

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
JULY 12, 2018 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Jordan Levine (Chair)
 Ms. Carolyn Kennedy
 Mr. Samir Eidnani
 Mr. Steve Wong
 Mr. Tieg Martin
 Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
 Ms. Diana Zoe Coop

REGRETS: Mr. Stefen Elmitt
 Mr. Charles Leman
 Mr. Darren Burns

STAFF: Ms. Tamsin Guppy
 Mr. Nathan Andrews
 Mr. Kevin Zhang (Item 3.a.)
 Ms. Tamsin Guppy (Item 3.b.)

The meeting came to order at 6:06 pm.

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of June 14, 2018.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

- Today's items are both affordable housing projects. Despite the financial constraints of an affordable housing project, the Panel's role is still to speak to urban design objectives.
- No meeting is scheduled for the month of August therefore, the next meeting will be held on September 13, 2018.
- Tour arrangements will be made for sometime in September with Sergeant Kevin Bracewell to visit a couple of sites that demonstrate the dos and don'ts of CPTED design.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 600 West Queens Road - Rezoning for a 5-storey mixed-use building with 80 non-market rentals and a seniors respite care facility

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Panel members for clarification raised the following questions to Mr. Zhang:

- Is the northern portion of the site meant to be used for park? Yes mostly, and likely some childcare. It will be a planning process led by the Parks Department and will be consistent with the outcomes of the Delbrook Dialogue Process.
- Is the site completely vacant? No, the north building is used by the Red Cross and the Little Rascals daycare is in its own separate building leased until 2023.
- The second phase will include the deconstruction of the old school buildings correct? Yes.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Duane Siegrist from Integra Architecture Inc. and Peter Kreuk and Michelle Biggs, from Durante Kreuk Ltd 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:

- Can the applicant describe the care space more in detail? Funded through Vancouver Coastal Health, the respite centre exists for people in need of 24 hour care and the support staff who provide it.
- What are the 18 beds for? The respite care home includes beds for frail seniors to stay over night, thereby giving their care givers a much needed break, and reducing the occurrence of burnout.
- How will this service help the community? The goal for the respite centre is to provide a place that keeps individuals in homes and in communities before having to leave for more institutionalized form of hospital care.
- Who will the non-market housing be for? The non-market rental housing includes a mix of unit styles to appeal to a mix of ages and stages of life.
- Will there be two separated outdoor spaces? Yes, the outdoor space for the respite care facility will be separate from the residential one, with a gate between them.

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, on behalf of Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, provided a brief presentation and provided the following comments for consideration:

- Explore amending the design to step down the slope to follow the topography.
- Improve the relationship of the project to the street (West Queens), especially at the parkade level.

- The residential entrance at the southwest corner of the site needs work, the lobby should relate to the street allowing people to wait safely inside, consider lowering the lobby so that there is less need for stairs up to the lobby.
- Consider further articulation of the building to minimize impacts of a long building.

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

- Great to see that a respite centre is happening on the North Shore.
- Materials work quite well and the vertical elements along the façade are good and do help break up the length of the building.
- Explore ways of improving relationship to adjacent buildings, for example through roof articulation and stepping the building height.
- The mews on the west side of the development works well and creates a mid-block path to the future park and open space.
- Good plant mix.
- The landscaped walls along West Queens to help soften the frontage and help screen the parkade.
- The patio in the back has a good variety of seating arrangements to accommodate either a vibrant social setting or quiet and tranquil spaces.
- The parkade could be improved by lowering it to reduce its effect on the relationship to the street and allow the ground floor to have a building frontage rather than a blank concrete facade.
- The residential entry on the southwestern side seems tight, hidden and with a lobby that needs more attention.
- Have a closer look at the shadow impacts, I think the rear garden may not get enough light and you may need to adjust the patio design.
- The housing entrance may create CPTED issues.
- The residential lobby is a concern – there might be an opportunity to work with the mews and improve the layout that way.
- Adding more of a podium base on the south side could allow for better outdoor private amenity space as well as more pedestrian scale frontage.
- The boxed elements along the façade are a nice addition but need some refinement as it seems quite busy, and the hierarchy is not clear.
- Paving and sidewalk space along Stanley Avenue could use a little more life instead of van parking as it is an important access point to the building and the future park space.
- Entrances need to be delineated clearly for first responders, so a clear access for the residential lobby is important.
- The parkade with gated separation between the residential and visitor parking could be challenging as in and out traffic will be sharing the one access point.
- Defining the public and private space will be important to address CPTED issues next to public park space.

- The shared garbage area should consider all of the needs from both the institutional and residential uses - check sizing and access.
- From a Code standpoint, there might be a lot of fire stopping especially with the mixed uses and dead ends so consider the best means to address this issue.
- It is a complicated building from a Code perspective.
- Spatial separation to the existing old Delbrook facilities need to be considered.
- The parkade exit must be separate from the elevator vestibules.
- The residential entry vestibule is also a stairway which may be problematic and an energy issue.
- Given the complexity you may need a safety review of the building.
- Consider reducing dead ends.
- Consider the width of the corridors in the respite care area which may need to be wider.
- Look at glazing opportunities for the east dining area to enhance the access to natural light.
- Consider adding more windows and engagement with West Queens Road to the ground floor to make it more appealing and less institutional.
- Consider the time of year and how the dark brick finish might impact comfort in the outdoor public amenity space along with the shadows.
- Consider improving the relationship of the care facility with the street (Stanley) – potentially by adding windows to the dining area that face onto Stanley thereby connecting the residents with the street.

The Chair invited the applicant to respond to the Panel's comments, and the following comments were provided:

- The comments from the Panel are appreciated and will be considered when assessing the relationship of the entry points, building composition, and issues of access for first responders and the general public.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Mr. Steve Wong and **SECONDED** by Ms. Carolyn Kennedy

That the ADP has reviewed the proposal and supports the general concept, and looks forward to a presentation at the development permit stage that includes a review of the items noted by the panel in its review of the project.

CARRIED

b.) 267 Orwell St (Oxford Street Affordable Housing) – Preliminary Planning Application for a Development Permit for a non-market affordable housing development

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, introduced the project on behalf of Ms. Casey Peters, the primary planner for the development proposal, and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Steven McFarlane from the Office of McFarlane Biggar Architects and Designers 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:

- Are there any building overhangs that the Panel should be aware of? At this point no deep overhangs are part of the development proposal.
- Did you explore the horseshoe shape or other shapes for that matter? It was difficult to reach pro forma and efficiency targets with other shapes, therefore the 4 bar scheme stuck as the proposed plan.
- Is the patio space accessible from the street or simply from within? The shared patio space is only accessed from within.

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, on behalf of Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, provided a brief presentation and provided the following comments for consideration:

- Staff are concerned that this proposed building layout pushes the density to the edges of the site and lessens the liveability of this building and its neighbours.
- The proportions of a 6 storey building versus 12 foot wide courtyard spaces might need to be re-evaluated and the function of these spaces assessed.
- Consider the Bars' impact on sustainability and unit affordability.
- As the project progresses, look at improving the arrivals and entrance sequence to have a stronger relationship to each street, and better connections for residents to the main street.
- Review the relationship the units have to each street.
- Consider how this building may improve the public realm and overlook of Phibbs Exchange and how residents may want to watch for "their bus."

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

- The simplicity of the concept plan really works in a functional way.
- The proposal utilizes the 12 foot courtyard gaps well ensuring that lighting is provided at various times during the day.
- Architecturally the project looks to be very attractive.

- Appreciate the reasoning behind the lack of balconies but potentially adding viewing platforms or window access along the internal corridors facing the courtyard space could help give life to it.
- The built form is very sculptural and interesting visually. With no art plan mentioned perhaps the ground or streetscape could be used as an alternative medium for artistic expression and connection to the building.
- The unusual design is refreshing and nice to see when a lot of proposals seem so similar.
- Very intriguing design with the implementation of a shared corridor at each level.
- The landscape plan for the courtyards is a bit worrisome but could provide for an opportunity to be more creative with the space – recognize from the outset that plant material will not survive and explore other options that may suite these shaded spaces.
- Strengthen the relationship to both Oxford Street and Orwell Street and consider ways to animate the frontages.
- Consider moving the main lobby towards the centre of the building.
- The roof landscaping creates some great outdoor rooms for various amenities.
- While I understand staff concerns about impacts on the neighbours, the lack of balconies may balance this.
- The ventilation and air circulation seems to work well with no glaring issues.
- A Zen garden idea might be an option for making use of the inaccessible courtyards and act as spaces for contemplation.
- The proposal would be a valuable and iconic addition to the neighbourhood.
- With new code requirements in place, the structurally components of the proposed building plan should be assessed very soon.
- The building envelope will need to consider shrinkage of materials and the impact of using mixed methods like wood frame versus concrete.
- The location and proximity to amenities and other buildings makes for an appropriate design.
- Given the width of the light wells, consider using light coloured cladding that may help reflect light to the lower levels.
- Consider a more central location for the lobby.

The Applicant team thanked the Panel members for the comments and look forward to improving upon the proposal.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Ms. Diana Zoe Coop and **SECONDED** by Mr. Tieg Martin

That the ADP has reviewed the proposal and supports the general concept, and looks forward to a presentation at the development permit 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 8:12 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

September 13, 2018

Chair



Date

Oct 11, 2016