

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
May 24, 2018 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

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

REGRETS: Mr. Stefen Elmitt
Mr. Darren Burns
Mr. Tieg Martin

STAFF: Ms. Tamsin Guppy
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Mr. Adam Wright
Mr. Kayzad Nadirshaw (Item 3.a.)
Ms. Tamsin Guppy (Item 3.b.)

The meeting came to order at 6:01 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 10, 2018.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

The Panel conferred that it is completely acceptable to discuss a motion once it has been composed and also to suggest that a specific motion be modified as needed.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 1149-1155 Lynn Valley Rd – Rezoning and Development Permit for a four-storey, 36-unit Multi Family Apartment Complex

Mr. Kayzad Nadirshaw, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Duane Siegrist, from Integra Architecture, and Ms. Alyssa Semczyszyn from Jonathan Losee Landscape 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:

- Why is the building limited to 4 stories rather than 5? It was more economical to have 4 stories.
- What is the reasoning behind having the one way lane with pedestrian connections? There is an exit stair that comes out from the east side of the building and we are anticipating a desire path here. We are moving the path around the large tulip trees. The lane will also connect to the greenway eventually.
- When would the greenway (lane) in the south be built? Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner indicated that the greenway extends southwest until E 27th and that it is difficult to provide a specific timeline for the construction as there are ongoing discussions on timing with neighbouring property owners.
- How have you mitigated potential odour and noise from activity from Safeway's loading zone in the southeast? No noise complaints related to Safeway have been received through our public input process so far. Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner indicated that the units will have to meet the District's noise mitigation requirements. When Safeway redevelops in the future, there will also be an opportunity to screen and enclose the loading zone.
- How will the soffits be treated? We usually do wood soffits, or Allura-type wood tone.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, provided the following urban design comments for consideration:

- Upgrades plans are appreciated, it is an interesting project and it is clear that good design decisions have been made from the beginning.
- The angularity of the northeast corner was an initial concern and this has been largely addressed.
- The open space of the northeast corner is an opportunity for further development.
- The overall massing has progressed well.
- There seems to be an opportunity to soften, break-up, or further step back and improve the visual impression of the parkade wall in the south of the building.

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

- The project is well thought-out and high-quality.
- The appearance of the rear wall along the parkade seems to be a relatively small issue.
- The stone work is appreciated, although the large amount of vertical use of this material could be reconsidered to produce a more realistic masonry element.
- The use of stone material itself could be reconsidered.
- The northeast corner is treated well and the greenway is also an opportunity to open up the residence to the community.
- There may be an opportunity for a children's play area.
- The details of the amenity space would have been helpful to see.
- The height of the parkade wall doesn't seem to be a deal-breaker, taller planting such as evergreens could bring down scale of the wall and improve its overall impression.
- Consider using Rhododendrons to cover the east wall facing the one way lane, as vines may not be enough to cover the entire wall.
- There may be an opportunity to reduce the size of the balconies to be more consistent with the scale of the building and to ensure privacy between units.
- The two storey pop-up is a nice focal point.
- A horizontal fence along the ground could compete with the verticality of the overall building, more vertical elements could be considered.
- The size of the on-site tree installations is somewhat small.
- Changes on northeast corner are appreciated, a children's play addition is supported as well as the possibility to integrate art into the open space.
- The human scale and colour palette and materials are appreciated.
- This site does lend itself well to incorporating a public art piece. A strong vertical art piece could be considered at this northern edge of the site. Given the style of the building which is reminiscent of a long house, a First Nations art piece may be appropriate.
- What material is used for the green roof? A low sedum mat, mostly used for colour and texture, and its drought-resistant properties.
- It is a great looking project for the community.
- Consider stepping back the parkade slab over more of the parkade entrance.
- From a code perspective, the space around the exit stairs is tight. Consider adding space for door swings, or flipping the stairs to provide more room.
- Consider ASHRAE requirements with regards to the indoor-outdoor lobby area.
- Enunciator and mail may need to be moved indoors.
- Challenging not knowing the timing of the greenway construction.
- The parkade wall would normally be a concern but with suitable landscaping and stepping of the slab, as discussed this evening, the urban design concerns can be satisfactorily addressed.
- The pop-up is a welcoming feature when approached from the east.

- Support the notion that the public area could lend itself to public art and playful elements.
- The interface of the stone work with the balconies is appreciated.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. The Project Team acknowledged the Panel's suggestions, appreciated the feedback and was happy to take them into account in the development of the design.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

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

THAT the ADP has review 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.) 2050, 2060, 2070 Marine Drive – Rezoning Application – Travelodge Site

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, introduced the project, reminded the Panel that the application is for a rezoning without development permit and provided the general policy context of the site.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Martin Bruckner from IBI Group Architects and Mr. David Stoyko from Connect Landscape 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:

- Can you speak to the parking area for the office building to the east? Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, indicated that the at-grade parking for the office building is currently on the north side of the office building, where there is also an access to the underground parkade.
- Is there access from Curling Road? Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, indicated that there is a new road that will connect to Curling and provide access to the properties facing Marine Drive.
- As a Panel member, what is the scope of commentary for this type of (rezoning only) application? Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, indicated that commentary should ideally be focused on site-planning, connectivity and its relationship to the local context and thoughts on the park design.
- What is the overall philosophy of the neighbourhood? Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, reminded the Panel of the policy context including the OCP, Implementation Plan and the Lions Gate Public Realm Strategy.
- What is the District's policy with regards to the format of rental projects? Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, indicated that the District has a Rental and Affordable Housing Strategy and that affordable housing is a critical need in our community, however, that both rental and owned buildings must abide by the same design guidelines, regardless of tenure.
- Have the neighbouring developments been approved? Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, explained that the Larco site across Curling Road is under construction, a development permit has been issued for the Grouse Inn site to the east.

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

- Consider how the rental building relates to Marine Drive and the adjacent pathway.
- The rental building design needs to better relate to the tower building and to the street.
- Consider how the amenity areas relate to adjacent areas.

- The mews between tower and the office building to the east need to be able to respond to whatever happens to the office building, including its potential redevelopment. There may be potential to add playful language from the park area in the mews.
- The massing of the low rise building needs to be more residential in character.
- Consider if a continuous balcony is needed on the northeast corner of the six story building on Curling Road or if it should it be segmented.
- The tower has an interesting built form and is articulated so as not to be shaped like a box. The top form of the tower could be improved with further development and articulation. Consider design function and finesse, rather than flare.
- The black fins on the tower are interesting, but do not seem functional, they seem somewhat superfluous. The design would be stronger if any proposed feature elements were integrated into the design.

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

- The landscape could be improved to better create a sense of arrival/entry for the six storey building.
- The four storey building needs the same attention and quality as the rest of the development.
- The top of the 29 storey tower could be a focal feature, as it would be the highest building in the area.
- The adventure park are is exciting, the river and fish hatchery and abstract/angular topography is interesting and appreciated.
- More abstraction could be added to the topography of the park edge that meets the east side of the six storey building, including more angular grading of the park lawn and possible raising of the edge similar to the approach on the west side of the park.
- The treatment of the paving in the park could be extended down into the plaza on northeast corner of the tower area to enliven the blank paving.
- The presentation is well-thought out.
- The layout and relatively slim profile of the tower is appreciated. The design seems to add a gateway character to the Lions Gate village.
- Given the flow of traffic along the adjacent street consider how to improve safety for children using the playground and whether you need a barrier or a larger separation between the play area and the street.
- Consider adding more play elements to truly be a wonderful play area. Sometimes it is better to have less separate play pieces to avoid conflicting safety buffer zones and allow for a more intensive play area (ie more pieces that are linked as opposed to fewer separate pieces). Inspiration could come from Whistler's Olympic Village play area.
- Consider the design of the "river" feature and ensure there are not hidden areas that may be CPTED issues.

- Buildings in Lions Gate Village are going to frame the gateway to the District, and understanding the massing and detail of the towers is a key issue.
- The current proposal for the shape of the tower has a heavy massing that may unnecessarily impact views and view corridors.
- The wedge and orientation of the tower and its relation to the street grid is interesting and it will be interesting to see the next iteration of the slender wedge tower design.
- The tower may be too close to the office building to the east, looking forward to how this will be resolved.
- Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, indicated that the massing may not be as much an issue between the tower and the office building because of the relatively smaller footprint of the tower.
- A future parkade could be considered for the office building, if either sites could have a knockout panel. It was noted that given the large sewer line that runs between the properties a connection to this site may not be possible.

The Project team thanked Panel for their comments and indicated that they will consider them as the project develops.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

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

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and recommends **SUPPORTS** the general concept, and looks forward to a presentation at the development permit stage.

CARRIED

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.

6. NEXT MEETING

June 14, 2018



Chair

Date