

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
JULY 9, 2015 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Kevin Harvey
 Mr. Tieg Martin
 Ms. Liane McKenna
 Mr. Dan Parke
 Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
 Mr. Samir Eidnani
 Ms. Annerieke Van Hoek
 Mr. Greg Travers

REGRETS: Ms. Amy Tsang

STAFF: Mr. Alfonso Tejada
 Mr. Michael Hartford
 Ms. Tamsin Guppy
 Ms. Natasha Letchford
 Ms. Azam Ansari

The meeting came to order at 6:00 pm.

1. MINUTES

A motion was made and carried to adopt the minutes of the Advisory Panel meeting of May 14, 2015.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a. 10 Pemberton Ave – Detailed Application for Development Permit for Office Building (Seaspan)

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, District Planner, introduced the design team and gave a brief introduction to the project including a review of the current EZ-I zoning, the OCP designation, and the size and context of the property. Ms. Guppy noted that the application is for a development permit for a four-storey head office building on the southern end of the large site, and that that proposal does not require rezoning.

The Chair thanked Ms. Guppy for her presentation, welcomed the applicant team to the meeting, and outlined the procedure to be followed in reviewing the proposal.

Mr. Alan Boniface, Principal Architect of Dialog Architecture, reviewed the site location and context, and introduced Peter Atkinson, Project Architect, to review the details of building form, material choices, contamination issues and habitat restoration. Mr. Atkinson reviewed the nautical theme proposed for the building and noted that the building is elevated above

sea level and protected from flood hazard. The challenging nature of the site was reviewed as well as the floor plan, roof design, landscape approach, and impacts of the adjacent wood fibre operation.

The Chair asked if there were questions of clarification from the Panel and questions on the following topics were raised:

What is the material for the landscape screening wall? Answer: Concrete panels in a grey colour.

Does mechanical equipment screening recognize the dust issue? Answer: Yes

Will fiber cement panels at the ground level be rain-screened? Answer: Yes

Is the west side pedestrian walkway public? Answer: No, it is for staff use only.

Can the public access the site? Answer: Yes, but only for business purposes with Seaspan.

What soffit material is proposed beneath the building? Answer: Metal.

Is the design of building intended to help the building stand out on the waterfront? Answer: No, the location is very busy and complex – a more subtle approach is intended.

Has rainwater collection been considered? Answer: Yes, under consideration but the storage location and dust issues are challenging.

The Chair asked for comments from the District Urban Design Planner, Mr. Alfonso Tejada.

Mr. Tejada supported the nautical theme of the building, and made some suggestions for the project:

- Consider reflecting the nautical theme in the design of the penthouse space to reflect a ship's prow
- Consider refining the railing design for the balcony to accentuate the nautical theme
- Extend and taper the roof line to have a lighter character
- Consider a more integrated and vibrant approach to colour accents;
- Alter or eliminate the low walls surrounding the parking area to provide for enhanced sightlines
- Allow for the spit to the south of the proposed building for use as a viewing and seating location

The Chair invited comments from the Panel.

Panel members thanked the applicant for a thorough presentation, and while they generally supported the nautical theme, it was questioned as to the extent to which the project really reflected this objective.

There was discussion about the roofline and whether the curve of the roof and the blunt edge of the roofline were successful or whether modifications to the roof line and roof edge would be beneficial and add to the nautical flavour of the building.

Panel members suggested that the site could lend itself to bolder use of colour and encouraged the applicant to consider expanding the use of colour on the building.

A Panel member noted some concerns with the potential for solar impacts on the atrium feature.

Panel members noted that the soffit material on the ground level beneath the main floor will be visible and needs to be carefully handled.

Panel members suggested that the landscape design would benefit from some additional attention, and encouraged consideration of improvements to the look-out area and the walkway. Discussion also focused on the wall beside the pathway and methods of softening this wall, as well as on the treatment of the landscaping at the base of the building. It was noted that a different plant palette could be considered for the screening of vehicles, which could reflect the nautical theme and allow for a better connection of the building to its site.

A Panel member noted some concern with the proposed boiler room location above the elevator shaft and the fact that drainage from the boiler room would need to be handled carefully.

The distance from the accessible parking stalls to the entrance and elevator location was questioned, and it was suggested that consideration be given to reducing this distance.

The Chair invited the project architect to respond to the comments made by the Panel. Mr. Atkinson thanked the Panel and noted that the design team would carefully consider the Panel's input.

The Chair invited the Panel compose a motion.

MOVED by Annerieke Van Hoek and **SECONDED** by Samir Eidnani:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal, and recommends **Approval** of the project **Subject** to addressing the following items to the satisfaction of staff:

- Further exploration of additional colour in the project
- Further exploration of the soffit material at the ground level
- Detailed design development of landscape treatment soften and better "ground" the building
- Design development of landscaping to enhance the southern plaza / outdoor seating area and walkway, to support better use of this area by staff and others
- Further exploration of the roof form and detailing
- Improvements to the location of the accessible parking to provide for greater convenience.

CARRIED

Dan Parke excused himself from the Panel at 7:05 pm

b. 2580 Capilano Road - Detailed Application for Development Permit for Veterinary hospital and District of North Vancouver Animal Shelter

Ms. Natasha Letchford, District Planner, introduced the project, noting that the site is bounded by Capilano Road and highway ramps for the Trans-Canada Highway. It was noted that the proposal is for an animal hospital combined with the District of North Vancouver animal shelter, with a total building of area of approximately 11,320 sq. ft. The building proposed is two-storeys in height, with one level of underground parking and access from Capilano Road. Current zoning is "General Commercial Zone 3" and the project is consistent with the current zoning and the Official Community Plan designation.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team to the meeting and Mr. Dan Parke of Salal Architecture presented the project to the Panel. Mr. Parke provided an overview of the design drawing attention to the curves of the building, the finish materials selected, and the fact that the rooftop accommodates the majority of the mechanical components and is organized to accommodate a future solar array.

Mr. Gerry Eckford of ETA Landscape Architecture Inc. commented on the landscape plans including the fact that the landscape objective is to maintain the existing trees and to enhance the project with primarily native plantings.

The Chair asked if there were questions of clarification from the Panel members and the following topics were raised:

How will southbound vehicles on Capilano Road access the site? Answer: Vehicle access to the site is most feasible northbound on Capilano Road. Southbound access is discouraged.

Are there multiple public entrances to the building for the two building components? Answer: No – public access is through a single shared front entrance.

How will the building be accessed 24 hours a day? Answer: Access will be available through the main entrance with the exception of dangerous animals which will enter via the rear elevator.

Will there be room for animals to exercise on the rooftop? Answer: Yes.

Is there a fire hydrant nearby? Answer: Not currently, but a new hydrant will be installed.

Is there a possibility of fencing the north property to create a space for animals? Answer: No, the Ministry of Transportation will not permit any fences within their setback

The Chair asked for comments from the District Urban Planner, Mr. Alfonso Tejada.

Mr. Tejada commended the design team on their well thought out approach, and noted that building has the potential to become a gateway element to the Lower Capilano area. Mr. Tejada suggested that some benefit could be achieved through simplification of the overall design approach, in particular the layering of materials on the west elevation and a reduction in signage. The use of clerestory windows on the south elevation was suggested as a method to break up the solid wall.

The Chair invited comments from the Panel members.

In general, the Panel acknowledged the challenges of the site and commended the project team on their overall approach.

There was general agreement that the building could benefit from:

- a reduction in the number of finish materials;
- a simplification of the architectural form by focusing on the three main elements of the building: corner pavilion, curved north elevation, and flat south elevation;
- improving the legibility of the main entrance and increasing its prominence; and,
- reducing and simplifying the signage
- ensuring successful wayfinding on the site to guide visitors to the front entrance
- careful analysis of issues such as exiting requirements for the animal shelter component and security of the parkade

It was suggested that a simple model of the site and building would assist in future discussions on the project.

It was noted that the progression in the landscaping from natural to more formal elements is a strong approach but that there could be value in adding more landscaping to soften the entrance plaza area.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Mr. Parke thanked the Panel for their comments and assured the Panel that their comments will be incorporated into the project.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion.

MOVED by Annerieke Van Hoek and **SECONDED** by Tieg Martin:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the application and **supports** the general concept, but recommends revisions to the proposal and a further presentation to address the items raised by the Panel in its review of the project including the following:

- a review of the building massing, articulation, and finishes to allow for simplification and greater clarity of building elements;
- exploration of options for improving building signage, particularly to provide improved way-finding to the main entrance;
- a review of the treatment of the north concrete wall to ensure an appropriate long-term appearance; and,
- strong encouragement for the use of a physical model in any future presentation.

CARRIED

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

August 13, 2015



Chair

SEPT 10, 2015

Date