

**Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel
Held at City Hall, 141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, B.C.
In Conference Room A on Wednesday, June 20th, 2018**

MINUTES

- Present:** W. Chong
K. Yushmanova
B. Phillips
B. Harrison
N. Petrie
K. Bracewell, RCMP
M. Messer
- Staff:** D. Johnson, Development Planner
M. Holm, Manager – Development Services
M. Friesen, Planner
G. Reyes, Development Technician
R. Fish, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** 339-349 East 13th Street (Rezoning Application)
Joe Muego, Hearth Architectural Inc.
Harry Haggard, Harry Haggard Landscape Architect
Marco De Cotiis, Cobblestone Fina Development Group
- 242-244 East 19th Street (Rezoning Application)
Thomas Grimwood, Grimwood Architecture
David Rose, PD Group Landscape Architecture Ltd.
Sukey Mehat, Bolder Homes Ltd.
Benjamin Han, Grimwood Architecture
Tanita Cherian, Grimwood Architecture
- Absent:** B. Jones
C. McLeod
J-P. Mahé
-

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

In the absence of the Chair, Vice Chair B. Harrison chaired the meeting.

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held May 16th, 2018

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held May 16th, 2018 be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. **Business Arising**

None.

3. **Staff Update**

D. Johnson reviewed the status of ongoing development projects.

B. Harrison thanked staff for bringing forward more complete packages for the Panel and Council to review as well as including a mix of more affordable units in a variety of forms and character. Staff were acknowledged for their hard work.

4. **339-349 East 13th Street (Rezoning Application)**

The City has received a development application to rezone 339, 345 & 349 East 13th Street to support the development of a stratified duplex and infill unit on each of the lots. The applicant is not proposing accessory suites in the development, therefore each lot would host 3 dwelling units. The site is located mid-block on East 13th Street, between St. Andrews and Ridgeway Avenues.

The existing zoning is Two-Unit Residential 1A (RT-1A), and the applicant is proposing a comprehensive development zone using the RT-1A zone as a base. The development is being led by Joe Muego of Hearth Architectural Inc.

Staff is seeking the Panel's input regarding the following:

- The proposed site design including: separation of units/buildings, setbacks, scale, the parking design, and any potential CPTED concerns;
- Architectural style, differentiation of units, the application of façade materials, the proposed colour pallet, and strategies to minimize illegal suites; and
- The proposed landscape plan, including stormwater management, delineation of backyard between units, and the planting plan.

Joe Muego, Hearth Architectural Inc., described the project to the Panel:

- We want to make sure we are being respectful of the OCP and introduce alternative housing types that have not been typically seen in the area and address affordability.
- Address CPTED and livability issues by breaking apart the forms.
- Asking for a 3ft relaxation for the setback to a 22ft setback.
- 3 car garage for each site as well as open parking, for a total of 4 parking spots.
- Entrances to the infill buildings at the back are visible from the street.
- Infill dwelling units are fairly modest, similar to the scale of a coach house.
- More durable product than wood, cementitious board, heritage colours.
- Included decks for outdoor living space as well as landscape pieces.

Harry Haggard, Harry Haggard Landscape Architect, reviewed the landscape plan:

- In the backyard areas there are raised beds for gardening with lawns.
- Flowering plants and screening for private areas.
- There is more landscape space between the buildings as well.
- Incorporated interesting, year round colours.

- There is a rain garden on each lot to help mitigate water going into the City's system with retention tanks on each property beside the garages to increase the sustainability of the development.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Are there any fences? **A:** We are trying to reduce the number of fences, but there is not a proposed significant fence. We could put a 4ft fence at the end for a sense of ownership. The planting and landscaping should make it feel like a private space.
- The rain garden is under the existing trees, what are they? **A:** They are sighted to be removed. They aren't in very good repair, we are adding a net 13 trees to the project. The rain garden won't impact that.
- Is there a full sightline from north to south for grade changes? **A:** No.
- What is the grade difference between the deck and the pathway that runs west/east? **A:** It's almost level, but we do step down a bit and have an increase in elevation.
- Is there a reason for not doing privacy screening between the 13th Street units and the smaller units in the middle? **A:** We could add some screening, it's just such a small space. We could look at enhancing the planting for those units.
- In the basements there appears to be three opportunities for glass and light, have you considered this? **A:** We did look at this, we had larger dugouts at the back but because of the rules with enclosures onto the buildings, it wouldn't have been possible for us. We can look at adding additional light wells.
- What is the growth rate of the 3 sequoias? **A:** 12-15ft.
- There's an opportunity to look at doing mixed tones or compatible colour tones for the siding, have you considered this? **A:** Yes, that's possible. We tried to break it up with the texture.
- What is the rationale for adding exterior stairs down to each of the basements, does it impact the site plan? **A:** There's uneasiness about not having an external exit with basements due to safety.
- Is there a plan in place for a covenant with City for secondary suites? **A:** We can consider this.
- What is the rationale for the bedroom sizes? **A:** They are condo sized but we want to give opportunities for young families to get started.
- Lot 339, the infill is set to the east, what is the rationale to lay it out this way? **A:** To retain the trees and make use of the shade. We looked at going back but the pathway networks work better this way.
- Is there a lighting plan? **A:** Yes. There is lighting on the corners of the buildings and by the outdoor car parking areas.
- Do you have a tree management plan? **A:** No extensive tree management plan.
- What about trees in the front? **A:** Hedgerow, pine and hemlock.
- How many trees are being taken out? **A:** 16.
- To staff: is there a concern about illegal suites that are not allowed by zone? **A:** If the applicant wanted to apply and accommodate their parking they could.
- What is the distance between the window wells? **A:** 6ft from edge to edge.
- Have you tried furniture layouts? **A:** Yes.
- Have you thought of a different configuration for the central lot? **A:** Yes, but there is enough visual interest between the units.
- Is there an opportunity to create a sense of separation for the infill units at the front? **A:** There will be address signs up closer to the street referring to the rear.
- Are all walkways concrete? **A:** Yes, or better.
- What is the rationale for using the Magnolia trees? **A:** They are evergreen, provide a good large flower, year round.

- There is a concern around safety relating to the corridor between the west and central building? **A:** We can include gates at both ends to mitigate this.
- How are you defining territoriality of the major access point between the east and central building where the car ports are? **A:** Low fencing would create that notion and separation between public and private.
- Are lines of sight clear through both pathways? **A:** Yes.
- What is the square footage of the infill basements? **A:** 575 sq. ft., the duplexes are 610 sq. ft.
- How does the stepping work along the sides of the lot lines for the neighbours? **A:** We are meaning to keep the topography similar and level with the neighbour.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Need to have defined territoriality so people don't assume they can go into said areas.
- Consider unit identification for east most unit, emergency responders need to be directed to rear buildings.
- Struggle with understanding landscape plan legibility, improve quality and planting location.
- Overall concept issues, there's so much worry about efficiency that the proposal is not liveable.
- Figure out how to make basements into suites. If that's not possible, that basement is not good the way it is, there's no light and it's walled in on all sides.
- A 6ft separation between two buildings is not good.
- Improve overall site planning, there is a lot of circulation and no consistent forms.
- Landscape plan needs a lot of work.
- Issues with the tree selection, the Magnolias are big trees on a small site, better choices are available. Don't understand the placement of the trees.
- The garden beds are massive and don't provide privacy between the front and back.
- Use unit pavers for pathways and better materials that are residential.
- Architecturally the package could be clearer for the Panel to review.
- Intention for this is unique, what's strong is the pavilion like buildings. It gets lost in economizing the buildings. Needs more design development for the paths.
- Move lot 339 to the west to eliminate the very narrow corridor.
- Highlight the figured ground with lighting and improve the paving and landscaping.
- Remove the stairwells to the basements to free up green space, and remove walkways to the basements.
- Include privacy hedges between the infill buildings.
- Review the bedroom layout sizes to be more liveable.
- Look at colour changes, mix and break it up.
- Light in the basement areas is important, figure ways of changing the landscape that allows for more light.
- Street presence needs entry structures that would support signage and create boundary and definition to the project.
- Get elevations around all parts of the buildings, windows will be directly facing the neighbours. Consider shifting the units to create diversity.
- Change the pathways, putting a single one between the units to the east.
- Include a stepped planter between the deck and the pathway to mitigate the privacy issue between the units. Fencing along the edges is important.
- Consider an e-bike plug-in.

Presenter's comments:

- At the public information meeting, people were opposed to the notion of suites or additional density primarily due to parking.
- No buildings are less than 10 feet apart.
- We will find a way to make the spaces more liveable.
- For the most western unit we struggled with identification for the unit from the street.
- Thank you for all the comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 339-349 East 13th Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the issues listed below:

- Develop circulation around the site for increased CPTED considerations regarding territoriality, lighting and clear unit identification for first responders;
- Inclusion of a comprehensive grading and lighting plan;
- Review of the narrow walkway between west and central garages;
- Consider the separation of the properties with a fence or plant material to address territoriality issues;
- Review opportunities for overlook and privacy issues between units;
- Further design development of scale and sense of place with consideration of a common community area for gathering;
- Address site planning and floorplan layout issues around livability, including room size and solar access of basements;
- Further definition of street presence and how the buildings work in tandem but also in isolation;
- Explore varying colour options and detailing of the façade;
- Consider the removal of exterior access stairs to the basements, or better defend their inclusion;
- Review the landscape plan thoroughly with respect to circulation, lighting and plant selection;
- Ensure all plants are legible in the landscape plan;
- Include tree management report;
- Consider the use of pavers for the pathways;
- Include a storm water management plan;
- Review building placement in response to the removal of the trees;
- Develop a more detailed sketch up model; and
- Ensure the overall submission package is presented cohesively.

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

Carried Unanimously

Break 7:00PM – 7:05PM

5. 242-244 East 19th Street (Rezoning Application)

The subject site is located on the south side of the 200 block of East 19th Street, between St. Georges Avenue to the west and St. Andrews Avenue to the east. The proposed four-plex is contained in two separate front-to-back duplex buildings with a main pathway running in-

between the two buildings to the lane that proposes two double garages, a visitor's stall, a garbage and recycling room and secured bike storage. The main pedestrian access is off of East 19th Street with the entrances of each unit being visible from the street. This is achieved by the rear units being inwardly offset from the front to expose the main entrances to the street, thereby creating a funnelling effect as one walks through the site to the back. Vehicle parking is accessed directly off of the rear lane.

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

- Overall site design;
- The architectural presentation of the proposal; and
- The overall landscaping proposal.

Thomas Grimwood, Grimwood Architecture, described the project to the Panel:

- An information session was held with strong support and was well received.
- Nice entry experience and rear units have a presence from East 19th Street.
- Simple building form and roof line.
- Roofline is extended to create generous weather protection.
- North units are terraced down.
- Each unit has private outdoor space on north or south.
- The second level extends out to create a covered outdoor patio.
- Open concept kitchen, living, and dining.
- There are exterior stairs to basements on either side.
- The basement and main level are interconnected.
- There is an enclosed garbage and recycling area with bike storage.
- Sloped pathway with stairs that step up from East 19th Street.
- Stained natural cedar with vertical composite panels, black windows, simple materials and colours.

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

- 9ft grade difference between laneway and road, used to good effect with steps and terracing of planters.
- Rear yards are screened from the central pathway with a hedge.
- Permeable paving on open car parking.
- Reinforced gravel side yards.
- Paving that leads to the entrances.
- Two street trees.
- Screening around elevated patios at the front.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Is the garbage and recycling room secured and locked? **A:** Yes, it is enclosed.
- With a lock? **A:** It can be.
- Is there territoriality definition at the rear? **A:** There are 3 points of access into the site. It's not shown as gated.
- What are you using for lighting? **A:** There are lights at the steps and 1 or 2 bollard lights.
- How are the suites identified to first responders? **A:** The units are numbered on the bottom and at the back, we could have them illuminated.
- There is nothing street side indicating the rear units? **A:** No.

- Can you describe the planting list and materials? **A:** 55% native, 45% ornamentals, hedges for screening, mixture of evergreens and perennials low planting down the center and screen planters around the front which are grassy, Douglas Maples at the front and small Magnolias at the side.
- Are there unit pavers in the central path? **A:** Yes, with a natural colour.
- Did accessibility come in to mind with the project? **A:** It would be possible to maintain access to the units, not as currently shown but with some minor revisions. The front units could be accessible from the side.
- Have you considered alternating the windows so they aren't facing each other? **A:** We can look into this.
- Have you discussed with the City about converting the basements into suites? **A:** That's not the intention.
- What is the size of the bedrooms? **A:** The minimum width is 9ft. It may be 8x6.
- What is the material of the gates into private units in the back? **A:** It will be a wood fence.
- How wide are the stairs to the basement? **A:** 3ft.
- The lawn areas are at the back and rear? **A:** Yes.
- What material will it be? **A:** Real grass.
- Is this not an issue with maintenance? **A:** No.
- Will this plan be irrigated? **A:** That hasn't been worked out yet but it should be.
- Is there any provision that the basements can be turned into legal suites easily? Will they be constructed to support a suite? **A:** No. We're not sure the City would approve that.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Consider an elegant metal fence at the back.
- Garbage recycling and bike storage needs to be screened or covered and securely locked up without signage.
- Lighting is important on the building or in the landscape, pathway and building edge.
- Make sure there is a plant list.
- There's an opportunity for more glazing down the exterior stairs to basement.
- Consider a covenant with the City for future secondary suites.
- Recommend alternating the window placement for a less direct view into other units.
- Add windows into upper stairwells for natural light.
- Recommend adding secured gates on the three pathways at the rear of the property.
- Add two more bicycle storages in front of parking stall three or extend the storage south into the planter zone. You could have two in front of the non-covered carpark.
- Simplicity will rely on the detailing being refined, this requires more thought.
- Doors to the rear could be another colour to help identify them for first responders.
- The landscape follows the overall simplicity of the architecture but the devil will be in the details for the overall success.
- Look carefully at the dimensions of the pavers and orientation of it on the lot.
- Encouraged to look at bringing the balcony features into the fencing material.
- Single rows of plants at the property line are not very viable, this needs to be bigger or removed. Think about how it works in the plan.
- Consider territoriality and the two movement predictors, especially with the divisions in the rear laneway.
- Include a robust lighting plan.
- Consider unit identification at the front indicating to go down the path.
- Consider the use of faux turf.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for all the comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the rezoning application for 242-244 East 19th Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Pay attention to the detailing of the building, roof and interface of the facade materials;
- Explore a more seamless and expressed interaction between the building architecture and landscape architecture;
- Include a robust exterior and interior site lighting plan;
- Consider the addition of more light penetration in the exterior stairwells to the basements rear units as well as the upper floors;
- Further design development of window placement to mitigate privacy issues between units;
- Ensure clear unit identification from 19th Street for first responders;
- Address bike storage and garbage/recycling room to address CPTED issues;
- Consider including and conveniently locating 4 e-bike charging stations; and
- Work with the City's Parks Department to review and approve the plant list.

AND THAT the Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation

Carried Unanimously

6. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, July 18th, 2018.

Chair

