comments from the Presenter:**

- The school has a Refuge Committee working directly on the Refuge area.
- The interior will be sympathetic to the historic building, but won't replicate the heritage interiors. There are currently few ceilings on Level 2 & 3 and plumbing is exposed.

- The doors are flat-faced panelled doors, unsure if they can be saved. A design rationale for the interior will be developed.
- The central corridor in the existing building will be the main access to all classrooms.
- Adding a separation between the gymnasium and the wing was more costly and created additional square footage.
- Some natural light into the gymnasium in proposed. A bright southfacing light is a distraction for those using the gymnasium.
- The existing water course will be most likely be reinforced at the lower end. An asphalt or concrete surface spills down. There are naturally occurring systems by the tennis courts. Catch basins are around the site and will retain as much water as possible.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Heritage Alteration Permit application for Ridgeway School (School District No. 44 / Downs Archambault & Partners) and supports the proposal as currently developed and makes the following additional comments:**

- **Further exploration of the architectural form and character of the gymnasium;**
- **Further exploration of the connection between the proposed gymnasium and the renovated school with a view to improving the access to daylight and views of the affected classrooms;**
- **Further details of the proposed material palette;**
- **Further development of the site plan, including the stormwater management strategy;**
- **Further details of the LEED and Sustainability approach for the project.**

**Unanimously Carried**

**K. Kristensen entered the meeting at 7:55 pm.**

### **3. 1805 Chesterfield – Rezoning**

The Development Planner provided the context for the project. The site is currently zoned RT-1 Duplex in the OCP at Level 3 maximum, FSR of 0.75.

The Chair read the resolution of the APC from their meeting of April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2009.

Scott Kennedy, designer, reviewed the site planning. All the units are two bedrooms with cellars, typical main floors and all have outdoor space. The unit over the garage is a one-bedroom unit with a large southfacing deck. Two units have a roof top deck. One parking stall is provided for each of the five units, and two tandem parking spots. One parking space was removed at Engineering Dept's request and the area will instead be used for bicycle storage. Setbacks were pushed out, similar to the other three corners. The design is a craftsman style building with a low pitched roof, and is under the height envelope.

Materials include cream colour hardi-plank siding, black windows, cedar shingles for the vertical bay windows and vertical elements, natural wood and cedar soffits. Hand rails will be black metal with a wood cap on top.

Ms. Pendl, landscape architect, reviewed the landscaping plan. Native species shrubs will be planted. Hedges between the outdoor spaces will create privacy for the units. The applicant is hoping to retain the mature laurel hedge around the property.

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

- What is the setback space to the north and the nature of that space?
- Why are there no windows on the ground floor level of the end unit?
- How will the garbage be handled?
- Could the porch facing Chesterfield wrap around to the other side?
- Are there street elevations?

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

- The applicant has provided a thorough, high standard package.
- High quality project – indoor and outdoor space.
- Roof decks - supportive of roof hatches.
- Supportive of keeping the hedge.
- Impressed with the design of the outdoor areas.
- Basement windows are situated up high and covered by a porch above.
- Consider how the corner treatment of the porch turns on 18<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Consider installing skylights in the covered porch on Building 2.

**Applicant's comments:**

- Struggled with the light wells in the basement.
- Having a large outdoor deck was a benefit for the unit over the garage. Bicycle storage was added below.
- Skylights in the covered porch on Building 2 is an idea.
- HRVs will be installed to bring in constant fresh air.
- A high window could be put in on the ground floor level of the end unit.
- All garbage is in a bin next to the garage.
- Would like to retain the laurel hedge and trim it down.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 1805 Chesterfield Avenue (Cornerstone Architecture) and recommends approval of project and commends the applicant for a thorough presentation.**

**Carried  
4 - In favour  
1 - Against**

**4. 654 West 15<sup>th</sup> Street (Duplex/Smart House) – Rezoning**

The Chair read the APC resolution of September 10, 2008 and the ADP resolution of September 24, 2008.

Mehrdad Rahbar, designer, explained that the project was approved by the ADP and the APC previously. However, it was put on hold due to the economic downturn. It is now before the ADP to review the Infill unit.

Mr. Rahbar worked with neighbours for their support of the project. Neighbours' concerns included (1) height; (2) setback from lane; and (3) legalizing a secondary suite in the basement of the Mason's House.

Details of the plans were reviewed. There will be no changes to the existing Mason's House. Rough-ins for solar panels on the south and east side of the roof of the Mason's house will be provided. The Infill was reduced to 1,200 sf. The upper floor was shrunk and will now comprise two bedrooms. A flat roof is proposed as well as 1½ ft overhangs on north/south sides, all hardi-plank and durable finishes. Windows, fenestration and façade materials to be worked out. The rear setback was increased from four to six feet, reducing the centre courtyard to 23.7 feet.

Changes to landscaping were reviewed and include a vegetable garden for each unit, roughed in with landscaping ties. Four fruit trees will be added to the property. The front of the property will have tiles or concrete slabs leading to a crushed gravel area at the back. There will be minimal lawn area.

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

- Is the existing house being raised?
- In between the main and upper floors are setbacks and some have a roof line between habitable space below. How will the roof be treated?
- The plans show the existing stairs remaining on the boulevard. Can the stairs be moved to private land?
- Is the street tree shown on the plans existing or a proposed new tree?
- How will the plumbing be handled?

**K. Hanvey left the meeting at 9:09 pm and returned at 9:11 pm.**

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

- Supportive of the plans for the Infill.
- Consider enlarging patio spaces for more liveability.
- Reconsider use of outdoor space, eg. minimal sunlight for vegetable gardens and fruit trees.
- Curious about going through a closet to get to the upstairs deck of the Infill.
- Consider adding light wells for more natural light.
- Concerned with the technicalities, which the developer appears to be working through.
- Consider removing extra details such as window jams, etc.
- Consider a green roof system.
- Consider reviewing the ability to achieve the thin edge of roof detailing.
- Could be difficult to maintain an energy balance with so much surface area for volume.

**Applicant's comments:**

- The existing house will not be raised.
- A green roof was considered previously. Will revisit it again.
- Will reconsider vegetable gardens and fruit trees.
- The roof detailing was achieved on another house.
- The plumbing will be capped and roughed-in. Dash lines will be provided for the new owner for their options. The basement of the existing house may have to be raised one foot for the plumbing.
- The street tree shown on the plans is a proposed new tree.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 654 West 15<sup>th</sup> Street (Vernacular Design) and thanks the applicant for their resubmission. The Panel feels that the following concerns have not been adequately resolved:**

- **Detail of expression of the infill to be resolved;**
- **Technical issues concerning the proposed rough-in of the plumbing/electrical work to be approved by the Building Dept.**

**Defeated  
2 - In favour  
3 - Opposed**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 654 West 15<sup>th</sup> Street (Vernacular Design) and recommends approval subject to the approval, by the Development Planner, of the following:**

- **Further study of the architectural detailing of the roof edge(s) to ensure that what has been presented can be achieved (Infill dwelling);**
- **Consideration of opportunities within the roof assembly for skylights and a green roof (Infill dwelling);**
- **Consideration of a simplified architectural expression of the Infill dwelling;**
- **Further consideration of the liveability of the exterior spaces, decks and outdoor spaces.**

**Carried  
4 - In favour  
1 - Opposed**

**C. Perry left the meeting at 9:35 pm.**

**5. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held March 18, 2009**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held March 18, 2009 be adopted.**

**Unanimously Carried**

**6. Business Arising**

None.

**7. Staff Update**

Western Avenue Open House

- On May 5<sup>th</sup>, there will be an Open House for Western Avenue - Back Lane.



### Design Awards

- The Development Planner will forward some sustainability ideas to add in the categories, eg. good back lane designs, etc.
- B. Spencer would like to join the sub-committee.

### **8. Other Business**

- The Development Planner will provide an update on 845 Marine Drive at the next meeting.

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

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, May 20, 2009.

---

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP 35302420\MINUTES\2009\2009 04 15.doc