

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
JUNE 8, 2017 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Craig Taylor (Chair)
 Mr. Laurenz Kosichuk
 Mr. Steve Wong
 Mr. Samir Eidnani
 Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
 Mr. Jordan Levine

REGRETS: Ms. Amy Tsang
 Mr. Tieg Martin
 Ms. Diana Zoe Coop
 Mr. Stefen Elmitt

STAFF: Ms. Tamsin Guppy (Item 3.b.)
 Ms. Jennifer Malcolm
 Mr. Alfonso Tejada
 Ms. Casey Peters (Item 3.a.)

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 May 11, 2017.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

3. NEW BUSINESS

**a.) 220 Mountain Highway & 1515 – 1555 Oxford Street: Preliminary Planning Application
– Rezoning and Development Permit for a 6 storey rental development**

Ms. Casey Peters, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Taizo Yamamoto of Yamamoto Architecture introduced 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 will the green courtyard in the south portion of the lot be used? The goal is to create a densely planted area with high screening. The south facing aspect will provide high sun exposure to plants.
- When Phibbs Exchange is redeveloped, will Oxford Street be the primary transportation route? The proposed design changes the configuration of Phibbs Exchange, but buses will continue to access Phibbs Exchange from Oxford Street.
- Define and clarify the mezzanine in the project. The mezzanine will be located on top of the sixth floor. It will be set back from the edge so below pedestrians will not be able to see it.
- To clarify, the parkade is concrete, and then the wood framing is to start at level 1? Yes.
- Explain the use of the space at the corner on level. This is the proposed location of an amenity room.
- Is there a larger suite above this amenity space? Yes, it will be a three bedroom unit.
- Are the parking spaces in the lane dedicated to the units over looking it? Not necessarily – visitor parking may be provided there.
- Is the walkway on the south side of the building private? Yes, it will be gated.
- Is the landscaped area off the laneway accessible? It is designed as a landscaped area, not a play area, so access will be limited.
- Regarding the corridor space between the two buildings, will windows be placed above the first level? As building design advances, the architect will look for opportunities to include windows that will be off-set for privacy.
- Can you identify the child play areas? There will be a small outdoor play area adjacent to the indoor amenity space on Oxford Street.
- Is the seventh storey technically a storey according to the BC Building Code? It was noted by a board member that 'mezzanine' is defined by the connection to the storey below. It was recommended that the Developer confirm that the proposal meets the code requirements. This building may fall under the new building code which will allow for taller wood frame buildings.

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

The main issues include:

- The 20 foot wide entrance gap is a very narrow space that will require widening. This will help create a greater separation between buildings.
- There is great value in the back courtyard for light, and applicant may want to reconsider access to this space.

- Building form appears strong, but the east portion of the building lacks character which should be developed further.
- It was noted that the constructed Lynn Creek Apartments to the east has softer edges creating a transitional element rather than a wall. The proposed edges of this development create a 'block' like feeling, creating neighborhood inconsistency.
- The elevation towards the south needs to have greater character.

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

- The mezzanine space will require a fire wall.
- As the garbage area is a part of the wood framed portion, resilient flooring will be required.
- It appears that there are two main entrances to the building. The primary entrance needs to be identified and known to first responders. It was suggested that the Mountain Hwy entrance be dedicated to residents while the Oxford Street entrance is further developed as a focal point.
- The vertical and horizontal elements of the two buildings need more emphasis at the south elevation. A deeper overhang would help build character.
- Rear parking should be dedicated to individual units that face the lane. Tenants will more likely respect and care for the area if they 'own' it.
- A common rooftop deck would be a nice amenity.
- Cautioned the use of hardi panel.
- Consider increasing the gap between buildings. The east building could have elements of glazing to help with the feeling of space between the buildings.
- Explore the opportunity of the space in front of the elevators.
- A sixth floor setback on the east side is not needed.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Mr. Yamamoto, 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 Mr. Kosichek and **Seconded** by Mr. Levine:

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.) 1634 & 1748 Capilano Road: Detailed Planning Application – OCP Amendment and Rezoning for a Mixed Use project including a 10 storey hotel, and a 24 storey residential tower

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Mark Thompson of MCMP Architects introduced the project. Mr. Thompson provided an overview of the project and was joined by Mr. Grant Brumpton (PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Inc.), Landscape Architect.

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:

- What do you envision / what is the character of the entrance / service area for the hotel? The hotel access lane will require a fair amount of servicing, including cars, taxis, deliveries, etc.
- How is the pedestrian area to the north controlled? Is it gated? It will be open to the general public and not gated. However, oversight will be provided from the hotel.
- What future do you foresee for the neighborhood east of this project? Viewed as a transitional area with the amount of multifamily units increasing. The design responds to the future development massing on the east side.
- Have you created a sensible east west connection across Capilano Road? Yes, the intention is to extend Curling Road across Capilano Road.
- What type of movement will take place on Curling Road up to Macguire Ave? All types - pedestrian, vehicular, and cycling. The special elements proposed, as well as the bending and shortness of the street will help mitigate traffic speed.
- Is the central parking area gated? And will parking security be provided? The lateral entrances will be gated, while the central area won't be. Security details are unknown at this time.
- Will there be speed bumps on Curling Road? No.
- How will first responder know where to go? Addressing of the hotel entrance will be visible, making direction easy. Responses for residential emergencies will be allocated to the residential lobby entrance.
- Are the design concepts of the two masses responding to anything in particular? It is a response to the DNV Design Guidelines, focusing on natural elements.
- Is there a plan for phasing? No there is not – the development will occur all at once.
- Are there any challenges on glazing and hitting LEED targets? Not that they are aware of. Though it was noted that the hotel component may require double or triple glazing.
- Will the large clusters of trees be coniferous or deciduous? Coniferous, with a large portion being Douglas Firs.

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

- It was noted that there is a powerful difference in the proposed site plan from what was suggested in the preliminary application.
- Proposed buildings appear be closer creating a slightly congested feel.
- The hotel has the potential to support the character of Curling Road, making it more interesting and livable but more work is required to ensure Curling Road is successful.
- Consideration should be given to a two storey street wall, as has been established elsewhere in Lions Gate.
- Consideration of how the lobby entrances and corner elements of the low rise buildings at the corners of Curling Road and McGuire Ave can support the future connection and integration with McGuire Ave.
- To encourage better sunlight exposure along Curling Road, the stepping of the project could be reversed and the building on the south side have its upper storeys step back.
- Consideration should be given to stepping back upper stories particularly on the 5th and 6th floors to maintain a 4 storey massing / built form along McGuire Ave.
- The 'gaps' (driveway entrances) in the building masses on either side of Curling Road need to be addressed.

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

- In some ways the design at the preliminary stage was stronger as it was more open with greater space between the buildings.
- Capilano Road has been treated tastefully, but the throat of Curling Road could pose as an issue as it looks too private - it appears to be a municipal street, but it is clearly not.
- The ratio of building height to road width along Curling Road appears to be off, with the buildings being too close.
- Traffic crossing Capilano Road could add congestion. Perhaps there is a way to respond to this with the massing of the buildings and the placement of them so that the street designs are not compromised.
- Generally, this version is an improvement from the preliminary stage and over what is there now – creating a key gateway design for this key site. However, the loss of the building setbacks and the resulting tightness may cause the pedestrian feel of the area to be lost – a key concern for a pedestrian oriented village centre.
- On the green wall, consideration should be given to whether it is a living wall vs. a green wall – maintenance is an issue and so is expense. Consider how you will achieve this bold statement.
- Need greater clarity of the choice of the tower shape and massing and in particular how it is angled at the corner.
- Show more details of the streetscapes with the next submission.
- Concerned about the views into and of the internal access driveway/service area.

- Great to see the hotel bringing a 24 hour presence to the area. Security needs to be thought through to ensure the details get it right. Please provide more information on this with the next submission.
- Concern that the modes of traffic using Curling Road are not mixed too much as this may reduce the safety on the street.
- Support for the large clusters of evergreen planting.
- Concern that the restaurant patio is in the shade.
- Perhaps a bridge across Curling Road could be incorporated into the design layout to encourage a transitional feel for the vertical elements.
- The project is a positive transition for the gateway to North Vancouver. It appears to be too compact which could cause an issue with tightness on Curling Road.
- The increase and speed of traffic could diminish the quality of the character created along Curling Road. Consideration should be given to traffic calming measures like speed bumps.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Mr. Thompson, 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 Mr. Wong and **SECONDED** by Mr. Levine:

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 8:35 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

July 13, 2017

Chair



Date

JULY 13, 17