

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
May 10, 2018 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

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

REGRETS: Mr. Samir Eidnani
 Mr. Alfonso Tejada

STAFF: Ms. Tamsin Guppy
 Mr. Kevin Zhang
 Mr. Adam Wright
 Ms. Robyn Hay (Item 3.a.)
 Mr. Erik Wilhelm (Item 3.b.)

The meeting came to order at 6:02 pm.

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of April 12, 2018.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Design Planner was unable to attend the meeting, however, he provided written comments on the applications to be communicated by Mr. Kevin Zhang, Development Planner.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 2555 Whiteley Court – Kiwanis Lynn Woods and Lynn Manor Renovation and Addition

- Façade upgrades to Lynn Manor were approved in 2017 and are underway. This subject proposal includes a new building to the south of the existing building and further upgrades to the existing building at ground level including canopies at the entrances and awnings over the walkways.

Ms. Robyn Hay, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Patrick McLaughlin, President of Kiwanis North Shore Housing Society, Mr. Greg Voute from Raymond Letkeman Architects, and Ms. Jocelle Smith 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:

- What is the net addition of parking stalls and are they compliant with the minimum requirements? Ms. Robyn Hay, Development Planner, indicated that there are 82 existing stalls on site, and that the proposal is for 133 stalls. The proposed number of stalls are well over the senior's parking requirement of 0.33 parking stalls per unit. The proposal also provides 12 visitor parking stalls.
- Do the tandem parking stalls exist currently and what is the plan for these stalls? They are currently shown on the plans, but we are planning on reducing overall parking demand over time to phase out some of the parking areas. Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner indicated that tandem parking seems to work well in this case as it is intended to function with a valet-like service for those residents who continue to own cars but rarely use them.
- What is the location of the parkade wall on the west side, is it at grade level? The wall is located on the west side of the parkade.
- How are you treating the difference in grade on the site? We are planning on providing a 1 foot berm to minimize the grade change and then plant the berm area to screen the parkade wall. Where will the PMT and parking exhaust vents be located? There is an existing electrical room that we are considering using, but we need to conduct a full engineering analysis before that is determined.
- Where is the yellow colour proposed to be used on the building? It is used as accent on the Northeast corner entrance and the west façade of the low rise building, as well as on the soffits of the existing tower below the patios.
- Have you considered putting a tower instead of a low rise building here? We have been trying to determine our best building footprint within the limitations of our budget. We started from the perspective of a tower, but found an approximate 30% construction cost premium of concrete vs. wood frame which was beyond our budget.

- Can you speak to the detailing of the patio sill to ensure it meets accessibility requirements? We will be providing a step, a non-slip rubber ramp and a threshold for wheelchair accessibility.
- Are all units Level 2 adaptable? Approximately 80% are Level 2 adaptable. Some units do not have a pocket door, as it is difficult to add these in some unit types as they take up more structural wall space but we are working to include as many of the adaptable features as possible on all the units.
- Are you able to achieve Step Code 3? While it will be a challenge to meet Step Code 3, we are planning on achieving it and we have a Sustainability Consultant on board to provide a comprehensive strategy. We currently have proposed a wood frame building with less than 40% glazing.
- Is the parking secured with a gate? Yes.
- For First Responders, is there clear access to the existing and new building? Yes
- How are you defining separate entrances for emergency access? There are two different addresses with 2 different building names.
- How are you defining territoriality and safety along the Kirkstone Park (south) side of the building? There is a fence proposed along the south side of the property to define the property and restrict access.

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Development Planner, provided the following urban design comments for consideration:

- The new building seems to be a complimentary addition to the existing building.
- The separation of the tower and mid rise seem to be appropriate.
- The design seems to suitably avoid windows at the pinch points between the buildings in order to maintain privacy.
- Consider playing with the arcade framing or adding more horizontal elements to respond to the vertical columns.
- Tall landscaping along the western edge is appropriate to maintain privacy between neighbouring buildings.
- The design seems to fit well with the site and landscaping.
- Although updates have been made to the east entrance, the materials and columns feel quite heavy. Consider separating the materials, using different materials, or adding some kind of relief between sections of buildings to lighten up the overall impression.
- The entrance elements could be lighter, friendlier, and human-scaled.

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

- The yellow accent colour on the facade could be bolder.
- The programming of amenity space is great, although seems to fill up the entire space. Consider reorganizing to create more space and consider the potential to provide more seating around the bocce lawn.

-
- The landscaping is well thought out, however the kiwis could be too aggressive for the trellis.
 - The package is comprehensive, the presentation was good, and it is an important and attractive building for the community.
 - Support the use of yellow as the colour is cheerful and may make the project feel less institutional and more like home, but support the consideration of a more intense shade of yellow
 - Beautiful landscaping proposed along the perimeter and good connection to the pathway on the east side of the property which links to Kirkstone Park.
 - Good materials, the contrasting lighter and darker colours works well.
 - There seems to be an opportunity for a green roof above the Great Hall which would benefit those units looking down onto it
 - A two or three foot wide gravel path could be added along the south side of the property for landscaping maintenance.
 - The west side planted berm seems to be predominantly deciduous planting, but in order to screen the parkade consider evergreen planting to screen the parkade for 12 months of the year.
 - The two entrance lobbies could potentially be confusing, but seems to makes sense for an addition.
 - The drop off and pick up area is generous in size and the level grade of the arrival courtyard is nice.
 - The light colour proposed on the top two floors help to ensure the building is not over bearing or dominate
 - The differentiation in building materials seems to satisfy the intent of the design guidelines.
 - The bathroom vents seem to be taken out through the soffits, which would not detract from the visual impression of the façade.
 - The electrical and mechanical rooms do not seem to be labelled on the plans.
 - Be careful on level one as you refine the design that you don't loose the electrical closet next to the elevator core and steer away from hydraulic elevators that add costs.
 - The length of the hallway / travel distance to the elevator could be reconsidered. An additional elevator could be provided to meet the demand.
 - Another service may be required from BC Hydro.
 - The amount of brick proposed is quite extensive, this could be scaled back for cost savings and not go as high on the building where it may not have the same impact as at grade
 - The careful arrangement of the windows at the pinch point between the two buildings is appreciated in order to maintain privacy of adjacent units in close proximity.
 - Consider rethinking the variety of balcony sizes to ensure that all units have a minimum useable open space.
 - The overall layout of the plan and the suites seem quite livable.
 - The package provided is impressive and greatly exceeds benchmark design quality.

- It seem as though the addition may be trying to make an apology for the older concrete tower as opposed to celebrating it.
- There may be potential to shift the overall expression from vernacular to a more modernist design.
- Agree that the yellow colour on the façade could be enhanced.
- The pathway leading into the amenity area seems to not be as direct as it was in the parti (concept plan) and as a result has lost the visual connection from the public path into the private garden. A visual link would make a more inviting entrance to the amenity space.
- The elevations tend to demonstrate a hierarchy in the façade, but the rationale in the design guidelines for stepping back the upper storeys is merited and without the step back the 6 storey façade may feel somewhat heavy. If possible consider a setback to those upper floors.
- Stepping back the building could be a good feature in the long run, despite being more costly in the short term.

A Panel member who was not able to attend the meeting provided comments in writing below:

- Consider beginning early discussions with your contractor regarding the potential impacts to the existing residents in the tower with respect to the construction staging and interaction with occupied areas; and the course of construction fire protection measures to the neighbouring sites (especially the tower).
- At this stage it does not seem like the new 6 storey will be connected to the existing high-rise; if connections to the existing building do occur this will require a review for the impact on the life safety systems and connection of fire alarms.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Patrick McLaughlin acknowledged the Panel's suggestions, appreciated the feedback and was happy to take them into account in the development of the design. Mr. Greg Voute also conveyed the following comments below:

- Two elevators are being proposed.
- The green roof above the Great Hall will be considered.
- More colour was initially considered in the recesses of the buildings along the back walls of the balcony, which will be reconsidered.
- Shingles were originally considered at the back (south side) of the building and within the interior courtyard instead of brick for cost saving and to create texture and difference of material.
- The comments on the pathway to the amenity space are appreciated.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Mr. Tieg Martin and **SECONDED** by Mr. Charles Leman.

THAT the ADP has review 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

b.) 1920 & 1932 Glenaire Drive – Holland Row Townhomes

Mr. Erik Wilhelm, Development Planner, introduced the project and reminded the Panel that the project was returning for reconsideration having been reviewed by the Panel on March 8, 2018, and provided a brief reminder of the general context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Thomas Grimwood from Grimwood Architecture and Mr. Darryl Tyacke 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:

- Were there supposed to be landscape drawings in the package? Yes, they are provided in the package (a new package was provided to the panel member whose package was missing key pages).
- How is the garbage managed by residents in Building 5? There is a stair connection that can be taken between Phase 1 and 2 buildings or they can take the ramp to dispose of waste.
- Will a gravel path be provided along the north side of the site? We are currently in discussions with Metro Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver about moving the path closer to the riparian area and adding a gravel path.
- Is the horizontal siding cedar? Yes, it is quite durable from a maintenance perspective.
- Does the turret element have a different black material? It is a darker grey.
- The wall on the far northwest corner of the parkade seems to be right on the property line, does this provide sufficient room? The corner is tight, we are considering construction limits from the property line, and room for vehicle flow in the parkade.
- Mr. Erik Wilhelm, Development Planner indicated that there is a need for a pathway connection, however, there are ongoing discussions with Metro Vancouver and West Vancouver regarding the provision and location of a trail.

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Development Planner, provided a brief presentation and provided the following comments for consideration:

- There have been many improvements and the package seems well organized.
- The patios on the front of the buildings seem to be addressed, the exit stairs to the parkade have been removed and the building design changes seem to better respond to Glenaire Drive.
- The pedestrian entrance could be improved to better use the space that has been opened up from removing the exit stairs. The geometry could be changed to be more inviting for people.

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

- The overall improvements create a more elegant and believable building form and the subtle detailing is helpful.
- The entrance marking trellis may not be strong enough, perhaps it could be perpendicular to the road to be more inviting and natural.
- The wall on the western property line is still a concern but if supported by parks staff it seems to be potentially addressed with landscaping.
- The eastern perspective, looking down Glenaire Drive, would have been nice to include in the package.
- The landscaping seems to fit well with the architecture, and the plant materials are great.
- A fire plan and clear unit identification will likely help first responders in an emergency.
- Cedar siding would be great, and the lack of corner boxes is great.
- A convex mirror in the northwest parkade corner will be helpful for drivers.
- Nice to see the colour palette tying in to Phase 1.
- The parkette is a lovely addition as a transition to the neighbouring park.
- There seems to be an opportunity to better frame the entrance plaza on the east side.
- The pergola design could better relate to the architectural era of the buildings, perhaps by being more elaborate or reflecting a time that is more consistent with the architectural design.
- There seems to be a nice balance between the two phases
- The project is greatly improved and it appears the applicant team listened to the Panel's comments and addressed the architectural concerns.
- Mr. Kevin Zhang indicated that garage doors in the parkade are not supported as the Fire Inspectors need to be able to see what is being stored. Mr. Thomas Grimwood explained that it is a metal grill gate, rather than an enclosed space, and the grill gate is transparent.
- The entryway is improved with removal of the exit stairs but agree with other Panel members that it still needs work.
- The backfill slope and the stair connection to the public pathway and park could be challenging and needs further work
- The space in between the two phases seems to be reduced to approximately 10 feet, consider any opportunities to widen the space between Building 1 (Phase 1) and Building 4 (Phase 2).

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

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

THAT the ADP has review 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

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 pm.

6. NEXT MEETING

May 24, 2018


Chair

May 24, 2018
Date