

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON  
AUGUST 11, 2016 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Ms. Amy Tsang (Chair)  
Mr. Greg Travers  
Mr. Laurenz Kosichek  
Mr. Tieg Martin  
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell  
Ms. Diana Zoe Coop  
Mr. Stefen Elmitt  
Mr. Craig Taylor

REGRETS: Mr. Samir Eidnani  
Mr. Dan Parke  
Mr. Steve Wong

STAFF: Mr. Michael Hartford  
Mr. Nathan Andrews  
Mr. Alfonso Tejada  
Mr. Kevin Zhang (Item 2. a.)  
Mr. Erik Wilhelm (Item 2. b.)

The meeting came to order at 6:00 pm.

**1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

A motion was made and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of July 7, 2016.

**2. NEW BUSINESS**

**a.) 1633 Tatlow Ave – Detailed Application for Development Permit for Mixed-use Project Including 33 Residential Units and 7 Commercial Units**

Mr. Kevin Zhang, District Community Planner, introduced the project and provided background on the site context, existing zoning, and previous development permit application proposed for this site - a proposal approved by District Council in 2014.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Robert Lee of Mara Natha Architecture, introduced the project. Mr. Lee noted the following points in the presentation:

- The proposal is for a four-storey, mixed-use building and FSR proposed remains the same at 1.75. Changes have been made from the previous Development Permit proposal including: a reduction in the number of dwelling units from 39 to 32; primary access to the

site changed from rear lane to Tatlow Avenue for both underground and surface parking; and a rear setback increased by 4.9 m (16 ft)

- Co-presenter Mr. Jahan Elizeh reviewed exterior finishes and colour choices as well as the design inspiration of building
- It was noted that no interior bedrooms are included in the development, a change from the previous proposal, and that overlooking issues between suites have been addressed
- Parking proposed fully complies with District Zoning Bylaw and is accommodated on one level of underground parking
- Bicycle parking exceeds the minimum standard required with a proposed 42 storage spots
- A 0.9 m (2.9 foot) variance to height to is proposed – similar to the previous application – to help accentuate the corner of the building
- Glass and metal canopies are proposed over the sidewalks and finish materials include “Hardie-Panel” or a similar cementitious board, and metal fascia
- Colour selections are buff, olive green, and tan
- The landscape design generally reflects the approach in the previous design taking into account the revised footprint of the building, and reflects the objectives for the Marine Drive streetscape.

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 brand of panel product is proposed? Not determined at this point, but could be Nichiha (a Japanese product) or Hardie-panel
- What is the nature of the height variance? Variance proposed is 0.9 m (2.9 ft.) to allow for an accentuated roof element on the corner - the variance matches the previous proposal
- Are angled areas on façade in the same plane? Generally similar, with a small offset of a couple of inches
- Are the rear portions of the commercial units glazed? Yes window glazing and doors
- How would access work from a handicapped parking spot? Generally level access, with entry to shops from rear
- On south elevation there are shadows shown, are these accurate? Yes, the balconies project and will create shadows on this facade
- How do tandem stalls work? Would be sold in pairs to the same suite
- Is public art proposed? Not a requirement of the project but may include an art element at the residential lobby
- What is soffit material? Aluminium fascia, likely with a vinyl soffit
- What is walkway surfacing material? Concrete pavers in different colours
- What green building objectives does the project include? Not finalized, but at a minimum will include “Low E” windows
- Is the project frame or concrete? Concrete to the floor of level 2, then frame above.

- How does stair exit at the north-east corner work? Does it include windows? Free-standing building adjacent to surface parking area. Currently does not include windows, but one could be added
- How recessed is the garage gate? About 20 feet
- Does walkway through building at grade allow access and viewing to shops? Yes
- Underground parking clearance appears to be shown as 6 ft 7 in - is this correct? Yes
- Could consideration be given to making an additional surface spot available as accessible parking? Yes, this could be considered
- What level of adaptable housing is proposed? Not determined at this point
- How will roof be drained – with internal drains or downspouts? Internal drains
- How will PMT be accessed? From lane but this require some adjustments to landscape
- What is the landscape treatment in the north-west corner? Hardscape with moveable planters
- What is edge condition along west edge of parking ramp? A railing along ramp edge and existing fence along property line. Further discussions are required with the neighbour.
- Will landscape be irrigated? Yes

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Design Planner, provided comments on the project. Three principles were noted as being relevant to the site:

1. a desire to highlight the southeast corner of the site
2. anchoring the southeast corner to the ground
3. providing a strong linear character to the roof shape

Mr. Tejada noted that the project would benefit from more details on how the roof edge will be treated and the type of materials to be used. Some concern was expressed regarding how commercial garbage and recycling can work with limited accessibility and it was suggested that this should be reviewed. Finally, it was suggested that the Panel's input would be valuable on how the project is contributing successfully to the streetscape on both Marine Drive and Tatlow Avenue.

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

- The Panel made comments on a number of topics including safety, parking, utilities, architectural expression, landscape design, signage, and selected materials
- Several comments were made regarding the raised roof element and it was suggested that the roof should reflect what is happening in the massing of the building below and avoid an appearance of being applied. Raising the glazing to meet the roof would be one way to address this, and would provide a pleasant interior space. Related to this, it was suggested that the curve of the roof did not appear to relate well to the remainder of the roofline and could benefit from a different approach – either a flat projecting roof could be considered, or a floating curved element.

- The balconies were noted as being large and likely comfortable, but their depth had the potential to make interior spaces dark. It was suggested that the balcony guard designs seemed somewhat arbitrary, and could benefit from a simpler design with higher-quality materials.
- It was suggested that the window designs seemed complicated and might benefit from simplification.
- With regard to colour, it was suggested that the chosen hues seemed a bit bland, and the palette could be strengthened to accentuate the rhythm of the architectural elements in the building
- The residential lobby was noted as being correctly located, but could benefit from being more of a focal point through a stronger identity
- An offset in the façade, with a greater physical separation between the corner element and rest of the building could be positive
- It was suggested that the ground-floor podium element could be stronger in the project to differentiate the commercial mass from the residential mass
- It was noted that the parking gate may need to be at least 6 ft 10 in high to allow access for over-height vans and that the security of the access could be improved by moving the gate closer to the building face.
- The proposed railing and screening at the west side of the parking ramp should be reviewed for a more suitable solution
- More details should be provided on the signage package to ensure this works well with the building design
- Access to the PMT should be reviewed carefully to ensure the parking and landscape designs reflect BC Hydro's guidelines and requirements
- The waste and recycling facility seems awkward with poor access in its current format and should be reviewed. There may be a benefit in swapping the location of the waste facility and the visitor bike parking area to improve both facilities
- The landscape approach for the right-of-way area in the north-west corner of the site should be designed for ease of maintenance, as well as attractiveness
- It was noted that the project presentation would have benefited from the participation of a landscape architect.
- Landscaping completely under-cover may not work well and an irrigation plan should be provided for the project
- For safety reasons, staircase exits should have windows to create a line of sight for the users and the proposed exit should be re-designed
- The exterior corridor through the building was noted as a likely security challenge and might be better as a secured space, particularly after business hours. The corridor should be revised to provide for a clear line of sight from end to end, and expecting retail outlets to use a rear door may be a challenge, particularly for smaller operations
- While bike storage in the project was noted as positive, the proposed location of the visitor bike parking area lacks visibility and would likely not be safe in its current format
- The commercial frontage might benefit from additional spacing between the CRU entrances to allow for greater individual identity to the businesses

- The project as presented appeared to include some conflicting information on finish materials and greater clarity on the material choices should be provided, including consistency in the representation of the project through the project drawings, renderings, and model

The Chair invited the project team to respond.

The applicant team noted an appreciation for the comments made by the Panel and made the following remarks:

- The curved corner element is designed to be subtle and integrated into the main roof
- The corner element was designed not to overpower the north wing of the building along Tatlow Avenue
- Agree the exterior elements could better reflect the massing of building and will explore changes in this regard

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

**MOVED** by Craig Taylor and **SECONDED** by Tieg Martin:

**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 consideration of the project.

**CARRIED**

**b.) 3468 – 3490 Mt. Seymour Pkwy – Preliminary application for Rezoning and Development Permit for 27 Unit Townhouse Development**

Mr. Erik Wilhelm, District Community Planner, introduced the project and provided background on the site and planning policy context for the project. The site has existing detached residential development to the west and multi-family development to the east. The proposal is for 27 townhouse units with an FSR of 1.2 in compliance with the community plan provisions.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team of TATLA Developments and architect Neil Robertson of Stuart Howard Architects. The following points were noted in the presentation:

The design is intended for three different types of residents including:

1. Young professionals
2. Young families
3. Empty Nesters, who might want a ground-oriented unit

The project details were reviewed including the following:

- 48 parking stalls are proposed with many of the dwellings having direct access from garages
- Integrated bike storage is provided within the units
- An elevator is proposed from the parking garage to the courtyard level
- Each unit has at least one private outdoor space
- Material choices help to break up the massing of the townhouse blocks
- High quality contemporary finishes are proposed including stucco, metal panel, wood, cladding, and black vinyl-framed windows

The landscape approach was presented by Pat Campbell of PMG Landscape Architects, with reference to the following points:

- The courtyard area will incorporate terraced garden plots
- A mews character is provided between the three buildings to define access routes through the development
- All units facing Mount Seymour Parkway have a raised entrance to help create a sense of separation
- An amenity space is provided at the west side of the property with a play area for children

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:

- How does waste management work? A small dumpster is provided at the garage level with wheeled bins for recycling
- How does access to townhouses work for courtyard area – do all have steps? Six units at the east end of the complex would be accessible without steps. The other townhouses have steps from the courtyard at their entrances
- What creates the need for steps in the courtyard? Grade change on the site, but also the desire to create a sense of arrival at front doors - consideration can be given to reducing the number of steps on at least some units
- What paving is proposed? Concrete paving stones in the courtyard with private patios in larger hydra-pressed slabs.
- Where is the parking gate location relative to the ramp and building? Recessed approximately 30 feet onto ramp and approximately 25 feet from overhanging building face
- What was the rationale behind selected architectural character and material choices? A desire for a more contemporary approach with heavier materials at the base and lighter materials above, and a general avoidance of more typical traditional materials
- What is the material for the “eyebrow” overhang elements on the facades? Not defined at this point but likely a bolted-on metal construction



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

Three design principles were noted as relevant to the review of the project:

- 1) Site Plan
- 2) Built Form
- 3) Open Space and Courtyard

Comments made referred to the following points and questions:

- Would like to see south-east corner treated differently to accentuate relationship to the public realm
- Westerly access to courtyard could be wider and include greater interest in the wall design
- A question to the Panel as to how the liveability of the central courtyard can be encouraged, given its range of width from 23 to 27 feet, and the more typical 30 foot guideline objective
- The different character of the easterly block and its more massive appearance with a suggestion that this form could be revised to be less severe and reflect the level of interest provided by the other two buildings
- The second level courtyard walkway and its impacts on the east end of the courtyard should be further explored and resolved
- Would like to see some more variety in the unit entrances and identities and an enhancement of residential character
- A review of the wall along the rear lane should take place to try to reduce the impact of this building element

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

- In general the Panel was pleased with the site planning and character of the project as proposed. Some Panel members suggested that the contemporary design constitutes a refreshing change from other recent projects with the rhythm of the units is handled successfully
- A desire for improved accessibility was noted, at least for the main levels of the townhouses and it was suggested that unit entry steps in the courtyard should be reconsidered
- The narrower courtyard was not noted as a major concern but a review of over-looking between windows in the courtyard was suggested
- The eastern building was noted as benefitting from a review to provide more exterior relief and a greater celebration of this project element
- It was suggested that the roof projections need to be kept thin to be successful and that building envelope detailing will be important due to lack of overhangs in some areas
- Some different treatment of the tall walls along the westerly courtyard access was suggested as being beneficial
- The south building elevations were noted as possibly benefitting from additional glazing

- The design celebrates the fronts of the units but not the backs and it seems that more could be done to enhance both the front and rear elevations
- Waste and recycling areas should be reviewed for efficiency and easy access and servicing
- The stair and elevated walkway at the east end of the courtyard was noted as a feature that should be reviewed for an appropriate construction approach with regard to maintenance and weathering
- Roof decks are generous in size, but could attract clutter – there may be value in recessing the guards from the edge of the roof and using something other than clear glazing
- Roof hatches were noted as needing to be detailed carefully to be code compliant
- The colour palette proposed, while generally positive, is somewhat restrained and could benefit from slightly more contrast

The Chair invited the project team to respond.

The applicant team agreed with many of the Panel's comments and noted that:

- the approach to glazing, particularly with regard to the south elevation facing Mount Seymour Parking, was designed to reflect traffic volumes on the fronting street
- The elevated walkway element at the east end of the courtyard is likely to be steel rather than wood decking and should be durable and easy to maintain

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

**MOVED** by Tieg Martin and **SECONDED** by Diana Zoe Coop:

**THAT** the ADP has reviewed the proposal, **SUPPORTS** the general concept, and looks forward to a presentation at the detailed application stage that includes a review of the items noted by the Panel in its consideration of the project.

**CARRIED**

**4. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

**6. NEXT MEETING**

September 8, 2016

Chair



Date

