

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
SEPTEMBER 13, 2018 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Jordan Levine (Chair)
Mr. Samir Eidnani
Mr. Steve Wong
Ms. Diana Zoe Coop
Mr. Charles Leman
Mr. Darren Burns

REGRETS: Mr. Stefen Elmitt
Ms. Carolyn Kennedy
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Mr. Tieg Martin

STAFF: Ms. Tamsin Guppy
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Mr. Adam Wright
Mr. Michael Hartford (Item 3.a.)
Ms. Carly Rosenblat (Item 3.b.)
Ms. Robyn Hay (Item 3.c.)

The meeting came to order at 6:01 pm.

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

The Panel agreed to postpone the adoption of the July 12, 2018 meeting minutes until the next Panel meeting on October 11, 2018, in order to properly review and incorporate additional comments that were received.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Ms. Tamsin Guppy explained that there are four positions that need to be filled on the Panel, and that relevant organizations will be contacted over the coming days to share the postings.

Ms. Tamsin Guppy noted that the clerical team has created a new agenda template that assigns specific times to each agenda item. Comments and suggestions on how to further improve the format of the agenda or of meetings in general are welcome.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 1510 Crown St & 420-260 Mountain Highway – Rezoning with Development Permit for a 349 unit mixed-use development including a 29 storey tower, commercial podium, and two mid-rise buildings.

Mr. Michael Hartford, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Peter Lang, Tony Wai and Dan Yang from IBI Architects Group 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 the townhomes expected to be concrete or wood frame? Wood frame.
- What is the intention of the lane that runs north to south and what type of development is proposed to the east of the lane? Mr. Michael Hartford, Development Planner, explained that the location of the lane running along the east of the site is confirmed, is 8 meters wide. The site east of the lane is a future residential development site for four to six storey buildings and that ground-oriented housing is not anticipated along the lane.

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

- Some specific portions of the site require some further design development in order to make the project more exciting and efficient.
- The north building facing the main plaza has the most impact on the heart on the community. Consider amending the northwest corner of the building in order to allow for greater sun exposure on the plaza.
- The design of the northeast corner of the building could be improved to better connect pedestrians entering the site from the north east.
- The corner on the northwest and northeast of the 5-storey midrise building could be set back to provide balconies, views, sunlight, and open space.

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

- The comprehensive package submission is appreciated, as is the effort to address the Panels previous comments.
- Support the secondary plaza which seems to add space and open up the site. However, the space feels empty and could better draw people in, consider adding seating or other features.
- Open parking is an improvement over enclosed parking.
- The sidewalk on two different grades seems to be handled well.

-
- The Magnolia in the mews is wonderful but has brittle branches that are prone to break off, other plant material could be considered here.
 - The convergence of the bus stop, bike lane, and sidewalk could cause conflicts as people are drawn to the plaza, consider controlled crossings and ensuring safety along Mountain Highway.
 - Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, explained that engineering is working with the applicant to consider raised and separated bike lanes, and other features that emphasize safe movement.
 - The new version of building code will consider this mid-rise as a 7-storey wood frame construction, which may pose challenges with regards to permitted building height thresholds and other implications.
 - Consider retaining a security consultant to help address the types of user groups accessing the complex. The low grade exits are separated, but the proposal still shows potential for mixing user groups, which can pose security concerns.
 - The emergency exit for the middle building should be reviewed.
 - There is slightly more separation of the high-rise from the podium element which will allow for a simpler code analysis.
 - Ensure safety considerations are compliant with new version of Building Code.
 - Consider adding occupancy onto the large roof areas.
 - Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, read comments from a Panel member that was not in attendance. The comments conveyed support for the general design of the project, however that the streetscape would benefit from better considering the context of the area and the relationship to neighbouring buildings including colours and materials.
 - The colour palette between the buildings are quite different. Consider better reflecting elements of each buildings in detailing. More subtle colours, less amount of colour, and use of green and blue hues could be more appropriate than a primary yellow here.
 - Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, noted that the Lynn Creek Design Guidelines are a resource for colour and material choice in this area.
 - The area that proposes a parking court along the east of the property seems to be underutilized.
 - The northwest corner of the north building could benefit from better architectural detailing that expresses a clear building base, middle, and top.
 - Consider working to better harmonize design elements between the wood frame and high rise buildings.
 - The split sidewalk seems to impair access to the public realm and creates a separation between building and public areas.
 - The plaza could be better integrated to connect the two grades and better respect the urban realm and connectivity.
 - Connectivity – surface parking is a disappointment to the lane of the site, the people across will be fronting a parking lot and a blank commercial wall.
 - Agree that shadow impacts to the plaza could be mitigated by shifting the positioning of the north building.

-
- Surface parking could have a negative influence on neighbouring residents to the east.
 - Consider using landscaping rather than the trellis at the north end of the parking to connect the mews and parking lot.
 - Consider integrating elements of colours in building detailing, rather than blocks of colour.
 - Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, explained that the difference in grade shown with the split sidewalk is a result of designing for flood prevention. He also noted the open parking lot is an improvement from a design which had previously proposed an enclosed parking structure.
 - Appreciate the secondary plazas and the pedestrian realm along Mountain Highway.
 - Details of proposed signage along Mountain Highway are required as vertical signage may not be practical or in the interest of all tenants.
 - The commercial retail units seem to be quite large, consider dedicating thought to how these spaces might be activated and provide visual transparency for people walking by.
 - The parking court along the east of the property could be improved to provide a better north south connection.
 - Consider improving the northeast corner of the site through better landscaping or commercial activity along the northern side of the lane.
 - Ensure the location of the emergency access is code-compliant considering landscaping and location on site.
 - The response to the Panel's initial feedback are appreciated and further consideration of the Panel's comments are encouraged.

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 in further improving the project design.

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.

CARRIED

b.) 3155 – 3175 Canfield Crescent – Detailed Planning Application – Rezoning with Development Permit for an 8-unit Townhouse Development

Ms. Carly Rosenblat, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Thomas Grimwood from Grimwood Architecture and Urban Design and Marlene Messer from PMG 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:

- What does the double rectangle represent that is shown in the parkade plan south of the stairs next to Unit 1? These represent bicycle storage.
- What materials are used for the detailing around the windows? A painted metal frame built from metal flashing, and a folded sheet metal that creates a shadow look.
- Can you explain the access to the patios from Canfield, there seem to be two pedestrian doors that go up to patio level, are they secured? These doors are an accessible at-grade connection to the courtyard, however, they are potentially gated. The intent was that the site looks inviting, but also creates a degree of territoriality and security.
- What is the addressing on Canfield? We have 4 separate entrances and addresses on Canfield, units 4-7.

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

- The site is unique as it is a confined space to create a little community and at the same time respond to larger single family homes to the east, and different uses to the north and west.
- The compact design is appreciated.
- The courtyard space may have too many angular edges, make sure that the planters are not more obtrusive than they are useful.
- Rooftops and access should better reflect the detailing and quality of the overall architecture.

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

- This is a challenging site with 3 different sides and 3 different neighbours.
- Agree that the level of detail is much better in the building frontages, and that everything below the roof is of high quality, and that this quality should be carried through to the rooftop access structures.

-
- The planning is well thought out and the material choice is good. The lighter coloured panelling is appreciated, the materials board shows slightly darker greys than the renderings.
 - The brick is quite dark and could be more refined.
 - The wood in the rendering seems to show better detail than the wood used in the material board.
 - The design, materials, and planning seem well thought-out.
 - The concept is contemporary and refreshing for Edgemont, rather than pretentious. The sidewalk will be a valuable addition.
 - If done well, this development could compliment the coffee shop across the street and create a kind of social hub.
 - Consider expanding the roof decks and rooftop walkways for better mobility and use.
 - Consider the level of access through the site from a security standpoint.
 - The transparency through this development will be an improvement to the existing block.
 - The project seem to reflect the single family character across the streets.
 - Courtyard is well lit and seem nice to walk and sit in.
 - Consider increasing the size of the smaller planters as plants often suffer in the summer from the limited room. Ensure good irrigation installed to adequately feed the smaller planters.
 - Consider either expanding the potential public gateways/doorways or closing them off, the current design seems ambiguous.
 - The setback is appreciated and no overlook concerns are anticipated.
 - It is an attractive project and is presented well.
 - The hardy board seems like a disappointment amongst the other high quality materials.
 - Consider thinking about downspouts and water drainage on the site.
 - Consider a more functional layout for the electrical and mechanical rooms from a building standpoint.
 - Consider how materials will weather, which types of wood would be most appropriate, and possibly upgrading from hardy panel to a higher quality product.
 - The project may be worthy of a nomination if detailing and finishing is correct.
 - The scale of the project is nice for the context.
 - Public access through the site may not be necessary to provide.
 - The success of this project may live or die with the details, consider how best to express the fine lines off of the facades and other detailing.
 - The typology of the corner unit on Highland Blvd. and Woodbine Drive could be slightly different to better respond to the different buildings across both streets. There seems to be an opportunity to integrate some interesting design elements for that corner, potentially a live-work unit.

The Applicant team thanked the Panel members for the comments and guidance 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. Darren Burns

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.

CARRIED

c.) 3015-3059 Woodbine Drive – Detailed Planning Application – Rezoning with Development Permit for a 3-storey mixed-use building with 20 residential units and 8 commercial units.

Ms. Robyn Hay, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Nick Sharpe from GBL Architects and Mr. Bill Harrison from Forma Design 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 a bike lane planned for Woodbine Drive? Ms. Robyn Hay, Development Planner, explained that the Edgemont Village Centre Plan calls for a shared bike lane on Woodbine Drive.
- Can you explain the prefab storage lockers located in the parkade, is one allocated for each unit? We would be looking at different options for constructing these lockers and ensuring that we meet Code requirements. Yes, individual lockers are allocated for each unit.
- Can you confirm the width of the breezeway and loading access area? The breezeway is 14.6 feet at its narrowest point, and an additional 10 feet in the loading area.
- Is the building concrete framed? Yes.

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

- The project has interesting geometry, modulation, and materials. The stained cedar and glass create transparency and the design seems logical.
- The south end of the building fronting the plaza seems to end quite abruptly. This is in contrast with the softer curves that exist as the corner of W Queens Road wraps around to Woodbine Drive. Consider designing a softer edge here that better responds to the geometry of the site, and offers a more inviting form.
- The contemporary design is well done.
- The exposed end wall on the north elevation is unresolved and requires appropriate treatment
- Rain protection along the whole façade is required to maintain a pedestrian protected zone, although it could be more varied in material and form.
- The activated lane is an important first step towards an enhanced pedestrian environment, more thought could be dedicated to the awnings here.

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

-
- Congratulations on an incredibly clean and polished package.
 - Building proportions, rhythm, and detailing seem well thought out and designed.
 - The extension of the retail portion at south end of the building, could be better treated to have its own separate architectural language.
 - The lane activation is wonderful.
 - The breezeway provides a good connection.
 - The plaza is great opportunity for pedestrian activation and will be get good sun exposure.
 - The rooftop planting with mounding effect is appreciated. If plants are in a terra firma, they will do better than in planters.
 - Agree that the southern terminus of building feels truncated and is incongruent with the angled shape of Queens. Consider having some kind of curving at least on the ground floor.
 - The glass sides in the breezeway add “eyes” and creates more transparency.
 - The plaza seems to need a prominent feature, and there should be a focus on public art to enhance the area.
 - A beautiful project overall with a sophisticated material selection and a great laneway.
 - The garage doors could be great for art studios, cafes, etc.
 - Artwork in the plaza could provide a visual barrier from traffic along W Queens Road. Consider some kind of lattice work.
 - Concern with possible conflicts between the loading area and pedestrian breezeway.
 - The PMT floating on the slab is unusual, consider confirming the design with Hydro and electrical contractors.
 - Please separate the commercial and residential vestibule.
 - Ensure doors are code-compliant around the elevator and mechanical room.
 - Agree that the southern corner needs better articulation and character.
 - The breezeway can be bright and vibrant with sufficient lighting and detail.
 - May need to increase the size of the loading area.
 - Well articulated, well defined, great precedent images.
 - The notch in the building at the south end of the building and circular area on southwest corner would be improved with further design and detailing.
 - Ensure that signage is congruent with the characteristics of the Edgemont village guidelines and the sign bylaw, it is helpful to include this in the package.
 - Retail use on laneway seems like a great fit.
 - Consider how best to create visual continuity along the eastern frontage that doesn't highlight the loading area, perhaps with more continuous rain protection.

The Applicant team thanked the Panel members for the comments and intends on improving the proposal.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Mr. Steve Wong and **SECONDED** by Ms. Diana Zoe Coop.

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 9:31 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

October 11, 2018



Chair



Date