



MEETING MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting held at City Hall in Conference Room A
141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, BC on September 17, 2024

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

Members Present

J. Levine
C. Toyota
O. Bibby
A. Enman
D. Jacobson
M. Rahbar
J. Wegman

Absent

D. Samaridis
K. Dusova

Staff Present

L. Mulleder, Planner 2
S. Larisch, Administrative Coordinator

Guests

Narjes Miri, Architect, m+Architecture
Rosanna Higgs, Landscape Architect, Binnie
Suki Bhatti, Property Owner, 422 East 1st Street
Virinder Bhatti, Property Owner, 422 East 1st Street
Preet Bhatti, Property Owner, 422 East 1st Street
Farzin Yadegari, Architect, Farzin Yadegari Architect
Incorporated
Yi Wen, Landscape Architect, pmg
Parviz Behrouzi, Property Owner, 216-232 East 3rd Street

The meeting was called to order at 5:33 pm.

- 1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
- 2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

A motion was made to amend the minutes of the meeting held on March 19, 2024 to reflect the correct company name of a guest in attendance, Paul Fast, to be edited from HDMA to HCMA.

Carried Unanimously.

- 3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

Nil.

4. 422 EAST 1ST STREET – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR FOURPLEX

L. Mulleder, Planner 2, reviewed the staff memo that was sent to members in advance to review the project to provide context on the development.

N. Miri, Architect, presented the following highlights regarding the design and character of the building:

- Despite being a multi-unit housing development, the design intentionally creates the appearance of a single family residence to blend into the existing neighbourhood.
- The building's frontage proposes secure bike storage.
- Neutral colours are incorporated to add warmth to the building.
- The majority of entrances to the building are on the building's sides.
- Access to the rooftop is through the building's interior staircase.
- Bay windows provide privacy between neighbors while still allowing visibility in the front entrance for security.

A flythrough video was played.

R. Higgs, Landscape Architect, reviewed the landscaping plans. Highlights include:

- Patio areas are kept simple with a planter wall to provide screening
- There is designated space for a barbeque, planters, tables and seating areas
- Wall lights are incorporated for safety and path lighting. Trees and planters have landscape up lights for a functional yet dynamic design.
- Development plans include goals to achieve Energy Step Code Four.
- The property offers a Level 2 electric car charger.

Members presented the following notable questions:

- How do bedrooms and lockup units A and B get natural daylight? **A:** Direct sunlight through light wells.
- What is the difference in elevation between the windows and the stairs? **A:** There is a one storey difference.
- Has a preliminary energy analysis been performed? **A:** No.
- How do you propose screening between properties? **A:** By retaining walls and a fence.
- Would the parking spots occupy the full frontage of the block? **A:** Parking is situated along the lane and cars have direct access.
- Please clarify the maximum height of the building. **A:** The building doesn't exceed the 12-metre height limit and is in compliance with guidelines.
- Who is going to maintain the permeable paving? If this is a strata building or a rental, are the owners or managers willing to maintain this? It only works if the material is maintained. **A:** We don't have an answer for that, but we will discuss it for the future. We do have a storm water management plan, though.
- Are you considering any adaptive re-use of the storm water plan? **A:** This is not currently in the plan but we will discuss it for the future.
- The architectural plans and landscape plans depict different renderings of the roof. Which of the two is correct? **A:** The landscape roof plans are the correct renderings.

4. 422 EAST 1ST STREET – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR FOURPLEX – Continued

- It was noted in the application that you're at 1.36 FSR and we'll be looking to bring it down to 1.0 FSR. What measures are in place to meet that? **A:** To clarify, the current plan is actually at 1.0 FSR.
- Are units A and B barrier free? **A:** They are adaptable with straight access and no stairs. Only the parking area has a barrier.
- Is the common space accessible by everyone? **A:** Yes.
- How far are the East and West setbacks? It appears the bay windows are encroaching on them. **A:** The bay windows are set back by two feet.
- What is the width of the bay windows? **A:** The width is 5-6 feet and the depth is 2 feet.
- How would the six cycling stalls access the street? Is there a ramp? **A:** We don't have a ramp, although if we made one, it wouldn't be in compliance with accessibility requirements due to space limitations.
- There are many south facing windows. How would you deal with heat in the summer? **A:** Overhangs provide shade in the summer.
- In terms of landscaping, are there any trees along the lane? **A:** The only vegetation includes some deciduous trees in the front.
- In the statistics table provided on A102, it says there is 100% lot coverage. Is this correct? **A:** That's a typo, it is actually 60% coverage.
- Where are bicycles stored in relation to the main units? **A:** Near the stair access.
- How are you going to carry the bicycles up and down to the units? **A:** We assume the resident is athletic enough to take a few steps up or down. A u-shape ramp could be a solution.
- In terms of adjacent properties, where are the neighbours in relation to this property? It would be ideal to see a profile of them in relation to each other. **A:** We don't have engineer drawings, but retaining walls and section profile shows the neighbour's natural grade. Their land is sloping in the same way as our property.
- Where is the garbage and recycling located? **A:** It is enclosed within the garage.
- Is there a sidewalk as part of the plan? **A:** Yes.
- How high is the fence? **A:** 5 feet.
- The back lane is where we find most people lurking around so the window above the lane is advantageous.
- How big are the accessible suites? **A:** 722 square feet.
- Where is the wheelchair accessible parking? **A:** On the road.
- Your video rendering indicates the grade is significantly lower than what is in the plans. Can you describe the conditions? **A:** The natural grade can only be raised up to four feet. The bay windows are proposed to create some depth.
- I'm interested to learn more about how the windows match up with the adjacent property. **A:** We don't have information about what the other property will look like but we can look into this.
- How many lock-off units are there? **A:** There are two units on the south side.

4. 422 EAST 1ST STREET – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR FOURPLEX – Continued

Members presented the following notable comments:

- It's difficult for us to talk about the neighbours with no context as to what will be surrounding. We'd like to consider not just the current context but also the future context, even just general massing.
- Despite the street frontage that is residential in character, there's a new emerging life to the neighbourhoods as developments occur. Wouldn't it be nice to have multiple entrances to provide a different expression of a public interface as opposed to only one entrance? This would provide a very different expression than the single family home.
- The rooftop access is very nicely done.
- Clarity on density would be very helpful.
- To ensure safety, it's important to have eyes on the property.
- The applicant should consider completing an energy analysis as soon as possible as they may not achieve Energy Step Code Four in the current state.
- There are no concerns with the façade treatment or height relaxation.
- Multiple points of entry would be preferable.
- The lack of natural light in bedrooms and lock-off units A&B is concerning for quality of life; additional lighting should be strongly considered.
- Look into windows for passive surveillance of parking spaces.
- The design is modern looking with no issues surrounding roof encroachment.
- The memo shares that the FSR is 1.36. It would be interesting to see what the massing would look like at 1.0. The windows add to the mass and the density affects how the landscaping will affect the site.
- It would be nice to have some context relating to the stairs.
- The single entry is complex because you're essentially landing on someone's property at the front. It's unclear how privacy is established in this model.
- With parking in the back and the main entrance at the front, the entrance feels secondary as it passes by another parking stall. Separate entrances would be preferable.
- Is there a better way to conceal the garbage, recycling and compost bins?
- The building is covering the entire site with very little to no area for meaningful vegetation. If we keep doing that in the City, I would have a problem with that.
- Consider ways that you could integrate green roofs.
- The property seems to encroach on the neighbours.
- What is the future plan for the property to the West? We don't have enough information to look at this.
- There is not enough supervision for storage safety and security.
- We need civil drawings to understand the plans further.
- More garbage space will be needed. A car won't be able to park there with all the bins for six units.
- The signage needs to be more visible for emergency responders.
- The spans look quite large for a wood frame building.

4. 422 EAST 1ST STREET – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR FOURPLEX – Continued

- From an occupant perspective, bikes are rarely kept in bike storage but rather in bulk storage so carrying it up the stairs is more likely.
- We can't comment on the quality of landscaping because no samples were provided.
- Unless there are utilities in the way, the consideration of street trees would be worthwhile as it's what makes every street beautiful to drive down.
- The use of native and adaptive plants is advised.
- The rationale behind creating the single use entrance is understood, although it's advised to create some more space between the units so the bedrooms aren't always visible. Planter boxes can go a long way to achieve this.
- Consider having a little ramp on the inside of the stairs. There are already some installed around the city as an example. Something to consider is that e-bikes are extremely heavy and a ramp would be advantageous to residents.
- Sustainability should be a great focus.
- Some clearance issues are observed.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the development permit application for 422 East 1st Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below. The Panel looks forward to reviewing the applicant's response at a future meeting.

- Provide context of adjacent properties
- Offer further detail on landscaping plans
- Consider integrating green roofs
- Perform a preliminary energy analysis on the property
- Further develop sustainability measures
- Integrate clear building numbers for emergency responders
- Clarify the proposed and allowable density
- Consider changes to the pedestrian access at the front, like providing multiple entries
- Consider changes to the communal storage/bike storage area, including adding a ramp for bike access
- Improve or increase the size of the garbage storage area

Carried Unanimously

5. 216-232 EAST 3RD STREET – REZONING APPLICATION

L. Mulleder, Planner 2, reviewed the staff memo that was sent to members in advance to review the project to provide context on the development, including:

- Clarification that the development is actually a stratified ownership, not rental units.
- This submission so far has not gone through any of the City review processes yet.
- In the Official Community Plan, developments have a blanket maximum six storeys, however depending on the zoning, there can be some variations.
- Staff don't have a city-wide plan for mid-block connections at this time.

F. Yadegari, Architect, presented the following highlights:

- Originally, the proposal was for a future rental property but due to a transfer of property ownership, the property's proposed use is now shifted to strata.
- Indoor and outdoor amenities are connected.
- Each unit has an individual private balcony.
- There are 16 units on each floor, except for the fourth floor, which has 14 units.
- Levels two and three are almost identical. Level four has a greater setback at the centre for the laneway.
- The plans illustrate a building below the maximum available height.
- Plans incorporate the natural slope with the landscaping and the design matches the street's contemporary look.

Y. Wen, Landscape Architect, presented the following highlights:

- Each yard proposes one canopy tree with a large patio. It's large enough to fit a table and chairs set, a barbeque and space to enjoy some outdoor activities.
- A public pathway along the east side of the building features lights and planter boxes.
- The north end of the public pathway offers a fenced in a play area for children.
- Overall, the site has 38 trees.
- Native plants are integrated into the site.

Members presented the following notable questions:

- What is the plan for the back alley to gain ownership of the greenspace? **A:** There's no fence, just landscaping.
- What is the access to the building for emergency services? **A:** A fob system and two exit staircases.
- Have you performed an elevator study for the amount of units in the building? **A:** As far as the elevator is concerned, it should not be more than 35 seconds for the cage to arrive. If this can be met, the number of elevators is sufficient.
- On the lowest parkade, there is a wall at the edge of the property line on the east side. Is this correct? **A:** Yes.
- There is a 5-metre setback, so shoring must occur. This might mean you lose a parking space.
- Have you made any efforts to break up the width of such an expansive design? **A:** No.

5. 216-232 EAST 3RD STREET – REZONING APPLICATION – Continued

- What is the planned construction methodology? **A:** Steel studs with corrugated steel and 3.5 feet of concrete on top.
- Regarding the play area, what type of fence is it and what is the height? **A:** There is an aluminum fence that is 1.1 metres high.
- Are there any wheelchair accessible parking spaces? How many and where are they? **A:** Yes, they're kept as close as possible to the elevator.
- Could you explain your sustainability measures? **A:** The delegation could not recall and the written outline was not accessible.
- Has a preliminary energy model been conducted yet? **A:** Yes and we've selected Hardie Boards as our paneling.
- How wide is the side walkway? **A:** 5 feet wide.
- How wide is the outdoor amenity space? **A:** About 12 feet.
- How much growing medium can you achieve? **A:** 18 inches, but we try to keep it at 2 feet.
- Please describe the project relationship to the projects on either side? **A:** Surrounding the development you'll see old, single-home residential projects except for one CD Zone multi-family project. The adjacent properties will eventually rezone to multi-unit housing.
- Do you have a plan that relates your grade to the adjacent property? **A:** The west side is shallower, resulting in a loss of parking to create the slope.
- What is the setback? **A:** 4 and 5 metres. This is still under staff review and the outcome would result in a zoning variance.
- Is there visitor parking? **A:** Yes.

D. Jacobson left the meeting at 7:28 pm and returned at 7:30 pm.

P. Arreaga left the meeting at 7:31 pm and returned at 7:35 pm.

Members presented the following notable comments:

- Concrete is one of the most carbon intensive units and we're beyond that at in this day in age. Using a different material is suggested.
- The public amenity space does a great job counteracting the epidemic of loneliness.
- The walkway on the side of the building needs to be wider. Staff should consider this as a factor of approval. The public won't use this because it feels far too private.
- The walkway needs further lighting to provide facial recognition.
- Balconies are not the place to meet neighbours, so the community space and its relationship to the walkway must be enlarged.
- The minimum requirement for trees is 2 feet. Consider appropriate larger trees where you have a deeper growing medium where wildlife can also reside.
- The building will fit in with the character of the street.
- There are no major concerns with the proposed massing and articulation, although questions remain about energy efficiency.
- The building feels like a large façade and it would be ideal to break it up a little.
- Explore more natural materials as an alternative to Hardie Panels for a richer pedestrian experience.

5. 216-232 EAST 3RD STREET – REZONING APPLICATION – Continued

- Public art generally puts a burden on projects, but there are creative ways to do this including the use of light.
- Street-level residents often keep their blinds closed for privacy, reducing livability. Installing vegetation could enhance privacy.
- All the class B bike stalls are near the back of the building. No one would want to leave their bikes in the alleyway overnight.
- There are opportunities to maximize the building's height.
- Some additional security measures could be implemented in the common space.
- The mid-block pedestrian connection could be expanded.
- The adjacency of the garbage space to the play area could be better resolved.
- The building itself looks great – could the building be narrower but taller? This would resolve the connector issue. Check this against the OCP to ensure we're not going too high.
- The outdoor play area could be a little larger considering the amount of units and corresponding residents.
- The public pathway may be a consideration for the future. Not everything can be done all at once.
- Keep the stairs lit so everyone can use them.
- The indoor stairs will be used but not by everyone, so the elevator's capacity and efficiency remains important.
- Consider having an amenity space on the roof.
- The building envelope is quite simple. The usability of the space will be improved when you pay attention to the materials of the overhang.
- The amenity space you currently have is not the best location. Consider placing the amenity on the rooftop. As you terrace, the last level could be enjoyable for all users.
- If the City could accept the west setback of 10 feet, have the connection on the west side, not the east side.
- This is one of the best projects we've seen for massing.
- Articulate the main entrance.
- This is an extremely busy street and traffic will be prominent. In terms of landscape, we'd like to see a different solution for apartments on the street level. Patios will be seldom used due to the traffic and the noise. A rooftop garden would be an appropriate solution.
- For security purposes, the presence of people are going to be the best form of security. Getting people outside is a great way to keep the building safe.
- The bikes are at a vulnerable location and will undoubtedly get stolen.
- Concern about the livability of the units. It's unclear how the rooms will receive any daylight since a number of the bedrooms don't have windows.
- The midblock connector is too narrow. There's a synergy between the connector and the living space, but it's just too tight.
- The building face, while it's attractive, it's very long with no break in rhythm.
- A suggestion was made for members to consider Suggested Resolution 1B, approval with conditions.

5. 216-232 EAST 3RD STREET – REZONING APPLICATION – Continued

The members inquired of staff what opportunities exist for returning applicants to the panel. **A:** The panel's decision determines the outcome. If an application is declined, further steps includes reviews from other City committees, staff, and public engagement. The applicant can revise based on this feedback, after which staff will assess the changes. The revised design then returns to the Advisory Design Panel.

The architect asked for clarification on what will happen if the City rejects the advice of the panel. **A:** As the architect, you're not required to follow all advice; you can make changes or not before returning to the panel, though they may have similar comments. Applicants can collaborate with the Planning Department to integrate feedback.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 216-232 East 3rd Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below. The Panel looks forward to reviewing the applicant's response at a future meeting.

- Widen the pathway in the mid-block pedestrian connection on the side of the building.
- The mid-block pedestrian connection needs further lighting to provide facial recognition.
- Enlarge the outdoor amenity space and increase its security measures.
- Explore more natural materials as an alternative to Hardie Panels for a richer pedestrian experience.
- Enlarge or relocate the children's play areas to accommodate the number of residents.
- Create a greater separation between the garbage bins and the children's play areas.
- Consider utilizing the roof for amenity use.
- Articulate the main entrance.
- Enhance security of bike storage by moving it out of the alley.
- Integrate natural lighting into the units.
- Consider the impact of a long repetitive façade, consider elements to address this.

Carried Unanimously

6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting is scheduled for October 15, 2024.

7. ADJOURN

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:21pm.

"Certified Correct by the Chair"

Jordan Levine, Chair