

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, March 17, 2010**

---

**MINUTES**

---

- Present:** J. Bitar  
T. Cailes  
S. Standfield  
K. Hanvey  
K. Kristensen  
B. Spencer  
Y. Khalighi  
C. Taylor
- Staff:** G. Venczel, Development Planner  
C. Perry, Supervisor, Engineering Services  
J. Hnachuk, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** J. Desrochers, Priority Permits  
R. House, Knight Signs  
B. Sawchyn, PC Urban  
R. Spencer, PC Urban  
C. Bozyk, Architect  
D. Stoyko, Sharp & Diamond  
R. Selitar, MCM Architects  
B. Reid, MCM Architects  
R. Goys, MCM Architects
- Absent:** K. Terriss  
G. Carlson  
Councillor Trentadue
- 

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

**1. Welcome New Members**

The Development Planner welcomed new Panel member Craig Taylor, architectural representative, and all members introduced themselves.

*Y. Khalighi entered the meeting at 5:36 p.m.*

## 2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

The meeting proceeded to the election of Chair and Vice Chair for the period February 2010 to January 31 2011. The Panel agreed to election by a show of hands.

Nominations for the position of Chair were requested. Kevin Harvey was nominated for the position of Chair and accepted the nomination.

**No other nominations being received, Kevin Harvey was elected Chair by acclamation.**

Nominations for the position of Vice Chair were requested.

Shira Stanfield was nominated for the position of Vice Chair and accepted the nomination.

**No other nominations being received, Shira Stanfield was elected Vice Chair by acclamation.**

*K. Kristensen entered the meeting at 5:42 pm.*

## 3. Annual Review

G. Venczel provided an overview of the Panel's role and procedures, election process, quorum requirements, attendance confirmation, conduct of members / delegations, resolutions and conflict of interest.

Kevin Harvey took the Chair at 5:45 p.m.

## 4. Minutes of Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held January 20, 2010

It was noted there were some spelling mistakes in the minutes to be corrected.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held January 20, 2010 be adopted with changes as discussed.**

**Unanimously Carried**

## 5. Business Arising

G. Venczel noted she is available on her cell phone should members have need to call for emergencies in getting to meetings.

## 6. Staff Update

None.

## **7. East Side Mario's Restaurant – DVP: Sign Variance**

G. Venczel provided background on the project. Staff is looking for a perspective of prominent and appropriate visibility as well if it fits within a pedestrian scale.

Jordan Desrochers, Priority Permits, reviewed the presentation boards to the Panel. He noted they would like the signs to look same look as other locations. East Side Mario's is the major tenant upstairs at the Lonsdale Quay.

Roland House, Knight Signs, noted that there is a lot of pedestrian traffic on the south side. The sign on the north side is larger than the small one at back. The standard East Side Mario's logo is six feet and 10 feet at the freestanding locations, but is being proposed at this location at five feet.

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

- How is power connected to the fascia signs?
- What is the function of the upper deck?
- Will the signs obstruct anyone's view?
- What is the maximum size allowed in the bylaw?
- What are the other businesses on the other side?
- What size are the signs of the other businesses?
- When the quay was developed, how was it anticipated that these businesses would advertise their business?
- What is behind the sign on the north side, eg. offices?
- At other East Side Mario's restaurant in the Lower Mainland, have they allowed extra signage?
- Does the proposed signage work on day/night time backgrounds?
- Have you looked in detail how you're going to install the sign?

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

- The signs on the south would be acceptable, but the one on the north side is inconsistent.
- The circular sign works well with established major signage and character.
- The idea to have similar signs for some of the other tenants on the north side is probably a reasonable approach.
- Don't like the visual look of the lateral fascia signs. Don't think people will be able to read them.
- Could be better if they were below the structure, laterally projecting out.
- Think the south sign is too small for the Seabus vision. Six feet is better visually.
- Think the neon look and scale is appropriate.
- Concerned with the precedent.
- Think the circular sign in that form is appropriate. Light background on the north side tends to pop out strongly.
- Not uncomfortable with horizontal banding of letters, but the building has a light ribbon structure to it.
- The smaller signs hanging underneath the circular logo are too much on the south side.
- People recognize the logo and brand anyway.
- Great job with presentation. Understand the need for signage.

- Uncomfortable with proposal. This is an iconic building.
- Could support signage on the second floor, but not by fastening it to the physical structure of the building.

**Applicant's comments:**

- Done a lot of models. See your concern.
- In discussions with City staff, they prefer the signage on the upper deck.
- This is part of the kit, which has been scaled down a lot. The business needs signage.
- The Landlord has approved the sign locations.
- Didn't want signage where it could obstruct the view for the patio clients.
- The face of the sign is removable. Fasteners will be hidden inside the cabinet. There is no mechanical or visible brackets. The back is neatly finished with a heavy gauge aluminum, painted to match the cabinet colour.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the DVP: Sign Variance application for East Side Mario's Restaurant (Priority Permits / Knight Signs) and, although supporting the principle of the circular East Side Mario's sign, feels that the supporting signs on the north & south sides of the building as presented are inappropriate to the character of the building and request that the applicant provide a revised proposal to the Panel.

**Defeated**  
**4 – In Favour**  
**4 – Opposed**

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the DVP: Sign Variance application for East Side Mario's Restaurant (Priority Permits / Knight Signs) and does not recommend approval, pending resolution of the following issues:

- Reconsider identifying the business with signage on the south side of the building behind the exterior framework of the building to be consistent with the overall pattern of signage hierarchy of the building eg. behind the glass or within the deck area;
- Reconsider the remote identification of the restaurant signage on the north side of the building.

**Carried**  
**6 – In Favour**  
**1 – Opposed**

The meeting recessed at 6:50 p.m. and members attended the Joint Advisory Meeting on the Marine Drive Streetscape Guidelines Presentation in Council Chambers from 7:00 – 8:00 p.m.

The Panel reconvened at 8:15 p.m.

*Y. Yhalighi left the meeting at 8:15 p.m.*

## **8. 212 / 400 Brooksbank Avenue – Rezoning / Text Amendment**

The Chair read the resolution of the Advisory Planning Commission dated March 10, 2010.

The Planner provided the context background on the project. There are two sites with one CD zone with the commercial component currently assigned to 400 Brooksbank Avenue. The applicant hopes to renovate the existing industrial use building on 212 Brooksbank Ave. and incorporate some limited non-industrial uses, similar to the commercial use on 400 Brooksbank Ave. Also, there is a strong interest in maintaining industrial lands. It was noted City staff would probably support a relaxation in parking.

Chris Bozyk, Architect, reviewed the project to recycle an existing building. The end part of the building would be removed and the balance of the site would be retained. A colour board was circulated. Simple, not an overly designed building. Cladding would be a corrugated galvanized metal panel along all fascias, any accent paneling will be swissborough panel. Canopies of the building entrances are proposed in charcoal grey, but it was suggested to opt for a colour to bring life to the building.

David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, reviewed the site landscaping. Masses of low maintenance plant material palette will be introduced. Some trees will be replaced. Bike storage is on the corner. The Advisory Planning Commission suggested stormwater management on site. There is some opportunity for that, eg. bring water off roof, and use it as an opportunity for public art, something whimsical.

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

- Did you consider a green roof for the building?
- What about contamination from the previous tenant?
- What is proposed for the treatment of the doors?
- Is there internal bike storage or showers in the building?
- Along Cotton Road, how much space is there between the edge of the parking and the property line?
- Clarify the new construction?
- Is the east elevation all corrugated?
- What is the lifespan of a corrugated surface?
- Entry detail on Dwg A5 looks narrow and slopes into the drive isles. Is there some way of narrowing the drive isles or having more generous circulation in front?
- APC was supporting a parking reduction. Do you not want the density?
- Metal screen on the corner of the building, how achievable is that? Think it will attract signage over time.

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

- Pedestrian circulation from buildings across to the parking. Concerned with the two-way drive isles.
- Suggest changing texture colour outside the doors for a visual feel and to encourage motorists to slow down.
- Too bad these buildings can't be a better neighbour to the park.
- Not sure in the long term how the single pots in the front of entries are going to look over time. Would rather not have them there. They're in the way.

- Think the overall form is exciting, but don't think it jumps out enough. Contrast would help.
- A stronger colour palette is more appropriate, with our environment.
- The back is a long elevation. May be an opportunity to plant in there.
- Like the idea of angled parking and see if you can get more depth with helping refuge areas and front door area.
- Corner screen – it would be good with colour mixed in and seasonally change the colours.
- Glad to hear public art is being contemplated.
- Recognize the proforma is schemey and latitude is fairly limited.
- Congratulations for holding onto a piece of existing building.
- Think the new construction will not support the broader structural idea.
- Suggest narrowing up the drive isles and have more room for green space, etc.

**Presenter's comments:**

- Agree with definition on colour, eg. yellow chartreuse colour. The emphasis on the form of the building and surrounds can be worked more toward our advantage.
- Second floor doesn't work for floor height. If there was better floor height, the end piece would be different.
- Think the new portion will become office space. Don't know who the tenants will be.
- The roof structure could accommodate the additional structure that would be required to give a green roof, but we haven't looked at a green roof.
- Looking at how we can do permeable paving.
- The Ministry of Environment provided a letter that the site is clean.
- Typically with buildings like this, the tenants provide their own shower facilities. We don't know who the tenants will be. We would rather deal with each tenant as they come in.
- Along Cotton Road, there is about 2 – 2½ feet between the edge of the parking and the property line.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning and Text Amendment application for 212 / 400 Brooksbank Avenue (Level Developments Corp. / Christopher Bozyk Architects Ltd.) and recommends approval with the following recommendations:

- The existing and proposed building form be enhanced with greater contrast in materials and colour;
- Reconsider the allocation and location of parking and drive isles to provide greater protection and safety, and entry of individual units;
- The entries to individual units be accentuated to provide greater visual articulation along Brooksbank Avenue;
- Consider stormwater management, if there is more landscaping space available in the parking lot;
- Consider removing the planter pots at the entry points;
- Further development of the north elevation facing East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street;
- Consider contrasting colour articulation of the east side facing the Park.

**Carried  
6 – In Favour  
1 – Opposed**

## 9. 221 West Esplanade – Building Permit

The Development Planner provided the context for the project. The application is for a building permit, it is at the design stage. There is a large open space and we would like to see these spaces used to the maximum. The application is within their zoning FSR.

Renata Selitar, MCM Architects, reviewed the scope of the design. The proposal is to connect the lobby and front area to provide more visibility for the retail and for the building. The main focus of design is to refurbish and refresh the canopy and also storefront. A new podium sign for the building is proposed, which has been submitted to City staff for review. The ground floorplane will be changed to animate the area.

David Stoyko, Landscape Architect, reviewed the landscaping plan. Plan includes using good, solid, permanent seating fixtures, new fresh planting and revive surfaces. Creating some additional amenities, benches, bike parking to make the area more lively. Spaces will be softened and will be more usable. The applicant is hoping to do some work in a large plant space in the Park adjacent to the area to activate the park as well. Overall, main things are quality materials, using some really nice modern graphic improvements.

Mr. Selitar noted light fixtures will be added as well as replacing some of the old dated stuff. There will be a more contemporary feel without changing the original look of the building. The proposed building signs will be a contemporary theme, a combination of glass, and will act as a guardrail in the plaza. In front is a series of freestanding letters up-lit at night for presence in the evening.

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

- Are you doing anything with the steps that go up to the raised plaza?
- Will it be a new canopy or are you repainting the existing canopy?
- Will there be any renovations in the main floor?
- Congratulations on doing this, its going to be great.
- Is the access point to Waterfront Park on the west side through the overpass?
- Would like to see how the entrance to the west side of the building is resolved.
- Describe the edge condition along the west edge of the plaza. Does that meet grade?
- You are not asking for additional FSR, this falls within your entitlements?
- What is the plan for lighting?
- Do you have a concept for public art?
- Landscape sections through planter show a tree, eg. cherry or tulip tree. Will there be new trees in those planters?
- How are you revitalizing the concrete surface?
- Drawings don't show a colour for the paving. Are the lines just a score pattern?

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

- Suggest working with the Parks Dept. to create a strong connection with the Park.
- Nice project.
- Like the image with all the red chairs. Concerned that the planters with seat edge won't seem modern.
- Concerned with the idea of glass behind the sign. Would look lovely, but there might be a problem with vandalism.
- Opening things up is good for CPTED reasons.
- Encourage you to think about lighting for the building to continue around the building.

- Would be good to see the walkway to the Overpass with a fresh new look too.
- Colour or different whimsical benches and treatments would give the entry plaza more punch.
- If the purpose is to open up and bring the stores close to the street, it was suggested to not have the proposed trees.
- Uncomfortable with not knowing how the Park access will be resolved and the main entrance to the building.
- Painting the canopy structure white will require a high level of maintenance.
- Landscaping treatment is nice. Pleased to hear surface treatment will be similar to the City plaza. Subtleties, e.g. verbiage and poetry, would be great.
- Like the new signage. Single large individual letters works well.
- Like how the area is opened up.
- Large scale moves, very successful.
- Support moving glazing out to the building face and creating lighter architecture.
- Signage is a huge improvement to open up that corner to the Park.
- Could be a bit bland.
- Reconsider the proposed Columnar trees in the planters.
- Location of lighting poles at back edges of planter may suggest the lighting is supporting the canopy structure. Consider looking along narrower frontage, fixed or in the plaza.
- Error in rendering concept – diagonal paneling is dropping down.

**Presenter's comments:**

- Thanked the Panel for their comments, they will be considered.
- Different expressions were considered. Contemplated removing glazing, but based on cost, the same glazing may be kept with less mullions.
- Landscaping is similar to that at the City Library.
- A little less than half of the \$3M budget will be on the building's exterior.
- Interior renovations include the whole lobby area, new elevator cars and washrooms and will continue up to the subsequent floors.
- The lighting concept includes a bit of public art. Lighting is on either side of the planters. They are similar to the new Conference Centre where they shine out the top and to the side, but no illumination in the aluminum pole itself.
- Public art includes treatment around the benches, aluminum seating, bike racks available in the U.S., that look like a chicken or salmon.
- All the concrete will be taken up by shotblasting and replaced with a thin coat of concrete, very clean, similar to the concrete treatment at the City Library. Then it can be patterned. A series of pavers are also falling apart and will be replaced.

It was regularly moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Building Permit application for 221 West Esplanade (Level Developments Corp. / Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership) and thanks the applicant for a thorough presentation, and for renovating and improving the exterior façade of the building.

The Panel recommends approval, and encourages the applicant to work further with the Development Planner to resolve the following concerns:



- Review of the lighting to be further incorporated in the architecture of the building with attention to wrapping around the west side of building, as well as along the pedestrian walkway to the Overpass to Waterfront Park;
- Work with the Parks Department & staff to integrate the Park's edge with the Plaza;
- Reconsider the fixed benches and look at opportunities for public art and animation of the space;
- Reconsider the proposed plantings in the planters on the north side of the building to avoid further blocking views into the businesses;
- Explore paving opportunities or interest to the Plaza paving by incorporating colour and ensure that the quality of the finish will work in the long term;
- Ensure detailing is of high quality and vandal proof.

**Unanimously Carried**

*J. Bitar left the meeting at 9:52 pm.*

#### **10. Other Business**

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, April 21, 2010.

---

Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\ADP\MINUTES\2010\2010 03 17.doc