

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
JULY 13, 2017 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Craig Taylor (Chair)
Mr. Laurenz Kosichek
Mr. Steve Wong
Mr. Samir Eidnani
Ms. Diana Zoe Coop
Mr. Jordan Levine
Ms. Amy Tsang

REGRETS: Mr. Stefen Elmitt
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Mr. Tieg Martin

STAFF: Ms. Tamsin Guppy
Mr. Nathan Andrews
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Mr. Erik Wilhelm (Item 3.a.)
Mr. Darren Veres (Item 3.b.)

The meeting came to order at 6:02 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 8, 2017.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There will be no meeting in August and Alfonso is away so Tamsin will read comments related to Urban Design on Alfonso's behalf.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 2028 – 2067 Glenaire Dr, 1963 – 1985 Sandown Pl, 1944 & 1976 Fullerton Ave: Detailed Planning Application – OCP Amendment and Rezoning for a 156 unit townhouse development

Mr. Erik Wilhelm, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context. The Project was reviewed at a previous Design Panel Meeting in 2015 at the Preliminary Application stage. The previous iteration encompassed less lot area and fewer units yet maintained a similar architectural design. Mr. Wilhelm provided an overview of applicable policy matters affecting the peripheral area and the development project.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Rob Ciccozzi of Ciccozzi Architecture introduced the project. Mr. Ciccozzi and Ms. Meredith Mitchell presented 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 is the interpretation of the 2 storey height guideline when a half storey seems to make it over height? The Single Family Residential area is higher in elevation, therefore the calculation of the height is made using natural grade which makes it a 2 storey interface.
- Is the adjacent Single Family Zone looking to stay as is? Yes, the orange buffer identified within the peripheral plan is there to help ensure a buffer is provided to protect the existing and remaining single family area.
- How many units are handicap accessible? 11 accessible units are proposed.
- What is the separation between buildings? 30 ft minimum with 26 ft 8 inches as the shortest gap along building frontage corridors.
- How is the parking accessed? The parking is accessed by 3 elevators and stairwells.
- What is the programming of the open space in the middle of the site? Children's play area, vegetation and opportunities for seating. There will also be different coloured pavers to separate public versus private.
- Will tall trees be added to the site? Small to medium sized conifers and deciduous trees not more than 30 to 35 feet will be added.
- Can the underground parking structure be versatile for other use if car usage diminishes? Alternatives have not been thought of at this point in time.
- Were negotiations for expansion of pathways part of the proposal or something that the District or third party requested? The project team has been in coordination with Metro Vancouver and the District to develop a plan to connect and expand pathways through the Lions Gate Neighbourhood to ensure pedestrian connectivity to key areas like the river and the community centre.
- Is there a provision for public art? No, but the Public Art Officer is aware of the proposal and possibly positioning something near Belle Isle Park could be considered.

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, District Planner, provided the following comments and questions for consideration on behalf of Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Design Planner:

The main issues include:

- Due to the inclusion of roof decks on the end units the building form reads as 3 storeys and instead of the recommended 2 storeys.
- The edge condition needs improvement and a better buffer for the neighbouring area allowing for better integration of pathway systems and connection to the various nodes.
- Pinch points created by the angled street plan seem a little too tight.
- The use of material is great but more variety of townhouse shapes should be considered.

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

- Generally the quality of design is quite high and the organization of the site is well planned out.
- A lot of sunlight allows for more positive use of the open spaces.
- The increase in unit count adds to the complexity of the site.
- Monolithic massing should be reviewed further to reduce the long corridor effect.
- Not entirely in agreement with Alfonso's comments, scale is done quite well and seems to be the right scale with open spaces in close proximity.
- The materials used like Hardi panel, aluminum and choice of brick work well.
- The project feels tight especially at pinch points where buildings come together.
- If pinch points are reduced then better corridor design will help alleviate the sense of confinement.
- Walkways should be widened when next to raised planters or walls and fences as that reduces the actual and perception of the width of the walkway.
- General feeling is pedestrian oriented space is good
- Incorporating boulder features along the east side adds character to the landscape.
- Consider changing the spacing and locations of the boulders to create nodes and seating areas, potentially having features switch sides.
- Consider adding way finding.
- Providing differentiation between private and public space through various shades of paver is a good design feature to highlight.
- Concentration of benches might be better spaced out across the site.
- Patio spaces seem quite small so potentially increasing paved spaces rather than sodded lawns could help.
- Roof top access is identical on most buildings so need more variation
- If colour palette is the same then how pleasant are the rooftop spaces really?

- Does it make sense to offer rooftop patios to everyone? Consider how to ensure roof decks have privacy and screening between units and potentially drop some roof decks to provide better screening and spacing between decks.
- If privacy is an issue then do outdoor spaces and amenities like rooftop decks become just another storage space?
- Appreciate the three palettes but think there should be more differentiation within the colour phases by block.
- Uniformity is important but ensure that the staircases meet code requirements and functionality.
- The landscape edge of single family homes could be celebrated with a pause or break in hedge line to create diversity.
- Like the organization of space and don't see problems with site constrictions.
- Phase 3 of row houses needs more moments for pause along corridor to better enact connection.
- 1 elevator per phase doesn't seem like enough so look at other options at least to enhance unit accessibility.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Mr. Ciccozzi, project architect, acknowledged the Panel's suggestions, appreciated the comments and made the following comments himself: In regards to pinch points, the design adheres to a 30 ft. minimum and due to the shape of the lot and increase in property size and unit count from 99 to 156 while still maintaining the 1.2 FSR, the compression of buildings and streets is inevitable. The Phase 3 portion of the site with the 400 ft. linear corridor is proposed to add a bit of variety to the types of units and housing styles on site. Rooftop access points will be reconsidered as well as the mixed colour palette for the different blocks.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Amy Tsang and **SECONDED** by Jordan 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

b.) 904 – 944 Lytton St (Seymour Estates): Detailed Planning Application – Rezoning for a townhouse and multi-family apartment development

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

A question was posed by the Panel for Mr. Veres regarding the differentiation between the allowed 1.75 FSR OCP designation and the proposed 1.2 FSR in the Maplewood Plan. In summary, the local plan is a policy reference document which provides additional guidance around density while the OCP is the main policy that dictates density.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Dale Staples and Mr. Thomas Palmer and landscape architect Mr. Michael Patterson who presented 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 does construction staging affect traffic in the area and the traffic trying to get to and from the school? Two access points and a looped road will help minimize construction disruption in the school area.
- Will visitor parking be included in the parkade? All 3 underground parking areas will have visitor parking.
- Are there periphery guidelines for density change? There are periphery guidelines as in good neighbour recommendations but nothing concrete regarding building height.
- Is the building form that steps down the hill then back up related to forest height? Yes, it also made sense to help define the end and corner of the site.
- Is it possible to extend the vehicle connection east to Broadview Drive similar to that of the pedestrian connection that currently exists? No, based on right of ways and legal structure, it is not possible.

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, District Planner, provided the following comments and questions for consideration on behalf of Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Design Planner:

- The site plan shows plenty of opportunities for connectivity through the site but how do you connect across the site effectively? Looking for key public routes through the site.
- Based on the guidelines, the six storey building on the corner requires more articulation to meet the building length requirement and the Lytton Street elevation needs further consideration.
- The roof of the corner building could use more flow and movement like other rooflines within the proposed development.

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

- Very strong design and drawing sketches were appreciated as part of the package.
- Agree with suggestion that the corner building's roofline requires more movement.

- The patios are a generous size which could lead to a lot of opportunities for community involvement and social interactions with neighbours.
- Other common areas from the play area could use more animation to create more uniqueness to each space.
- Appreciate the long term vision for play and shared spaces which also incorporate a lot more natural vegetation as part of it.
- The corner building with existing large diameter trees works because of the scale of both the features are similar in size.
- The orientation of the buildings result in minimal shadowing.
- Appreciate the amount of open space that is available in part because of the mix of building forms.
- Very detailed and comprehensive proposal which gives the feeling of what it might look like when complete.
- Work on the permeability and pedestrian connectivity.
- Art installations would be great to add to the connection of the surrounding environment and tie everything together.
- Site staging should be considered early in the process to ensure that construction and traffic impacts are kept to a minimum.
- If adaptable housing is part of the concept then focus on it now.
- The strata building has potential for rooftop patios and vantage points.
- Identifying what materials work best for the siding now makes a big difference in the long run so ensure that Hardi Panel or Hardi Plank for example is the way to go.
- Given the forested nature of the area, consider a lighter/ brighter colour palette.
- Permeability through the site is key and needs improvement but location fits given the amount of other amenities nearby.
- Consider adding a roof top amenity area.
- Consider real wood rather than Hardi panel soffits to introduce a more natural feel and transition between nature and built form.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Mr. Staples and Mr. Palmer, project architects, acknowledged the Panel's suggestions, appreciated the comments about the corner building, amenities, adaptable housing, potential art pieces, and were 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 Amy:

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 8:30 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

September 14, 2017

Chair



SEPT 14, 2017

Date