

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
DECEMBER 10, 2015 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Kevin Harvey
Mr. Tieg Martin
Mr. Dan Parke
Mr. Greg Travers
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Ms. Annerieke Van Hoek

REGRETS: Ms. Amy Tsang
Mr. Samir Eidnani
Ms. Liane McKenna

STAFF: Mr. Michael Hartford
Ms. Natasha Letchford (Item 3 a.)
Ms. Ashley Rempel
Mr. Alfonso Tejada

The meeting came to order at 6:28 pm.

1. MINUTES

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of November 12, 2015. It was noted through discussion that minor corrections were required and amendments were suggested. A motion was passed to adopt the minutes as amended.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a. 3105 – 3115 Crescentview Drive – Detailed Application for OCP Amendment, Rezoning, and Development Permit for a 26 unit multi-family development.

Ms. Natasha Letchford, Community Planner, introduced the project and explained that the site is part of the Edgemont Village Centre, adjacent to an existing seniors' condominium building and single family homes. The site is zoned RSE, for single family uses, and the OCP designation for most of the site is "RES5: Low Density Apartment." The proposal would rezone the property to a CD Zone to allow for a 25 unit apartment building and one unit as a single family home, all over a shared underground parking garage. An OCP amendment is necessary for the westerly lot in the development, as it is currently designated for detached residential uses.

The Chair invited questions of clarification from the Panel and the following points were raised:

- Is a separate lot proposed for the single family home? The single family will be on the same lot as the apartment building - the particulars of the property configuration and whether this includes an airspace parcel are still being explored.
- Are any variances proposed? The necessary comprehensive development (CD) zone will be written to reflect the guidelines in the Edgemont Village “refresh” plan and the specifics of the development being proposed.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Ray Letkeman of Ray Letkeman Architects presented the project to the Panel. Mr. Letkeman made note of the following key points:

- The property assembly backs onto a ravine and is partly designated as a slope hazard and creek setback development permit area;
- The corner of Connaught Cres. and Crescentview Drive will be formatted as a small plaza area with public art and will serve as an entranceway to the shopping area;
- The northwest corner of the underground parking structure encroaches slightly into the creek setback area at the rear of the property. The parking garage, including the access ramp, has been positioned in a way to reduce impacts on the nearby single family residential uses, and no trees are proposed to be removed from the creek setback area;
- The geometry of the project layout reflects the street layout and property configuration and the project design attempts to highlight the angular context of the two portions of the apartment building;
- Raised roof features are proposed for each stack of units over the living room areas;
- Horizontal band features have been introduced to break up the 3 storey mass;
- Unit mix is primarily 2 bedroom units, with some 1 bedroom and 1 bedroom plus den units;
- Underground parking is on one level with 44 spaces proposed;
- Visitor parking is currently shown in an open area at the entrance to the garage, but could be secured with a security gate;
- Materials and colours include brick elements with two colours of “Hardi” panel, with wood elements to reflect the west coast setting;
- The single family home is set back 25 feet from Crescentview Drive to remain consistent with the zoning provisions for single family properties;
- The 1.5 storey single family home is proposed to utilize an airspace parcel for ownership, and an easement in the underground parking garage to provide for access.

Mr. Bill Harrison of Forma Design presented the landscape design with reference to the following key points:

- Gates are included from the street frontages to the ground level homes;
- Natural elements, including additional plantings along the rear of the property will provide a buffer for the ravine;
- The landscape design incorporates themes to reflect mountains, the forest, and rivers;
- A collection of trees in a grid pattern will provide a feature at the front entry, with seating on either side;
- The single family home will have its own street entrance with a “front yard” character;
- Street tree species remain to be decided with input from the District;
- Landscape design includes layered edges, but still provides for eyes on the street;
- Taller trees are proposed along the street frontages to provide for privacy.

The Chair thanked the applicant for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel. Questions were asked and answered on the following topics:

- Are the proposed large living room windows individual window units or “storefront-style” glazing? Living room windows are storefront glazing, all other windows are individual units;
- Is the corner post at the living room feature area integral to the window wall? Yes;
- Are additional details on the colour palette available? Black window frames in feature areas, cedar elements at entrance and balconies, two colours of Hardi-panel;
- Are there vertical break elements in the façade? Yes, on the Connaught Crescent side, but not around the corner on Crescentview.
- Why are the vertical breaks not consistent? There is a different unit type beyond the corner, which does not provide for the vertical break at a glazing edge;
- Why are there only two windows on the north side? Privacy concerns limited the number of windows on this elevation;
- Is access to underground visitor parking secured? This has not been resolved but could include a third gate at the top of the ramp;
- Why is the lawn area artificial turf? Artificial turf has been selected as there is no maintenance and it is considered environmentally friendly;
- What are the required setbacks for single family homes in the area? The required setbacks in the RSE Zoning are 25ft at the front and rear and 6ft from side lot lines. The proposed setbacks for the single family home are 30.5 ft. at the front, 25 ft. at the rear, 6 ft. to the adjacent existing house, and 12 ft. to the proposed apartment building;
- What are the undefined rooms in the floor plans? Dens, flex rooms, or storage.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Design Planner, provided the following comments:

- The project team has successfully responded to District input to date;
- The different roof elevations respond well to the context of the site and the surrounding buildings, with the building gradually scaling down to the single family homes to the east;
- Flat roofs can sometimes be repetitive and boring, but having the variations in the roof line help to make the building slimmer and less monotonous, breaking up the mass;
- Overall, the design, finishes, and colours of the project appear successful.

In their review, members of the Panel noted the following comments and items for consideration:

- The project is generally an attractive design, and represents an appropriate density for the location with successful transitions to adjacent properties;
- The floor plans include good accessibility on the second and third floors, with the exception of Unit D, which shows a 180 degree transfer in the bathrooms - this should be adjusted to provide for a 90 degree transfer;
- The location for the parking garage entrance works well on the site;
- The proposed single family home seems awkward - surface parking could be considered as an alternate option for this unit;
- Front yard setback for the detached dwelling seems too deep, and if reduced the dwelling could help to screen a portion of the adjacent apartment wall;
- Consideration should be given to the inclusion of an elevator for the single family home to allow for universal access to all floors, including the parking level;

- Third floor common corridors and individual “flex rooms” could benefit from daylighting either through windows or skylights, but if windows are used some attention should be paid to the appearance of the stairwells from the street;
- White vinyl windows seem harsh in contrast to the dark aluminum storefront glazing, and there may be merit in being more consistent with the colours of windows;
- The proposed storefront window walls work well with the brick pier elements and the brick elements on the building seem generally positive;
- There may be value in reconsidering the choice of the brick colour relative to the colour of the adjacent “Hardi” panel and the window walls. Another option to consider is deleting the brick piers.
- “Hardi” panel selections for the three storey elevations seem excessive - breaking this up with a variety of colour choices should be considered;
- Proposed elegant roofline is positive, but with the eaves interacting with the window walls - particularly along the south-west elevation - care will be needed in how these areas are detailed to ensure the elegance of the building is maintained;
- Floor plans show washrooms over the elevator machine room and this may need reconsideration as code requirements normally preclude services running through the machine room;
- North elevation seems plain, and could benefit from reconsideration;
- The approach to landscaping is generally positive;
- Given the relationship to the ravine and creek, there is a need to consider how to manage stormwater effectively;
- Bicycle room layout needs to be examined to ensure there is enough space to make it useable, and the potential for adding surface bicycle parking should be considered;
- Building layout generally provides good surveillance but the bicycle and visitor parking areas create some concern, and consideration should be given to securing these areas;

The Chair invited the project team to respond.

Mr. Letkeman thanked the Panel for their comments and noted the following points:

- Project team is committed to a thin eave to ensure an elegant roofline;
- Will explore adding an additional security gate at the top of the ramp;
- Regarding the material selections, the desire is that the glazing elements of the facades will predominate, but are willing to look at other options for the Hardi material selections to ensure a successful outcome;
- The approach to the bicycle storage can be revised to ensure a convenient format.

Mr. Harrison noted that the approach to stormwater management remains to be fully resolved, but the system will be designed to comply with District requirements, and the management of stormwater will take place on the site.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Tieg Martin and **SECONDED** by Anneriek Van Hoek:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the application and recommends **APPROVAL** of the project **SUBJECT** to addressing the items noted in the Panel’s consideration of the project.

CARRIED

Sgt. Kevin Bracewell departed the meeting at 7:29 pm.

b. Consideration of Design Excellence Awards

Michael Hartford, District Planner opened the floor for discussion about the six projects nominated for consideration of a Design Panel awards. Panel members summarized their reviews of the sites on the self-guided tour and shared their scores for the projects on a number of evaluation categories. Through discussion and review of the Panel members' scores it was concluded that two of the projects would be eligible to receive awards:

Award of Excellence: Kevington Building Corp. (Edgemont Commons) 3053 Edgemont Blvd.
Honourable Mention: Denna Homes (Beacon) 1550 Fern Street.

The Panel made the following comments about the award recipients:

"Edgemont Commons":

- "Successful, unique and innovative"
- "Building works well in this location"

"Beacon":

- "The level of execution and detail are well-managed"
- "Well-designed and well-built project in a challenging area"

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

January 14, 2016



Chair

FEB. 11, 2016

Date