

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON  
DECEMBER 8, 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. Stefen Elmitt  
Mr. Craig Taylor  
Mr. Samir Eidnani  
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell  
Ms. Diana Zoe Coop

REGRETS: Mr. Tieg Martin

STAFF: Mr. Michael Hartford  
Mr. Nathan Andrews  
Mr. Alfonso Tejada  
Mr. Kevin Zhang (Item 3.a. and Item 3.b.)

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 November 10, 2016.

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. Michael Hartford reported on two items:

a) Appointments to the Panel:

Mr. Jordan Levine has been nominated by the Architectural Institute and appointed by District Council to a two year appointment to the Panel as "Architect."

Mr. Samir Eidnani has been re-appointed by District Council for an additional two year term in the role of "Professional Engineer."

Mr. Hartford expressed his appreciation to Mr. Eidnani for offering to stand for re-appointment, to Mr. Dan Parke for his two years of service to the Panel, and to Mr. Greg Travers for his four years of contributions to the work of the Panel.

## b) Design Awards Voting:

To allow sufficient time for visits to the project sites, voting on projects has been deferred to the meeting of January 12, 2017. Mr. Hartford clarified for the Panel a question on the voting process and how comments will be recorded.

**3. NEW BUSINESS****a.) 1700 Marine Drive/1633 Tatlow Ave.: Detailed Planning Application – mixed use development with 33 residential units and 7 commercial units (Second Review)**

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Community Planner, introduced the development permit application and provided background on the past work supporting the application, the site context, the relevant OCP guidelines for Commercial and Mixed-Use Buildings and Energy and Water Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reductions, as well as the Marine Drive Design Guidelines. It was noted that the development proposal is under its second review at the detailed stage after being presented to the Panel at the meeting of August 11, 2016.

The development site is located on the north-west corner of Marine Drive and Tatlow Avenue. It is adjacent to commercial properties, to the east, south, and west, and residential properties, to the north. The development proposes 33 apartment units, 6500 square feet of commercial space, and an FSR of 1.75. No rezoning is required or proposed.

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:

- Changes from the previous proposal were reviewed, including a key change in the roof height variance for the corner feature from 2.9 feet to 4.5 feet in order to provide more prominence for this feature
- The angled corner feature has been modified with the use of glass extending to the upper roofline
- Garbage and recycling facilities for the residential and commercial units will have a shared access point for efficiency
- The residential lobby space has been simplified and made to feel larger and the access corridor at the rear of the commercial spaces will have glass corner displays to alleviate the angularity of the corridor
- "Nichiha" siding panels are proposed as the key finish material
- Shadow testing was done to ensure that the 7 foot depth of deck spaces would still allow for good interior access to light
- Mr. Tom Barrett, Landscape Architect, reviewed the landscape changes in the revised proposal as well as the structural soil proposed for tree planting beds
- It was noted that the streetscape designs for Marine Drive and Tatlow Avenue are meant to reflect the objectives from the Marine Drive Design Guidelines including the use of a variety of paving types and plantings with interest in all seasons

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:

- Is real turf used on the North West corner of the site? Yes, real turf is proposed
- What types of benches are proposed? "Victor Stanley" as per the District specifications
- What is the clearance for the closet entries to allow access to the bathroom? The doorway is the standard allowance of 30 inches
- Will the "Nichiha" siding be painted? The siding comes pre-finished
- What is the proposed soffit material? High quality perforated aluminum
- What was the inspiration for the change in colours? The intention was to stay away from earth-tones and instead to brighten things with a more marine-influenced, pastel, or art deco scheme
- How is the roof insulated? An inverted roof system with insulation above the membrane
- What landscaping is proposed along the walkway to the garage exit staircase? Low grasses to ensure good visibility
- How tall is the landscaping in the planters at the northwest corner of the site? Approximately four feet in height – meant to screen the corner area reserved for a future lane and to provide for a more appealing overlook
- The breezeway is enclosed but are the loading bay and garbage areas still open? Yes, the loading bay and garbage areas are not secured
- Is it proposed that the breezeway include mirrors for security purposes? Yes
- What is the sustainability target for the project? No specific target because rezoning is not proposed but project will include some sustainability measures to address green building development permit guidelines
- Does the "Nichiha" siding material extend to the ground? Yes, with a 6 to 12 inches concrete base

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

The west end of Marine Drive has not seen much development while the east end has. The Marine Drive Guidelines encourage a relationship to existing development, but this project will be setting the theme in this part of the corridor. With this in mind a number of adjustments could be considered to enhance the project:

- Re-considering the "paired" doors to the CRU's
- Allowing for the pattern of residential units to continue through to the commercial base to provide for a better relationship in the elements of the building
- The colour of the building and the treatment of the west wall need more attention
- The Marine Drive Guidelines encourage an industrial and transport theme with reliance upon natural materials
- The canopy elements should use strong dark colours
- Treatment and colour of the soffit material should be reconsidered

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

- A number of comments were made noting the improvements to the overall project design, including the efforts toward simplification
- There was some appreciation for a more adventurous colour and material scheme, but it was suggested that the selections do not adequately reflect a North Vancouver setting and the Marine Drive context - introducing timber or heavy steel elements at commercial and residential entrances might be positive additions and the applicant was encouraged to refer back to the Marine Drive Guidelines for colours and materials
- It was suggested that an option to explore would be to substitute wood finish materials for the "terra cotta" coloured components of the project
- Canopy elements in particular were noted as benefitting from being simplified, but it was suggested that the end points of the canopies needed some further work to clarify exactly what they are sheltering
- Provision of security gates in the breezeway is a positive feature but during the daytime the space may still face safety challenges – the proposed gates will need to be secured appropriately to avoid creating other security issues
- To ensure safety and comfort, the breezeway area needs to be bright, visible, and airy so it does not attract the unwanted users – some additional design work in this area is necessary
- Some disappointment was noted that the previous comments regarding the building façades were not significantly addressed
- It was suggested that the curved corner element seemed like an out of place design choice relative to the other building forms – this element seemed to compromise the simplicity and rhythm of the project
- Massing and window layouts were noted as positive, but the corner element as currently designed was noted as needing some additional review – the soffit detailing in particular of this feature would benefit from a different approach
- A greater harmony was noted as desirable between the commercial and residential elements of the project – coordinated articulation and building materials could help to bring these elements together and the commercial frontages should reflect the building alignment above
- A simpler approach to the CRU entrances with the deletion of the proposed dividers between doors was suggested
- The deep balconies, particularly on the north side of the building could benefit from some different material choices, and the angled balcony dividers were noted for unnecessary complexity while not necessarily offering the desired privacy.
- An alternate location for the amenity room, rather than having it face the Tatlow Avenue street frontage, would allow for a more active frontage in this portion of the building
- Proposal for planters and turf in the area at the northwest corner of the site was noted as being overly complicated – in particular because the proposed grasses can grow quite tall

- Previously consistent approach to paving seemed like a positive aspect of the original proposal – the current proposal for multiple paver types seems like it needs additional attention to be successful
- Loading bay might benefit from bollards to avoid vehicles driving onto the pedestrian walkway area
- For code purposes, the below grade and above grade exit stairs need to be separated, a compliant fire separation between the loading area and the open breezeway needs to be implemented, and access for bike storage from the residential lobby needs to be re-considered.
- The fire sprinkler and alarm system approaches will need to be considered carefully to ensure that the systems meet code requirements and Fire Department expectations

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Mr. Robert Lee, project architect, acknowledged the Panel's suggestions, and suggested that the design team will work with District staff to further refine and improve the design and colours of the building, as well as to review the corner feature of the project.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

**MOVED** by Craig Taylor and **SECONDED** by Stefen Elmitt:

**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 review of the project.

**CARRIED**

**b.) 2932 Chesterfield Ave: Detailed Planning Application – 4 unit townhouse development (Second Review)**

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Community Planner, introduced the project and provided background for the application, including the site and surrounding uses, relationship to the Official Community Plan, and that the project would be measured against development permit guidelines for Ground Oriented Housing, Multi-Family Housing, and Energy and Water Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction. Mr. Zhang noted that the project was originally considered by the Panel on September 8, 2016 - the project design has been since been modified to address the Panel's comments.

Mr. Zhang noted that the site is zoned Residential Single Family Zone RS4 and is located at the north-east corner of Chesterfield Avenue and West 29<sup>th</sup> Street and has an area of approximately 692 square meters. The site is considered part of the "Queensdale Village Centre" which supports increased densities in order to take advantage of transit options, access to services, and general walkability. The development proposes four townhouse units within two separate buildings. The three-storey development proposes an FSR of 1.2 and will require rezoning and a development permit approval by District Council.

The Chair asked if there were any questions from the Panel for Mr. Zhang and the following question was posed:

Are secondary suites accommodated by the proposed zoning of the site? The application has been modified to remove the secondary suites previously proposed.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Farzin Yadegari of Farzin Yadegari Architecture introduced the project. Mr. Yadegari noted the following points in the presentation:

- Revised project has the same number of units, floorspace ratio, and parking arrangement
- Key difference is that the buildings have been simplified and are more streamlined in design - more contemporary materials are proposed and the front entrances are better defined
- Corner element at the south-west corner of the site has been highlighted and this portion of the westerly building has been enhanced with corner windows and a wood siding detail
- More continuity along the west side of the building facing Chesterfield Avenue has been provided to simplify the building
- Roof deck access is provided by code-compliant skylight hatches in each unit
- Revised landscaping shows more variety in the plant selections and the art element at the south-west corner of the site has been replaced with a cherry tree
- The landscape design incorporates deciduous and evergreen plant materials to create continuity with the local neighbourhood and adjacent developments as well as to provide year-round interest
- Evergreen vines have been incorporated on the back wall of the parking area to enhance this element 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 and answered on the following topics:

- Have options been considered to amend the roof deck stair enclosures to avoid blocking views? This can be reviewed in more detail to explore options for revisions.

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

1. Main issues with the project as previously identified have been addressed in the revised proposal
2. Character of residential units has been successfully highlighted as well as the relationship with the existing adjacent multi-family development
3. Revised materials and massing are appropriate

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

- In general it was noted that the changes proposed were refreshing and that the applicant team appeared to have addressed successfully the Panel's previous comments – the "before and after" images clearly show the changes, as well as the rationale for the changes
- It was noted that the design approach is different than what might have been expected 10 years ago for this site, but the current proposal seems very successful
- The proposed roof decks were noted as positive and an improvement over the previous proposal, but it was noted that the detailing of the building envelope and flashing on the decks should be looked at to avoid drainage and water issues
- Some exploration of further refinements to the roof deck and balcony railings would be beneficial - the west and south elevations could benefit from a bit more differentiation in terms of the glass balcony and roof deck guards
- Fenestration should be detailed carefully to accurately represent operable elements of windows
- Significant code issues exist for four-storey residential townhouse buildings and it was noted that these issues will need to be examined carefully prior to the building permit stage of the project, particularly with regard to the compliance of the roof stair enclosures
- Proposed gate element to parking area still seems a bit thin and could use more weight to counteract the void between the two buildings
- The landscaping changes and the integration of vines in the parking area were noted as positive additions to the site, but it was suggested that the wall at the rear of the parking area could be softened by introducing lattice or trellis type materials

The Chair invited the project team to respond.

The applicant team thanked the Panel for the comments.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

**MOVED** by Diana Zoe Coop and **SECONDED** by Steve Wong:

**THAT** the ADP has reviewed the proposal, commends the applicant for the quality of the proposal, and recommends **APPROVAL** of the project as presented.

**CARRIED**

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

January 12, 2017

Chair



Date

JAN 12, 2017