

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
December 14, 2023 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

- ATTENDING:** Mr. Kelvin Lit (KL)
Mr. Joshua Bernsen (JB)
Mr. Jean-Pierre Mahé (JPM)
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell (KB)
Mr. Nathan Shuttleworth (NS)
Mr. Rafael Santa Ana (RSA)
Mr. Brian Newton (BN)
- REGRETS:** Ms. Alexis Chicoine (AC)
Ms. Nancy Paul (NP)
- STAFF:** Ms. Franki McAdam (Development Planner, Item 3.a.)
Mr. Alfonso Tejada (Urban Planning Designer)
Mr. Kevin Zhang (Staff Liaison, Senior Development Planner)
Mr. Dennis Wong (Development Planning Assistant)
- APPLICANT:** Mr. Chris Lee (MOSAIC Vice President)
Mr. Harper Sherman (RWA Architecture)
Mr. Bob Worden (RWA Architecture)
Ms. Alexa Gonzales (DK Landscape Architecture)

1. PANEL WELCOME AND DINNER

JPM opened the meeting at 6:05 pm.

- Attendance was taken and panellists and staff introduced themselves.
- New members present were invited to introduced themselves.
- It was clarified that current members will be commenting and voting on this meeting's agenda.

2. Administration

A motion was made by JPM, seconded by RSA, and carried, to adopt as amended the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of November 9, 2023.

JPM welcomed the applicant team and explained the procedures for the ADP meeting.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) Address: Emery Village Phase 4

Project: Development Permit for Form and Character for a single 61 apartment unit building.

Ms. Franki McAdam, Development Planner, provided a brief presentation on the project:

- The project completes the final of 4 Phases of “Emery Village”.
- It is applying for a Development Permit for a five-storey building with 61 residential units.
- It is in general accordance with the Accessible Design policy with 5% of units to meet enhanced standards.
- The design of the buildings and configuration were contemplated at rezoning.
- It complies with OCP and all CD 115 zone requirements.
- The form is considered consistent with the Lynn Valley Flexible Planning Framework adopted in July of 2018.

Ms. Franki McAdam posed the following for the Panel’s Input:

- There are 3 matters for ADP consideration:
 1. The contextual integration with the rest of Emery Village development.
 2. The colour palette and materials proposed.
 3. Design appropriateness for the entrance to Emery Village.

The applicant team introduced and presented the project.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for their presentation and opened up the floor to Panel for questions to the applicant team:

- **Q:** RSA inquired about the PMT / civil infrastructure’s location, landscape fencing as a security measure and what is the kiosk seen on the map.
 - **A:** The team responded with the following:
 - PMT station could not be placed elsewhere. Mr. Alfonso Tejada noted the need to co-locate the PMT boxes which resulted in this format shown.
 - A picket approach was used for landscape fencing.
 - The kiosk is an entrance for the townhouses.
- **Q:** KL inquired regarding the layout of the building. Why was it an L shape? Why was the courtyard facing out instead of facing in?
 - **A:** The team cited grading issues, accessibility, and fire access. The L shape is function of fitting density onto the site. Parking from the lower end was only way as the site was too small. The team also agreed there are arrangement challenges for an entrance for the neighbourhood. The flow of cars from the other phases were a factor for the placement of the parking ramp. Mr. Alfonso Tejada commented that the landscaped courtyard is an entrance piece for Emery Village.
- **Q:** NS Inquired about the rationale for the programming for the courtyard.
 - **A:** Ground level patios and a robust amenity package contributed to the landscape design of the courtyard. The other phases already give community togetherness. The team also mentioned the want for mature tall trees to cover

the exposed parkade entrance. Views from the parking area will drop in scale for the building with this type of layered landscaping.

- **Q:** JB inquired on what is the combined Emery Village Mosaic site? What are the materials on the boulevard (swooping patterns etc)? Does the parkade entrance have to be set back that far? Is the finish for the landscape fencing untreated/treated?
 - **A:** Ms. Franki McAdam clarified that all 4 phases of Emery Village is developed by Mosaic. The team notes that the boulevard is part of the offsite package of a separate submission and already designed and developed with the overall Emery Village site. The parkade must be set at the indicated distance otherwise there would be major changes to the design. The fencing is treated and painted to match the three other developments.

- **Q:** Sgt. KB inquired if the courtyard is just for residents and how will the main entrance be receptive to first responders.
 - **A:** The courtyard is just for residents. For first responders, the building is addressed off Emery Court, not Emery Place with streetlights along Emery Court. The buildings massing on Emery Court's roofline emphasizes the entrance.

- **Q:** JPM inquired on materiality and if RWA are the architects for the other phases of this project.
 - **A:** Materials are similar to phase 1, humble but good materials that don't break design barriers. Small details are made to be authentic. The team acknowledges that they have set the tone with respect to all design aspects.

- **Q:** RSA inquired about clarification for the design guidelines from the District about material feature differentiation.
 - **A:** Mr. Alfonso Tejada commented that the 4 phases of Emery Village was to follow a cohesive design as per the rezoning of the development.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada gave a brief presentation and provided the following comments for consideration:

Building Form and Character:

- The site was designed as a whole with a distinctive roofscape to show a village character.
- Ground level colour coordination:
 - Recommended that the ground level has some colour differentiation from higher storeys.
 - Try to create a lighter building at ground level versus the dark tone currently designed. Phase 2 has this as an example.
- Top level Colours:
 - Retain the character as it was conceived on materiality/expression on the upper levels or balconies.
 - Introduce back the lighter colour on balconies but the materials will remain the same.
 - This would create a connection between the other buildings and the current proposal.
- Courtyard concept configurations:
 - Original concept created a nice active mini court that would be a blending space between people and landscape.
 - The current concept may have too much landscaping with large trees and benches that only look down to the parking.

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

- KL
 - L-shape courtyard:
 - Felt strange for a courtyard to have a sharp corner. Is there space to chamfer or treat corner for a smooth transition from the corner?
 - The courtyard feels restricted.
 - The space in front is taken by the PMT and seems to be a natural corner to address the entire complex. Once built, feels restricting to the overall project.
 - Craftsman house styling:
 - Hard to deviate from this styling since the other buildings are already built in this style.
 - Raised concerns on form and character concerning:
 - Shallow roofs and eaves. Current design defeats the purpose of the craftsman roof styling.
 - Windows don't go to the very top as designed like Phase 2 and can be designed to show lightness.
 - There are opportunities for roof extension to give balcony more presence when looking from the pedestrian level.
- BN
 - Agreed with lightening material on windows.

- Courtyard circular area with benches is not great and won't be used/is not interesting.
- Liked the other phase's glass extended onto the roof. Inquired if there is a chance for glass to reach roofline.
- Sgt. KB
 - Entrance and Street:
 - Street signage requires consideration as they are currently inadequate and almost invisible at nighttime.
 - Ensure front entrance is clearly visible for first responders.
 - Must have good wayfinding. People may look at the large courtyard as the main entrance instead.
 - Courtyard:
 - Courtyard is a one way in and one way out, which causes accessibility and safety issues.
 - The large amount of landscaping can hide unauthorized users who can come in from streetside.
 - Abnormal users may come use the courtyard if it is not used by residents.
 - Parking
 - Parking gates are good but biking parking is accessible from visitor parking, which may get broken into. New builds give opportunity for bad actors to come in and steal bikes.
 - Often the constructed doors are not enough. The resulting cost will be downloaded onto Strata to replace the doors. There is a need to look at robust doors and locks to ensure access is not easily obtainable.
 - CPTED:
 - Good eyes on the street but views may be limited by landscaping especially the courtyard.
 - One way in one way out movement needs to be looked at.
- JB
 - Felt this project is a big improvement to the neighbourhood.
 - As a gateway envisioned, the design is a little lacking coming in from Mountain Highway seeing parking entrance and terrace walls.
 - Main entry to building is subdued. Materials could be introduced to the street and celebrated more as it current has a lack of identity.
 - The boulevard treatment has nice softness but functionality is very muddy so should consider more access points on the grass element.
 - Nice to see colour placed into the fencing. Laser cut panels/materials could also be placed on the gate/fencing.
 - Nice job on the planting.
- RSA
 - Gave praise for a cohesive presentation.
 - Appreciate the various design elements including columns, balconies, soffits, material balance, entry anchoring and verticals.
 - Potential improvements:
 - The entry seems really small with only 1 glass door/gateway.

- Lobby needs more presence.
- The building feels very private and enclosed.
- Don't think there is a need for the lower level to be lighter in colour due to landscape colouring.
- Questioned if the renderings are the true colours.
- If this design is aiming at west coast scheme – hybridity of newer systems expands longevity of style and could still be pursued to bring innovation to the language of the building.
- NS
 - Gave praise for a cohesive presentation.
 - Contextual integration works well.
 - West-coast modern style works well.
 - Commented on materiality use and colour; Agreed with RSA for no lighter colour on ground floor but maybe lighten the balconies as people would look up to the building.
 - Liked applicant's explanation of tiering landscaping.
 - Programming and orientation for courtyard needs to be usable.
 - Generally, the design is appropriate.
 - Does a good job on using landscaping with the grading presented.
- JPM
 - Craftsman styling:
 - Acknowledged that Emery Village is not going to strictly follow craftsman styling.
 - Commented on presentation of the renderings and the craftsman style.
 - Roofscape is losing translation due to height of the building.
 - Recommends lightening up on the base and integrate with the landscape.
 - Recommends integrating the stone base and bring it up to window height.
 - Entryway is too timid and recommends a more welcoming, or “oomph”, to the entrance with possible overhang.
 - Give interior rooms on the roofscape more height.
 - Gave suggestions on roof styling and referenced other phases as examples especially on the concrete buildings.
 - Fourth level patios feel a little too timid.
 - Be more creative with roofscape since it is an L shape block.
 - 3 Main points:
 - Bring landscape up to engage with building not just sitting and engage with the ground plane.
 - More prominent Main entry.
 - Consider more articulated roofscape.

The Chair invited the applicant's team an opportunity to respond to Panel comments:

- Materiality issues will be addressed.
- Will continue to work on roofscape.

- Comments brought up by ADP will continue to inform further exploration, especially in terms of roofing and top floor windows.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by RSA and **SECONDED** by JPM & NS

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

None opposed.

3. YEAR IN REVIEW – ADP 2023 RECAP


- Panel looked back on projects from 2023.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be on January 11th, 2024.


Chair


for Rafael Santa Ana


Date

