

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD
ON OCTOBER 10, 2019 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Charles Leman
Mr. Darren Burns
Mr. James Blake
Ms. Kim Smith
Ms. Carolyn Kennedy
Mr. Don Aldersley
Mr. Stefen Elmitt
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Ms. Riva Nelson
Mr. Steve Wong
Ms. Diana Zoe Coop

STAFF: Mr. Kevin Zhang (Staff Liaison)
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Mrs. Ashley Bellwood
Ms. Casey Peters (Item 3.a)
Mr. Darren Veres (Item 4.a and 4.b)

Mr. Kevin Zhang opened the meeting at 5:57

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Staff announcements:

- Clarification was provided regarding review and discussion before the applicants' presentations.
- Panel discussed best practices for making motions, and agreed that after everyone has commented they will open the topic for discussion, make a motion, and then vote.
- Mr. Kevin Zhang explained the process for selecting new panel members. He also recognized and thanked those panel members who are finishing terms this year.

2. FURTHER AGENDA ITEMS

a.) 1565 Crown Street – Question of Clarification

Ms. Casey Peters, Development Planner, made a quick presentation about the project at 1565 Crown Street and posed questions on the outcome of the discussion that took place at the July 11, 2019 ADP Meeting, regarding the following two topics:

1. Density and massing of the building against the green spine linear park
2. Quality of building design

On the topic of massing, Ms. Peters proposed the following options:

1. Relocate the landscaped roof deck to the west side;
2. Modify fifth floor to retain landscaped roof deck on the east side but increase the setback at the fifth floor;
3. Additional options?

On the topic of Building Design, Ms. Peters proposed the following options:

1. Panel provides specific direction to staff.
2. If no direction provided, staff will continue to work with applicant on what is perceived to be the best solution according to our Form and Character Design Guidelines and Lynn Creek Design Guidelines.

The Chair invited comments from the Panel members on the topic of massing, and the following comments and questions were raised:

- What is the width of the green spine? 10m dedication with 2m landscaped setback on either side. This project dedicates 5 and requires a 2 m landscaped setback.
- The site on the west side of the green spine is designated in the OCP at 2.5 FSR.
- The ratio of building height to the width of the green spine corridor should not be greater than 1:1.
- Shadowing studies should be provided.
- Staff should look to enforce shadowing restrictions on new development, which will require further setbacks as buildings move down the green spine.
- The design needs to address the existing condition of single family homes to the east.
- The project should follow design guidelines, the setback from the first nations land is appropriate.

The Chair invited comments from the Panel members on the topic of building design, and the following comments were provided for consideration:

- There is too much hardi-panel
- There should be some articulation, and variation of materials for key building elements such as eaves, soffits and projections, to create features and quality that cannot be done with hardi-panel.
- Placement of storage lockers of storage lockers on the southwest corner is logical for access but it creates issues for the design.
- Minor decisions on the building design have a cascading effect on the over all quality of the building. The Panel cannot provide the comments to resolve the design issues. The Panel continues to have concerns with the quality of design of the building.

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made and carried to adopt as amended the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meetings of July 11, 2019.

Adoption of minutes – 526 Riverside development – concerns of inaccessibility was not communicated well enough to applicant/ in minutes. Suggestions for improvements.

Page 8 – 2/3 down – re: “pattern book architecture”. Remove bullet 4 from comments and items. Moved by Don seconded by Riva.

4. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 2131-2171 Old Dollarton Rd: Maplewood Gardens – Detailed Rezoning – 319 owned apartments, 135 market rental apartments, and 58 below-market rental apartments. No development permit.

The Chair explained meeting process.

Mr. Darren Veres, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context. He emphasized the fact that the application is only for rezoning and that each building will undergo a review for a development permit at a later stage and posed four questions for the Panels consideration in their review:

1. Is the tower appropriately located and is the massing appropriately articulated to reduce the appearance of bulk given existing context?
2. Do the two plazas along the new pedestrian-oriented “shared street” function as gathering space and encourage interaction?? Get Darren’s presentation
3. Does the site layout enhance connections to key destinations in the area and is the public able to navigate through the site?
4. Is the hierarchy of open spaces and the range of amenities proposed in the central courtyard suitable for the development?

The Chair thanked the Planner for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel. The following questions were asked:

- If there was any zoning requirement for the use of mass timber? No, there is no requirement in Zoning Bylaw or the Design Guidelines.
- Aside from the intent of the larger building being mass timber, are there any other commitments to sustainability in the project? The applicant will be required to apply for a Development Permit for Water and Energy Conservation and Green House Gas Reduction at the next stage of the project which will include a sustainability strategy.
- Is the NW corner plaza intended to be the village centre? Yes, the centre is broader than that, but is focused on that intersection all the way along Old Dollarton Road to the corner Riverside Drive.
- Are there requirements for the setbacks for the plaza? No, there is a requirement for the plaza, but nothing specifically defining how large it must be.
- What was the process for community involvement in the creation of the density for the sites OCP designation? When the Maplewood Plan was approved in Dec 2017 after a significant community engagement process, the OCP was amended to change the land use designations and establish new densities.
- There has there been consideration to the traffic capacity in the neighbourhood? The applicant has provided a Traffic Impact Assessment report that is being reviewed by Transportation Department. Further, the Maplewood Plan included a transportation study, which is available online.
- Can you explain what uses are intended for the street facing ground level units? This is a mixed use building with retail uses along the street.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team; Allan Seppanen, RWA, introduced the project. Craig Taylor, Taylor Kirk Architects + Design (TKA+D) presented on modular rental building. Derek Lee, PWL presented on the landscape 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:

- It looks like there is two pedestrian paths, can you please elaborate? There is the 2.5 – 3m wide municipal sidewalk at street level and there is a pedestrian path on site that is raised due to the flood construction levels. This pathway will be fully accessible.
- Are the two plazas at the same level as the upper path? The plazas come down from the path to the street level and will also be accessible.
- Is the shared street defined by a curb? We are exploring the options for the shared street with Development Engineering. We feel that j-walking should be considered a measure of success. We do not think the use of the street should be restricted with barriers. Ideally there is no curbs, maybe with the use of bollards to allow the streets to be closed for events, similar to Granville Island.
- Is the shared road not imagined to be a busy street? No, the main route to Mount Seymour Parkway is along Front Street and Riverside Drive.
- Can you elaborate on the loading spaces? We designed the loading spaces to be public spaces that can act as loading spaces.
- Is the plaza ramped into the court yard? Yes, it is universally accessible.
- Is there a bicycle path on north side? Yes, there is a dedicated bike path on riverside as well, which wraps along Old Dollarton Road.
- Is there any intention to do green roofs? With timber beam construction, there is a limit to the level of plantings that can be accommodated. However, the building is designed to allow for rooftop amenities
- Is there any commercial uses, or is it just industrial? Our vision for the zoning is to have it allow industrial and light industrial uses, so there is the flexibility to allow for some industrial retail, such as warehouse sales rooms.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, provided a brief presentation and provided the following comments for consideration:

- Plaza should be free open space, with tower further to east to create more space.
- Intersection at Old Dollarton Road intended to be the gateway to the rest of the residential community.
- Questioned whether the tower was in the most appropriate location. Analyzed and considered 6 different locations for the tower(s)
- Main issues are building height and building form.
- Tower at the location in the northwest corner must have a specific character including strong transitions and stepping back
- 12 storey building with no setbacks to Old Dollarton Rd, casts shadows to the other buildings to the north and the intersection is meant to be a connection/gateway to the community.

Plaza space should be functional and open, this is too close to the street and may need to step back.

- Design team needs to focus specifically on massing and form.
- Using timber structure is innovative and interesting. But how can the future of the project maintain the open space to be active and functional.

The Chair invited comments from the Panel members and reiterated to provide comments on siting and massing, and the following comments and items for consideration were provided:

- Feels there should be a commitment for energy efficiency at the rezoning stage.
- Recognizes that constructing towers with timber frames create limits to stepping back, but this is required by the guidelines so not doing so is problem. Without step backs, the building is just a big façade. While there is no shadow to your site, it does impact the surrounding buildings to the north of the site.
- The side elevation of the modular building is blank. If this were midblock okay it might be okay, but it is a concern on the corner of Riverside Drive.
- The public plaza needs to be bigger.
- More permeability from the public plaza into the interior courtyard of the site is needed, be it visually or physically.
- Some commercial uses are important and good to have.
- Green roofs on timber frame are possible, so integrating them is recommended.
- Overall, great package.
- Including the modular housing and utilizing it for the accommodation of displaced tenants is great.
- Appreciate the use of mass timber tower, its sustainability is positive.
- Internal courtyard is a great feature, and it being publicly accessible is positive.
- Two small plazas on the same street are not ideal.
- There is a lot of shading on the plaza from the 12-storey building.
- If upper pedestrian plaza has seating spilling out from retail units the pathway will be crowded and there will be increased use and congestion District sidewalk. Concerned about safety if this traffic is shifted to the shared street. May want more separation.
- The loading bay will impede the movement through the centre plaza, it is recommended that it is separated from the pedestrian access with landscaped screening.
- The access from timber frame building to the green space is limited, I can only see one connection to the parkade.
- Feels like a lost opportunity that the pedestrian plaza is behind the building and is not more connected to the public realm.
- The articulation on three sides of building T1 is positive, but the west side does not much articulation and is disappointing.
- Concerns about shadowing for the neighbours north of the 12 storey building. This shadowing will diminish the light to their units.
- The universal design measures and wheelchair accessibility is generally quite positive, but the proposed stairways do not address visual impairments very well. There are stairs that

disappear on building C3. Consideration must be given to ensure that the steps and seating areas in the development are marked well to make it safe for people with visual impairments.

- In general, water features are not safe for unsupervised children.
- Great project and well designed.
- The onsite circulation could be improved.
- Discrepancy with the preliminary design concept since approval of the Maplewood Plan in 2017. The north south connections seem to be gone. Access from Front Street looks quite narrow, feel that it could be more inviting.
- The connections from buildings C1 and T1 to the courtyard could be improved.
- The programming and features in the courtyard are done well.
- Likes the tower and location, and am not worried about shadowing.
- The public plaza spaces do not work well at all. In general, plazas at intersections do not work well, especially when you have an elevated flood construction level.
- Would recommend not requiring plazas at intersections.
- Would like to see more work on how there are so many buildings and why the tower is where it is. Buildings pushed to the side (edges) and buildings are too close.
- It might be better to have two towers instead of one and bring them further in to the site.
- Would have liked the applicant to have explained why the siting is the way it is.
- The tower is not articulated at all. It is very vertical and is at the properties edge, which is causing it to crowd the corner of the site.
- The layout should be reviewed to see how it can enhance connections. The paths are very tight and the buildings are nearly wall to wall, which feels crowded.
- The internal plaza is done well.
- With deliveries for so many industrial units and then people moving in and out of the building at the end of the month, the loading bays will not function well as public spaces.
- The public plaza at the northwest corner doesn't look useable.
- Overall approach to sustainability and tenant relocation is positive.
- Mass timber towers are not technically permitted by building code yet, so would recommend that this is not a requirement.
- Impressive project and quite detailed. Speaks to all the kinds people who want to live there.
- Love the live-work spaces, and can see an artists wanting to be showing their creations to the community where there is a lot of interaction.
- Love modular buildings in general and appreciate the inclusion of one in the proposal.
- The inner court yard feels like a positive space.
- Feels like the design is futuristic and thinking about where young people might want to live in the North Shore.
- This is a unique project that provides many aspects that the North Shore needs.
- Interesting urban scale in a more suburban neighbourhood, it is treated as a whole city block with five different buildings.
- Question how successful the inner courtyard would work; it does not feel like a public space.
- Main issue with the siting is that there is there no lane. Without a lane there is no way to service (deliveries etc.) the site. Depending on the extent of development that takes place in

the neighbourhood, the courtyard may be inappropriately used. Not an urban enough environment to be actively used.

- Would recommend that the site be designed so that vehicles can access the courtyard.
- Would suggest that the live-work units face on to the courtyard to improve the feeling of it being a public space.
- The design of the building on the northeast corner of the site doesn't turn the corner and nor does the building on the southwest corner.
- The west elevation of the modular building is not activated. The building is well designed, but this could be improved upon.
- Supportive of rental units to existing residents is positive, but noted that it is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that existing tenants have the ability to continue to maintain their existing cost and sq. ft. of living spaces doesn't change. Feels like offering the modular building as an option to provide a smaller space is a quick and cheap work around to this responsibility.
- A 12-storey tower on a site this large should be split into two towers. The best locations would be the southeast and northwest corners best. However, if would like only one tower, then the southeast is best.
- Like the design of the towers and don't particularly want to step back. However, if this is a design requirement then on step down to the courtyard so as to improve massing and to not shadow your own site or others.
- Very appreciative of the design and materiality of the project (no hardi-panel).
- Concerns about the shared street, the setbacks should be 4m from the curb to the retaining wall, not the building face.
- Buildings northeast are 45m in overall length, massing must be improved to address this.
- Breaking up the massing of the modular building has been done well, because the setback is significant enough.
- Shadowing from massing of the proposed tower is a concern. The applicant needs to consider what they are trying to do on the site, and what they do not want to do to their neighbours
- Concerns with courtyard configuration, as it is counter to the OCP. This area should be designed to be more permeable and open with live work spaces.
- The site is effectively a mega block with an entirely private space in the courtyard; this layout does not meet the intent of the guidelines.
- There are no features inside the courtyard to attract the public, so people will not think to cross the site to move through the community.
- Some industrial units and live-work units should be turned to face the interior courtyard to make it more public and open.
- Too private and closed, do not support the siting in this form.

Chair invited comments from the applicant team and no comments were provided.

The panel discussed the motion and the following comments were made:

- The main consideration is regarding the 12-storey tower; is it too big, is the siting placement okay?
- Concerned about the way the towers mass and articulation is presented. The tower and northwest plaza needs to have activation
- Density on the site is not a major concern.
- There are ways to modulate and articulate the tower to improve the civic heart of the community. The heart of this site could be the civic heart of the community.
- Several people discussed the option of two towers, and asked staff if this is an option. Staff confirmed that it has always been an option, but noted that the developer is pursuing a single tower in a 12-storey massing.
- Timber frame tall buildings aren't seen from the outside, so lose that benefit
- Density distribution is fine, approach with modular and phasing is done well.

Applicant asked to address question regarding potential for two towers. They indicated that the first two pre-applications included two towers. Based on community feedback and discussions with members of Council, the applicant felt project would not to be approved with two towers, so sacrificed some density.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Mr. Charles Leman and **SECONDED** by Mr. Steve Wong

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and commends the applicant for the quality of 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.

The panel voted on the motion and it was approved 11 - 0.

CARRIED

b.) 904-944 Lytton St - Rezoning and Development Permit - Building 15: Mixed-use commercial residential building with 56 market-rental units, 33 below-market rental units, and 88m² of commercial space.

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

The following questions were posed by the planner:

1. Building identity and access? Legible and identifiable
2. Change in grade across the site – does the proposal address the change in grade effectively through the building design?
3. Integration with the overall project – Does the design of “Building 15” fit with the overall form and character of the other buildings in the development?

The Chair thanked the Planner for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel. Questions were asked and answered on the following topics:

- Road at the end of Lytton Street a dead end? No, access to one of the Windsor High School, two-way road and a busy parking lot. Changes being proposed to the road to improve the access. One of the improvements to be provided by the developer would be installation of a new sidewalk around the cul-de-sac and traffic calming measures such as curb bulges.
- Access points at North of the site, driveways or pedestrian? Pedestrian access only.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team. Brent Carlson of Anthem, introduced the applicant team. Thomas Palmer, Integra Architecture, and Michael Patterson, P+A Landscape Architects 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:

- Is there any overlooking from the buildings on the north of the site? There should not be any over looking onto the apartment due to the changes in grade across the site.
- Will the apartment have a Lytton Street address? Yes.
- Since there are many buildings on Lytton Street, how will first responders know where to go and how will they know how to get to that specific building? The main entrance will be lit up and we are discussing installing bollards or way finding at the corner of the intersections. There will be monument signage and placards, with address numbers for buildings relative to addresses to the north.
- How will the property line be defined? There will be a 6ft fence between the building and the school.
- Do the entrance doors have weather protection? Yes, there is weather protection on the frontage and entrances on the east and west. The access at the rear of the building may not be covered. Cover is for weather protection it is not enclosed, our design has considered CPTED.
- Is the door at the rear without cover an emergency exit? Yes.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, provided a brief presentation and provided the following comments for consideration:

- The proposal has many challenges, but the major concern is the relationship between the parking access and the main building entrance.
- The parking entrance is not well defined so it is not clear what it is.
- How can the main entrance to the building and the entrance to the parking be differentiated?

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

- The natural surveillance on the site will likely be great between 8 am – 8 pm. However, in the evening when the site is quiet, safety will be more of a concern. The Lonsdale/Esplanade

corridor is the most regularly travelled corridor and is also the location of most break-ins/ stolen bikes.

- The double facing doors on the bike storage will make it easy for people to sneak in and steal bikes.
- The exits are right next to bicycle storage, substantial security is required on exit doors to ensure that people are kept out.
- Consideration for lighting and landscaping is very important for the rear of the building.
- If parkade visitor door will be left open during the day, it must be closed in the evenings at minimum, but recommend using a system that requires FOB access 24/7.
- Good project, it has a west coast feeling in its materiality and fits in with the rest of the development.
- Feel that the soffits would be a good place to use real wood.
- It would be preferable for garage access to be separated so that it has a distinct identity.
- The colour and material palette for bike storage entrance is too similar to the palette used for the main entrance.
- The building design has dealt with the change in grade well.
- There is an opening next to the main entrance that could be mirrored around the entrance to the bike storage to create a cohesive frame.
- The use of natural coloured hardi-panel can look similar to natural materials from a far.
- Even though the building is designed so that BCBC recognizes it as six stories it still is technically seven stories and feels like it.
- Could create a 2 storey plinth, with the top storey setback so it reads as a three part building with an appendage on top, rather than just painting different colours on top.
- The building doesn't read horizontal, and the façade composition may benefit from a vertical element that could connect and create symmetry throughout the building.
- The level of detail provided for the accessibility is helpful to be able to understand the plans.
- Accessibility in 'A' unit (one bedroom) could be improved by replacing soaker tubs with walk-in showers, which are more accessible.
- Another option to improve accessibility would be to include side open ovens; the cost is the same, but its function is more accessible for someone in a wheelchair.
- Create more tabletop workspaces by including things like pull-out bread boards, which can be used by someone in wheelchair when there is limited counter space.
- Weather protection over the wheelchair accessible ramp to front door would keep surfaces dry, and easier to maneuver.
- Grouping of sections on the building may make it feel less repetitive
- Like the warm wood tones, but not the beige. It is bland and not warm, something bolder would be an improvement.
- Entry comments from Alfonso: Seven different levels make the building feels heavy; wonders if moving the entrance would improve this.
- Additional consideration required for lighting and landscaping at the rear of building to increase security.
- Presentation was well done.
- The massing of the building looks large, but appreciate the pattern and symmetry.

- Wood material is indicated as cedar, but on sample board it is identified as a veneer over hardi-panel. If the columns are just wrapped in thin layer of cedar, this will not be very durable in the long run.
- Corners with the crown are “contrived”. If the design were using true timber this idea would work well, but if it will just be an ornamental feature, the design will be underwhelming.
- The beige colour is a weak colour choice
- The wood veneer and wood cedar slats used on the entrance for the bike storage seem complimentary to the main entrance.
- The massing of the building feels like its pushing the limits of the 45m maximum building length requirement? Perhaps further articulations could be explored to help break apart the massing.

The Chair invited the applicant to respond to the Panel’s comments.

- Will try to soften things up to make the exterior more soft and welcoming. Will work with what we have heard tonight and see what can be done and where we can improve the proposal.
- Usually design more horizontally (flat roof lines) but tried to break it up to improve massing.
- Colours on the material boards are representative than the printed package. Some of the beige will be stronger in the finished product than in renderings.
- Some recommendations will be challenging to address, but we appreciate the feedback.
- In this revision we broke up the balconies horizontally, and included a lighter colour palette. We are trying to strike a balance between what’s too dark and what’s bright enough.
- Columns, are not real wood they are clad.

The applicant team thanked the Panel for their comments.

The panel discussed the motion and the following comments were made:

- Alfonso commented, columns to make the buildings more like the rest of the site in attempts to create a connection.
- Difficult to comment on overall integration.
- Experience as a panel, had to deal with a lot of six-storey building proposals such as this one and this may be one of the best examples seen thus far. Good value for the type of product.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Mr. Stefen Elmitt and **SECONDED** by Mr. James Blake.

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and commends the applicant for the quality of 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.

The panel voted on the motion and it passed 11 – 0.

CARRIED

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:09 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

December 12, 2019



Chair
for Darren Burns

Dec 23/2019

Date