



MEETING MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting held at City Hall in Conference Room A.
141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, BC on March 19, 2024

The City of North Vancouver respectfully acknowledges that this meeting is held on the traditional and unceded territories of the Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish) and Səlílwətał (Tseil-Waututh) Nations.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>
Councillor S. Shahriari C. Toyota R. Greene A. Enman D. Samaridis A. Enman J. Wegman J. Levine O. Bibby K. Bracewell	Robert Skene, Deputy Director Civic Development and Strategic Initiatives Christina Stevens, Manager, Strategic Initiatives Dianna Foldi, Senior Project Manager Matthew Menzel, Planner 3 Linden Mulleder, Planner 1 Bram van der Heijden, Planner 1 Sarah Friesen, Administrative Coordinator I
<u>Absent</u>	<u>Guests</u>
-	Paul Fast, HCMA Michael Ross, Catalyst Community Developments Society Steve Watt, Integra Architecture Rhys Leitch, Integra Architecture Dylan Chernoff, Durante Kreuk Alyssa Semczyszyn, Landscape Architect, Prospect Refuge Carman Kwan, Architect, Architectural Collective Bobby Purba, Owner, By Design Construction

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm.

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The Agenda for March 19, 2024 was adopted as circulated at 5:30 pm.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting on February 20, 2024 was adopted as circulated.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Chair requested for panel members to keep comments for consideration as high level key objectives for the resolution and refrain from detailed commentary, as staff will consolidate points shared into a summary for the chair to review.

4. NORTH SHORE NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSE – PHASE 2 – PRESENTATION

City staff began with a brief presentation at 5:35 pm to re-introduce panel members to North Shore Neighbourhood House (NSNH).

The delegation began their presentation began at 5:43 pm.

- Phase two is situated just below phase one which is currently in construction.
- The process has been expedited to begin construction in September 2024.
- An 18 storey mass-timber structure is as sustainable as it gets.
- The project satisfies the requirements for floor space, parking and accessibility as outlined by the City.
- In the parkade, a full cut off wall prevents any water or flooding from entering.
- Separate elevators access residential units and commercial features (daycare).
- Presenters referenced a case study from City of Vancouver about residents living in a similarly designed rigid structure.
- Utilizing vinyl windows will not be a fire hazard as long as they are spaced at least one metre apart.
- The building's height and density were reviewed in earlier phases of the project. A slide displayed a computer generated image of the development within the city's context.
- Exterior materials include dark brick to offer a feel of a more permanent residential structure.
- Landscape review includes a variety of colour integrated into features, including chairs, plants, children's play areas and bike racks.
- Bike racks are located in a secure area off the street behind a glass wall where the public could see theft occurring.
- Special considerations have been made to preserve the landscape within the daycare facility, as typically grass areas for children are well-used and become worn out.

A brief flythrough video was shown to panel members.

The presentation concluded at 6:07 pm.

4. NORTH SHORE NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSE – PHASE 2 – QUESTIONS

Questions from the panel included the following:

- Walk me through how I'd bring a child into the daycare.
 - There are two entrances. Come into the parkade into the elevator bank, or off the street into the foyer, then elevator bank. Security would be provided from the elevator and foyer. This is completely separate from the residential area.
- Outside area of the east side and park side: is it accessible to the public or just NSNH?
 - Just NSNH and daycare. It will be gated.

- Structure to embellish the neighbourhood house: the scale of the trees are quite close to the house itself. Why hasn't it extended into the public realm?
 - We haven't had an opportunity to bring it forward. The developers would be open to this in the future.
- On level two, there's a balcony and neighbourhood house space in the back. Can you walk through how you'll make this a soft transition to the park?
 - Take advantage of the grades. Utilizing the top areas to expand the planters which may have to go vertically on a climber structure. There aren't final grades yet for the park.
- It seems like a gaping piece of the puzzle is not in your hands yet. How much of the architecture can you address now?
 - There is an opportunity to move the parkade vents. We can be flexible until they begin construction on this. We're hoping to use the slopes to create a soft edge.
- Guidelines mention way findings and three functions including NSNH + daycare. It's hard to distinguish the separate functions within the buildings from the exterior. Can you increase each section's visibility by making them more prominent?
 - We are seeking a unifying ribbon to create consistency within the building which has a civic and residential frontage which have two very different functions.
- What is the difference between window treatments facing north, south, east and west?
 - We have reduced glass, and there is an Innova heat pump on the balcony. The comparison between this and a typical towers is that typical towers receive a lot more blazing given the energy targets.
- Why is there less than 10% of affordable units?
 - Similar feedback was given from City staff in a previous interaction, so 13-14 % is now available. Three bedroom units have been less popular and are more challenging to fill. Families from overseas may be more likely to fill the larger suites with more bedrooms.
- Where is the space for public arts?
 - There was no requirement during the rezoning for public arts and there was never an intention for this to happen. There is a whole park being developed next door which will present opportunities for presenting art. This will all tie together.
- Can you clarify the intent for entry with the Outdoor space for the NSNH between podium and the park to the east?
 - There will be connectivity to the park for NSNH residents.
- The exit staircase to the southeast is quite prominent. Is the intent to be used only as an exit stair?
 - Yes. There will be massing to bookend the podium.
- Can you clarify that there will be 36% vehicular parking (based on 65/179 units)?
 - Yes
- How does daycare pick up drop off work in this configuration?
 - All daycare users will utilize visitor parking located in P1
- There's a gap between two buildings in the middle: what are we doing in that area?
 - Outdoor residential amenity space (Reference to slide 14)
 - Working on a landscape plan with the operators. Storage box for toys that doubles as a seat. Rubberized surface similar to first phase. Patterns on the floor. Amenity rooms are ideal for socializing for sitting and meals. A comment was made that there will be plenty of shade for users in the warmer months.

- Connection space from NSNH from north to south?
 - No. They're completely separate despite the visual appearance of connectivity.
 - Commercial space in phase 1- care space. Phase 2 NSNH operated separately.
- Are bedrooms are adaptable from a design perspective?
 - 30% CMHC Accessible units
- Storage for each units?
 - Bike parking and resident storage (catalyst requirement) 4 x 6 cages.
- Heat pumps in additions?
 - Yes
- Is there dedicated daycare parking? Where are guests supposed to go if that's full?
 - No. If full, park on the street.
- Plans for covered play area?
 - Yes, it will all be designed to the guidelines. There 24 spaces being provided. The current childcare offerings would not meet requirements but the City is working to bring it up to the licensing requirements. Following similarities with The City of Richmond.
- Moving trucks and deliveries park where?
 - See slide 9. Same location as where the garbage truck comes in.
- Daycare on the northeast corner – what is the notch on the property line for?
 - Extra space for the daycare.
- Explain the various uses of the entries and what does it look like?
 - See slide 8. Access directly from east first. A second entrance for the emergency shelter. There's a one way system from food bank.
 - Large lounge space is designed for foodbank queue and general public usage.
- What is driving the need to hide all the wood?
 - New code compliance is fully encapsulated timber.
- Why isn't the roof utilized for social spaces?
 - It is not advised with Mass Timber on 18 floors.

4. NORTH SHORE NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSE – PHASE 2 – COMMENTS

Comments from panel members included the following:

- Building security weak points include parking gates and visitor parking. Ensure there are sufficient anti-pry gates. Bike storage is a hot spot for theft.
- First responders may be unclear on how differentiate the two entries and access the building for residential or commercial purposes (1st Street or St. George's).
- Colour schemes in and around the structure are favourable.
- Use canopy street trees if possible. Suggestion to review outdoor space as quick as possible for children's area, it's easy to lose sight of those in a blink of an eye.
- Praise for the soft areas on the outside.
- Praise that that the limited access to the park (residents only) creates a sense of community.
- Architectural expression of the project is favourable. Two or three major functions can be enhanced better through architectural expression and create distinction between the different elevations.

- Park ramp on the south side of phase 1 development create some potential blank walls. Utilize design development to soften this. Consider adding vines.
- The podium seems quite busy through the stacking expression.
- Integration of park and outdoor space is challenging to comment on without a park design. Integrate as much as possible as soon as possible.
- The two titles read quite similarly on the exterior – consider a more prominent and distinguishing design.
- Stairs on the exterior lack legibility.
- Planter location and columns feels more residential rather than a community hub.
- Linear childhood space may prohibit optimal function.
- Passive shading systems are recommended because active systems can fail.
- Would like to see some public art on the southwest side and entry to soften the impact of the tower and street planting of double rows trees on the south and west side.
- Lack of parking is quite concerning especially considering the recent regulations. 30% parking will make it challenging especially for the daycare. Visitor parking can be occupied overnight. A small drop off area directly in front of the building would be beneficial.
- The corner of the intersection is conventional and could be treated with a bit more flair. Create a focal point such as a plaza or waiting area; said space could house public art.
- Carefully select trees to have a large canopy to break down the massing.
- Encouraged that soil cells take advantage of the adjacent planting areas.
- Distinction between the two entries (blue language means both entries look the same).
- Gathering space feels dark and compressed (cones, single height space and brick wall, vision between indoor and outdoor). The retaining wall looks a bit high – could it be taken down to soften the edge? Simplify the podium.
- Exit tower to the southeast are counterintuitive to bridge the building with the park as they compete with each other. Turn the rendering over as it appears to be a barrier to the park.
- Architecturally, it looks like a separate building. Bring a connection of the park to the building. Consider bringing daycare and upper levels down. Doing so would open up the whole level to the park and street.
- Parkade entrance – extending patio entrance to connect with the park to open up the corner. This will soften the language of the building to the park.
- Daycare plan: Slide 14. Consideration: Solution of the stair – remove the cut out and square cut out. Does this give privacy to amenity space to the residents? Develop secure stair access connecting parks, daycare, and residential units.
- Well done on trying out the CLT Mass Timber at this level.
- Scale shifting – it's a shame that the mass timber cannot be further exposed. Covering wood with materials that looks like wood seems like a shame.
- Make the tower a beautiful grid, be a distinct unit. Distinguish the podium as it's hard to tell.
- Proportion of outdoor space to the studio. The studio could likely benefit from 4 or 5 more feet of indoor space and remain with plenty of room on the patio.
- This is a truly small amenity space. A private developer would be held to a higher standard. Consider sacrificing one unit to create a larger amenity space for the amount of homes being offered.

- There could be a very good cost argument to go further with shading on sides of the building that get a lot of sun.
- The rigid building expressed through the pattern of the patterns could be more lyrical with the placement of the unit openings.
- The podium could benefit from a design flare, and colour all around.
- It would be nice to make a comment regarding the building face – how does it resolve itself on the park? This is unknown.

The presenters expressed gratitude for the panel’s comments and are pleased that the suggested changes are in alignment with those that they’ve been working on.

4. NORTH SHORE NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSE – PHASE 2 – RESOLUTIONS

It was moved and seconded that...

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the North Shore Neighbourhood House for a detailed design review of Phase Two and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner. The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

1. Exploration of solar shading on the tower face;
2. Consideration of security – gates/hardware for parkade entrance;
3. Continue the landscape accent colour from Phase 1; consider accessibility features to be integrated for someone with visual impairment;
4. Include access to the park from the outdoor amenity on Level 2;
5. Establish a distinct architectural identity of residential versus civic uses;
6. Increase overall design volume and flare of the entrance plaza;
7. Further consideration of the outdoor space of the daycare;
8. Consideration of programming issues regarding crossover of different uses, specifically the outflow of the feedback relative to the residential areas;
9. Consider space on street or on site for a delivery van;
10. Expand the unit depth of studio units to reduce balconies and increase unit size;
11. Design development of the corner expression of the public interface; and,
12. Consider integrating public art.

The resolution was unanimously carried.

The delegation left at 7:14 pm.

5. 2416 WESTERN AVENUE – REVISED DRAWING

At 7:19 pm, staff provided a brief project overview outlining some site constraints (road dedication and two large cedar trees). This is an engineering matter in need of review.

The delegation began their presentation began at 7:23 pm.

Some historical context was provided to give new panel members a comprehensive understanding of what has changed since the previous presentation, including:

- GFL has reviewed the proposal and can make the plans for garbage removal.
- Massing: height of buildings has reduced by 5ft.
- The addition of two roof decks to result in four total.

The landscape architect reviewed the landscape drawings with the panel:

- Hardscape and landscape has been adjusted to be in the tree protection zone.
- Responded to requested planting in the boulevard. Two additional street trees. This will be included in the permit application.
- Increased vegetation and permeable paving system, added planters at front doors to illuminate the fact of front entrances. Green added through the central spine.
- Paving for wayfinding – different paving patterns (darker – public, lighter – residential).
- Opening up nodes to promote community and variety of seating spaces.
- Vine system over the parkade for privacy and softening the transition.
- Adding further landscape planting along the boulevard.

A flythrough video has played to review the structure.

The architect noted that:

- Gated structures are compatible with wayfinding for first responder access.
- Ballards have been included for corner traffic.
- Recycling staging is in the back.
- Pedestrian and bike access is included in the drive isle.
- There is a shortened spine with greater dynamic and vegetation through planter boxes.

5. 2416 WESTERN AVENUE – REVISED DRAWING – QUESTIONS

The panel presented the following questions:

- Accessibility to the greyed open spaces. How will one enjoy the space with friends who have accessibility challenges?
 - Go around the back through the lane into the garden.
- Would the planters prohibit the width for fire access? Ensure they are not removed.
- How deep are the canopies?
 - Maximum allowed by the building code. 21 inches depending on the recess.
- To confirm, there's no minimum requirement for amenity space for this type of development?
 - No, however it is encouraged and based upon discretionary approval. The City is taking land away so it's something we have to take into consideration.
- Is the courtyard permeable pavement?
 - It's off slab, otherwise we're on parkade slab chosen for storm water management. Brentwood boxes are already chosen.
- How much wider is the central spine?
 - About a foot, but there's more where the recesses are.
 - Front yard setback has not changed.

5. 2416 WESTERN AVENUE – REVISED DRAWING – COMMENTS

The panel presented the following comments:

- The site is still very confusing. Fire annunciating panels only work for firefighters, but other first responders need to have a very clear identified path of where they're going at 2:00 am when it's dark and pouring rain.
- Pleased to see the changes made. It has improved – the back areas have expanded and the addition of roof top patios plus front treatment of two trees.
- Glad to hear the trees will be protected. Consider the tree root density in this zone.
- Planters are a great step towards making the space more livable.
- Fewer small trees and a couple large ones create greater visual interest
- Providing warm lighting can make the space much more livable, especially in the spine. Lighting for facial recognition is important.
- Not concerned about the massing.
- Livability: Unit only has one glazed wall on it.
- Units 8 and 13 have bedrooms directly facing each other – utilize design development to improve privacy concerns.
- Unit design: no entryway in the layout, daylighting is a concern.
- North elevation: existing trees remain
- Courtyard functionality – outdoor corridor is not a functional space.
- 95% permeable pavers present. With planters raised, why bother having permeable pavers? High maintenance each year to keep it functional. Recommendation to remove them. The cracks with sediment are prime location for weeds to grow. Redo the calculations, doubtful there will be great changes or barriers.
 - City of Vancouver has stopped recognizing permeable pavers.
- There's improved breathing room with the spine.
- 95% of the site is a hard surface so trees are appreciated.
- North or south elevation – page 81 (RZ303) there's a lot of jointing in the panel which can be expensive and untidy. It feels like there's been a lot of energy into making it look interesting, therefore losing cohesion. Consider looking at where the property lines meet – homeowners may wish to have quiet distinction to determine what is there.
- An improvement has been made in areas of our concern.
- Typology is unique due to proximity of the units together – outlook of the units have been addressed – we see this type of construction in European contexts where density is tight in a ground-oriented format.

The delegation expressed appreciation for the comments which have enhanced the project.

5. 2416 WESTERN AVENUE – REVISED DRAWING – RESOLUTIONS

It was moved and seconded...

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 2416 Western Avenue, and recommends approval of the project. The Panel commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal and their presentation.

J. Wegman and E. Enman were noted in opposition of the motion.

A summary of the remaining issues were outlined below by the chair:

1. Emergency responders can find units in the dark
2. Landscape lighting from a safety perspective to enable facial recognition
3. Consider outlook of apartments along the long corridor
4. Further development of layout improvements in the unit into the living room
5. Consider removing the use of permeable pavers due to maintenance
6. Further development of north and south facades, constructability of all of the panels which come together.

The delegation left at 8:03 pm.

The panel discussed that the presentations went significantly overtime, and that in the future, staff should consider how long the presentations will actually take. Panel members agreed that depending on the project, such as the crucial nature of North Shore Neighbourhood House, going overtime is acceptable. The Chair proposed that questions take less time and while allowing for some in-depth questions.

Staff and panel further discussed the resolution made for 2416 Western Avenue, agreeing that the delegation could have done a better job comparing the changes made from the last presentation until now.

6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of next regular meeting is scheduled for April 16, 2024

7. ADJOURN

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:12 pm.

“Certified Correct by the Chair”

Jordan Levine, Chair