MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON MARCH 14th, 2019 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER

ATTENDING:	Mr. Charles Leman Mr. Darren Burns Mr. James Blake Ms. Kim Smith Ms. Diana Zoe Coop Mr. Don Aldersley Mr. Stefen Elmitt Sgt. Kevin Bracewell Ms. Riva Nelson
REGRETS:	Mr. Steve Wong Ms. Carolyn Kennedy
STAFF:	Ms. Tamsin Guppy (Staff Liaison) Mr. Kevin Zhang (Item 3.a) Mr. Alfonso Tejada Ms. Taylor Jenks Ms. Casey Peters (Item 3.b.)

Mr. Darren Burns opened the meeting at 5:55pm

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Darren Burns, seconded by James Blake, and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of February 14th, 2019

Passed

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

- ADP awards confirmation
    - Ms. Tamsin Guppy Reviewed the results of the Panel's decisions on who the winners of the 2018 awards were and the titles of the awards, which were as follows:
        - Polygon, Cates Landing – Award of Merit
        - Brody Developments - Covo Townhouses – Award of Excellence (for architecture and implementation of the design only)
        - Boffo - Edgemont Walk – Award of Merit
        - Denna - Compass, Seylynn – Award of Merit.

- Ms. Guppy clarified the order of business during ADP presentations; reminding the Panel to ask questions first, and save comments for discussion period.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) **1371 McKeen Ave – Detailed Planning Application Phase 1A for Light Industrial Building**

Mr Darren Burns welcomed the applicant and clarified points of order for the applicant.

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team; Jim Spiers of Wesbild, Martin Nielson of Dialog and Matthew Thomson of Dialog introduced the project.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel.

Questions were asked and answered by the applicant team on the following topics:

- This project is the start of a master plan, has it been carried out? The subdivision application is in its preliminary stages and the current proposal includes an amenity parcel to the south.
- Where is the transit access from? Marine drive is the major transit point but potentially looking at a shuttle system to service this site, similar to the one that Seaspan offers.
- Have you accommodated a drop point for a shuttle on this site? Senator Road will have a drop-off / pick-up zone.
- Are there any other amenity spaces indoors other than on the roof? – In addition to the outdoor roof deck, there is an indoor kitchen and washroom facility on the roof.
- Have you considered that some of the employees would need accessibility measures? Yes there are accessible washrooms on every floor and universal access at the front door as well.
- Is this a strata? Yes, as currently proposed.
- What are the groundworks? It will be stone columns.
- Is it a cast in place concrete structure? Yes.
- Are there any health facilities like a gym? Not yet, but we have considered that and are working through some options.
- Is there a caretaker facility in the building or any live/work capacity? Not at this time, a caretaker's suite is permitted in the bylaw but at this time we are not going to go that route.
- Is the flood construction level established by the district? Ms. Guppy clarified that applicants undertake site-specific studies.
- Is the site fully serviced right now? It will be at the time of subdivision.
- The flood construction level seems low in comparison to the neighbours? By raising the site, we can reduce the risk associated and have a lower overall Flood Control Level.
- What uses are allowed in the zone? Employment Zone Industrial (EZI) is intended to facilitate Port uses and maintain the ability to have the rough and tumble industrial uses including service and manufacturing uses.
- Are you anticipating that it is going to be operating 24 hours a day? Potentially it could,

- Will it have a Mckeen Avenue address because the address is currently facing Senator Road, so how would you guide first responders? We have yet to design signage but will ensure it is visible, the access point will be on the corner of the building which is visible.
- Is the lower level parking going to be secured? Yes, it will be secured after regular working hours
- Is the parking space for employees and clients? Yes, during business hours it is for both, after five(ish) it will be fob access.
- Has there been any thought given to the territorial definition of parking to prevent people from using the parking for alternative activities? We will take that into consideration.
- Is the dark corrugated metal material being used for the long walls? Yes.
- Have you given thought to anti-graffiti materials? Yes we have included it up to 3 metres on the exterior walls
- Where is the waste management location? It is located on the NW corner of the building and to be used by all tenants.
- Have you done view studies with the increased ground height? We haven't done any view studies because we feel it is far enough away from any neighbouring residents and because of the height of the neighbouring Waste Water Treatment Plant which blocks the view of this building from Pemberton Heights. We did meet with the Pemberton Heights Community Association who didn't have any concerns.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, gave a brief presentation and provided the following comments for consideration:

- Relationship to McKeen Avenue – Mr. Tejada voice a concern with the orientation of the building and the resulting relationship to McKeen Avenue, raising a concern that the building would overpower the streetscape.
- The height in proportion to the neighbouring building is complimentary, but in relation to the street it's a large massing. The equivalent of nearly a 13 story residential building.
- Articulation of the building façade - It would be nice to follow the same vocabulary of the East/West elevations and create a stepped segment away from the road.
- North façade could benefit from some vertical articulation, breaking it up the same way you have the other ends of the building.
- The landscaping features are also nice contributions to the area.

The Chair invited comments from the Panel members, and the following comments and items for consideration were provided:

- Amenity space – the outdoor space could benefit from a covered area, since it does rain but it's still nice to be outside. Companies, such as the ones mentioned in the presentation as potential tenants, are interested in integrating lifestyle into their working spaces and therefore you may want to consider a stronger amenity package.
- Agree with Mr. Tejada in the need to articulate the façade, it's possible you could flip the North/South oriented buildings so that it steps up away from Mckeen to the rest of the buildings
- We don't yet have a master plan to review this against, so if we are to replicate the orientation of this building, the massing may become too intense. Slab after slab of

East/West oriented buildings, potentially change the direction of one or some of the buildings.

- If you created some verticality, for example windows that lined up with each other rather than being offset, then it would break up the scale
- Commend the team for the development of an exciting design, and the possibilities on such a large site
- The colours are a great start
- The mews has some walls that seem overly prominent.
- Question the lack of public art, you could go a long way with the marine/port theme.
- Leaving the Photovoltaic elements out is unfortunate, the tenants of the building will likely want to use this in the future so you might as well start that process off from the beginning.
- The building is big enough to support the live/work element and it could contribute to the life of the building so it should be considered.
- Height and massing, if there is anywhere to have over-height buildings, behind the sewage treatment plant would be the place.
- Tenants likely won't want to go to the third floor with a pallet, so expect offices at the top of the building.
- The roof level/amenity package isn't as thorough as it could be – is there a chance for a child minding service or school for the kids of employees. The roof should be a contribution to the lifestyle for the workers.
- Overall it is an impressive building and will be an interesting addition to North Van.
- From an access perspective, there should be a lot of thought put in to how people way-find on site from office to office or to exits, as well as for first responders who may need to find specific units/rooms.
- From a building code perspective, try to design for the permitted uses including Assembly uses.
- Given the area and minimal chance of 24 hr occupancy, you're going to have to discourage access to open areas in the evenings and weekends.
- In the mews area, there is going to have to be an exceptional lighting system both for the safety of employees exiting at night as well as discouraging alternate user groups from taking over the space.
- Echo the wayfinding comments, both for first responders and even for delivery in a tight space.
- Appreciate the large windows on the building which helps with surveillance on the property.
- The approach to the flood level is effective.
- Support the overall strategy for the site with tall strata units and saw tooth design at the lower levels.
- East/West orientation makes sense for views and solar orientation, but perhaps it should be pulled back from the street so that the shading doesn't cover the whole street. The building mass could be moved to mid-site instead.

- Alternatively, consider flipping the building and the bar elements as that would be that much more impactful as seen from Mckeen.
- Consider curating your tenant mix - Tenants are potentially going to benefit from the other tenants, and it could become a very dynamic workplace. If one of the businesses had more of a social purpose like catering or the like, it may help create a social network within the building.
- Surprised to see that there isn't a distinction between the north and south elevations, for example they have the same amount of glazing.
- How are you going to indicate corporate identity and business signage? It isn't incorporated into the design at all yet but would make the building stronger.
- The volume of waste is quite possibly going to exceed the space allocated for it, given the intended tenants. Same potential issue with the demand for space in the loading dock.
- The ground floor units don't have direct access to the loading dock, how do they get to the loading dock if they have larger shipments.
- The first floor tenants do not have individual elevated loading docks.
- Compliments on the all-glass side of the building, it feels like a warehouse from New York.
- Is the orange proposed in horizontal lines on the building more similar to the materials board or the renderings? It will be more like the materials board.
- Like to commend the team for their complete, easy to read application and package.
- Typology is excellent, the form feels like it could be an office and thought there would be a bit more density out of the bar building
- With 40% glazing there is room to excel in regards to energy efficiency and resource use.

The Chair invited the applicant to respond to the Panel's comments, and the following comments were provided:

- The public art isn't required but we are looking into the possibility, the goal is to tell a story about what the site is about, with street signs and pieces leading down to the waterfront.
- The rooftop amenities are definitely something that need to be flushed out, the goal is that these will become employment centers and we need to include things that are attractive to users of the space.
- In regards to CPTED, we haven't worked out the perimeter issues and nighttime access yet, there are a lot of details that need to be refined.
- Appreciate the combination of minds and access to the ideas of the panel, as well as the direct comments regarding CPTED.
- There is a daycare operator interested in the space and the discussion has started.
- In regards to the orientation of the building and the rest of the site, there are a number of other uses intended for this subdivision therefore a number of other buildings and building types, so it won't end up being a wall of bar buildings. Potentially a mirrored

building next door to compliment the mews area, but the intention is to create the first building at the entrance and set the tone for the future of the site.

Question from the applicant - What is the overall thought on the height variance?
Response from Mr. Burns. Based on comments from the panel and the visions of the OCP, what you have laid out seems appropriate. The articulation of the height will make a difference as to how it is received because the Mckeen frontage feels a little tight at the moment.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Ms. Diana Zoe Coop and **SECONDED** by Mr. Stefen Elmitt

That the ADP has reviewed the proposal and commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal, and recommends approval of the project subject to addressing to the satisfaction of staff the items noted by the Panel in its review of the project.

CARRIED

b.) 1565 – 1589 Rupert Street – 6 Storey rental building with 95 units.

Ms. Casey Peters, Development Planner, introduced the project, and explained the context.

There was a question of clarification from the panel regarding the recommended height in this area. Ms. Peters responded that the proposal is in keeping with Implementation Plan for the area.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team, and Reza Salehi of Salehi Architecture Inc. and Gerry Eckford of ETA Landscape Architect introduced the project.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel.

Questions were asked and answered on the following topics:

- How do kids in the building access the park? There are two options: out the front door to the Green Spine on the west side of the building or out the southern exit into the amenity space and via a path to the Green Spine.
- Looking for clarification on the grade shown in elevation drawings on page 11; on the lane to the south of the building the elevation of the lane in comparison to that of the site. The elevation will likely change with closure of the lane to the south.
    - The East/West lanes In Lynn Creek are to be closed and consolidated with development sites. The existing lane will remain open until the property to the south develops at which point the lane would be sold and assembled with that development. There is a requirement for projects in Lynn Creek to address the Flood Construction Level.
- What is happening with the cul-de-sac at the right of the property? That is part of the First Nations Territory and is therefore not in District jurisdiction, the boundary is at the east side of Orwell street.

- Has there been conversation with Squamish First Nation about the development? The District of North Vancouver sends notification letters but in the past haven't had much response. They were involved in the planning process for the Lynn Creek Town Centre on an on-going basis with District staff.
- For the purposes of this application we are assuming that Orwell Street stops mid block? Ms. Peters clarified that this portion of Orwell Street will be opened to the existing lane as part of this development.
- How do you access the bike storage? They can be accessed down the ramps or down the elevator.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, gave a brief presentation and provided the following comments for consideration:

- Concerns with the edges of the site to the North, East and West.
    - Challenge is to integrate utilities without conflicting with the front of the building. They are currently treated as a separate entity rather than considered in design.
    - Encourage keeping the corner of the building as focused on residential as possible, rather than utilities.
    - The long ramp on Orwell is reducing the possibility of having a residential presence.
    - Could propose a parking entrance to the south of the building that serves both this property and a future development to the south.
- The same character that is along Rupert should be continued on the west side along the green spine as well.
- The entrance along the green spine is a secondary entrance and needs to have a presence, it could be emphasized as a residential entrance with a gate or a covered entrance/exit rather than just appearing as a service entrance.
- In trying to articulate the blocks of windows on the front of the building, the centre section seems weaker and is lacking a relationship to the others. It appears as just two thin posts supporting the overhang.
- The corner of the building on Rupert is almost blind to the corner of the street.

The Chair invited comments from the Panel members, and the following comments and items for consideration were provided:

- The elevation drawings appear to have a significant change in grade at the location where it was suggested that the park access would be located. It was clarified by the applicant that there is a set of stairs leading down to the Green Spine.
- Consider having the amenity space to the west of the building rather than the south as a future building to the south could impact the privacy and light.
- All of the accessible units are located in the northwest corner of the building. Consider a ramp into the units on the first floor so they can have direct access into the unit. It was confirmed that this ramp is already included.

- Would the unit also have a lip going into it from the patio? No there is a maximum ½ inch lip which would likely be manageable.
- Appreciate that the accessible parking spaces are side by side with a shared cross-hatch pattern which enables van loading. The applicant is encouraged to continue the cross-hatch all the way to the elevator.
- If the lane is closing, the applicant could consider putting the access to parking at the rear of the building. Could separate the grade difference with a retaining wall.
    - Ms. Peters responded by saying that the east/west lane will be closed but the entrance could be moved to the south east corner of the building off Orwell Street.
- Encourage the applicant to relocate the garbage staging area from the prominent corner to somewhere more discreet
- There is currently only one accessible entrance to the building. If the entrance to the west is going to be enhanced, consider including a ramp for a secondary accessible entrance and access to the green space at the west of the building.
- At 8'10" the height of the parkade will be pretty tight to get a van into, the typical height for newer buildings is usually a little higher.
- With a 1.0 FSR bonus, we should not be allowing any compromises with building materials.
- The units are maximized and thought-out; the layout of infrastructure is well-designed.
- The perimeter, especially on the Northeast corner is struggling. There doesn't need to be a garbage staging area at the top of the ramp, it is already at the base of the ramp, and the PMT doesn't need to be encased.
- The east facing wall at the top of the ramp is currently blank and needs some softening.
- On the Southeast corner, it seems odd to suspend the detention tank, instead it could be liveable space.
- There are some accessibility issues with corridor widths, and placing fridges next to doors etc.
- In-bound bedrooms are not ideal and should be reconsidered.
- The package is lacking information that helps with evaluation for example a materials board.
- The location of the ramp perpendicular to Orwell Street should be re-evaluated as well as the parkade access at the corner of the building.
- Comments on materiality, the vertical corrugated metal is difficult to use in this setting. The rest is composed of Hardie panel, but we should instead be using materials that are more appropriate for their intended uses.

The Chair invited the applicant to respond to the Panel's comments.

- The parkade access has been reviewed with the planning department and it seemed this was the latest option proposed.
    - Ms. Peters clarified again that Orwell Street will be opened up with this application and the ability to use it for access will be available.

- The applicant noted that the services at the front of the building are required; they tried to choose areas that have the least amount of impact on units but it comes down to the availability of Orwell Street.
    - Mr. Tejada noted that the way the utilities are treated is the issue as they aren't incorporated into the design.
- An attempt was made to address the blank wall on the east of the property with the difference in plane between the first and second floor units.
    - Mr. Tejada clarified that the ground level and its relation to human scale is the one that needs addressing.
- On the north elevation, the middle set of balconies is different to try and define the entry rather than making it the same as the other two. We can look at the proportion of the column size if that would help.

The applicant team thanked the Panel for their comments.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Mr. Stefen Elmitt and **SECONDED** by Mr. Don Aldersley

That the ADP has reviewed the proposal and cannot support the general concept and recommends reconsideration of the proposal to address the items noted by the panel and look forward to a presentation at the detailed application stage of the new concept.

CARRIED

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

April 11th, 2019

Chair

April 11/19
Date