

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON  
JANUARY 16, 2014 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING:           Mr. Jim Paul  
                          Mr. Kevin Harvey  
                          Mr. Robert Heikkila  
                          Ms. Amy Tsang  
                          Ms. Liane McKenna  
                          Sgt. Kevin Bracewell

REGRETS:             Mr. Greg Travers

STAFF:                Ms. Casey Peters  
                          Mr. Michael Hartford  
                          Ms. Shannon Martino

The meeting came to order at 7:30 a.m..

**1. WELCOME NEW MEMBER**

Michael Hartford advised the Panel of the appointment of new member, Amy Tsang, who will be filling a vacant position for Landscape Architect. Mr. Hartford welcomed Ms. Tsang to the Panel and thanked her for volunteering her time and expertise.

**2. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**

Mr. Hartford advised the Panel that at the start of each year, the Panel elects a Chair and Vice Chair.

Nominations were called for the position of Chair and Mr. Jim Paul was nominated by a member of the Panel. A vote was called and Mr. Paul was unanimously elected to the position of Chair for the 2014 term.

Nominations were called for the position of Vice-Chair, and Ms. Liane McKenna was nominated by a member of the Panel. A vote was called and Ms. McKenna was unanimously elected to the position of Vice Chair for the 2014 term.

**3. MINUTES**

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of December 14, 2013.

**MOTION CARRIED**

**4. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

After welcoming Ms. Amy Tsang to the Panel, Michael Hartford reviewed with the members the following vacant positions.

1. One additional architect, to be nominated through AIBC
2. Visual Arts Specialist

3. Representative of the Building Industry
4. Representative of the Development Industry

Mr. Hartford encouraged Panel members to share the vacancies with colleagues, and to have any interested individuals contact the District for more information.

Michael Hartford concluded by outlining the ADP meeting process for the new panel member, Ms. Amy Tsang.

## **5. NEW BUSINESS**

### **a. 1325 /1335 Draycott Road – Preliminary application for rezoning and development permit for a 35 unit apartment project with underground parking.**

Ms. Casey Peters of the District Planning Department gave a brief overview of the application and site context. The development site is located on the south side of Draycott Road, east of Mountain Hwy. There are existing single family lots to the south, commercial buildings to the west and north, and an existing condominium apartment development to the east. The preliminary application proposes a rezoning of the properties to a new comprehensive development zone to accommodate the construction of 35 apartment units in one building. Included in the proposal are 58 parking spaces located in two levels of underground parking. The underground parking is to be accessed from the new north-south lane to be constructed at the east side of the site.

Ms. Peters noted that the District's Official Community Plan (OCP) identifies this site with two designations: three of the four parcels are designated "Residential Level 5: Low Density Apartment" and one parcel is "Residential Level 6: Medium Density Apartment". RES5 permits densities up to 1.75 FSR and RES6 permits densities up to 2.5 FSR. To determine the eligible density, the available square footage for each lot under each designation has been added together and the floor space has been averaged over the entire site for a total of 1.9 FSR.

Ms. Peters noted that the project will be subject to achieving "green building" targets, and making a commitment to the provision of public art.

The Chair thanked Ms. Peters, welcomed the applicant team to the meeting and outlined the procedure to be followed in reviewing the proposal.

The project architect, Mr. Joey Stevens of GBL Architects, introduced the design team to the Panel and began his presentation by noting the neighbouring buildings and land uses, including Maple Leaf Garden Centre to the north, and indicating how he hoped the proposal would help to improve the neighborhood.

The proposed five storey building is to consist of 35 units. The fifth floor is to be set back to help minimize the sense of mass. The design team's goal is to adhere to the 1.9 FSR limit.

Mr. Stevens showed a site plan and pointed out the proposed 24 foot lane dedication at the east side of the property that is to connect in future with the existing lane to the south, and eventually to Ross Road.

Mr. Stevens noted that because there is a grade change of 13 feet across the property, this has affected the driveway access located on the south-east side, as well as the massing of the building.

The setbacks for the project were reviewed, including reference to the deep 35 foot setback from the curb of Draycott Road. It was suggested that this setback will provide a large area for landscaping.

It was noted that the target market for the project is families and that the project is entirely two and three bedroom units of a relatively large size and each with spacious outdoor areas. In addition, the large amenity space at the north-west corner will allow for large children's play area and space to create a landscape design to be enjoyed by all age groups.

Material choices were inspired by the new Lynn Valley Library and Town Centre and include vertical cedar cladding, painted panels, accents of cedar throughout, and the use of roof overhangs to break up the building, highlight the lobby, to give a more residential feel to the project.

The project landscape architect, Ms. Senga Lindsay, spoke to the landscape design, noting that her goal was to increase the greenscape surrounding the project. To help provide buffering and privacy, the chosen plants include various evergreen species that will help meet these objectives throughout the year.

Ms. Lindsay noted that the proposed children's play area is to be formatted with an element of discover, and the elements have been chosen to be both attractive, and appealing to children.

The large roof overhangs for the patios will help to provide weather projection, and plantings around the perimeter will provide privacy screening and shading for units facing south. At the east side of the property, landscaping including trees and under plantings is proposed to be included within a 7 foot setback area along the new lane.

The plant pallette will include rich colors and evergreens that will be attractive through all four seasons.

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

Questions of clarification were asked on the following topics:

Fencing proposed along current parking lot on the west side of the children's play area?

Answer: Not proposed this time, but a combination of planting materials and a solid hedge will be provided to delineate this separation.

Function of waste disposal area? Answer: A stairway leads down to this area at the garage entrance, but some additional design work will be necessary to work out the details.

Is a grey colour palette proposed for the cementitious siding? Answer: Cedar accents will be included with a mix of muted colors, but the choice of colours is still being resolved.

Configuration of access gate to garage and setback of visitor parking from lane? Answer: Currently one gate is proposed. A couple of visitor parking stalls are in the setback area from the lane outside the gate, but there could be an additional gate added for visitor parking.

Resolution of outdoor security lighting. Answer: No, further work needs to be done on lighting.

Clarification of location of fencing on the south edge of property? Answer: There is a grade difference from the patios to grade level so there is no fence in this location. The proposal is to install privacy screens between patios, but at grade level there would be hedge plantings along the south property line.

Proposal consistent with height limit? Answer: There is no specific height restriction in the OCP, only a density limit, but the new comprehensive development zone will regulate height for the project.

Future plans for the lane access in the area? Answer (Michael Hartford): The Lynn Valley Town Centre plan calls for the new lane to the east to provide a north-south connection from Ross Road to Draycott Road. The east-west connection would be terminated to the west, preventing direct vehicle access onto Mountain Highway.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and staff for their clarifications and asked for comments from the District Urban Design Planner, Mr. Alfonso Tejada, to provide his comments based on the District of North Vancouver's Multi-Family Housing Guidelines.

Mr. Tejada was unable to attend the meeting; however Michael Hartford read the following comments into the minutes:

- Guideline: Public Realm and Streetscape Elements - Partial above grade parking structures should not exceed a height of 1 meter (3.0 feet) and the current proposal should consider some changes to reduce the parking structure height above grade on both the north and south elevations.
- Guideline: Built Form and Architectural Elements - Designs should ensure that access to the building is easy understood and the main access to the proposed building could benefit from a more legible entrance feature including the provision of weather protection.
- Guideline: Unit Identity and Relationship to the Street - Ground level units are encouraged to have front doors on the street and design that celebrates the unit identity and to add eyes on the street. Access to ground level units along Draycott Rd. should be considered.
- Guideline: Stepping Down a Slope - On sloping sites, building roof lines should step down the slope to reflect topography. The proposal should explore the possibility to step down the slope gradually to allow a better fit for the parking levels and for street access to units.
- Guideline: Endwalls - Where there is an exposed end wall, it should be designed and finished to be aesthetically pleasing. The east and west end walls of the building could benefit from some design development.  
This east and west, end walls should have a more interesting treatment, i.e. color, material bands or other approach to avoid a plain look toward neighbouring properties.
- Guideline: Building Materials and Transitions - Building should be faced with substantial and durable materials and detailing should avoid a "wallpaper" look. The frame element utilized at the main entrance could benefit from attention, to avoid a "wallpaper" look in the application of the materials.

Mr. Tejada's final comment was that the character of the building should emphasize a compatible residential identity with the existing context to the East and the eventual residential character to the west. The architectural precedents for this project should avoid the institutional or commercial character precedents shown in the design rationale package.

The Chair thanked Mr. Hartford for sharing the District Urban Design Planner's comments and invited input from the members of the Panel.

Panel members thanked the applicant for the presentation and an appreciation was noted in particular for the 3D context drawing that was provided in the information package. Panel members suggested that at the detailed stage there would be merit in providing a similar drawing to show how the project would relate to the "build out" of the Lynn Valley Town Centre.

Panel members suggested there would be value in exploring options to provide access to the individual dwelling units fronting on Draycott Road.

It was noted that the exposed concrete of the parking garage structure around the edges should be minimized as much as possible, as this was impairing the buildings relationship with the site. Related to this, it was suggested that the idea of stepping the building with the grade could help with the individual unit access issue. Further, the review of the relationship of the building to the Draycott Road frontage could benefit at the detailed application stage from a drawing showing the streetscape on Draycott and the building's relationship to it.

A member expressed some concern regarding the lack of design details for the east and west elevations of the proposed building and suggested that these areas could benefit from additional design development. It was further suggested that the entrance of the proposed building could be more strongly defined as a feature of the building.

With regard to the proposed children's play area, Panel members encouraged the exploration of opportunities for improved visual and sunlight penetration from the north and west, and the potential to include a second walkway adjacent to the area to provide more activity.

It was noted that the patios at the south are very generous in size but could benefit from additional soft landscaping between the patios to improve their usability and privacy.

It was noted that relatively little landscaping is being proposed at the ground level on the east and south sides of the building and having the garage structure coming out of the ground is a further challenge at these edges. A different approach to landscaping in these areas could help improve the relationship of the building to its site.

A Panel member suggested the need to think about the function of the garbage area to ensure that convenient access is available from an interior entry, and in particular that it is convenient to use for any disabled residents.

It was suggested that to avoid undesirable behavior, the design team consider a second garage gate at the garage entrance and also the installation of security lighting along the proposed lane at the east side of the property.

The need for some caution was noted with regard to the proposal for an emergency exit through the parking garage, as this could be a code compliance issue. It was also noted that

the interior configuration should be reconsidered as it appeared to show a prohibited unit entry from an exit lobby area.

It was further noted with regard to code compliance issues that given the base grade, the east elevation of the proposed building may be defined for code purposes as a 6 storey building and this could affect a number of code issues, including interior layouts of suites to accommodate fire walls.

With regard to the interior layout of the penthouse units, it was suggested that the interior layouts could benefit from some adjustments in order to take better advantage of the large deck areas proposed.

Members of the Panel expressed some concerns with the elements of the building that appeared to lend themselves more to concrete, than to frame, construction. It was suggested that if these elements are to remain part of the building, it will be important to resolve their detailing in order to ensure implementation of these elements is successful.

The Chair thanked the Panel for their comments and invited the project architect to respond to the comments made by the Panel.

Mr. Stevens thanked the Panel for their comments and input and noted that the design team will take the input into consideration as the design evolves. Mr. Stevens noted some agreement with the Panel's comments regarding landscaping at the east side of the site.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and invited the Panel to compose a motion.

**MOVED** by Kevin Hanvey and **SECONDED** by Liane McKenna.

THAT the ADP has reviewed the application, supports the general concept, and looks forward to a presentation at the detailed application stage that includes a review of the items raised by the Panel in their consideration of the proposal at the preliminary stage.

**MOTION CARRIED**

## **6. OTHER BUSINESS**

A Panel member asked a question regarding whether a conflict of interest is created should an applicant approach the member's firm for consulting services following the Panel's review of a project.

Mr. Hartford explained that the terms of reference for the Panel prevent a Panel member from participating in the review of a project with which they are involved, but do not preclude an applicant approaching a member of the Panel following the review. Should the application come back to the Panel for re-consideration and a member is involved with the consulting team at that time, the member would be asked to remove themselves from the consideration of the project.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was carried, and the meeting adjourned at 8:30 a.m.

**8. NEXT MEETING**

February 13, 2014

James R. Pace  
Chair

13 February 2014  
Date