

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
November 9, 2023 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Jean-Pierre Mahé (Chair)
Mr. Joshua Bernsen
Mr. Rafael Santa Ana
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Mr. Kelvin Lit
Ms. Nancy Paul
Ms. Alexis Chicoine

REGRETS: Mr. Nathan Shuttleworth
Mr. Brian Newton

STAFF: Mr. Kevin Zhang (Staff Liaison)
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Ms. Tamsin Guppy (Item 3.a.)
Ms. Afrooz Fallah

APPLICANT: Mr. Byron Chard (Chard Developments)
Mr. Hugh Cochlin (Proscenium Architecture and Interiors)
Mr. Grant Brumpton (PWL Partnership Landscape Architects)

Page | 1

1. PANEL WELCOME AND DINNER

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 by Mr. Jean-Pierre Mahé and attendance was taken.

2. ADMINISTRATION

The minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting on October 12, 2023, underwent review. Ms. Nancy Paul, Mr. Kelvin Lit and Mr. Jean-Pierre Mahé provided some comments. The necessary corrections will be made, and the updated minutes will be presented for signatures at the next meeting on December 14, 2023.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 1634 -1748 Capilano Road - OCP Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit for 423 Residential Rental Units, 169 Hotel Units and 4 Commercial Retail Units

Page | 2

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

Ms. Tamsin Guppy outlined the policy context and highlighted that the local plan is now 10 years old and went on to discuss some of the changes the neighbourhood and the District have seen in the interim that impact this proposal including:

- Increased tower heights and a change in landscape, particularly with the construction of a 26-storey building at 303 Marine Drive;
- Council's recommendation that projects consider inclusion of affordable housing units in response to the ongoing housing crisis;
- The shift to return north-south bus traffic to Capilano Road and the impact that has on land dedication and street design along the Capilano frontage;
- And lastly, a study is also underway to assess the feasibility of a simplified pedestrian connection to Lions Gate Plaza, potentially eliminating the need for a vehicle extension of McGuire west at the crossroads.

Ms. Tamsin Guppy posed the following questions for the Panel's input:

1. The hotel's north façade is a very visible building façade as traffic flows south down Capilano Road. Does this façade do enough to celebrate the hotel and the destination in Lions Gate village?
2. The hotel's service areas are at ground level, reducing the potential for overlook along McGuire Avenue. To address this the applicant team are proposing hotel units on the second storey. Is this sufficient to create a positive public realm on this street?
3. The hotel requires a convenient drop-off / pick-up zone for guests which is provided from a large auto court accessed from Curling Road. The auto court appears to extend south to the street, with bollards delineating the sidewalk and public realm. Is this sufficient, or would greater definition of the street edge be beneficial?
4. The residential component now includes a 11-storey mid-rise, next to McGuire Avenue, which is currently single family. The design team have created a landscaped setback to the building, but is this sufficient, or should the building step down to McGuire Avenue?

The Chair welcomed the applicant team; Mr. Byron Chard of *Chard Developments*, Mr. Hugh Cochlin of *Proscenium Architecture and Interiors*, and Mr. Grant Brumpton of *PWL Partnership 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 to the applicant.

- **Question:** Ms. Alexis Chicoine raised concerns about the lack of detailed plans for assessing the accessibility of parking, public areas, gathering places, and unit layouts.
 - **Answer:** Ms. Tamsin Guppy clarified that while it is a “detailed” application as compared to a “preliminary” application this package focuses on the big moves associated with the OCP Amendment and Rezoning and does not provide the level of detail associated with the Development Permit.

- **Question:** Ms. Nancy Paul expressed concerns about the absence of detailed landscape plans for commenting.
 - **Answer:** Detailed landscape plans were not presented during the meeting.

- **Questions:** Sgt Kevin Bracewell inquired regarding the south building, will there be separation between commercial and residential parking? Will there be only one way into the main building, and what about the storage building along the parking entrance?
 - **Answers:** Yes, commercial units in the South building share the parkade with residential, and there will be separation between visitor shopping and residential parking. The main tower entrance is off Curling, and the storage building serves external storage, accessible by coming out of the building.

- **Questions:** Mr. Joshua Bernsen inquired regarding expanding the paving at the roundabout’s driveway entrance. Additionally, he questioned about the feasibility of combining the two driveway entrances. Mr. Bernsen also sought clarification on the purpose of the bike parking on the north side, specifically whether it is intended for bike share or regular public bike parking. Lastly, he inquired about the possibility of extending the walkway eastward from the children's play area.
 - **Answers:** The applicant team has acknowledged the possibility of extending the paving to enhance the entrance experience and will explore the potential extension of the grid pattern. While the idea of combining the two driveways has been considered, a step between the entrances is deemed necessary due to grading and height constraints. The bike parking on the north side contributes to the count for public bike parking and is not specifically designated for bike share. The extension of the walkway is constrained by rainwater management requirements and programming considerations.

- **Question:** Mr. Rafael Santa Ana raised a query regarding the decision to consolidate the OCP amendment, rezoning, and development permit application.
 - **Answers:** Ms. Tamsin Guppy acknowledged the comprehensive nature of the applicant team's submission, emphasizing the strategic approach of prioritizing key elements during the early stages to gauge the project's general direction.

- **Questions:** Mr. Kelvin Lit questioned the confirmation and flexibility of elements like the tall tower and hotel placement, seeking information on massing studies. He also inquired about the architect's current role compared to the planning exercise a decade ago, expressing confusion about commenting on seemingly predetermined massing.
 - **Answers:** Ms. Tamsin Guppy explained the influence of a local plan from 10 years ago and ongoing adjustments in the design process. Mr. Hugh Cochlin highlighted the potential disconnect between the current detailed design phase and a previous presentation to a different design panel, emphasizing the need for clarification.

- **Question:** Mr. Jean-Pierre Mahé inquired about the absence of an intermediate stage between preliminary and detailed plans. Asked whether a traffic study had been conducted, expressing concerns about congestion at the intersection of Capilano Road and Marine Drive. Raised concerns about the entryway to the hotel and suggested perforating it for better visibility. He also inquired about the meaning of an elevated bike route.
 - **Answer:** Ms. Tamsin Guppy responded that most applicants find the process onerous enough without an additional intermediate stage. She confirmed the completion of a traffic study, and the traffic consultant addressed concerns about the intersection, explaining that the development would provide an additional outlet to alleviate delays. Mr. Cochlin confirmed the possibility of perforating the entryway to the hotel. Mr. Cochlin also clarified that an elevated bike route refers to bike routes separated from road level.

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

Site Plan Issues:

1. Arrival Plaza:
 - a. Recommended refining the Arrival Plaza for enhanced definition and visual impact.
 - b. Encouraged the integration of public art as a focal point within the Plaza to elevate its aesthetic appeal.
 - c. Emphasized the importance of establishing synergy and connectivity between the Plaza, the building, and the Town Centre.
2. Streetscape Character:
 - a. Stressed the significance of preserving a strong visual and physical link between the building and the residential community.
3. Auto-Court & Services Functionality:
 - a. Advised on optimizing the functionality of the auto-court and services for improved efficiency.
 - b. Suggested a comprehensive evaluation of traffic flow, access points, and service functionality to ensure seamless operation.
4. Small Green Areas Function:
 - a. Noted the loss of green spaces and connectivity.

- b. Encouraged conducting a massing study and shadow analysis to confirm the appropriate location of green areas for optimal community benefit.
- 5. Residential Frontage Character Connecting with Residential Street:
 - a. Encouraged the incorporation of design elements that strengthen the connection between the building and the residential street.
- 6. Urban Node (Square/Plaza):
 - a. Advocated for a well-defined urban node or square/plaza to enhance the overall urban experience.
 - b. Highlighted the urban node's role as a central point connecting pedestrian paths to the Town Centre.
 - c. Emphasized the need for thoughtful design to facilitate a seamless transition and elevate the pedestrian experience within the urban environment.

Hotel Issues:

- 1. Length of the Hotel building:
 - a. Highlighted the building's length exceeding guidelines.
 - b. Emphasized the importance of breaks in the structure for a reduced perceived length.
- 2. Scale:
 - a. Expressed concerns about the hotel's scale and highlighted challenges with scale and proportion.
 - b. Encouraged further study and development of the hotel design, especially in terms of functionality and integration with the front.
- 3. Materials Tonality:
 - a. Raised concerns that materials might not harmonize with the surroundings.
 - b. Encouraged the evaluation of a cohesive colour palette and material selection for visual harmony.
 - c. Questioned the dominance of black colour in renderings, suggesting a reconsideration of the material palette.
 - d. Encouraged exploration of softer colours for better integration with the surrounding context.
- 4. North Edge Termination:
 - a. Noted the lack of a defined termination at the northern edge of the hotel which was originally intended as a flat iron building format given the shape of the lot.
 - b. Advised considering architectural elements to provide a clear endpoint or transition.
- 5. Street Residential Interaction:
 - a. Highlighted a lack of active frontage along McGuire Avenue.
 - b. Pointed out the absence of engaging elements, such as shops or entrances.
 - c. Urged a reconsideration of the design to encourage interaction and vitality along the street.

Urban Design Recommendation (Tower and Midrise)

- The articulation (frames and accent), as considered in the preliminary submission, should be strengthened to establish a cohesive connection and distinctive reference for the midrise, ensuring it is perceived as an integral part of the overall neighbourhood design.

Page | 6

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

- Ms. Alexis Chicoine:
 - Expressed gratitude for the presentation and thanked everyone for insightful comments.
 - Emphasized the need to bring the discussion back to the committee in the next phase for detailed plan comments.
 - Raised concerns about accessibility, questioning the target audience for accessibility considerations.
 - Highlighted the broader implications of disability and stressed the importance of planning in line with the Accessibility Act.
 - Anticipated providing detailed comments on project plans in the next meeting.
- Ms. Nancy Paul:
 - Expressed agreement with Mr. Alfonso Tejada's observations.
 - Compared the current presentation to the original layout from a couple of years ago and expressed a preference for the original design.
 - Raised concerns about extensive paving, proximity of the parking garage entrance, and dissatisfaction with the hotel entrance design.
 - Echoed concerns about emphasizing corners and intersections, feeling the project became larger and more imposing.
 - Shared reservations about the current layout.
- Sergeant Kevin Bracewell:
 - Highlighted the need for robust security measures, especially for bike storage due to the prevalent issue of bike theft in the area.
 - Raised concerns about the potential hazards of combining pedestrians and cars, particularly in unfamiliar locations like a hotel turnaround. Drawing attention to a similar setup at the Rosedale on Robson and Hamilton, he cautioned against inadequate delineation, citing it as a potential danger zone for pedestrians.
 - Stressed the need for clear and well-defined spaces to avoid accidents, acknowledging that more detailed discussions on crime prevention would be appropriate in subsequent stages.
- Mr. Joshua Bernsen:
 - Appreciated the incorporation of green roofs in both buildings.
 - Commended improvements on McGuire.

- Suggested extending pedestrian-friendly materials for a cohesive pedestrian zone along Curling Road and the auto court.
 - Emphasized the importance of visible bike parking locations for better visibility.
 - Praised the outdoor restaurant patio but suggested making it more animated for a vibrant experience.
 - Focused on enhancing aesthetics, visibility, and the overall experience of outdoor spaces. Page | 7
- Mr. Kelvin Lit:
 - Expressed concern about the massing, suggesting a reduction in the number of stories and consideration of additional public space and greenery.
 - Questioned the relationship between the two buildings, proposing a more balanced approach.
 - Urged a re-evaluation of the massing, potentially rotating the tower and exploring curved forms.
 - Stressed the need for a distinctive feature or passageway to differentiate the high-rise and mid-rise blocks.
 - Emphasized the importance of creating a design that resonates with the special character of the North Shore.
- Mr. Rafael Santa Ana:
 - Acknowledged the complexity of the project's scale and expressed appreciation for the work done.
 - Suggested room for further improvements, especially considering the building's significant scale.
 - Encouraged a reconsideration of balcony articulation and a closer look at how interior plans inform the exterior.
 - Urged revisiting elements like the plaza and maintaining momentum in the design process.
 - Indicated that the project merits a second review with a focus on more granular design information.
- Mr. Jean-Pierre Mahé:
 - Questioned the treatment of the mid-rise and the tower and provided several suggestions for improvement, including stepping back of the mid-rise element or integrating the tower more.
 - Recommended exploring alternatives for reconfiguring the volumes.
 - Suggested greater use of colour and accent elements could be bolder.
 - Advised looking at Wall Centre as an example of good urban design for hotel turnaround.
 - Raised questions about entry design, service areas, and suggested rethinking exit and entry points to the hotel.
 - Emphasized the importance of materiality, texture, colour, and their gradual transitions for a well-balanced design.

The Chair invited the applicant's team to respond to the Panel's comments:

Mr. Byron Chard of *Chard Developments* acknowledged the Panel's comments and provided background information on the history of the project and highlighted design rationales related to the proposal.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Ms. Alexis Chicoine and **SECONDED** by Mr. Rafael Santa Ana.

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and SUPPORTS the general concept for OCP Amendment and Rezoning with careful consideration of comments made by the Panel but recommends revisions to the proposal **to the satisfaction of staff and a further presentation to address the items noted by the Panel** its review of the project for a future Development Permit application.

CARRIED 6-1

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

3. NEXT MEETING

December 14, 2023.

Chair



Date

2023.12.14