

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON  
MAY 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2015 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING:           Mr. Kevin Hanvey  
                          Mr. Tieg Martin  
                          Ms. Liane McKenna  
                          Mr. Dan Parke  
                          Ms. Amy Tsang  
                          Sgt. Kevin Bracewell  
                          Mr. Samir Eidnani  
                          Ms. Annerieke Van Hoek

REGRETS:             Mr. Greg Travers

STAFF:                Mr. Frank Ducote  
                          Mr. Michael Hartford  
                          Ms. Casey Peters  
                          Ms. Lilian Arishenkoff  
                          Ms. Azam Ansari

The meeting came to order at 6:02 pm.

**1. MINUTES**

A motion was made and carried to adopt the minutes of the Advisory Panel meeting of April 9, 2015.

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Michael Hartford welcomed a new member to the Panel, Mr. Samir Eidnani. Mr. Hartford noted for the Panel Mr. Eidnani's area of expertise in code consulting and thanked him for volunteering his time and knowledge.

**3. NEW BUSINESS**

**a. 1634 and 1748 Capilano Rd – Preliminary Application for Rezoning and Development Permit for mixed-use development.**

Lilian Arishenkoff, District Planner, introduced the design team and gave a brief introduction to the project. The current zoning of the site is Tourist Commercial Zone (C4), the OCP designation is "Commercial Residential Mixed Use Level 1" and the site is part of the Lower Capilano Marine Village Centre Implementation Plan which allows for a range of density from 2.8 to 3.0 FSR for hotel use. Ms. Arishenkoff noted that the applicant is proposing to develop two lots currently occupied by Best Western and Comfort Inn with overall density of 3.85. The north and the south sides of the site are divided by a new Curling Road extension. The north side includes a 10 storey hotel with 170 rooms and full services including meeting rooms, ballrooms, restaurant, café, and spa. It was noted that adjacent and to the east of the hotel, is proposed a 5 storey, 33 unit rental unit building. Parking access to the hotel and the rental building is from the new Curling Road extension and parking on the north site is 228 parking spaces.

The south site includes a 22 storey residential strata highrise with 134 units, a 6 storey medium-rise strata building with 112 units and flanking townhouses. The development has just over 10,000 square feet of street level commercial space along Capilano Road. Ms. Arishenkoff concluded that a total of 311 parking spaces are provided for this portion of the site, with the parking entry from the new Curling Road extension.

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

Mr. Mark Thompson, Project Architect, reviewed the site location and surrounding area, noting that the site is a triangular shape located at the intersection of two road grids. It was noted that transit circulation has been an important influence on the site layout. Mr. Thompson noted the additional density requested beyond OCP limits is associated with the hotel use and the design team is attempting to provide a full service hospitality facility. Approximately 25% of the site area is absorbed by public realm areas, such as a plaza and the extension of Curling Road. Mr. Thompson reviewed the urban design rationale and noted that there will be a green wall on the hotel south elevation including a waterfall.

Mr. Thompson introduced Ms. Margo Long, Project Landscape Architect to review the landscape of the project. Ms. Long emphasized the following: 1) The bicycle and pedestrian paths fronting the project site are well connected to Crossroads Plaza and neighbourhood networks; 2) The arrival plaza at Curling Road extension and Capilano Road is intended to contribute to the project heart and emphasize the mews environment for Curling Road; 3) The design of the streetscape is intended to create inviting public spaces for pedestrians and cyclists, especially on Curling Road and McGuire Avenue.

It was noted the design elements for the private and common outdoor areas on rooftops will include stone, timber and natural elements. Ms. Long concluded that the wavelike shape of the boulevards is intended to reflect the river edge of the nearby Capilano River.

The Chair thanked the design team for their presentation and invited the Panel members to ask any questions of clarification.

Questions for clarification were asked of the design team on the following topics:

Is the timber proposed natural wood? Answer: Wood composite panel will be used.

What size of delivery vehicle can access the hotel loading area? Answer: There are two loading areas with one of them designed for a 30-40 foot long truck.

Has a traffic engineer reviewed the two loading areas with regard to traffic impacts? Answer: The design is early in the stages - the design team have been reviewing tour bus access and this should allow for truck movements as well.

Is the proposed hotel length 70 meters, and if so, have options to break up the length been explored? Answer: Yes, it is approximately 70 meters in length, and the design includes some elements to attempt to respond to the design guidelines regarding length.

What are the various access routes to the hotel entrance? Answer: The hotel can be accessed via a new traffic light at Curling Road and Capilano Road, the drop-off area on Curling Road extension, and from McGuire Ave and Hope Road.

Is the hotel parking separate from the residential parking? Answer: Yes, one gated parkade is designed for residents. There is parking for hotel guests secured with fencing, intended to allow visibility in the garage areas, in contrast to concrete walls.

What is the breakdown in parking for each of the proposed uses? Answer: There are 128 stalls for hotel guests and 302 stalls for residents. In addition, there are 43 spaces for commercial units and 66 spaces for residential visitors.

What is the rationale for the proposed increases in height and FSR? Answer: The high-rise building could be designed under OCP provisions with 18 storeys, but the design team believes the urban design is improved with a 22 storey height. The FSR increase is related to the desire to create a full-service hospitality facility including meeting spaces, ballrooms, spa and a swimming pool.

Has a public meeting been held? Answer: Yes, in addition to individual group consultation.

Has the south side open space been designed only for use of residents? Answer: Yes, it is exclusively for residents of the project.

How will traffic circulation from McGuire Ave to Curling Road work? Answer: The traffic circulation from McGuire Ave to Curling Road is only for service functions and tour buses.

Will the area be monitored by surveillance cameras? Answer: In some areas there will be surveillance cameras.

What is the face to face between the hotel and the residential building? Answer: The dimension is approximately 110 feet.

Will there be a road dedication for the purpose of widening Capilano Road and to provide cycling facilities? Answer: Yes, there will be a road dedication based on the "Urban Systems – Lower Capilano Functional Design Study" undertaken by the District.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and asked for comments from the District Urban Design Planner, Mr. Frank Ducote.

Mr. Ducote complimented the proposal as one which includes a well-thought out approach to urban design and which appears to contribute to the overall sense of place for the area. It was noted that the elevations of the two higher forms – the residential tower and the hotel - are treated in visually-interesting ways, with staggered balconies on the longer elevations, and interesting materials, fenestration and textures on their end walls.

Mr. Ducote questioned whether the amenity functions in the hotel could be deleted from the hotel to decrease the density and whether the rental building design justifies an increase in density beyond the OCP provisions. Mr. Ducote further observed that the hotel use might be better suited to the south side of the site as this would be closer to other commercial uses, the 5 storey building might work better as a 4 storey

building, and the shadow impacts on Capilano Road and the plaza on the north side of the hotel building need to be reviewed.

The Chair thanked Mr. Ducote and asked for comments from the Panel.

Panel members thanked the applicant for their presentation and remarked on the character of the buildings proposed, the green wall at the south end of the hotel, and the proposed mix of land uses.

Panel members suggested that the additional density requested for the hotel building may not be appropriate at this site.

A Panel member noted a number items for code compliance review, including emergency vehicle access from Curling Road, the need to maintain a nine meter separation between the scissor staircase exits, and the use of only non-combustible materials on the exterior.

Some concern was expressed regarding the width of Capilano Road at this location, whether there would be sufficient space to accommodate a suitable pedestrian space, and whether the proposed plaza spaces might end up being sacrificed to achieve traffic functions. Some concern was also expressed with the hotel loading area and the functionality of the proposed "tunnel element" of the service road. Panel members suggested that measures should be implemented to avoid drivers using Curling Road as a shortcut around traffic congestion on Capilano Road.

It was suggested that the proposed intensive green roof on the rental component could be better integrated with the overall approach to the landscaping for the project.

It was noted that the plaza area at the north side of the residential tower will be in shade much of the time, so adjustments to the siting/massing of the tower or the format of the plaza space might be beneficial.

Some concern was expressed from a solar gain point of view with regard to the glass facades on the east and west elevations.

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

Mr. Thompson thanked the Panel for their comments and responded that traffic management will be studied and that they will incorporate the comments made in the project.

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

**MOVED** by Tieg Martin and **SECONDED** by Amy Tsang:

**THAT** the ADP has reviewed the application, **supports** the general concept, and looks forward to a presentation at the detailed application stage which includes a review of the items raised by the Panel in its review of the project at the preliminary application stage.

**CARRIED**

**b. 467 Mountain Highway - Preliminary Application for Rezoning and Development Permit for mixed-use development**

Ms. Casey Peters, District Planner, reviewed the application and context noting that this site is located on the corner of Mountain Highway and Charlotte Road in the heart of Lower Lynn Valley Town Centre. The site surroundings consist of industrial, commercial, and residential uses as well as a District Fire Hall to the east and Seylynn Park to the north. It was noted that the site is designated in the Official Community Plan as "Commercial Mixed Used Level 3" (CRMU 3) which allows up to approximately 3.5 FSR and the Lower Lynn Implementation Plan suggests up to a 6 storey building form on this site.

Ms. Peters noted that this preliminary application is to rezone the site from Light Industrial Zone 3 (I3) to a new Comprehensive Development zone. A Development Permit for Form and Character, Energy and Water Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction, and Creek hazard is also required. The proposal is for a 6 storey mixed use development with 67 residential units and 4 commercial units. Access to the residential lobby and to the underground parking is from Charlotte Road. The building is designed around a courtyard and residential units have access from exterior walkways around the courtyard.

The Chair thanks Ms. Peters for her presentation and welcomed the applicant team to the meeting.

Mr. Walter Francl, the Project Architect, reviewed the project design and noted the benefits of the courtyard layout including more neighbour interactions, improved ventilation and allowing more light into units. It was noted that there will be commercial units along Mountain Highway. There will be two levels of underground parking and additional parking at grade. The massing will be emphasized on the corners of the building with timber elements on the exterior. The planting options and shadow studies were reviewed. The massing on the south elevation drops one floor to enhance the day lighting into the courtyard and to provide some variation of the streetwall to Charlotte Road.

Mr. Francl introduced Steven Vincent, the Landscape Architect for the project, who reviewed the landscaping. It was noted that the proposal has three levels of landscaping:

1. The streetscapes to include street trees and street furniture consistent with the Design Guidelines for the Lower Lynn area
2. On the second level, the courtyard space including a small play area, a seating area and individual unit patios. The courtyard design elements include wood, stepping stones, turf and large tables to animate the space.
3. At the top floor level, a private landscaped terrace area shared by two units.

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

Questions for clarification were asked of the design team on the following topics:

Is the north elevation building made of cementitious panel? Answer: Yes

Is this a wood frame building? Answer: Yes

What is the clearance between north wall and adjacent property? Answer: It is anticipated this will be a zero lot line condition and there will be an adjoining wall when the adjacent site redevelops.

Have noise studies been undertaken for residential units in other courtyard-oriented projects? Answer: No, but have worked with residents of other buildings and have not heard any noise complaints. Window selections will be made to minimize noises within the units.

Is there a mezzanine in the top floor? Answer: No, it is only a higher ceiling.

Clarification about material and color palette was asked. Answer: Intend to use as much wood as possible. It is not feasible to use wood siding on the exterior of the wood-frame building, instead more durable cementitious materials which will be used.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and asked for comments from the District Urban Planner, Mr. Frank Ducote.

Mr. Ducote noted that the project included an innovative layout that had not been seen before in the District. Mr. Ducote suggested that the shared open space did not appear to receive much sunlight and that the livability of the proposed west-facing units could be a challenge due to proximity to industrial uses.

The Chair thanked Mr. Ducote and asked for comments from the Panel members.

In general the panel was supportive of the courtyard format of the building, and particularly the opportunities for the courtyard to assist with ventilation. The Panel was generally supportive of the architectural expression of the exterior elevations. Some concern was noted regarding the impact of the adjacent industrial use on the residential units.

The usability of the courtyard was questioned due to the proposed size and potential for shading. It was noted that the format of the courtyard could benefit from further review to ensure that it functions appropriately. Panel members encouraged the use of natural materials in the courtyard and recommended that the design be softened. It was suggested that the size of trees in the courtyard and on the upper terrace areas should be reviewed to determine whether there would be enough soil depth for the plantings proposed.

For the street frontages, it was suggested that the project would be enhanced with increased street level plantings, rather than just street trees, along both Charlotte Road and Mountain Highway.

The break in the roof line on the south elevation of the upper floor was supported and Panel members commented that it appeared it would assist in providing additional light to the courtyard. It was suggested that some reconfiguration of the units on the south elevation could allow for even more sunlight into the courtyard.

It was suggested that the design team explore the option of rooftop decks to provide for additional private outdoor space.

It was questioned how the cladding of the north wall can be maintained given that it is located at the property line with no setback.



A Panel member noted a concern as to whether sufficient residential storage and bicycle storage was proposed, and how sufficient space would be made available for these functions. It was further noted that the waste and recycling facility location appeared to be in conflict with the lobby exits and should be reviewed.

It was noted that the lobby and amenity room both appear long and narrow and could perhaps benefit from different configurations.

It was suggested that the design team consider a different approach than the proposed extruded "frame" around some of the windows as this feature may date the building.

It was noted that the rendering of the building suggests the building is concrete construction and that given the wood-frame format, a more realistic representation of the appearance of the project would be appropriate at the detailed application stage. Related to this, it was noted that the renderings at the detailed stage should present a more realistic impression of the north wall of the project to better reflect the selected materials.

The applicant was encouraged to use a physical model of the project as part of the Panel's review at the detailed application stage.

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

Mr. Francl noted an appreciation for the Panel's comments and assured the Panel that their comments will be taken into account as the project moves to the detailed application.

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

**MOVED** by Annerieke Van Hoek and **SECONDED** by Dan Parke:

**THAT** the ADP has reviewed the application, **supports** the general concept, and looks forward to a presentation at the detailed application stage which includes a review of the items raised by the Panel in its review of the project at the preliminary application stage.

**CARRIED**

**c. Lower Capilano Marine Village Public Realm Design Guidelines**

Mr. Jessie Gresley-Jones, District Policy Planner, introduced the topic and noted that the Lower Capilano Marine Village public realm design guidelines have been developed through consultation with the public and through staff review with the consultants retained on the project.

It was noted that a public meeting is scheduled to be held shortly with the public being invited to comment on the draft proposals.

The vision for this area as stated in the Lower Capilano Marine Village Centre Implementation Plan is as follows: "The Village Centre serves as a gateway to the District and will function as a vibrant, walkable neighbourhood with local serving businesses, jobs, community recreation opportunities and a range of housing options."

Mr. Gresley-Jones pointed out that the purpose of the guidelines is to establish a design framework for future developments and to provide a consistency of theme, in form, character, colors and material elements for the public realm for Lower Capilano Town Centre and its peripheral area. The public realm guidelines are based on the land use concept shown in the village centre implementation plan. Mr. Gresley-Jones noted that public realm concept was inspired by the flowing water of the Capilano River and the architecture was informed by natural and diverse landscapes. The "river flow" concept was reviewed in detail and it was noted that the sidewalks in the area are proposed to be separated into three general zones to accommodate different pedestrian activities.

District staff reviewed the village centre's three distinct components including the heart, the streets, and the neighbourhood parks and open spaces.

The village green is a key element of the village heart and will act as a connection to residential neighbourhoods to the west, and as an area for public outdoor use. It is an integration of a play area, water features, soft landscape with open lawn areas, and a naturalized rainwater management feature.

The "Crossroads Plaza" at the village heart is the main link to the eastern part of the neighbourhood with weather-protected transit stops and a pedestrian crosswalk on Capilano Road. The Crossroads Plaza will be lighted by catenary light fixtures and features a canopy element, areas of crushed stone, evergreen trees, and low-level vegetation.

A "Gateway Plaza" is proposed at the southern entrance to the village centre. This will act as an important focal point at the intersection of the two major vehicular routes of Capilano Road and Marine Drive, and will include a public art element.

The central plaza will be a focal point for most community activities and events. There will be retail units at the corners facing the plaza and programming options will be assisted with power and water connections for various parts of the plaza.

It was noted that in the heart of the village centre there will be a new north/south road, formatted as a "woonerf" which will connect Fullerton Avenue to Curling Road. This is a shared, multi-modal road which has a curbless paving treatment and features that differentiate the sidewalk area from the parking and driving areas. The road design will facilitate comfortable use by pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles and will be formatted as an extension of the central plaza so that it can be closed off for larger-scale community events.

Mr. Gresley-Jones reviewed the neighbourhood parks and their connections in the village centre noting that within the parks there will be designated meeting places, playground areas and casual recreation spaces. It was noted that Belle Isle Park located to the west of the village heart will have a variety of seating types and tables and that the park space will be a benefit to the proposed nearby childcare facility. Staff pointed out that on the south-west of the village heart, a new park "Curling Road Park" will feature a sculpted berm, water play and slides, all for active play.



The Chair thanked Mr. Gresley-Jones and asked for comments from the Panel members. Panel members expressed a general appreciation for the guideline document and commended staff for the quality of the document and the clearly-organized presentation.

Some Panel members voiced a concern regarding the format of the bike lanes on Capilano Road and asked whether additional width will be added to Capilano Road to accommodate these facilities. Staff responded that the bike lanes will be separated with a 0.3m extruded concrete median with appropriate signage at the intersections and that road widening will be attained to accommodate this infrastructure.

A Panel member questioned whether the bike lanes are to be separated from pedestrian areas within the village centre. Staff commented that multi-modal paths will be shared with pedestrians in the greenway area and will be designed to accommodate this shared use.

It was suggested that there may be value in accentuating the entrances to the central plaza to ensure clear way-finding for the public.

Panel members noted support for the river theme and suggested that there may be value in extending the water theme to the buildings proposed for the village centre, as well as the public realm.

It was noted that perhaps consideration could be given to a pedestrian overpass on Capilano Road for pedestrians and cyclists to be able to avoid traffic and enable crossings.

Additional covered seating areas were encouraged in the plaza areas as a positive addition to the guidelines.

It was noted that it would be helpful for the guidelines to provide more explicit direction on how storm water management should be undertaken and monitored.

A Panel member commented that while the wood bollard lights appeared to be positive design element, they may be subject to vandalism. Staff noted in response that similar bollards are being used in Toronto with minimal problems.

It was suggested that proposed street furniture and lighting selections be confirmed as using sustainably harvested materials.

The Panel thanked the staff for the presentation, the quality of the design guideline document, and noted how well the guidelines outline the objectives. The Panel noted an interest in seeing the adopted guideline document, when available.

Staff thanked the Panel for their comments and noted that the comments will be used to help fine-tune the final version of the guideline document.

**4. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**5. NEXT MEETING**

June 11, 2015



---

Chair

JULY 9, 2015

---

Date