

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON  
MARCH 9, 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. Tieg Martin  
                          Mr. Jordan Levine

REGRETS:             Ms. Diana Zoe Coop

STAFF:                Mr. Michael Hartford  
                          Mr. Nathan Andrews  
                          Mr. Alfonso Tejada  
                          Ms. Tamsin Guppy  
                          Mr. Darren Veres (Item 3.a.)  
                          Ms. Casey Peters (Item 3.b.)

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 February 9, 2017.

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. Hartford is stepping down and will be replaced by Ms. Guppy.

**3. NEW BUSINESS**

**a.) 5020 Capilano Rd: Preliminary Development Application – Proposal for a 3 storey mixed use building**

Mr. Darren Veres, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context for the project.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Ms. Shannon Seefeldt of Ciccozzi Architecture Inc. introduced the project and provided an overview of the proposal. She was joined by Josh Bernsen of Forma Design who presented an overview of the landscape plans.

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:

- Will the commercial space be used for a restaurant? The existing owner of the property and of the restaurant will be included into the new commercial space
- What trees are proposed as street trees on Clements Avenue? Linden trees are proposed for the site and can grow to approximately 35 ft. in height
- What are the Grey horizontal bands on the west side of the site? River rock and paver bands, purely for aesthetics which illustrate river rock and river connection
- On the north side of the property is there access to and from the lane? Yes, there is access but it is not meant to be a primary access point
- Does the guard rail prevent access to the courtyard from the south? Yes, there is no access along the south side to the courtyard
- What is the siding material at ground level on the townhouses along Clements Ave? The lower level will use a type of eco stucco
- Will real turf be used for the mound in the courtyard? No, the plan is to use artificial turf
- Is the commercial loading requirement provided? Yes, in the parkade space is available for smaller delivery services and a time sensitive loading zone on the street is proposed for larger deliveries as well
- Where is the commercial garbage area? The garbage area is shared with the residential area in the parkade and some elements such as the grease receptacle would be separate and likely at grade level
- How does the restaurant venting work? Restaurant venting will be provided through the building and parkade venting from the ramp entrance and at the north-west corner
- Is there a significant amount of trees to be removed? Yes
- Are any trees proposed to be retained? No
- Is a tree replacement requirement being fulfilled? Still to be discussed
- Is the building wood frame? Yes
- How is territoriality defined between the lane and the edge of the building on the north side? Territoriality will be defined by a Gate to north east and hedging with locked doors on the north west side
- Is the project expected to be stratified? Yes and the commercial will be retained by the owners.

- Restaurant with residential above - Habitability? Noise? Might have steel frame will look at it further at methods of containing noise and smell.
- How do roof deck layouts and stair accesses work? Mix of conventional stairs and hatch accesses and the deck covers almost entire roof
- Is a door proposed to the patio area? Yes – may be a sliding door

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

- Contemporary style seems a little too dramatic a change in terms of context as it is not a commercial area.
- Proximity of the commercial entrance to the main lobby entrance is too close and confusing.
- Commercial character appears to be based on scale of the double height space but doesn't seem to conform to the residential character of the area.
- The North West corner of the building requires reconsideration and improvement.
- Units 6, 7, 8 at the lane level will be challenged by lack of light.
- Roof-top access staircase enclosures could be treated differently to perhaps connect and pair up access points.
- In general project has potential but separation of uses needs to be improved.

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

- Some elements are nice including textures styles and landscaping.
- The streetscape from Capilano Road needs more street appeal and should create a sense of entry from the west.
- The courtyard seems a bit cluttered and the location could be unfavourable due to shadowing and lack of sunlight.
- Townhouse units to the south could use natural grass instead of artificial turf.
- Pots are good but be careful with sizes of trees.
- The apartments on Clements Avenue take advantage of the south facing side.
- Landscape treatment along Capilano Road feels a little too urban for this location so perhaps introducing more trees to soften the street side would be beneficial.
- Would like to see some component of existing trees reflected in replanting to improve ecological value.
- Materials are nice and the façade on the south is well done.
- Appreciate the theme of the landscape and should take it further with associating it to west coast.
- Think about future use of commercial space and future proofing
- Consider moving townhouse units to the ground level on Clements Avenue with the apartments above.

- The north edge of the building is vulnerable because 3 entrance doors are tucked away so landscape, lighting and security should be addressed carefully.
- The colour palette along Clements Ave sets up the transition very well but other sides need to be looked at more closely.
- Courtyard elevations become the back but should be similar colour and articulation to give the courtyard some animation.
- Consider the location of the guard rail along the roof top patios, pulling back the guard rail is recommended.
- The residential lobby could be reduced in size to better accommodate unit layout
- Wayfinding and more specifically emergency exiting will be challenging for courtyard units.
- A central stairwell would be preferred as opposed to a scissor stair due to code requirements and safety standards.
- Elevator exits also need to be assessed for safe and efficient points of access
- Due to building code standards the Bike locker access cannot open into the exit lobby therefore placement or entry point needs to be refined.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Ms. Seefeldt, project architect, acknowledged the Panel's suggestions, and thanked them for the comments.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

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

**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**

**b.) 1502 – 1546 Oxford St: Detailed Planning Application – OCP Amendment and Rezoning for 180 bed residential care facility**

Ms. Casey Peters, Development Planner, introduced the project and provided background for the detailed application, including site and surrounding uses, relationship to the Official Community Plan and Rezoning. Ms. Peters reminded the Panel that the project had been reviewed the project at the preliminary stage on July 7<sup>th</sup> 2016.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Derek Crawford of Derek Crawford Architect Inc. introduced the project. Mr. Crawford provided an overview of the project and was joined by Mr. Travis Martin, Landscape Architect, who addressed the landscape plan for 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:

- How is the kitchen exhaust addressed? The mechanical shafts will run up through the building as well as the parkade The Panel reviewed the project at the preliminary stage on July 7<sup>th</sup> 2016.
- What is the size of the emergency generator and type of fuel being used? The generator will be sized for all the service needs and fueled by an underground tank.
- Is hydronic heating being proposed? Yes.
- What is the hardscape treatment in the circular driveway? Will have to look at it further.
- Are the bathrooms barrier free shower rooms as well? Yes.
- Is there a gate that encloses the loading and garbage areas? Yes, also a storage collection space which will mostly be below grade.
- Is there a secure parking gate 24/7? Usually a secured access point.
- Is the greenway public? Yes, the landscaped setback will include hedging to define territoriality.
- What is the sidewalk treatment on Oxford Street and is the bike path at the same grade as the sidewalk? A 4 metre wide multi-use path with a mix of bikes and pedestrians is proposed but details are still to be resolved.
- Is each room single occupant? Yes, but there will be opportunities for adjoining rooms.

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

- Key concerns are how the project relates to the Mountain Highway frontage on the west and the Greenway on the eastern side.
- Greenway edge is problematic and further work is needed to incorporate it into the project.
- Treatment of driveway surface has to be very clever and well designed to activate the streetscape.

- Would like to see sample boards of the materials used to see how strong colours and textures relate in person.

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

- Dark surfaces in the courtyards might get hot so think about textures to avoid overheating.
- Consider alternatives to screen the generator area as proposed trellis may not be enough and also ensure screening of utilities from views out of the building.
- Be aware of code for venting and fire separation for kitchen ducting.
- Garbage area and low grade stairs should be looked at for life safety standards.
- Appreciate the level of detail and continuity.
- Difficult site but great job with the architecture and colour material palette with the richness quality and contrast work.
- A one-way driveway loop is recommended to avoid major conflict for service vehicle and visitor traffic.
- Simulated wood is nice and the articulation is great.
- Drop-off area needs revision in material choice.
- Cyclist lanes should be separated from the pedestrian walk ways.
- Plant choices should be reconsidered regarding shade and sun needs.
- Corridor to the courtyard could be animated but good use of tables and chairs.
- Ensure access to electrical room isn't blocked by vehicles in loading bay.
- Views out of the building should be considered carefully for the benefit of residents.
- The south garden access appears narrow and should be reviewed.
- The big moves made are nice there just needs to be more rigors to the resolution of the details but it should fit well with the residential neighbourhood.
- Grey Hardi Panels appear to be larger in size than Hardi is available.
- Details such as flashing need to be handled carefully.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Mr. Crawford, project architect, acknowledged the Panel's suggestions, appreciated the comments and was happy to take them into account in the design development.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

**MOVED** by Steve Wong and **SECONDED** by Tieg Martin:

**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**

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

April 13, 2017

Chair

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a large, stylized initial 'G' followed by several vertical strokes and a long horizontal tail.

Date

APRIL 13, 2017