

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, January 20, 2010**

MINUTES

Present: K. Hanvey (Chair)
J. Bitar
G. Carlson
A. Hii
Y. Khalighi
K. Kristensen
B. Spencer
S. Standfield
K. Terriss

Staff: G. Venczel, Development Planner
L. Tylla, Committee Secretary
C. Perry, Development Services
G. Penway, Deputy Director, Community Development
C. Miller, Planning Technician, Community Development

Guests: J. Lopez, Owner
L. Fiddler, Landscape Designer
M. Kadzielska, Designer
T. Mactavish, MGB Architects
A. DeGroot, MGB Architects
A. Maddaugh, Space2Place Design Inc. Landscape Architects
J. Henderson, Turnbull Construction Services
M. Craig, Designer
D. Klassen

Absent: Councillor Trentadue

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

The Chair acknowledged that it was Augustine Hii's last meeting as a member of the Design Panel, as his current term ends on January 31, 2010. On behalf of the Panel members, he wished Augustine well and thanked him for his many years of service.

1. **Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held November 18, 2009, and December 9, 2009**

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held November 18, 2009, and December 9, 2009 be adopted.

Unanimously Carried

2. **Business Arising**

None.

3. **Staff Update**

Ms. Venczel provided a brief staff update on the following:

- 1033 St. George's received 3rd and Final Reading.
- 1629 St. George's received 3rd and Final Reading.
- 'Our Climate, Our Community' Open House to take place on January 26th.

4. **OCP 2021 and Beyond**

Gary Penway, Deputy Director, Community Development provided a presentation on the current process being undertaken to create the next version of the City's OCP.

Mr. Penway noted the first OCP was completed in 1980. Prior to that, zoning bylaws shaped the community. The OCP guides Council on how cities might grow and how bylaws may change in the future. An OCP is for Council, where as Zoning Bylaws are for homeowners. The "Sense of Place" and "Implementation" chapters are most pertinent for the Advisory Design Panel.

Concurrently, Metro Vancouver has created "Metro Vancouver 2040". The City of North Vancouver has not been identified as a growth concentration area. Growth is suggested at 1% per year, similar to the last 20 or 30 years. The City's 100 Year Sustainability Plan forecasts the City to triple in population and to become carbon neutral.

Questions from Panel included but were not limited to:

- Will there be any consideration / cut off point for new projects until the new OCP is adopted? (A: no they will follow the current OCP and the new OCP will be similar but current zoning bylaw will prevail. Harbourside Waterfront Development will be considered in conjunction with the new OCP.)
- Is the District of North Vancouver doing an OCP as well? (A: yes, they are currently creating their first OCP.)

5. 302 East 12th Street In-fill Duplex- Rezoning

The applicant, John Lopez, introduced himself and his team - Larry Fiddler, Landscape Designer and Monica Kadzielska, Designer.

The existing home is on the corner of East 12th and St. Andrew's. It is a character home, but not registered heritage. The rezoning application is to build an in-fill duplex on the property. The existing home will be retained and renovated. The proposed duplex has a full cellar and double detached garage with two additional parking spaces for cars or bikes. There is also a roof-top garden above the garage for one of the units.

Design of the existing home, new duplex and landscape were reviewed.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Is the heritage house going to be renovated? (A: yes- new windows, paint, interior renovations, etc. The benefit for keeping existing home is environmental and not heritage conservation per say.)
- Landscaping- all walkways/parking appear to be hard surface or pavement- have you considered permeable surfaces? (A: changes can be made.)
- Do you know if you are doing offsite works? Landscape plans do not show boulevard? (A: only drew plans to property line.)(Engineering A: new sidewalk curb and gutter, street trees, and street planting will be required.)
- The building separation between existing and new building appears to be 22'. Have you considered having part of second floor over garage to increase spatial separation between the second stories at least?
- What was reason for selecting the same colour palette for both homes? (A: wanted to be visually similar.)
- How do residents access parking? (A: common walkway with gates between properties. Garage is for existing home.)
- What is the number of parking stalls required? (A: 1.5 per unit. A parking relaxation would be required from 6 to 4- a two stall variance.)
- There appears to be a 6ft fence in front of the garbage- how do you access it? (A: from lane.) (Engineering suggests that City would likely not allow that.)

Comments from Panel included but were not limited to:

- Would like to see Engineering's requests on the new landscape revisions.
- Would like to see the windows on the existing home replicated in double glazed. Concerned about plastic mullions between glass. Consider windows that are truly divided, not just with plastic dividers.
- Recommend slightly different colours between duplex and heritage house.
- Would like garbage shed moved close to the other property line and not in front yard. Should relate to exterior finishings on building.
- Supportive of preserving the main building and creating density.
- Concerned side yard is too small for access.
- Don't recommend 6' high wall with 6' side yard.
- Liveability of outdoor spaces is compromised with current configuration. Contextual arrangement on site is tight.
- Creative design would help offset shortness of space between buildings and lack of parking.

- Consider configuring duplex differently in regard to space in between buildings, while still considering limited windows.
- Roof top patio is nice.
- Access is addressed well, taking advantage of the corner site.
- Form and character work well together, but new building is overpowering in scale.
- Detailing of the new building is overpowering in relation to existing home. Consider reducing heritage elements, and not imitating the heritage building.
- Would like to see the colour toned down.
- Appreciate limitations in trying to preserve the existing home.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 302 East 12th Street and although it appreciates the effort to retain and enhance the existing heritage home, does not recommend approval of the submission until further consideration has been given to the following issues:

- **applicant to review site planning to create more liveable outdoor spaces with an improved circulation pattern, and an enhanced relationship between parking and garbage handling in relation to land use and visibility to 12th Street;**
- **the duplex should have wood windows, replicating as closely as possible the windows in the existing home in configuration and character;**
- **that the treatment of heritage building and new building should be differentiated by colour/finish;**
- **the exterior detailing and fenestration of the new building to be simplified;**
- **the applicant to work with City Engineering for direction on creating more permeable surfaces;**
- **sidewalks and any other offsite improvements are to be included with a future submission and indicated on the site plan and landscape drawings.**

Unanimously Carried

6. City Hall Revitalization

The Chair reviewed the previous ADP resolutions regarding the project and G. Penway provided background and context on the project.

Tracey Mactavish, Architect, introduced herself and the project team. She reviewed the goals of the project and highlighted the design changes since the project was last seen by the Advisory Design Panel.

Highlights of the presentation included:

- Fairly small project budget, particularly for landscaping.
- Accommodated pedestrian movement around the site and make the space more public and engaging. Provided backdrop for spirit square plaza and support structure for events (washrooms, etc) if it is to be used as a public space.
- North side will focus around the entrance and create integration with existing spirit square. Façade is softened with low minimal band of plantings.

- South side was difficult to get presence of civic centre- want to support that presence through landscape by clarifying circulation pattern, moving architecture out into landscape and providing an accessible paved area that follows direct access line to building.
- Screening against the lane has been introduced with three ash trees planted at the top of the berm to screen cars and concrete buildings beyond. Four foot high grass with presence through winter. Staying away from shrubs that might become overgrown or of CPTED concern.
- Will relocate Japanese maples from roof to soften concrete and glass-mixed façade.
- Looking to do plantings with limited irrigation, drought tolerant plantings with distinct colour in landscaping. Leaving room for floral displays for City to plant.
- North entry – Ramp off plaza at 13.6% to entry level. Main entry will have a revolving glass door with vestibule treatment.
- A fin wall with signage will provide more visibility for the entrance at 14th Street. North end of atrium becomes a room with a view to forest and plaza.
- Passive solar screen for west side of atrium- all solar strategies will be specific to area of building. Will be within requirements of a naturally ventilated building.
- Signage to be worked out with City and team.

Questions from Panel included but were not limited to:

- Is there a sample of the fibre optic translucent block? (A: no- trying to have them made locally. Block needs light to be translucent.)
- What is the eyebrow canopy made of? Concerned with condition of space, needs insulation, parapet, etc. (A: designed to create a portal to indicate way to get to a major place in the City. Made of timber strand – same as atrium.)
- What is the use of the space at the north end of the atrium? (A: waiting area, seating made from reclaimed wood from alder tree to be removed from site. Looking out onto forecourt, about 80' back from street.)
- What do you see lawn on south side being used for? (A: south facing – would create a soft surface to sit and have a lunch, a true lawn scenario.)
- How would you find the entrance when approaching the courtyard from the north? (A: surface treatment changes, side walls of revolving door will be sculptural- colour to indicate a wayfinding feature mimicked inside the building.)
- How high is the fibre optic wing wall? (A: starts at plaza level- 42" and down slope stays at constant elevation, at plaza level 5'4". Wanted translucent materials for CPTED concerns.)
- How does the rain water feature work? (A: the model was circulated and explained)

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Meeting space at the end of the atrium is a nice feature.
- Content with current design.
- Like the additional detailing in the plans.
- Uncomfortable with fibre optic wall. Unfortunate to block off deck. From CPTED point, wing wall may feel uncomfortable.
- Appreciate drivers of the project and tight budget.
- Looking forward to the finished project.
- South entrance handled well.

- North entrance could be stronger, eg. entrance on side of high mass terminus.
- Concerned with universal design, if revolving door will accommodate scooters and large mobility pieces.
- Access on lawn is better.
- Consider backrests and arm rests on public seating.
- Wayfinding across north plaza – provide cue to find doorway for someone with visual impairment.
- The delegation was thanked for their level of investigation taken to answer questions brought up at previous presentation.
- Like the south forecourt and grading of landscaping.
- Like the landscaping and planting plan.
- Water feature – helps illustrate history of community, but odd the way that water is collected on the building and distributed in the water feature.
- South façade – inflect building in some way to show water coming down.
- Entry way off plaza – appreciate challenges with grading, but is not a successful solution for entry. Canopy when resolved and detailed with cap flashing and curb will not look anything like model. Needs a different solution.

The applicant thanked the Panel for their comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Building Permit submission for the City of North Vancouver City Hall Revitalization and recommends approval in principle while recommending further review of the following:

- **the north entrance with consideration of CPTED principles in relation to wing walls and wayfinding for the visually impaired and further investigation of the canopy and its resolution through detailing;**
- **further development of the water feature (adjacent to South entry) and its relationship to the building and the manner in which water is conveyed from roof to the reception pond; and**

THAT the Panel commends the applicant for the refinement of the project and thoroughness of their presentation.

Unanimously Carried

7. 277/279 East 8th Street – OCP Text Amendment and Rezoning

The Chair read the previous resolutions regarding the application from the APC and the HAC.

G. Venczel provided context and background from a staff perspective. She noted that this project is not considered to be a financial gain but is considered important as it will see heritage designation for the building and a positive contribution to the neighbourhood.

The building was constructed in 1912 and the owner wishes to re-inhabit it with the original intention- retail or commercial on the bottom floor and two residential units on

top. The building has an interesting non conformity as it overhangs city property and the neighbour's property.

New owner would like to create some sort of art or community use space if financially feasible. Limited by the need to sprinkler a public gathering place- otherwise will investigate leasing it as office space.

The applicant and designer have undertaken archaeological research to restore the building similar to the original appearance. No accurate photographic evidence exists but the paint has been chipped away to expose original colours and they have investigated the crawlspace to find original entrances and colours of the building. They have also discovered the original window configuration which is currently covered with siding in some areas.

Currently the building has been painted with many layers of turquoise alkyde marine paint. Original coating from 1912 was brownish/red and likely would have been a practical coating such as pitch or marine coating. A restoration expert they have working on the project suggests that it is an oxidized red.

For the proposed colour palette, the exterior will be a red/burgundy colour. A band of tongue and groove siding hides a series of clerestory mullions, which have also been found to contain a green trim colour suggested in the new plan. The colour application will also include a cream and blue trim.

It had been suggested that the lower storey was originally a corner entry. The structural support above clerestory and storefront glazing is only 6x6 construction. Evidence on the original flooring and construction suggest a small weather-proofed corner entry. The current door that is in the lower storey does not line up with any of the existing framing or mullions.

A photo from 1930, provided by a local resident, shows a metal-framed 6' deep fabric covered awning and a suspended metal blade sign, which have been incorporated into the new design. The applicants are suggesting a sign that is the name of the building, or something to denote the historic colour of the building (blue). An example was provided.

All of the glazing at the street-front level will be replaced with wood windows in a similar design to the original windows.

Questions from Panel included but were not limited to:

- Have building code issues been investigated, eg. rear exit stairs? (A- Yes, but there is zero lot clearance. Non-compliant in a number of areas. Too many risers in areas, guardrail, handrail, open risers. Will address as project progresses.)
- What is the underside of floor structure in relation to clerestory? (A: at top of trim at window- ¾" sub-floor on 3' x12' floor joists. Have sought building permit to replace lath and plaster. Looking at equivalency consultant to investigate solutions and how many code issues can be offset by sprinklering.)
- Corner canopy - Have you considered other materials other than fabric or something that would tie the corner down to ground? (A: anything outside building envelope is on City property. Posts to support awning would have to be on City property.)

- Have you investigated how the use of the building would influence traffic in the neighbourhood? (A: A traffic study is underway. At the Developer Information Session, residents noted that the only day of the year when parking was an issue is on Remembrance Day. The park provides some on-street parking.)

Ms. Venczel noted that from a planning perspective, staff would consider a parking variance as it is only two blocks away from Lonsdale Avenue.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Congratulations and best of luck.
- Excited to see building used.
- Landscape should reflect the opening of the entrance.
- Corner canopy needs to be more substantial and in keeping in character with building and better integrated into design.
- Like idea of sign.
- Support in principle the colour scheme.
- Understand encroachment constraint.
- Landscaping needs further development, eg. corner entrance and relationship to street and neighbours.
- Appreciate the project is a labour of love.
- Commend the applicant for the courage to rehabilitate an important piece of North Vancouver history.
- A cross-section of the building was not included in the package.

Comments from the Applicant:

- Dealing with the corner lot is difficult, with an intersection, no landscaping and a traffic circle with a ramped corner.
- Concerned with a vehicle hitting and damaging the building. Installing a piece of public art or similar could prevent accidents.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning and OCP text amendment application for 277/279 East 8th Street and commends the applicant for their proposal and their efforts to maintain an important heritage building in North Vancouver. The Panel recommends approval of the application and encourages refinement of the corner treatment of the building (at 8th Street and St. Andrews Avenue) and further development of the landscaping;

AND THAT the Panel recommends that the heritage of the building be respected in working through code issues and further details.

Unanimously Carried

8. Other Business

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, March 17, 2010.

Chair