

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
MARCH 8, 2018 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Jordan Levine (Chair)
 Mr. Steve Wong
 Mr. Stefen Elmitt
 Ms. Carolyn Kennedy
 Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
 Mr. Darren Burns
 Mr. Charles Leman
 Mr. Samir Eidnani
 Mr. Tieg Martin

REGRETS: Ms. Diana Zoe Coop

STAFF: Ms. Tamsin Guppy
 Mr. Alfonso Tejada
 Mr. Adam Wright
 Mr. Michael Hartford (Item 3.a.)
 Mr. Erik Wilhelm (Item 3.b.)

The meeting came to order at 6:05 pm.

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of February 8, 2018.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Awards Night:

- Reminder of the upcoming ADP Awards Night: Tuesday March 13th 2018.
 - The Panel decided in its January 2018 meeting that there will be one “Award of Excellence” Winner, Delbrook Community Recreation Centre (851 West Queens Road) as well as one “Honorable Mention,” Walter’s Place (1325 Draycott Road).

Other Information:

- Following a presentation on landscape design by a junior member of a landscape architecture firm, it was requested that we follow up with the BC Society of Landscape Architects BCSLA – the BCSLA confirmed that the preference is that presentations to advisory design panels should whenever possible be done by a landscape architect who is registered and in good standing with the BCSLA.
- It was decided that the Panel will try holding only one question period per application, in order to keep the meeting on time.
- The Panel noted that while some applicants and Panel members may need a gentle reminder to stay on time, there is some flexibility when items require further discussion.
- Ms. Tamsin Guppy recognized the notion that some application packages are higher quality than others, and that the District of North Vancouver has a standard for the ADP application packages that includes specific submission criteria and that effort is made to work with applicants to achieve that standard.
- Ms. Tamsin Guppy conveyed that the District has a Public Art Advisory Committee that supports the development of policy, procedures, and recommendations for public art in the District.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 480 Mountain Highway and 1521-1543 Hunter Street – Intergulf East / Fire Hall Site - Detailed Planning Application – Rezoning with Development Permit for 198 Strata units, 26 below-market rental units, and approximately 434 m² (4,667 sq. ft.) of commercial space.

Mr. Michael Hartford, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Jim Heinmiller, architect from Ramsay Worden Architects and Gerry Eckford, from ETA Landscape Architects 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:

- Where is the elevator machine room located? There is a penthouse in the roof area that contains the elevator machine room.
- Does the elevator go to the top of the building? The elevator does not go up to the top floor, it is accessed by stairs only.

- So the graphic of the roof on page DP2.13 is not correct? Correct, the graphic is incorrect.
- Has the large planter in the plaza been cut in half? Yes, to provide better circulation. Access to and from the parking area also flows right into the plaza to support traffic flow.
- Can we have a further explanation on the materials? The tower will consist of solid panels and are Swisspearl cementitious panels, the glazing is spandrel glass panels, and the privacy screen will have a muted palette.
- You had previously showed using concentric circles to animate the plaza floor, what design did you end up using? It is a diagonal pattern that stretches across and bands through the plaza back and forth, we are looking to have a piazza concrete in a couple different tones of grey.
- With the 25 stories, what is the deciding factor before installing on a third elevator? Basically it relates to the number of floors in the building. We haven't retained an elevator consult. On the previous building it was 27 floors with 2 elevators, and both the speed and size of the elevator was increased, so we had a consultant look at that and are working off of a similar design.
- A roof deck is considered a story – you are supposed to have roof access – you may have to play with the height of the elevator, and speak with an elevator consultant.
- What kind of slab is on level 1, is that PT slab? We haven't got to that level of detail yet.
- Does the parking access off the lane have a gate? I believe not.
- There will be 24 hour access to visitor parking? Yes, that will have to be addressed.
- As a first responder, like ambulance or police, how would I know where to go? You would go to the lower lobby for direction.
- What is the height relaxation amount, is it not cast in stone? (Mr. Michael Hartford, Development Planner): The Lower Lynn Implementation Plan sets some recommended heights for buildings, I believe for this site it is 22 stories, however, those are not part of a bylaw, they are recommendations. The applicant has said that it is difficult to achieve the density on this site with the existing height recommendations, so we have allowed for the added height, although ultimately it will be Council's decision on whether to approve the rezoning.
- What are the building materials that make up the balconies? We haven't done detailed development on that at this point. There will be a glass guard rail, the underside of balconies will be concrete, we could clad it, we have not given that a lot of consideration just yet.
- In terms of sustainability, what building standard are we looking at achieving? Step Code 3 for the tower and Step Code 1 for the commercial areas. We are looking at having a glazing area at roughly around 50% and solid area of 50%. In the low rise area, the glazing area is around 35%.

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

The main issues include:

- Could improve elements in both the top of tower and the base.
- The identities of the CRUs could be explored and developed further.
- There is a pinch point with the planters that restricts pedestrian mobility in the north east side of the plaza.
- The Applicant's willingness to evolve their design were commended.

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

- It is an attractive building and quite responsive to the site, great presentation.
- Consider looking at extending the canopy and shelter in the plaza, which could be cantilevered out and provide summer shade for the CRUs.
- Planters, although pleasant, can be a bit of a barrier to mobility in the plaza.
- Consider reviewing the elevator machine room and mechanical shafts extending down into the parkade, as well as ensuring proper ventilation in the parkade.
- The generator room is in a good location, but may need a double wall to protect the adjacent bedrooms from venting and noise.
- Consider ensuring good access to the amenity room.
- Consider shifting the bathroom to the north of the fitness room so that plumbing does not conflict with the electrical room below.
- The application package is well thought out, and provides a clear intention.
- Added shadows are unlikely to be significant with the additional 3 stories, it seems to be a valid trade-off for a pleasant plaza and below market housing.
- The CRUs are in context with the plaza now, rather than in the context of Mountain Hwy.
- Need to think about selecting appropriate tenants to make sure that there are enough people coming in and out of the CRUs.
- Great selection of plant material, the Lily Turf provides a high level finish.
- It appears that there will be more mass on the top of building, there could be more thought dedicated to completing the top of the building.
- There is only a small amount of commercial space provided in a mixed use project, hopefully the unit to the south will have more commercial space.
- Ensure that the step down to neighbouring site is thought through, and consider the input of the neighbouring property.
- Consider hi-rise exiting plan carefully, its potential impact on the service stairs as well as exit routes for the CRUs.
- Garbage area should be enclosed, and exit route on the way out may need to be extended.
- Ensure universal access to rental building.
- A security consultant may be able to assist with stairs and ramps for parking and parkade elevator to courtyard.
- Consider vestibules for the retail spaces.
- The application shows that there are risers, but no ramp to get to the lobby, ensure that there is access to both.

- Good styling on the plaza, may want to add seating near the play area.
- Could tweak the location of the planters and seating for better circulation.
- Note that the Sarcococca (Sweet box) plants are located in the sun on the landscape plan.
- The glass guards on the roof may be windy for the balconies.
- Consider having set backs or detailing on the roof box to softness the impression.
- Materials could be better explained.
- Consider how this building with compliment or clash with its neighbours in the larger community.
- A heavier plinth could allow the tower sit better on the ground level.
- There is potential to better express the commercial nature of lower floor.
- The lowest fin on the building seems slightly thicker than others. (The transfer slab will be thicker).
- Consider how signage will be handled.
- Some concern with the chosen materials being able to convey curves and a sense of quality.
- Consider that the landscaping and planters may be a visual obstruction to the CRUs.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Mr. Doug Ramsay, project engineer acknowledged the Panel's suggestions, appreciated the comments and was happy to take them into account in the development of the design. He also conveyed the following comments below:

- They are communicating with neighbours to the north and south, a large grocery store will be a tenant to the south.
- The CRUs are facing Mountain Hwy and the plaza and they could be one whole restaurant.
- There is 15-20 feet of overhang with the transfer slab and glazing.
- Client wishes to have a signage package with relevant strategies.
- Dark Swisspearl will provide the soft curves of the building, and will be concrete. It will be fastened in behind the balconies.
- Swisspearl is a quality material that they are quite familiar working with.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Steve Wong and **SECONDED** by Tieg Martin.

THAT the ADP has reviewed 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.

CARRIED

b.) 1920 and 1932 Glenaire Drive: Detailed Planning Application – 15 unit townhouse development

Mr. Erik Wilhelm, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Thomas Grimwood, architect from Grimwood Architecture and Daryl Tyacke from ETA Landscape Architecture 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:

- What was the buffer horticultural planting material that looked magenta? There's a plant list on the first page on the landscape plan – We're carrying forward the same palette as was done in Phase 1. Riparian planting will be on the west side, the intent is that there is not an abrupt change as you enter the park to the west.
- What material would be used for the public pathway? The same material as paving on the northwest units with three grey tones of Abbotsford piazza paver which is a continuation from Phase 1.
- What is the waste management strategy with this development? We have made the parkade able to serve both Phase 1 and 2, with trucks able to come in and out of the parkade to collect waste.
- How is parking exhaust shaft treated? It is on the south side of the parkade, we don't have any detail on that yet.
- There doesn't seem to be a street level view from the east included in the package. The eastern wall is white.
- Are you using the exact same material as Phase 1? The family of details is consistent, we are using the same room, windows, and entry canopy.
- How are you treating the adjacency with the wall against the natural park on the extreme left of the drawing? The idea is that that landscape would be tailored and landscaped to meet that edge. There are ongoing talks with Metro Vancouver and the District of North Vancouver to address the connection and the relationship to the park.
- Is parking gated? Yes.
- How are you defining your territoriality on the west side and along the north pathway? There will be fencing.
- What about security or lighting in the unobserved areas? That's something we will work through at in more detail, in Phase 1 we have LED lights going up the stairway.
- How do you gain access to the units? Through the pathway off Glenaire.
- As a first responder, would I have to go through the narrow pathway to figure out where I am? Yes.
- What is the distance between Phase 1 and 2? 10 feet.

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

- A major issue is the narrow pinch point at the entrance to the buildings on the curve of Glenaire.
- The narrow area at the curve of Glenaire needs to respond to the character of the street.
- The staircase going into the parkade from the corner and the other built forms in that area could be opened up, or be designed to better receive, or terminate Glenaire.
- The building stance on the curve is situated in a somewhat aggressive position in relation to Glenaire.
- It will be interesting to hear the Panels thoughts to the change in materials.

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

- Consider how the large untreated concrete wall relates to the park to the west.
- The character of buildings seems somewhat monochromatic. There seems to be a tension between the colours and styles of Phase 1 and those of Phase 2.
- Entranceway would be improved with a more generous expression at such a pivotal entry point.
- It seems more fitting to have more natural granite pathway to the north, rather than paving.
- The development is vulnerable in its interface with the park, and may need a physical deterrent to discourage unwanted access through the site.
- Ensure wayfinding and signage provides clear direction on addresses for first responders, like ambulance and police.
- Commendable effort on the variety of roof forms, however, the hatches may spoil the roof line and pose maintenance issues.
- Rain water leaders are not shown, and could have a visual impact against the white colour.
- The white colour can make the outdoor space feel oppressive in the summer and could get quite dirty in the winter.
- Could have more variety with colours and materials, including the windows.
- Consider changing the lawn spaces between units 4 and 5 into patio spaces.
- Agree the frontage needs something to anchor it – consider a gate.
- The massing is great, the site plan is great, although the development would be enhanced by more variation in colour.
- May want to reconsider the stone work and cottage roof design.
- Consider improving the landscaping on the riparian edge consider a softer approach that has more natural feel.
- Package submission is somewhat confusing, it's important to have clarity in the design layout.
- The roof deck is considered another story and roof hatch may not comply with code so it will be important to speak to the building department about how these are treated.
- Consider code requirements for steps to unit entranceways, as well as the direction of the door swing that may impact accessibility.

- The fifth building seems to be facing the wrong direction which creates a different relationship to the street and the character may not fit with the other buildings.
- The precedents in the front of the package are good, however, there is less variety in the detailing.
- The white building may be somewhat jarring, but if detailed, could be nice.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Mr. Thomas Grimwood, project architect, acknowledged the Panel's suggestions, appreciated the comments and wishes to improve and open up the residential entrance point. He also clarified that two grey buildings have been integrated into Phase 1 for colour variety, and that they are in communication with Metro Vancouver and provincial bodies to discuss the potential for a second, more natural public pathway.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Stefen Elmitt and **SECONDED** by Steve Wong.

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and **SUPPORTS** the general concept but recommends revisions to the proposal and a further presentation to address the items noted by the Panel in its review of the project.

CARRIED

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

April 12, 2018

Chair



Date