

**Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel
Held at City Hall, 141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, B.C.
In Conference Room A on Wednesday, July 18th, 2018**

MINUTES

- Present:** W. Chong
B. Phillips
N. Petrie
K. Bracewell, RCMP
M. Messer
B. Jones
C. McLeod
J-P. Mahé
- Staff:** D. Johnson, Development Planner
B. Hurley, Planner
J. Braithwaite, Development Technician
R. Fish, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** 519 East 1st Street - Moodyville Phase 3
Padraig McMorrow, IBI Group
Smitha Vidyasagar, IBI Group
Emma Artis, IBI Group
Tony Wai, IBI Group
Derek Lee, PWL
Sofie MacNeill, PWL
Edmund Siqueira, Wall Financial
- Absent:** B. Harrison
K. Yushmanova (recused)
-

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

The Chair welcomed new Panel member Cam McLeod. The members introduced themselves.

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held June 20th, 2018

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held June 20th, 2018 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. **Business Arising**

The Panel moved to cancel the August meeting and resume with the regularly scheduled meeting on September 19th, 2018.

3. **Staff Update**

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

4. **519 East 1st Street - Moodyville Phase 3**

This application is for a development permit under the East 3rd Street Area (Moodyville) DPA Guidelines. The proposed 1.40 FSR design is for a 6 building project with a total of 134 units.

The project is broken into three building types: an apartment building with a courtyard (82 units in Building A), a set of two pairs of stacked townhouses that are both connected with a bridge (49 units in Building B+C and F+E), and a set of small townhouses (3 units in Building D) on the other side of an extension to the Ridgeway Greenway. The 26 adaptable units required for the project are provided in the apartment building. Only one Lock-Off is being provided in this proposal.

Staff would be interested in the Panel's input regarding the following:

- The design, façade, and architectural vernacular of each of the buildings as they respond to and potentially coordinate and demonstrate individuality with other buildings of the Moodyville Area and each other;
- The overall massing and form of each building as it relates to both the street edge, greenway edges, and the internal spaces of the proposed development;
- The quality and effectiveness of the interior courtyard facing units;
- Quality and overall cohesiveness of the landscape plan, pedestrian circulation, as well as, transitions between common and private outdoor spaces;
- The nature and quality of the shared and public open spaces provided in this plan;
- The design quality and approach towards incorporating both Spirit Trail improvements and Living Laneway guidelines as part of the southern edge;
- The interface with the neighbouring house to the East and properties across the lane to the West;
- The function and impacts of the proposed 3-level parking structure on this development and the landscape;
- Design regarding sustainability and energy performance goals; and the
- Quality of livability and CPTED responses for the townhouses and apartments in this proposal;

Padraig McMorow, IBI Group, described the project to the Panel:

- New typology of apartment building alongside the stacked townhomes.
- The trails are defined largely by a greenway running north-south to Ridgeway Avenue.
- East of the site there is a public portion which connects to Alder Street as part of a larger Open Space Network.

- East of the greenway there are 3 single family townhomes, these units echo some of the design in the earlier stages which ties this neighbourhood together.
- Limited the number of parkade entrances on the site to 2 serving 3 levels of underground parking.
- Architectural expression is different from previous phases and begins to integrate more contemporary industrial materials and colour palettes with natural colours and sits on a backdrop of fiber cement panels which emphasizes the metal and echoes the industrial past.
- For the stacked townhomes, the upper section is on 1st Street, the lower section is on Alder Street and is a sloping site with a 3 storey difference.
- There are no living spaces overlooking each other directly. Planted trees mitigate any direct overlook into units.
- Open plan living space with roof access, bedrooms on second and third floors.
- Placed lock-off unit and 2-bedroom standalone units on level P1, directly accessed from parking and private open space onto the courtyard.
- Courtyard space is an active space with multiple uses, but with the upper part being gated and lower open portion including a play area and community garden.
- Apartment buildings are laid out in a U-shape which creates an overlooked shared space for residents.
- Amenity on lower level, connected to the Spirit Trail.
- Access to kitchen facility, shared open space and yoga studio.
- Fixed tables and covered outdoor space with a barbecue.
- Achieving LEED Gold with ASHRAE at 15%.
- Unit mix is 1-bedroom apartments, 2-bedroom apartments, 2-bedroom plus den townhomes and 3-bedroom stacked duplex.
- The apartment building is 25% (28 in total) adaptable units across a range of bedrooms (three 3-bedroom, 17 2-bedroom, and eight 1-bedroom)

Derek Lee, PWL Partnership, reviewed the landscape plan:

- Inspired by the surrounding context of Moodyville and naturalized ravine.
- Bringing in aspects of naturalistic qualities.
- Vine Maples, Cedars and Douglas Firs.
- Permeability and network of trails through naturalized spaces.
- Phases embrace public access.
- Greenway is a major connection. All walkways are publically accessible.
- Strong sense of community and connectedness.
- Currently developing a viewpoint concept at the termination of the greenway.
- Active seating edges create an intimate outdoor lawn space.
- Creating a series of north-south access points across the site and community nodes with seating edges for encounters and congregations.
- Roofs will have active patio space for each unit, with the two south-west buildings having expansive greenspace on top.
- Common features of the community is the townhouse presence with well-designed streetscapes.
- Attempting to maintain the spirit of livable laneways and stepping the building to not feather down or erode usability.
- Wayfinding through trail markers. Providing a common kit of parts for vertical artful elements with a strong sense of continuity within the grade change, including vertical elements with light channels through them.

- Inspired by the sense of timber (and former Timber Industry), we are reconstituting the elements into various features of the site.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Will this be one strata? **A:** Yes.
- Will there be further development of the greenway portion that bisects the site? **A:** We want it to be fairly passive, there are opportunities to celebrate the outlook. It is a passive space with trellises and seating.
- How does Building A use the amenity? **A:** It's accessed from the outdoors which is the case for all the individual units. We are creating an ethic of people wanting to use the trails. There is underground access as well.
- Is there a reason for not doing more colour with the planting? **A:** Yes, we are open to this. Most of our planting palette is native species but we can dial up the colour.
- What do you see happening in the courtyard where the north side is in a dark hole? **A:** An open lawn and edge condition with potential for seating, trellis structure with seating, fire pit and outdoor dining space with a barbecue.
- Is there only one interior amenity space for the entire complex? **A:** Yes.
- What is the reason for having it there? **A:** For the activation and connection to Alder Street.
- Staff: the nature of the Spirit Trail is that as a greenway it is technically required to be the front of the building, the amenity attempts to act as the front of the building.
- Staff: the previous phases of the development didn't include an amenity space, is this meant to compensate for that? **A:** No, this amenity space is only for this strata.
- Have you thought to provide more amenity spaces for this development? **A:** We wanted to create a language of nodes, neighbourliness and sense of community by having it this way.
- Can you talk to how the townhouses on Building D relate to the house? **A:** From the neighbours property line there is an 8ft setback which is planted and has a retaining wall to match the neighbours.
- Have you considered a small hedge running across? **A:** The intent is that it would be a hedge, for security reasons we may also need a fence.
- Staff: the guidelines demand a setback along the first 20ft of the project that is set in an additional 4ft beyond if there is a remaining property.
- Can you point out which material is corrugated metal cladding and describe what the joint is? **A:** The white portion is Hardie panel with an open jointed reveal, the metal is framed. There are brick soffits at the entrance.
- What are the plans for shading on the south and west façades, everything is exposed without any shade? **A:** Balconies where possible will provide shading elements as well as smaller windows.
- The Moodyville Guidelines speak to breaking up and changing façades, all these buildings look the same, have you considered this? **A:** We have been striving to achieve it by mixing colour and unit types, the edges of buildings and whiter townhomes. The buildings on the south have a different expression. We worked with the guidelines to stagger the buildings with a difference of 4ft to create interesting movement.
- Are the overhangs on the walkways for shade and protection from rain? **A:** They have continuous weather protection and canopies fixed back to the building, as well as a 5ft deep walkway with 4ft canopies.

- Have you considered canopies for upper balconies just below the top floor? **A:** Good suggestion, we can integrate this into the design.
- The façades have a lot of repeated forms in the main building, have you looked at a more haphazard distribution or breaking up the façade? **A:** The project celebrates verticality in proximity to the silos, we went with stacked solid panels on the balcony. We can take a look at a pattern approach for randomization.
- Between Buildings B+C and E+F, there's a lot of shadow there, have you analyzed how many hours of sunlight this channel will get? **A:** We've done a shadow study but not to that detail yet.
- Staff: be sure contextual buildings that will impact this or be impacted by this development are included in the shadow study.
- How are you managing noise mitigation with all the hard surfaces? **A:** Staff: the zoning requires noise mitigation.
- Is there no access plan for the green roofs? **A:** There will be a roof hatch, but not for public use. The idea is to have the Spirit Trail as the main use.
- Can you clarify your private and public spaces, where is it gated? **A:** The only area that is gated would be the courtyard to the apartments with secured access by FOB for residents in this lot. Other areas are all essentially open and permeable.
- Can you clarify the lighting plan? **A:** We utilized the walls for low level lighting to highlight the steps, with highlighting on address markers along the trails and bollard lighting. This combination will create an illuminated ground.
- What is the distance between Buildings B+C and E+F? Can you support robust trees in these spaces? **A:** We are selecting smaller trees, they would be appropriate for a planter this size.
- What's the height of them? **A:** About 10-15ft at full height, the width is about 12ft. We want to have a porous canopy and want to control the size of these trees.
- Is there privacy mitigation for the adaptable unit? **A:** Yes, there will be a solid wall and planting will provide privacy. We can consider etched glass to bring daylight into the corridor.
- The space between Building C and E has a deep crevice, how wide are the patios? **A:** The southern patios will get more sunlight and are like intimate courtyard spaces which are off of the kitchen in some instances, fairly casual use spaces.
- Is there one address for all the buildings? **A:** They are all addressed off East 1st Street. There will be 5 different addresses with different units for each.
- How will emergency responders be guided to the rear units if the address is on 1st Street? **A:** There will be signage for first responders, a map and potential for fire and other first responders to drive around. There will be an address post in front of each stair on the south that will indicate an upper or lower unit.
- How do you divide the underground parking from the visitor parking? **A:** All are located off of Alder Street. Access off the lane will be for residents.
- Once the visitor is in, do they have complete access? **A:** Yes.
- How many families will be in this development? **A:** 500 and up, approximately 40% of the population could be children (150-200 children).
- Are the trails a bit conservative as a concept, could you make bolder moves? **A:** Absolutely, we will look at the role of the trails and greenspaces.
- Is there a way of battering the vertical walls and engaging people with the vertical elements to make them more playful? **A:** Yes, this is definitely a good idea. We expect further development of this.
- Can you treat the exterior exit stairs differently? Is there a way to lighten them up and make them more open, maybe an exterior stair? **A:** We can consider this.

- Could you consider Buildings E and F to align with Alder Street and open the interior courtyard to more than 29 feet? **A:** Yes, that's an interesting thought.
- Is there a possibility to bring natural light into the parkade? **A:** Yes.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The active amenity space is too small if there are 150 kids. This area will be used the most and it is the smallest. Explore adding another one or make it larger.
- Refunction the courtyards to make the space feel less narrow.
- More colour in the landscape.
- The terraced walls of the park can have stairs with intermittent stop spaces to break up the staircase from street to trail and up to the greenspace.
- The rooftop could be adapted for public or residents.
- Like the idea of adjusting buildings across Alder Street to give more space.
- Façade design and the mix and expression of materials is good.
- Some forms at their shoulders could be softened, particularly stair forms.
- Keep the large tree in the outdoor space.
- Consider roof spaces on all buildings to have roof decks. Don't see much development of what the decks feel like; further development of what the building occupants will use it for and provide a variation of materiality up there.
- Explore widening the green pathways through the buildings.
- There are deep shadowed areas between Buildings B+C and E+F.
- Explore changing the material usage; it's repetitive.
- Explore shade options for light and rain, there are a large amount of open windows on the south and west with no coverage to reduce heat gain.
- Explore pulling down Buildings E and F towards the lane and increasing the amount of space between buildings or placing parking levels in that space to reduce depth.
- The idea of the trails is successful but could be brought to another level. Wayfinding should be part of the development, part of art component and help with activation of spaces from one end to the other.
- Put in trees that are robust, like a path in a forest. The trail is the more prominent aspect and the architecture is second to that.
- Stairs and walkways can be an element itself. Find balance between how wide and what planting materials can work with the slopes.
- The edges on Building D gives little softness towards the whole building. Consider how the neighbour also uses the public space which is the key idea of the trail.
- The two adaptable units need to be reworked with the patio and terraced units with clear definition between the east wall and the back end of it.
- The west facing corridor of the east wing of Building A needs to be thought out.
- The silos are important to this development; consider a sectional cut through that will see a difference from lower level to high level with shadows. This may produce benefits with shading to the patio areas on the south.
- Consider where service vehicles would park for extended amounts of time.
- Consider green roof access for unit owners.
- Have a robust unit identification plan to guide first responders going to the back buildings and ensure sightlines are not obstructed.
- Ensure a lighting treatment where buildings narrow and in open public spaces in dark areas.

- Landscaping plan should have clear lines of sight. Consider the use of vegetation, hedges and tree height.
- Visitor parking should have a secure gate into the resident parking. Having it right next to bike storage may be problematic.
- Celebrate the grade changes a bit more. Also note the Silos as an important contextual element of this set of buildings.
- An angled or battered wall is much more appealing.
- Breakdown the massing by treating the exit stairs in a different yet integrated fashion.
- Some stairs connect to the parkade, there's an opportunity to take the light right into the parkade to make it safer.
- Garbage and recycling rooms should be against the south wall, opening it up will be a more pleasant experience and will get more use.
- Consider the alignment of Building E and F, opening it up could do wonders and would help pinching Alder Street and the Spirit Trail.
- Consider the livability aspects of the buildings and units.
- As you develop the greenspace, provide a barbell connection between the two nodes.
- Look at all the stairs and find a way for all of them to work more with the landscape and the walls rather than a straight run out of the units.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for all the comments.

- We can look at relaxing the positioning of the building.
- Wayfinding is very important that will strengthen the connectedness and landscape narrative of the site.
- We are on board with the amenity comments and allowing buildings to Alder Street could solve a lot of the comments that have been made.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the development permit application for 519 East 1st Street – Moodyville Phase 3 and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below:

- Consideration towards additional separation between Buildings B+C and E+F and align with the lane as much as possible;
- Step back the façade of Building D at eastern property edge per the Design Guidelines;
- Further design development of the exterior access stairs;
- Consider using battered and angled landscape walls where possible to soften the stepping down of the site, creating more variety and interest;
- Encouraged to bring down the edges at the west side if possible;
- Consider providing more amenity space and family orientated programming, or enhance current amenities to connect to the rest of the site and be readily shared;
- Further development of the amenity areas and the stairs and suites that flank and access them. Consider the fenestration of the hallway and suites adjacent to the central amenity area;
- Ensure the visitor parking is separate from the residential parking while including a safe route to the bike storage room;

- Include a well laid out and clear unit identification plan with attention to the needs of emergency responders;
- Ensure all public spaces are well lit and have clear lines of sight to reflect CPTED principals;
- Consider adding natural light into the service areas, parking areas, stairwells and garbage and recycling rooms;
- Encourage working with the City to retain large onsite trees;
- Consider a wider variety of colour in the planting selection;
- Introducing more shade elements on the south facing glazing and identify appropriate rain protection overhangs elsewhere;
- Consider shared roof access to the greenspaces on Building A; and
- Present the silos in the context of the site to demonstrate the relationship of the grain elevators with the buildings.

AND THAT the Panel looks forward to reviewing the applicant's response at a future meeting.

K. Bracewell left the meeting at 7:53 p.m.

Break 7:53 p.m. – 8:02 p.m.

B. Jones joined the meeting at 8:02 p.m.

5. Discussion

There was a discussion on livability, submission contents, physical models, and room layout. The main points of discussion focused on what the Panel would like to see from delegations, including unit sizes and layouts, sustainability/livability aspects and added value (value for the community, owners, residents, tenants, etc.) in the proposals.

The Panel discussed possible changes to the Advisory Design Panel Submission and Presentation Guidelines and Checklist to include a more detailed written design rationale with respect to connectivity with the neighbourhood and providing a sense of community.

A suggestion was made for physical scale models and more complete digital models to be included in submission packages. It was resolved that the Committee Clerk send digital copies of the submissions to the Panel prior to the regularly scheduled meetings.

6. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, August 15th, 2018.

Chair

