

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON  
NOVEMBER 10, 2016 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING:           Mr. Dan Parke (Chair)  
                          Ms. Amy Tsang  
                          Mr. Greg Travers  
                          Mr. Laurenz Kosichek  
                          Mr. Steve Wong  
                          Mr. Tieg Martin  
                          Mr. Stefen Elmitt  
                          Mr. Craig Taylor  
                          Mr. Samir Eidnani

REGRETS:            Sgt. Kevin Bracewell  
                          Ms. Diana Zoe Coop

STAFF:                Mr. Michael Hartford  
                          Mr. Nathan Andrews  
                          Mr. Alfonso Tejada  
                          Ms. Natasha Letchford (Item 3.a.)  
                          Mr. Erik Wilhelm (Item 3.b.)  
                          Mr. Kevin Zhang (Item 3.c.)

The meeting came to order at 6:01 pm.

**1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

A motion was made and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of October 13, 2016.

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The voting packages for the Design Excellence Awards are being organized and will be circulated to Panel members. Voting will be summarized at an upcoming meeting.

**3. NEW BUSINESS**

**a.) 229 Seymour River Place – Detailed Planning Application: Rezoning and Development Permit for Mixed-use Redevelopment (Second Review by ADP)**

Ms. Natasha Letchford, Community Planner, introduced the project and provided background on the past work supporting the detailed planning application, its context and relevant development guidelines, including those for form and character, commercial and mixed-use buildings, and energy and water conservation. Information was also provided on the work toward an implementation plan for the Maplewood Village Centre. It was noted that the development proposal was previously reviewed by the Panel at the meeting of July 7, 2016.

The project consists of a mixed-use development containing commercial/retail use on the ground level with two separate five-storey residential buildings above. The residential units are a mix of apartments and townhomes with both rental and strata tenure.

The project includes approximately 10,500 square feet of retail commercial space, 193 dwelling units, 275 vehicle parking spaces, and 242 bike parking spaces. Since the Panel's last review, the number of units has been reduced from 201 to 193 and the applicant has made a number of changes to address the comments of the Panel.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Bryce Rositch of Rositch Hemphill Architects and Mr. Daryl Tyacke of ETA Landscape Architecture. Mr. Rositch and Mr. Tyacke noted the following points in their presentation:

- Significant changes have been made to improve shared space and private space within the inner portion of the site layout
- The original narrow separation of the inner courtyard is now 30 feet to help address the cramped and somewhat shaded layout from the previous design
- The residential portion of the project has been broken into three elements, each with their own character and colour scheme
- Bike storage and workshop areas have been proposed in the areas at the south-west corner of the courtyard that were previously rather cramped unit layouts
- The commercial "back of house" functions have been simplified and improved to allow for better access to the retail space
- Commercial and residential waste disposal and recycling areas have been separated
- Stronger corners with bolder accents and colours have been added to create character in the project
- Vertical metal siding has been added in feature areas of the building for more interest
- The landscaping approach to the courtyard has been revised to take advantage of the additional open space and greater building separation
- The landscape design and planting plans for the courtyard design and the streetscapes were reviewed.

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

- Lines are shown on the siding in the elevation drawings – what siding is proposed? Cement siding in a horizontal and vertical pattern (Hardi-panel 2.0) as well as corrugated metal siding
- Is the courtyard flat? Generally, but also meant to have a mounded area as part of the children's play area
- Is there a concern about mixing rentals and strata in one portion of the building? Not concerned with mix because it is similar to condo developments that have private individual rented condos and client has experience with management of rentals
- Have turning radii and transfers to toilets been reviewed in enhanced accessibility units? Further review is needed to accommodate turning radii and toilet transfers

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

1. Building corner at Old Dollarton Highway and Front Street would benefit from revisions as the previous version had stronger massing and it seems that in adjusting certain design elements some of this strength has been lost
2. Revised design includes a ledge element beyond the balcony railing which may be too strong and could be reduced in depth or broken up
3. Having flat canopies creates a somewhat reduced geometric appeal for the building and some sloped canopy elements should be considered
4. Design for the driveway entrance to the parkade feels disjointed and could benefit from reflecting the line of the adjacent commercial canopy
5. Walls flanking the service area seem too high and lack human scale so could be improved with greater residential character

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

- Overall, it was suggested that the site layout and building massing are more successful and the and the project team was commended for the responses to the Panel's previous suggestions - the greater openness between the building elements and within the courtyard was seen as positive
- A simpler more elegant approach to elevations was encouraged as some of the clarity in the project has been lost in the use of additional colour schemes – there needs to be a greater logic in the location of the different materials and colours and some of the stronger elements of the project design are being diminished by the changes in colours and materials
- Instead of three colour schemes, perhaps two would be sufficient, and the use of similar stone in the various schemes could help provide some consistency
- It was noted that breaking-up the building elevation along Old Dollarton Road seems quite successful
- The “pop-up” roof elements appear to be more successful on Seymour River Place than on Front St and some further review might help rationalize the use of this element in the overall project design
- Success in the design of “turning the corner” is greater at the south-east corner of the project than at the south-west, and refinements for the south-west corner should be considered
- Materials should be reviewed to incorporate more timber elements at the townhouse entrances along with “grounding” the entire building scheme, and overall the project would benefit from the use of more natural materials
- North elevation of project needs to be handled carefully to give it more interest and avoid a long-term blank wall
- Accessibility should be reviewed for the bathroom areas to allow for convenient access as well as appropriate transfers to toilets

- Consideration should be given to providing some parking spaces with higher head-room for vans
- While the courtyard design was noted as being improved, it was suggested that there is still limited access to courtyard with only one stair from street level – improved connections would be benefit
- Would be a benefit to allow for the patios of the accessible units to have direct barrier free access to the courtyard and to provide for barrier-free access to the centre of the courtyard space rather than just the perimeter
- Plant selections should take into account shadier areas of courtyard while enhancing the increased openness between building elements
- Further review is suggested for the space between the seating area and the play area to ensure less chances of landscape deterioration – a defined pedestrian route through this area could be of value
- The grass mound in the courtyard is only 1 foot high and might benefit from greater height to increase its interest and play value.
- The placement and design of the parkade, utilities and mechanical rooms need to be explored in more detail to ensure the commercial space venting is resolved and appropriate parking access clearances are provided

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Mr. Bryce Rositch acknowledged the Panel's suggestions, commented that the design team appreciates the input from the Panel, and noted that the team will work with District staff to further refine and improve the design.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

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

**THAT** the ADP has reviewed the proposal and recommends **APPROVAL** of the project **SUBJECT** to addressing to the satisfaction of staff that the items noted by the Panel in its review of the project.

**CARRIED**

**b.) 2046 Curling Road, 1886 – 1956 Belle Isle Place: Detailed Planning Application – rezoning and development permit for 87 unit townhouse development**

Mr. Erik Wilhelm, Community Planner, introduced the project and provided background for the application, including the site and surrounding uses, relationship to the Official Community Plan, and the specifics of the Lionsgate Village Centre and the peripheral area housing policies, as well as the guidelines against which the project would be evaluated.

Mr. Wilhelm noted that this site is occupied by eight single-family properties and the surrounding neighbourhood will see an increase in density as envisioned within the peripheral housing policy. The proposal is for 87 townhouse units, within 11 separate buildings, and a total floor space ratio of 1.2. All buildings are 3 storeys in height with rooftop decks, and an underground parkade to accommodate a total of 166 parking stalls.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Duane Siegrist of Integra Architecture and Mr. Daryl Tyacke of ETA Landscape Architecture, introduced the project. Mr. Siegrist and Mr. Tyacke noted the following points in the presentation:

- Mr. Siegrist reviewed the rationale for the site layout including the site influences and relationships to nearby development and the proposed expanded park
- Seating and social areas are proposed at entrances to the site to enhance plaza, park, trail, and river connections
- A variety of approaches to elevations of units has been proposed depending on influences from the site – whether they front on a walkway, a courtyard, or the park
- Units fronting the park were designed with a more vertical expression
- A mix of stacked and conventional townhouse layouts provide diversity to the neighbourhood and a good transition between the existing single family dwellings and the future taller towers to the east and south
- Project looks to achieve Built Green Gold
- Accessibility standards have been prioritized to meet District standards and the inclusion of some single-level townhouse units will help in this regard
- Mr. Tyacke spoke to the park “edge” and the way in which the landscape reflects the rhythm of the buildings along the park
- Outdoor amenity and play area designs have been formatted to allow a positive relationship to the adjacent development and the potential for sharing of these spaces
- Project layout highlights permeability to allow multiple options of getting to and from central nodes such as the adjacent park and the town centre and wayfinding signage will be a key element
- The plant palette will reflect the natural features found on the North Shore and also help to create a unique character for various areas of 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 on the following topics:

- What material are the front entry stairs? Timber stringers with concrete treads
- Is the 35 foot separation wall face to wall face? Yes, but 26 feet is proposed for rear portion of units fronting park – these units do not face each other
- Do enhanced accessible units have steps at front entrances? No, the entrances are on the ends of the units with no steps
- Are windows all vinyl-framed - some looks like storefront, or window-wall? All vinyl-framed and similar approaches have been used in other projects
- Drawings show thin overhangs and a lack of gutters – Project will use Hardi-2.0 which allows for slimmer details with overhangs designed to avoid need for gutters
- Siding detail shows a mix of “Hardi” and cedar materials without overhangs, is this correct? These areas are wood-look “Hardi” material and will be durable without overhangs
- Some roof decks do not have an enclosed stair – what is the logic for this? Some variety in designs was desired as well as a reduction in the bulk of the buildings

- There is some lack of clarity on steps through courtyard areas – are there steps? Some refinements have been made to remove some steps from some areas and drawings will be updated to reflect these changes
- Has heating approach and connection to District energy been considered? Exploring options, but not resolved

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

1. District guidelines encourage variety in building forms for the edge along the park and the current proposal does provide for much variety
2. Building facing greenway seems long and could benefit from a break in the building
3. End units facing streets should turn corners as per guidelines
4. Driveway ramp needs to be treated carefully to create a successful relationship between the two projects which will share the ramp
5. Seems like shared amenity should be more central rather than at the south-west corner of the site and it may be difficult to achieve a successful approach to sharing of this space
6. Some of the roof deck accesses are creating the impression of 4 storey buildings – these deck accesses should be reconsidered to soften the approach, with the potential use of more exterior spiral stairs.

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

- Overall, Panel members expressed an appreciation for the work undertaken in site planning for this odd-shaped parcel
- The format of the courtyard areas seems well thought-out and will help to provide appropriate building separations as well as pedestrian connectivity but with a maximized floor space ratio the site seems a bit dense
- The access points into the site were noted as being well-handled, with no “dead ends”, but even with the number of internal walkways, the distances from some units to public streets seem quite long and quality connections to the neighbourhood should be considered
- In general it was felt that the amenity space might be better located in a more central location as the current location can only really work with a successful arrangement with the adjacent property- further, there might be merit in co-locating the amenity space with the elevator from the parking garage
- The material choices for the project were supported, and the use of “Hardi 2.0” was encouraged to allow for quality detailing
- The project was commended for taking a positive approach to accessibility issues in a ground-oriented townhouse form, however further work should be done to ensure that the courtyard areas and amenity space are accessible without steps

- Repetition of units seems more successful than mirroring of building elements because it adds simplicity to the design of the site as a whole, but it was also noted that the elevations of Buildings 1 and 2 seem somewhat monotonous
- For units facing the park, it was suggested that a low wall with a railing on top might work better as a suitable separation from the public to “semi-private” areas
- Providing some better buffering for grade level outdoor spaces could be positive for some of the units closer to the park, while some other units seem overly enclosed
- Some concern was expressed regarding the approach to fencing and buffering along the west side of the project to ensure a comfortable and attractive relationship to the adjacent project
- Roof access elements on the south building adjacent to the higher density development seem to work as a positive transitional feature but some concerns were expressed with exterior planter elements and spiral staircases above living space that could lead to drainage and noise issues associated with the steel roof access stair

The Chair invited the project team to respond.

Mr. Siegrist thanked the Panel for the comments and noted a willingness to explore opportunities for an amended common outdoor amenity area. It was indicated that opportunities for a shared space with the neighbouring development would also continue to be explored. Fencing along the west side of the west building will also be addressed and is to be 6 feet in height so buffering between sites should not be an issue.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

**MOVED** by Laurenz Kosichuk and **SECONDED** by Craig Taylor:

**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 of the project.

**CARRIED**

**c.) 2049 Heritage Park Lane: Preliminary Planning Application – Rezoning and Development Permit for 42 unit townhouse development**

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Community Planner, introduced the project and provided background for the preliminary planning application including the site and surrounding uses, Official Community Plan provisions on density and development permit guidelines, and some background on the status of the Maplewood Village implantation planning work.

The site comprises five existing single-family lots that are bounded by Heritage Park Lane to the north, a newly completed townhouse development to the east, Maplewood Farm to the south, and Maplewood Creek to the west. The northern and western parts of the proposed site will require approximately 10m to 15m setbacks from Maplewood Creek to accommodate riparian protection.

The proposal includes 42 townhouse units in two buildings, each of four storeys. Underground parking is provided in a one level garage and the overall density proposed is consistent with the OCP at 1.2.

A question of clarification was posed regarding the difference in creek setback (15m to 10m) on the west side of the property. In response, it was noted that the creek setbacks are the result of an analysis by a qualified environmental consultant, with review by the District of North Vancouver Environmental Protection Officer – in this case an area of setback to a reduced width of 10m was found to be supportable.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Mark Blackwood of Ekistics Architecture introduced the project. Mr. Blackwood noted the following points in his presentation:

- The project includes 42 townhouse units in two buildings: one building with units in a back to back configuration and the other single-loaded
- Five garden suites are proposed along the east edge of the site to be formatted for enhanced accessibility
- A fire department access pad is located in the north portion of the site, adjacent to the garage entry
- Project is targeting Built Green “Gold” equivalency
- The finish and colour selections were reviewed, with a mix of natural colours inspired by the surroundings
- Project includes significant riparian enhancement and long-term protection for Maplewood Creek

Mr. Gerry Eckford, Landscape Architect, presented the project to the Panel with reference to the following concepts:

- Central courtyard includes a jogged walkway alignment to provide more interest
- A play area is proposed in the north-west portion of the site with an adjacent overlook to the riparian area
- Significant planting is proposed along the street to help provide a sense of arrival, as well as planting along the south property line to provide a buffer to Maplewood Farm.



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 as follows:

- What access is available to riparian area? Not accessible, as per municipal requirements
- Are electrical rooms accessible without steps? Southerly room has no steps. Northerly room requires three steps
- Are open riser stairs permitted for exterior entries as shown? Yes, as long as opening is limited in height as they are in this project
- Is an elevator proposed from the parkade? No
- Will the swing of doors on storage rooms interfere with parked cars? Yes, currently the door swing will encroach into parking space
- There seems to be a lot of stairs in this development - is the play area accessible? The play area is accessible itself but there are steps to the courtyard so access is not entirely barrier-free. Only the east building walkway access is currently shown as accessible
- Why is no elevator provided from the parkade? Mainly due to economics and lack of space on site – but can be reviewed
- Why are there steps to accessible ground-level units? A reflection of grades, but can be reviewed to eliminate unnecessary steps
- What is the rationale for back to back units? Driven by land available once riparian setbacks were accommodated
- Is there a pedestrian linkage to east or south? None to the east and only Fire Department access to the south - pedestrian access is via Heritage Park Lane.
- What are main pedestrian desire lines? Mainly south on Seymour River Place to Maplewood Village Centre

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

1. The project has a significant constraint in creek setback and water table level and this is affecting the site layout
2. Proposed materiality seems more successful than existing project to the east which is positive
3. Accessibility between the garage and unit entries is a concern and should be reviewed
4. West building roof shape contributes to an impression of excessive mass and this roof shape should be reconsidered
5. Wrapping of corner units to north elevations of both building could be improved and would help to provide an improved presence on Heritage Park Lane
6. The garage access dominates the front of the project, and could be improved with a quality paving treatment.

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

- Generally Panel members noted that the site layout and form of development seems reasonable for the site - the built form, layout, and rooflines provide a good foundation for the character of this site
- Significant concern was expressed regarding accessibility in the project, both for the individual unit entries and the common areas in the project
- Revision of steps in the project overall, as well as in front of the accessible units should be considered to improve accessibility and avoid need for stair glide installations
- Improved garage access, with more comfortable stairs and consideration of an elevator, should be explored
- The children's play area was noted as a positive element in the project, but consideration should be given to enhancing the connection between the site and the riparian area through material choices and opportunities to interact with nature
- An improved overlook from the main entry ramp was noted as a possible solution to enhancing connectivity with the environment as well as providing an educational opportunity for children at play
- Specific consideration should be given to the use colour in the project to provide more interest
- Placement of one white-framed window on the north elevations should be re-considered
- Courtyard elevations would be improved with a continuation of the stone cladding currently shown on the street elevation
- Front entrance and relationship to street needs some work to draw the arrival point closer to the street and create a more welcoming relationship – there needs to be a better defined common pedestrian entry
- Fire Department requirements should be reviewed carefully to ensure that the format of access and proposal for grass-crete paving are acceptable
- A 4 storey building with 3 storey townhouse units may require an innovative approach to sprinkler system integration and code compliance issues
- Given the relationship to the creek, robust waterproofing will be needed for the parkade as well as the various mechanical and utility rooms
- Given that the only outdoor space for the upper units is a balcony, the configuration of the balconies should be reviewed to ensure the greatest comfort and usability
- A different type of access door for the garage storage lockers should be considered to avoid conflicts with parked vehicles

The Chair invited the project team to respond.

Mr. Mark Blackwood thanked the Panel for their comments and noted that stacked townhomes are a challenging housing form. The project team is pleased to look at various options to refine the project and in particular to improve accessibility.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

**MOVED** by Steve Wong and **SECONDED** by Amy Tsang:

**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 review of the project.

**CARRIED**

**4. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

**6. NEXT MEETING**

December 8, 2016

Chair



Date

