

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
SEPTEMBER 10, 2015 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Kevin Hanvey
 Mr. Tieg Martin
 Mr. Dan Parke
 Mr. Samir Eidnani
 Mr. Greg Travers
 Ms. Amy Tsang

REGRETS: Ms. Liane McKenna
 Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
 Ms. Annerieke Van Hoek

STAFF: Mr. Michael Hartford
 Ms. Natasha Letchford
 Ms. Ashley Rempel

The meeting came to order at 6:04 pm.

1. MINUTES

A motion was made and carried to adopt the minutes of the Advisory Panel meeting of July 9, 2015.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Michael Hartford welcomed the new Community Service Clerk, Ms. Ashley Rempel.

Mr. Hartford announced that appointments for the 2016 Advisory Design Panel will take place over the next several weeks and explained the following:

Three re-appointments are required for the following members:

- Tieg Martin, Representative of the Construction Industry
- Annerieke Van Hoek, Architect
- Amy Tsang, Landscape Architect

Because the terms of reference for the Panel indicate that "no person may serve a third consecutive term" the following members are not eligible for reappointment and the relevant professional associations will be asked to provide nominations for replacement members:

- Liane McKenna, Landscape Architect
- Kevin Hanvey, Architect

Mr. Hartford noted that the following two positions have been vacant for some time and the District will be advertising for members for these positions:

- Development Industry Representative
- Visual Arts Specialist

3. New Business

Dan Parke was excused from the Panel at 6:09 pm

a. 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 and noted for the Panel that the project was reviewed at the Panel's July meeting. Ms. Letchford reviewed the existing "General Commercial Zone 3" zoning for the site, and noted that the project is consistent with the current zoning and the existing Official Community Plan designation.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team to the meeting and Mr. Dan Parke of Salal Architecture presented the revised project to the Panel. Mr. Parke provided an overview of the four recommendations from the Panel's previous review and explained the changes that have been made to address each concern:

- West wall simplified to allow for one wall plane and continuous materials;
- Roof forms simplified with a reduction in covered roof areas to allow for individual elements to be expressed and ceiling height reduced from 15 feet to 13 feet;
- Ground level signage removed and wall signage enhanced to improve way-finding for visitors on foot and in vehicles;
- North elevation simplified in the approach to entrance design, roof elements, and finishes. The north wall remains concrete as this is believed to be the best material – the owners are aware of and comfortable with the necessary required;
- East elevation displays a simplified roofline and architectural features, as well as a reduced number of material choices. The electrical transformer has been relocated and the inset stair moved to the building face;
- For the south wall, the District's Urban Design Planner had suggested that a clerestory window approach might help to break up this façade. Mr. Parke noted that the design team reviewed the idea but concluded that a better approach would be to break up the wall with additional landscaping.

Mr. Gerry Eckford of ETA Landscape Architecture outlined the design team's responses to the Panel's comments with regard to landscaping:

- The plant palette has been revised to highlight more natural selections, particularly for the area along the north terrace - this approach is intended to reflect the nearby natural forest edge;
- Two large trees have been added for additional shading and buffer in the area at the north side of the building;
- Two curved rooftop terrace areas are now proposed, which include seating and plantings to reflect the natural plant palette;
- The relocation of the electrical transformer allows for additional plantings to reduce exposure to Capilano Road traffic.

The Chair thanked the applicant 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 intended use for the upper deck areas? Staff use and exercise for animals, with separate areas for dogs and cats;
- Why does the path on the north side of the building change from concrete to gravel? The pathway is intended for emergency exiting use only, so the gravel surfacing is intended to reduce the likelihood of the public using the path;
- The revised plan shows the deletion of two ground level signs – is the owner comfortable with this change to signage? Yes.
- Are the material selections unchanged from the original proposal? Yes.

Comments from the District Urban Design Planner, Mr. Alfonso Tejada included recognition of the following positive aspects to the amended project:

- The project appears less busy with a greater clarity of the built form and the corner element on Capilano Road acting as a focal point for orientation and access to the building;
- The vertical green elements proposed for the south elevation should be helpful in breaking down the length of this elevation.

Mr. Tejada also offered some comments for consideration:

- The concrete wall on the north façade does not appear to show variations in treatment and some clarity is needed on the final treatment for the wall finish;
- Additional detail is required on the adjustments to signage proposed to ensure clarity and simplicity.

In their review, members of the Panel noted the following comments and items for consideration:

- Project appears much improved and simplifying the design has improved the aesthetics;
- Some concern regarding the apparent “floating plane” over the underground parking entrance, as this element is finished in quite a heavy material for a location over a large opening;
- Could reconsider roof extension on corner tower above loading dock – in the current format, this element may be too high and thin to serve the desired purpose;
- Loading dock lighting needs to be examined to ensure safe movements in this area;
- Ensure signage on corner tower element is readable;
- Tongue and groove cedar finish material could be problematic for maintenance, and alternate finish materials with a similar look might and reduced maintenance might be preferable;
- Gravel surfacing for the exit pathway could be problematic for compliance with Building Code, so needs to be reviewed carefully;
- There would be a benefit in seeing more definition or interest in the proposed north and south concrete walls;
- Vines proposed for south wall may need to be re-considered as code requirements stipulate non-combustible materials along the property line;
- Code compliance for safety issues should be reviewed for the underground parking area;
- The proposed stair details in the project are interesting, but should be reviewed to ensure code compliance for safety;

- The project includes a large variety in hardscape paving choices for a relatively small project, and there may be merit in simplifying these paving selections;
- The roof deck area could benefit from more seating, and perhaps a circular pathway layout to allow the area to be more comfortable and functional;
- Landscaping approach appears improved and the incorporation of native plant materials is particularly supported.

The Chair invited the project team to respond.

Mr. Eckford, Landscape Architect, requested some clarification on the Panel's comment regarding combustible materials along the south property line. It was explained that in the area adjacent to the property line no combustible materials, including the potential for dry vegetation, is permitted, and compliance with the code requirements will need to be reviewed.

Mr. Parke, Architect, noted an appreciation for the Panel's comments and suggested that the previous input had improved the project.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion.

MOVED by Tieg Martin and **SECONDED** by Amy Tsang:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the application and recommends **APPROVAL** of the project **SUBJECT** to addressing to the satisfaction of staff, the items minuted in the Panel's review of the project.

CARRIED

Mr. Dan Parke rejoined the Panel at 6:43 pm

b. Workshop Item – Format of Meeting Minutes

Mr. Hartford introduced the discussion topic, and explained that over the last couple of years the minutes of the Panel's meetings have tended to become longer and more detailed. Mr. Hartford reviewed three approaches to minutes that could be used to record the Panel's meetings. These approaches were termed "verbatim," "verbatim light," and "action items." The characteristics of each approach were reviewed. Mr. Hartford concluded the introduction with a number of questions for the Panel as way to establish what form of minutes would work best for future meetings:

- How much detail is needed in the summary of the applicant's presentation?
- How much detail is needed in the "questions of clarification" section of the minutes?
- How much detail is needed in the Panel comments section of the minutes?
- Any other ideas or comments on the way in which the minutes are formatted?

A general discussion took place on the purpose of keeping minutes and how the minutes could best be formatted. A number of questions and comments were made by Panel members in the ensuing discussion:

- Shorter documents are preferable for the Panel members in reviewing the draft minutes for consideration of adoption;
- Summarizing presentations and discussion in bullet point form is simple and helpful;
- The meeting minutes should provide enough detail to be understandable to a Panel member who was not present at the meeting;
- There should be enough detail in the summary of the presentation to understand the minutes without using the submission package;
- Could less detail be provided in the discussion section of the minutes, with more detail in the final motion? It was suggested that trying to include too much detail in the concluding motion could result in the Panel spending an inordinate amount of time composing and discussing the draft motion and it might be preferable to avoid this;
- How much detail is required in the summary of the Panel's comments? It was noted that some level of detail in the commentary can be useful for applicants and staff to be able to determine the intent of the comments, and the changes that might be necessary in a project design;
- Could applicant's presentation materials form part of the meeting minute package? In response, it was suggested this might be possible, but to ensure the minutes packages did not become huge, would require submission of all applicant packages in an electronic format which is not currently done.
- It was noted as valuable to reference the fact that some minuted comments may reflect general agreement among Panel members, while others may reflect the opinion of one or two Panel members.
- Questions of clarification used to be a separate part of the meeting, could they be removed as a way to shorten the minutes? The group concluded that the opportunity to ask clarifying questions is important to allow for appropriate commentary to be provided. Whether documentation of these questions and answers needs to be recorded in the minutes was discussed, and it was agreed that on a case by case basis and if a question was asked that could be answered by reference to the submission package, documentation of the clarification question could be omitted from the minutes.

The Panel agreed that using an approach reflecting the "verbatim light" style of minute taking would be most beneficial for the Panel in allowing for ease of review and a shorter, clearer document, while still providing sufficient detail to allow the minutes to be useful.

District staff thanked the Panel for their comments and committed to incorporating the suggested changes into to the approach to the meeting minutes.

It was agreed that no resolution was required, and that the revised approach to minute taking would be implemented as discussed, with any further changes in format to be reviewed with the Panel prior to implementation.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

October 8, 2015


Chair

Nov. 12, 2015
Date