

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 18th, 2017

MINUTES

- Present:** B. Checkwitch
J. Geluch
B. Harrison
S. Gushe
A. Man-Bourdon
- Staff:** D. Johnson, Development Planner
S. Kimm-Jones, Committee Clerk
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Servicing
M. Epp, City Planner
C. Miller, Planner 1
- Guests:** 232-234 West 5th Street (Rezoning Application)
Jordan Kutev, Jordan Kutev Architect Inc.
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd.
Marco De Cotiis, Fina Group
- 2601 Lonsdale Avenue (Rezoning Application)
Rodrigo Cepeda, gbl architects inc.
Stu Lyon, gbl architects inc.
Bill Harrison, Forma Design Inc.
Alfonso Pezzente, Pezzente Holdings Inc.
Sofia Pezzente, Observer
Mario Pezzente, Observer
John Pezzente, Observer
Matteo Ciolfitto, Observer
- Absent:** K. Bracewell, RCMP
K. England
P. Maltby
A. Sehwoerer
-

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. with B. Harrison in the chair.

Students from the UBC Centre for Community Engaged Learning attended the meeting as part of their assignment on Community-Based Experiential Learning, and were welcomed by the Chair.

1. **Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held December 14th, 2016**

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held December 14th, 2016 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. **Business Arising**

None.

3. **Moodyville Update**

C. Miller, Planner 1, gave an update on Moodyville. Seven projects of differing characteristics have come before the Panel for review.

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

- I am surprised on how much the design of the buildings has changed for the better since we review them. It is good to see the progress.
- There are good examples of two buildings of identical length with style cues but significant differentiation.
- Where is the amenity space in the Fairborne building? **A:** The previous design privileged private amenity space; the amenity space has been moved to the back to give public space more importance.
- When is the Qualex project coming back? **A:** A report has been sent to Council in which the comments from the Panel were included. It will be discussed at the Public Hearing.
- How often does that happen? **A:** Not very often. The report included the Panel's specific comments and suggestions and staff are addressing them with Qualex. Staff would be compelled to issue the Development Permit if it was not a rezoning.
- I see that the Moodyville Guidelines are challenged by scale; smaller projects are having an easier time being approved. Larger scale projects seem to have difficulty.

4. **Staff Update**

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

5. **232-234 West 5th Street (Rezoning Application)**

This is an application to rezone the lot from RT-1 (Two-Unit Residential) to a Comprehensive Development Zone to permit a three-unit development consisting of a two unit building fronting West 5th with a single unit infill building in the rear.

Staff asked for Panel's input regarding the following:

- Visibility of the front of the infill building from the street, enhancing one's sense of arrival;
- The design of the infill building's northern lane-facing façade;
- The lane treatment including the landscaping;
- Appearance and design of the rooftop deck and features mitigating overlook into the neighbouring lot to the west.
- Sustainability and energy performance commitments.

Jordan Kutev, Jordan Kutev Architect Inc., described the project to the Panel:

- The lot is 50 foot wide with a lane at the back.
- The existing house is three stories and is higher than the proposal.
- There is a neighbouring heritage house which has a ridge height of 195.3 feet.
- The house to the east has a ridge height of 194.3 feet.
- The proposal is for a triplex with two units at the front and one infill unit at the back with parking in the lane.
- There will be a courtyard between the two buildings.
- There are full basements in the duplex and the infill house.
- All three units have small lofts with patios. The lofts are fully enclosed with no windows.
- The rear patio has been reduced in size in response to neighbourhood comments.
- The roofline has been increased to increase privacy and decrease overlook.
- It is a simple, modern design to emphasize the neighbouring heritage house.
- Windows have been added to the rear unit staircase to animate the rear elevations.
- The heritage house has a zero lot line; the fence is designed to not block their windows.
- Parking in the lane is six feet higher than the front property.

David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Inc., reviewed the landscape plan:

- The sidewalk will not be changing; the design takes advantage of the existing purple maple in the front; the entry paths will wind around the tree.
- There are patios at the back in the courtyard bordered by terraced planting with a walkway and screened by hedging due to the grade difference between rear and front units.
- The planting consists of 33% native plants to 66% ornamental plants.
- There are rain gardens at the front of the property.
- Permeable paving is used for the pathways.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Your proposal mentions an energy report? **A:** We are waiting for the report from the energy consultant and are looking at EnerGuide 82 as a base.
- What green building principles are you using in the landscaping or building? **A:** Mainly in the landscaping.
- Why is this a high quality project? **A:** There are modern and durable finishes, the use of HardiePanel will improve the quality and visual impression of the building.
- **To staff:** Is the application contingent on high quality and sustainable guidelines? **A:** There have been responses through the resubmission and changes in response to the feedback from the public. The applicant will adhere to the Low Density and Sustainability Guidelines. EnerGuide 82 exceeds the minimum energy requirement. Staff will discuss these items in greater detail with the applicant.
- Are you achieving EnerGuide 82 by use of a heat pump, not the building envelope? **A:** We will work with the consultant on how to achieve it in the most efficient way for this type of building.
- What is the material used to frame the windows? **A:** HardiePanel.
- Will it have flashing? **A:** Yes.
- The reveals are exposed aluminium? **A:** It is an aluminium channel.
- How will the infill building address be identified from the street for first responders? **A:** It will be on the building at the back. There will be a strobe light at the front.

- Has there been any discussion on the egress code with regard to the stairwell and window well; you may have a challenge. **A:** We will look at it.
- No rating system? **A:** No.
- Are the heat pumps on the back decks scaled? They seem small. **A:** We will check.
- What is the screening material between the two unit balconies? **A:** Opaque glass.
- What material is used in the rear parking area? **A:** Asphalt to match the laneway; we have to repave a portion of the lane.
- **To staff:** Can they cover the parking? **Staff:** Yes, however an attached carport counts towards the maximum floor area.
- Is there any way to put a roof on the carport e.g. a green roof? **Staff:** We try to be consistent on how floor area is calculated; any request to bonus the floor area has to be consistent with policy and bylaws. The benefit to open parking is that the infill building is removed from the lane; a roof would add massing back into the lane. A variance could be requested, or the buildings can be reduced by the size of the covered area.
- The existing sanitary line runs under the tree; does it have the capacity to deal with the added density? **Staff:** They have to replace the line so the existing tree will likely not survive unless the sanitary line is moved over which is more expensive. They will have to plant two new trees.
- **To staff:** What do we have to do to save the tree? **Staff:** The service has to be severed at the connection in the road and a new one installed.
- Why do you have exterior stairs down to the basement and the space at the landing? **A:** We added the external stairs to serve the mechanical room.
- The mechanical room seems oversized? **A:** It will be a mechanical room / storage.
- What wood are you using for the louvres? **A:** Stained cedar over glass.
- Will you be considering a higher performance in the building envelope with higher insulation values? **A:** Yes, we will.
- What is the difference between Finished Grade and Building Grade; they should be the same, but are different on your plan? **A:** We will look at it.
- The eyebrow around the window is important; how do you make it clean and sharp and crisp? **A:** We will have flashing; it is only 6 inches, the lip of the flashing will be about half an inch.
- What is the setback on the west property between your pathway and the main building? **A:** Nine feet except for the window well.
- Is mechanical room exempt? **A:** Being located under the patio it must have dedicated green building systems for it to be excluded.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The mechanical room looks very generous; green systems tend to take up less space. It seems oversized although I understand they need storage.
- The exterior of the duplex is a real challenge in the architectural language. I appreciate the historic house; this house looks like a collision between historic and modern architecture.
- There is modern geometry packaged under an awkward sloping roof. The confusion is carried through the materials; the renderings show strong dark grey material which is faux wood grain. The beige areas are modular emphasizing the pattern of the rectangularity; looks like it is faux wood grain
- The renderings seem more clean and modern than the materials used; there is a disjunction. The HardiePanel does not seem to go with the plans.
- I find emphasizing the modern expression with aluminium unconvincing.

- There are big volumes on the roof; there is a lot of FSR on the site and a shortage of outdoor space for the families who are going to live there.
- The patios have a lot of overlook and the planters are taking up a lot of space.
- The space between the buildings is very cluttered. The private space is way up on top of the buildings; you are going to a lot of effort to address overlook issues but it would be cleaner if the design was modern with flat roof structures. If you roofed over the carport, the rear unit could use it as a patio.
- Pick an architectural direction with a flatter roof and cleaner lines, clean up the materiality.
- Bathrooms do not have windows in two of the units; look at adding them.
- The corner glazing in the bedrooms on the two front units makes it difficult to fit a bed and there is no room for side tables. It is not liveable.
- Unit three is an awkward resolution of modern form with sloped roofs.
- With regard to the lack of communal space in the back; you could have narrower landscaped areas with narrow tall shrubs to give more room.
- You need some kind of structure over the carport; a vertical structure would include the building.
- I do not like the asphalt at the back; you could do a better job with unit pavers. The back lane is changing character with more pedestrians and concrete pavers would animate the space and could be connected to the other permeable pavers.
- With all the rain it is a shame there is no roof over the parking.
- The storage for garbage and bikes creates a significant problem from a CPTED point of view and sightlines when backing out of the parking.
- The back elevation feels like a bunker; I appreciate the functionality of the storage units but it needs work.
- Note to staff: Ensure that there is something innovative and new happening with regard to the green bylaws.
- I would rather see EnerGuide 83 than 82; it is mentioned.
- I would encourage using a third party green system.
- The Sustainable Guidelines are an opportunity to improve the performance of the building.
- The location of the heat pump is not good on the back deck; it will be too noisy.
- There are several points in the package which are misleading such as using the most current sustainability guidelines and higher than average R values, the tree will probably die, there is no adaptable housing or provision for more diverse units (I do not see much diversity). I am having trouble with the presentation: you are saying one thing and we are finding out something different in the package.
- I take exception to the use of the term “high quality”; I do not see it.
- There are challenges. I quite like the form and character. I like the front house but am not keen on Unit Three. I am very concerned about the streetscape and existing tree. Losing the tree will compromise the scale.
- The devil in the details. If you pull it off according to the rendering I do not have a concern, but there are a lot of edges to be addressed and flashed; it should be reconsidered.
- You should reconsider proposing a light airy structure to cover the carport which could be attractive for weather protection. I would go after a variance.
- I have concerns about whether you have followed the Sustainability Guidelines.
- Liveability is a big issue.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for all the comments. We are using HardiePanel because it is durable and pre-painted. They only paint the textured HardiePanel. We want it pre-painted but with a flat not faux wood finish. The palette is to show the colour not the texture. All edges will be sharp and well-finished with aluminium. I agree the true expression would be better with a flat roof but everything needs to be concealed in the roof. It is a compromise; you will not see too much of the roof from the street. We can work on the landscape for Unit Three although it is north-facing. We can look at unit pavers for the parking to make it feel less like a laneway. Re the tree, we can talk to staff about what the cost is to save the tree. The carport is City policy.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 232-234 West 5th Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues below. The Panel looks forward to reviewing the applicant's response at a future meeting.

- Clarification of adherence to the Sustainable Development Guidelines;
- Consistency between the written description of the project and the actual project specifically regarding environmental performance, architectural detailing, resolution of the existing tree and how it fits with the landscape;
- More resolved clarity of roof form and materiality;
- Investigation of potential coverage of the carport;
- Materiality of the carport with respect to CPTED;
- A closer look at the size of the mechanical room and whether the stairwell access is really required;
- Putting windows in all bathrooms;
- Resolving whether the front element is truly a window or an applied design element;
- Confirming that window well dimensions comply with Code;
- Increasing usable space in the central courtyard where possible; and
- Ensuring the rear unit is clearly identified from West 5th Street to comply with CPTED.

**Carried
4 in favour
1 against**

Bill Harrison declared a conflict of interest and left the room and re-entered with the delegation.

B. Checkwitch took the Chair.

6. 2601 Lonsdale Avenue (Rezoning Application)

This is a rezoning application for 2601 Lonsdale Avenue and a City-owned road right-of-way. The application proposes a six storey 44 unit apartment building with 27 market rental units on the first three levels and 17 strata units on the upper floors and level P1, which fronts a proposed green space.

Staff asked for the Panel's input on:

- The proposed site design;

- The proposed architecture of the building;
- The proposed landscaping plan; and
- The proposed orientation and design of the proposed public walkway.

Rodrigo Cepeda, gbl architects inc., outlined the project to the Panel:

- The design was approached from a historical perspective.
- The applicant owns the lot; the City owns west 26th Street. The City approached the owner regarding merging the sites and closing the street and building a pedestrian path.
- There is a large cedar and garden at the south east corner which the design takes into consideration, and a large garden between the street and the existing building.
- The existing building has views to the south.
- The proposed building will have north-west and south-east views.
- The cedar tree will be retained with the building stepping back from the street.
- The building will be set back as much as possible to the north to create the pedestrian path to the south.
- Car access will be from West 26th street. The parkade will be covered by units with direct access to the lane.
- Access to the ground floor is from Lonsdale Avenue.
- Level 3 steps back, and then level 5 steps back further.
- The building will have double-tinted metal panels the colour of which will vary depending on where they are viewed from.
- The main material will be dark with dark stone at the base.
- The number of rental units will increase from 13 to 27 integrated with 17 stratified market units.
- As well as the pedestrian path there will be an extensive public landscape.
- The wood frame building will be low in CO2 emissions.
- In the storm water management plan water will be collected and released within the property.

Bill Harrison, Forma Design Inc., went over the landscape plan:

- There is lots of opportunity in the landscape plan to take a negative area and turn it into a community benefit.
- There is a tremendous opportunity for public art which may be located at the pedestrian pathway.
- The root zones of the existing trees at the north edge are growing into the building site and will be replaced if they cannot be saved.
- There is a steep grade on the eastern edge on Lonsdale Avenue. The design takes into account how the building presents itself to Lonsdale with curving soft and hardscapes including a pause area at the entry with a bench.
- At the south edge there will be a CPTED- friendly pedestrian walk to make it desirable to pedestrians. A boardwalk crosses the cedar tree's root zone.
- The rain garden is under a boardwalk at the south west corner.
- There will be an artful wall along the pedestrian pathway and a bench half way along it.
- Entries to the units off the lane are emphasized.

The panel examined the model.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- What is the roof material? **A:** It will be metal which may have to be soundproofed.
- What do the orange panels reference? **A:** We want to build contrast between the metal and wood-based material with a shiny material to give an appearance of appearing and disappearing.
- It is a 9% slope on the pathway? **A:** Just in one place. The path will be contoured. There is a four foot grade change from Lonsdale Avenue to the bottom corner. We will blend it as best we can.
- What is the boardwalk made from? **A:** We are going to work with the City on what it should be. We would like composite or maybe a suspended slab. It is a public walkway so has to meet City standards. What has the discussion been about the maintenance of the pathway? **A:** It is still be negotiated. **Staff:** The City will not maintain a boardwalk.
- How do the modular storage tanks work; will the water be reused? **A:** They are just to slow the water; it will not be reused.
- Talk about the visual cues that identify the pathway as public access? **A:** It is about two metres wide and very open at both ends, you can see right through it. From Lonsdale Avenue it will be obvious. It will be well used.
- Is the lawn area private? **A:** Yes; it will probably be artificial or faux turf.
- Will there be an open fence along the wall to separate the public and private spaces? **A:** Yes, probably an Omega fence.
- Will there be cues for people exiting on to the lane? **A:** Probably some kind of treatment. It will be obvious as it exits on to a street that operates as a lane.
- Have you used the wood panel before, is it a rain screen? **A:** We are in the initial stages of choosing a material; it might be wood or wood-based. We want it to have texture and provide light and dark.
- Is the stone real stone? **A:** Hopefully, it depends on the economics. We want a stone that will match the other materials.
- How is water collected at the end of the roof? **A:** There may be recessed gutters.
- What is the glazing system? **A:** Aluminium or vinyl frames.
- What determines the width and depth of the columns? **A:** The structure.
- Light wood is only used in the soffits? **A:** Yes.
- Could it be used on the underside of the balconies? **A:** Maybe.
- Will there be mass timber elements? **A:** There will be exposed beams inside and at the top floor.
- Have you used the metal material before in significant amounts? **A:** No; it is very striking as it changes in natural light.
- Do you have a civil engineer? **A:** Yes.
- Will it be difficult to move the planter and stairs on Lonsdale Avenue to outside the road dedication? Where did you calculate the 50 feet? It needs to be 10 feet not 9 feet 4 inches. **A:** We will work it out.
- How high is the omega fence? **A:** Four feet.
- The soffit material is light wood, cladding is the metal panel? **A:** Yes.
- Will there be a public art feature? **A:** Yes; hopefully around the bench on the public walkway.
- What is the overhang of the roof on the east and west sides? **A:** Five feet.
- What is the roof structure? **A:** Wood.
- What is the roof thickness? **A:** 12 inches. The slope of the roof follows the slope of Lonsdale: 12%.

- Are there fire issues with a wood soffit? **A:** We will have to check. Wood soffits present a maintenance problem.
- The depth of the roof structure and ability to hide gutters.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- 9% is quite steep and materiality will be paramount on the pedestrian walkway especially for people pushing buggies or in wheelchairs. See if you can smooth out the slope. Materials will be important.
- I find the building to be interesting. I have some concerns. The orange panel could be wildly successful but there is an inherent risk.
- I have concerns regarding the material; you seem undecided on the materials for glazing, cladding, etc. It is difficult to comment on the design when they are not finalized.
- I appreciate the public access way, the public art; it creates feature to draw people in.
- Thank you for the well done presentation; it helps to understand where the building is emerging from.
- It is one of the most unique buildings I have seen in my two years on the Panel.
- The massing is very unique and original. It is not your typical six storey; I appreciate it.
- I was very excited about the real materials; I am now concerned about not knowing what they are. It worries me. It could be a totally different building once you have costed it and looked into fire issues. It is really hard to comment on a building that is not fixed. I would like to have a better feeling about it; I feel it is really in flux. I am challenged on how to move it forward when we do not know what the materials are going to be.
- Gutter and downspout details are important. I do not want to see a gutter on the outside of the fine architectural details. Gutters should be shown on the rendering. The depth of the roof structure and ability to hide the gutters will be important.
- The verticals are very strong; are they too big or appropriate to the structure to hold the roof up? It looks a little bit heavy; the design could have more elegance but the columns may have to be that width.
- I like the rental and market mix and integration. The City needs it.
- I like the walkway; it is a real improvement. It will be a great addition to the City.
- Thanks for the refreshing presentation; a lot of passion has gone into it.
- It is a challenge to comment when the materials are not decided; they need to be closer to being resolved.
- Construction-wise the roof system calls for a structural insulated system.
- Overall, I think it is quite nice. It will be a big change to the location. Hopefully, the neighbouring buildings will develop in a similar fashion. Deep thought has been put into the form.
- I find the massing very unique, original. I think it works the way it reference other sloping things: mountains, slope. It suits the North Shore.
- I have a big problem with the orange panels; I think they will be loud. There is a difference between the reality of the material and the rendering.
- Street incorporation is an important part of the project; could the path be more generous where it meets the streets to be more welcoming? I want to make the path as public as possible.
- I appreciate your analysis of the site and how it has led to the design.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for your comments. I hear you re widening the entrance of the path; it makes sense. Regarding the roof, the metal would have to be insulated. With regard to the columns: the thinner the better. I agree that they should be slimmed down. We are not using vinyl siding. We use good quality materials. We are prepared to sprinkle granite through the project.

I know the orange calls attention immediately; we thought about corten steel but it is double the price. We have a good building geometry we will fine tune it and it will be much better.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 2601 Lonsdale Avenue and recommends the applicant return another time to give clarity to the following.

- Exterior cladding materials; and
- And an update on the evolution of the design.

The Panel commends the applicant on the quality of the proposal and their presentation.

Carried unanimously

Bill Harrison re-entered the room and joined the Panel.

7. Other Business

Members were reminded to bring their binders to the February 15th meeting.


Roberts Rules of Order Workshops will be on March 28 and 29 – 6-9 pm. An invitation will be sent to Panel members.

D. Johnson thanked outgoing members for their contribution to the work of the Panel.

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, February 15th, 2017.



Chair