MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 12, 2017 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER

ATTENDING: Mr. Craig Taylor (Chair)
Mr. Laurenz Kosichek
Ms. Amy Tsang
Mr. Steve Wong
Mr. Stefen Elmitt
Mr. Samir Eidnani
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Ms. Diana Zoe Coop
Mr. Jordan Levine

REGRETS: Mr. Tieg Martin

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

The meeting came to order at 6:00 pm.

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of December 8, 2016.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Michael Hartford welcomed Mr. Jordan Levine as the newest member of the Panel – Mr. Levine was nominated by the AIBC for a position as "Architect" on the Panel, and appointed to a two-year term by District Council.

Mr. Hartford advised that the Panel required a Chair and Vice Chair for the 2017 term and nominations for these positions were discussed.

Mr. Craig Taylor was nominated for the position of Chair. Mr. Taylor accepted the nomination and was acclaimed in the position.

Mr. Laurenz Kosichek was nominated for the position of Vice Chair. Mr. Kosichek accepted the nomination and was acclaimed in the position.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) Consideration of Design Panel Awards and Summary of Voting:

The Panel had reviewed seven projects completed in the last year, and Mr. Michael Hartford, District Planner, opened the floor for discussion about the projects eligible to be considered for a Design Excellence Award. Panel members summarized their site reviews from the self-guided tour and shared their scores for the projects on a number of evaluation categories. Through discussion and review of the Panel members' scores it was concluded that three of the projects would be eligible to receive Awards of Excellence:

"Northwoods Village" – mixed-use project at 2150 Front St. and 2150 Dollarton Hwy.

"Connect at Nature's Edge" – townhouse project at 757 Orwell Street

"Amadon Plaza" – commercial project at 1226 Marine Drive

Mr. Hartford noted that the awards are expected to be presented by Council to the project teams at a Council meeting on February 27th.

b.) 1700 Marine/1633 Tatlow: Detailed Planning Application – mixed use development with 33 residential units and 7 commercial units (third review)

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Community Planner, introduced the project and explained the project by Spring Olive Developments located at 1633 Tatlow Avenue was reviewed twice previously by the Panel on August 11, 2016 and December 8, 2016. It was noted that the development site is located on the north-west corner of Marine Drive and Tatlow Avenue, with "Mr. Lube" to the west, "Destination Chrysler" to the east, and single family homes to the north across the lane.

The development site is approximately 0.22 hectares (0.54 acres) in area. The project proposes 33 apartment units and approximately 6,500 square feet of commercial space, with an FSR of 1.75. Applicable development guidelines for the site include the OCP Development Guidelines for Commercial and Mixed-Use Buildings, Energy and Water Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction, as well as the Marine Drive Design Guidelines.

The applicant has made changes to the design based on the comments from the December review of the project by the Panel. The major changes include simplified architectural elements, changes to the overall colour and material choices, and adjustments to the ground floor breezeway configuration and paving specifications.

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:

- The four major areas of change from the last design iteration include the simplification of the colour palette, a change to the roof shape, an improved relationship between the commercial podium and the residential units above, and adjustments in the material selections, to include brick and wood
- Decorative elements as previously seen on railings and between units have been simplified

- Metal cladding and dark wood elements have been included as more prominent features to better reflect the Marine Drive Guidelines
- More clarity and consistency throughout the project and a more defined character is created by the revised design
- The breezeway has been simplified and widened to allow for better visibility and improved security
- The landscaped area in the north-west corner of the site has been simplified to remove the curved element
- The sloped canopy at the residential entry better matches the rest of the building in style and reflects the roof slope of the corner feature element
- Paver selections have been changed to reduce the number of paving materials and to allow better relationships between the various areas of the hardscape on site

The Chair thanked the applicant for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel. The following question was posed by the Panel:

- The project package appears to reflect primarily the changes made to the project, rather than all of the drawings, is this correct? Yes, the information provided in the packages is focused on the changes made elements such as the street frontages are the same as in the previous presentation to the Panel.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Design Planner, provided the following comment for consideration:

- The changes show a significant response to the Panel's previous comments about following the Marine Drive Guidelines and simplifying the design of the project.

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

- In general Panel members noted that many of the changes appeared to reflect the Panel's previous comments on the project and it was suggested that a more appropriate and successful colour scheme had been introduced
- The project is improved with the revised material selections, and the physical materials board helps to demonstrate effectively the revised materials, but a colour shift or more contrast between the brick and the upper metal panel material might be worthy of consideration
- Wood cladding might not be the best material to use when considering longevity and the wear and tear from North Vancouver's weather and a type of hardi-type paneling might be a better choice from a maintenance perspective
- The angled divider walls on the decks seem to be a distracting detail to the building
- The simplified roof shape for the corner element is a positive change, however detailing of the corner features will be challenging with the proposed angled cuts in brick and should be reconsidered
- Having different window configurations on each of the three levels of the corner element seems a bit confusing and could benefit from some further simplification

- The revised canopy feature at the residential entry is positive, but the slope of the canopy could be adjusted to be more welcoming - perhaps sloping upward towards the street
- Changes to the width and alignment of the breezeway to alleviate the long secluded spaces are positive, but the gate configuration needs further attention to ensure it is practical
- The amenity room facing the street is still a bit of a problem as it seems not to be the best use of this street frontage
- The format of the rear entrances to CRU's should be reconsidered to enable better flow and security for the units
- Paver detailing has been improved and there seems to be better cohesion throughout in the approach to the hardscape
- The landscape approach for the right-of-way area in the north-west corner of the site should be revised to include shrubs and groundcovers
- Planting choices along the street frontages could benefit from some more variety

The Chair invited the project team to respond.

The applicant team thanked the Panel for the recommendations and noted a willingness to find solutions for simplifying the detailing of the corner element as well as strengthening the appearance of the balcony dividers. It was noted that the project design already includes quite a lot of contrast between colour selections in the brick and metal siding, but the team is happy to look at other choices for the final finish selections.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Steve Wong and **SECONDED** by Stefen Elmitt:

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

c.) 2160 and 2168 Old Dollarton Road: Preliminary Planning Application – 27 unit mixed-use development

Mr. Erik Wilhelm, Community Planner, introduced the project and explained that the site is part of the Maplewood Village Centre, and is adjacent to two recent development sites to the west, as well as to future redevelopment sites to the east. The site is currently zoned RM3, for multi-family residential, and the OCP designation for the site is "Commercial Residential Mixed-use Level 2" allowing for rezoning to commercial and residential uses at a maximum of 2.5 FSR.

Comprised of two lots, the proposal aims to create a mixed-use building with 27 apartment units above ground floor commercial space fronting Old Dollarton Road. The building is proposed to be four storeys tall and have an FSR of 2.48 which is within the allowable 2.5 FSR for the OCP designation. Applicable guidelines for this area include Commercial and Mixed-use Buildings, Energy and Water Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction, and Creek Hazard.

The District is currently finalizing the "Maplewood Village Centre" planning process and the outcomes of this process will inform the analysis of this project – this could include modifications to density targets for the area. The project requires rezoning and development permit approval.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Simon Richards of Cornerstone Architecture introduced the project. Mr. Richards noted the following points in the presentation:

- A similar scale will be used to replicate the massing of adjacent developments
- The goal for this building is to create a more mellow and calm design, in contrast to adjacent recent buildings
- Achieving sufficient parking on the site was a key challenge for the project team and the proposal includes a split-level parking garage approach
- The project configuration includes two commercial tenancies below the residential units to allow for an active street frontage
- The commercial frontage is broken up to give the appearance of four storefronts
- Repetitive landscaping along the frontage will provide natural definition between storefronts
- Generous terraces for the residential units will improve livability as well as provide an attractive appearance from the street
- Simplicity has been introduced in the type of hardi-panel used and articulation of the building including shadowing elements has been incorporated into the design

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:

- How will side yards be treated? – portions of the sideyards are needed as egress routes leading to the street, so have walkways in them. There may also be some potential for a public north/south connecting walkway at the east side of the building
- How would CRU's access waste disposal and loading areas? The commercial functions would be small tenancies and would have pedestrian access to parkade
- Have turning radii for parking ramps been reviewed? Yes

- Will bike storage be provided? Yes
- Will the structure be concrete podium and wood frame construction based? Yes
- What types of commercial uses could be permitted? Based on the zoning bylaw it allows for a wide range of retailing, restaurants, and office space
- Is the alcove at the garbage entrance covered? Yes

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

- In general, the project is successful but could benefit from further refinement
- Proposed continuity of commercial space is very positive especially as it includes neighbourhood scale commercial uses
- Design as shown may be somewhat urban and the breaking of the CRU's into four "bays" may be too complicated an approach for a small building in this location
- The roof decks on the north side of the building are very large while southerly decks are smaller – a different approach might better reflect solar access
- The landscape on the east side of the building includes a green wall and the details of this feature should be resolved

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

- Overall Panel members noted an appreciated for the sophistication of the design and the quality of the presentation, as well as the success of the calm colour and material palette and building articulation and rhythm
- Consideration needs to be given to providing universal access from the parkade levels to the lobby and commercial areas
- The project seems well sited-and deals successfully with the oddly-shaped site and it is positive to see that front and rear facades have each received careful treatment, but lane elevation could still use additional attention to be successful
- Proposed sun shades are a positive and successful element in the design
- The waste/recycling room entrance needs to be secured and made visible
- Walkways along the sides of the building need clear sightlines, good lighting, and low plantings to ensure that they are safe and useable connections
- Would be positive to provide for natural lighting in at least one of the residential staircases
- May be necessary to reconsider exiting to avoid using the lobby as an exit path from the parkade
- A general appreciation was noted for the light colours selected for the project, but end wall treatments need to be explored to ensure they are successful
- The CRU frontages might work better as two bays, rather than four, but this will likely depend on the types of uses selected
- Turning movements in the parkade should be re-examined as well as headroom for the CRU's to ensure they are practical

- The streetscape proposed appears generally successful, but could be improved with the placement of one or more benches along the street frontage
- Important to provide a more thorough signage and landscape package at the detailed application stage to better define the character of the site on all sides of the property

The Chair invited the project team to respond.

Mr. Richards thanked the Panel for their comments and noted the following points:

- Agree there are opportunities for revisions to the rear elevation and this will be explored
- Will explore adding an additional exit for the garage to enhance the safety and security
- Will ensure that the calm approach to colour and materials continues to be a focal point for the project and a higher level of detail will be demonstrated as the project moves forward to the next stage of the process

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Laurenz Kosichek and **SECONDED** by Samir Eidnani:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and **SUPPORTS** the general concept, and looks forward to a presentation at the detailed application stage that includes a review of 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 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

February 9, 2017

Chair

FEB 9 / 2017
Date