

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
February 14th, 2019 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING:

Mr. Steve Wong
Mr. Charles Leman
Mr. Darren Burns
Mr. James Blake
Mr. Don Aldersley
Mr. Stefen Elmitt
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Ms. Riva Nelson
Ms. Carolyn Kennedy

REGRETS:

Ms. Kim Smith
Ms. Diana Zoe Coop

STAFF:

Ms. Tamsin Guppy (Staff Liaison, and Item 3.b.)
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Ms. Taylor Jenks
Ms. Casey Peters (Item 3.a.)

Ms. Tamsin Guppy opened the meeting at 5:50

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION – Inaugural Meeting of the 2019 Panel

- Introductions
- Discussion and overview of the role of the Panel, including:
 - Panel's mandate, as defined by the Bylaw
 - Types of applications – i.e. Preliminary vs. Detailed
 - Design Guidelines that projects are reviewed against
 - Minutes are prepared following each meeting and are distributed with the following meeting package
 - Sample motions provided, but the Panel may choose their own wording for a motion.
 - Meeting length kept to 2 or 3 items maximum with a goal to wrap up by 9:30pm.
 - Cold food and drinks provided, let us know if you have allergies or preferences.
- Ms. Guppy provided the ADP meeting schedule for the year.
- Mr. Darren Burns asked if the Panel should make a formal motion when reviewing institutional projects.

- Ms. Tamsin Guppy responded that in addition to the Panel's discussion, a formal motion helps clarify for staff and the applicant team the Panel's position.

Ms. Guppy went over the 2018 ADP Awards tour of nominated projects, scheduled for February 25th

- The 2018 Panel members will be visiting the 7 completed projects.
- Meet at the Hall at 8:30am.
- Schedule goes from 8:30am to 5:00pm. Presentations are scheduled at most sites. District of North Vancouver (DNV) will provide food.
- A points system is used to frame the discussion and review of projects. Panelists will be grading projects as you see them throughout the day with an opportunity for reflection and further discussion at the end of the tour.
- Goal is to choose the winners (if any) of awards by day's end.

Choosing of Chair and Vice Chair – item 2d

Chair – Ms. Tamsin Guppy noted that Mr. Darren Burns has offered to be chair.

- The panel unanimously elected Mr. Darren Burns as chair.
- The panel unanimously elected Mr. Steve Wong as vice -chair.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Mr. Darren Burns asked for comments on the minutes as presented

A motion was made and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meetings of December 13th, 2018

Passed

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 220 Mountain Highway and 1515-1555 Oxford street – Detailed Planning Application for a 134 unit, 6 storey rental building.

Ms. Casey Peters, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team; Taizo Yamamoto from Yamamoto Architecture and Vanessa Goldrub from ETA 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:

- There was a question surrounding the B-line and how the timeline would impact this project.
- Response saying that there is about a 30% design for the B-line, and that this project is proposing some road dedications to accommodate for the B-line route.
- Clarification on parking – are you proposing more than required? We are providing more bike parking than required, and are meeting the motor vehicle requirement.
- Landscape – Are you proposing different details from one half of the building to the other? The Landscape details are the same.
- Access- there appear to be steps from the street to the patios, does that mean those units aren't accessible for people in mobility devices? The units are accessible through the interior corridor, but not from the street.
- Are there no guard rails/handrails? There would need to be a glazed guardrail in the parking area.
- Have you considered any handicap parking available for vans? We have provided accessible parking as per District of North Vancouver requirements.
- The area of the children's area is it stepped up? It is raised relative to the sidewalk, but level to the inside because it needs to be accessed from inside the building.
- Is the building accessible for low income people? That is something that the owner can speak to – we are noting that the ratio of multi-bedroom units is higher than normal.
- Slide showing interior floorplan – The pocket doors aren't an enhanced accessibility feature but are actually more difficult for the visually impaired or those in a chair. We have done projects with pocket doors with handles other than the little recessed pull, it would project past the jam of the door.
- The lane for access for trucks seems too narrow with the planters? The planters were added late in the design, so they would have to be coordinated to ensure the through lane was wide enough.
- In regards to the glazing, what is the extent of the aluminum? And what material is where? The window wall is limited to the area in between the halves of the buildings and the rest is vinyl to infill between vertical posts.
- Do the units on Oxford have an individual entrance? Are they unit numbers or street address? They are labeled with unit numbers.
- Is the rear parking secured in any way? No the rear parking is open.
- Landscape screening at the back, does that carry over to garbage area, parking, entrance etc? The area with loading, parking etc. is mainly paved, and access doors are located in this area.
- The roof elevation seems pretty high, what is it made of so that it would support itself? The screening would be a metal picket on a curb, it would have to be structurally sound to stand up to wind.
- Are you encroaching into height restrictions? From a zoning perspective this would be allowed, and it shouldn't be a Building Code problem.
- Is the elevator over height? What I'm seeing looks taller than it needs to be, why would you add that? The extra height is due to the elevator accessing the roof.

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

- Site plan – Questions the space dedicated for the children’s area as it is on the north side, has a shadow almost all year- round as well as being on an active corner with buses passing by all the time.
- The potential for roof space came out of previous conversations.
- Turning radius of the garbage trucks etc. would create issues with the screening proposed in the back of the site.
- Front entrance to the street, has addressed the presence on the street in alignment with the design guidelines
- With a 6 story building, there are challenges with height and the guidelines ask for the upper level to recess.
- The applicant has done a good job at giving the impression that the upper level recedes by projecting the rest out.
- The tunnel is narrow, to fix this you could have a tapered entrance, starting wider and narrowing closer to the back.
- Roof top elevator, mechanical room and staircase height – This area should be constructed as part of the building with similar character as the rest of the building.

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

- Concerns with play area location because it is on the busy corner.
- Attractive project, and a purpose built rental next to Phibbs exchange is fantastic.
- Support the progression of the project since the preliminary stage.
- Not concerned with the building length given break in the building.
- The new north south lane is positive, creates a nice permeability to the whole block.
- Good choice of plant material.
- Encourage relocating the play area.
- In the entrance, it is very deep and towards the inside the plant material is going to have a difficult time growing. Feels like a narrow dark entry point, is there an opportunity to reduce the depth and increase the size of the lobby?
- Good to see the planter and trellis on the south next to the lane.
- Are you at the maximum distance from the roadway for the entrance? Would this change the use of the entrance area?
- Wondering about the rooftop space – doesn’t look particularly usable so far into the building and there is only one means of egress.
- Consider rethinking the exits so they are not going through the garbage area which could create an egress conflict.
- Echo comments about depth of entry, and problems with proposed landscape treatment at the entry.

- Architecturally the two sides are treated separately which helps break up the length of the building – consider using this approach on the landscaping so that it is also broken into two distinct styles along the frontage.
- The lane doesn't line up with others in the area, is there an opportunity for a mid-block crossing and treat it as a more pedestrian focused lane?
- Could the playfulness of the kids' area wall be carried in to the horizontal space as well?
- There is a proposal to relocate the magnolia but is there anywhere better for it with more soil?
- Commend the design team for a creative expression of a 6 storey building.
- Good project and right kind of project for the District of North Vancouver
- Agree with the Urban Designer's comments
- The vertical expression in the one half of the building could be stronger. For example a series of tall posts, columns etc. to hold up this element.
- Children's play area could be better located, and you could take the second set of stairs up for two accesses, tying it together with screening and railings.
- If the exit is by the garbage, it would help to provide a fireproof screen to separate staging and garbage.
- Commend the team for responding to the concerns from last time, many improvements and great features including the massing for such a large building.
- Programming is well thought through.
- Roof landscape, it would be ideal to have play centre on the ground level and on the rooftop.
- Could also look at the opportunity for a green roof to support some roof-top activities.
- Concerned that the rendering does not clearly depict the materials and that the actual material choices will be problematic.
- With two thoroughfares, units exiting onto the street and a recessed main entrance the challenge is to have easily identifiable units and building identification.
- Consider suitable signage and lighting.
- The rear area with parking is a thoroughfare to a transit hub and with unsecured parking, means there is going to have to be a balance between landscaping used to provide territoriality and maintaining views of the parking. Don't want to reduce natural visibility or surveillance.
- This carries towards the garbage area, accesses are hidden from line of sight.
- Lighting is going to have to be amazing.
- There is a setback issue – page 11 shows how the massing steps back but the addition of the cap at the top defeats the purpose. To achieve the objective, you would have to remove the cap at the upper level.
- Building separation has been addressed and the applicants have done a nice job of doing this, it will read as 2 buildings rather than 1.
- Echoes comments about the visual that is presented not being what will be achieved by the material pallet. The promise of the design is reflected in the neighboring building where the detailing of the façade lets it down. Monolithic paneling will not be achievable with the materials selected.

- Explore the detailing of the materials you have chosen, as well as the detail of the joinery and connection in materials.

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

- The recess is a way to also deal with the grade change from sidewalk to access lobby and the length makes the ramp a low slope
- The balconies align with units so to shift them away from the entry to open up the entrance would mean they don't line up anymore.
- The roof line is attempting to differentiate the two sides of the building.
- In terms of the materials, we are going to be looking at step code 3 which is expensive while also being cognizant of what it will take to build the building and keep it as a reasonable rental rate.

Owner

- Thank you very much for all of your comments, appreciate all of the combined minds to provide feedback.
- The children's area is challenging where it is located, there will be an area on the roof as well, but also leaving an area for quieter moments. The roof area will be more clearly defined in later designs.
- Agrees with Sergeant Bracewell on the CPTED issues, there is lots of work to do there.
- Comment taken most to heart is in regards to materials - will work to make the next iteration more representative

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

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

~~#3.~~ 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.) Old Dollarton Rd and Dollarton Highway (PID: 009-072-250) – Maplewood Fire and Rescue Centre

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, introduced the project, and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team. Linus Murphy of S2 Architecture, and Nastaran Moradinejad of PFS 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 is the cost for a project like this? Or is it an unlimited budget? It is roughly \$35 million.
- Is there turnaround room for the vehicles, have turning radii been designed? The parking spaces have been designed with enough room for the trucks to turn around the entirety of the building, the training area has been kept tighter on purpose for more realistic training.
- Will there be two exits or is one of the two showing just temporary? There are two access driveways, which provides redundancy which is beneficial for rescue services.
- Which facilities will be moving to this location? Fire Hall #2, the fire training facility on St. Denis, and the administrative staff.

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

- The linearity that is present on the front of the building could be carried around the back as well.
- Horizontal band at the human scale should be carried around the building, paying particular attention to breaking up the southern façade.

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

- Agree that the south side could use some work
 - Could be done by varying the colour of the panels
 - Could utilize placement of windows to create this as well.
- Could use a colour on the brise soleil.
- If using a tree as a symbolic memorial then consider something more substantial, like an oak tree.
- Appreciates the landscaping, the invasive species that are being removed will have to be combatted with rigorous replanting to force them out.
- Low native shrubs could be added in the transition areas.
- Storm water system seems to be small, does there need to be permeable pavers or something similar to complement it?
- Might consider a nicer fencing along the edge of the property rather than chain link
- The edges of the building look ideal for birds to roost, consider maintenance methods.
- Consider strengthening the pedestrian connections both from Dollarton and Mt Seymour Parkway.
- The design has a retro feel of municipal infrastructure from the 50s, with concrete and hard horizontal lines, but generally works.
- The north and south elevations could use a work.
- The windows don't punch out at all, they hide in the walls.
- Wonder if there is a way to make the top floor float, with a more dynamic interruption between the levels.
- The entrance is lacking something, could use some more drama.

- Great idea to coordinate the fire stations, training and public/admin uses into one building.
- Fencing is definitely a concern
- Agree the south needs some more work to create consistency
- Gorgeous but consider simplifying things. The project could stand to lose a few features and still maintain its architectural standard. Consider some value engineering
- The bi-fold door approach is interesting, wonder how they would fair after an event?
- In the event of a large scale emergency, the site will be used as a meeting place, so you might want to consider being self-sufficient as far as water sources go.
- Encourage some use of colour and vibrancy in accordance with the design guidelines.
- May want to consider some bird-proofing measures, they will find a way to use the rooflines. In the very least have a way to tie off to the roof system for whoever is going to clean them.
- It is a strong project and deserves a lot of merit.

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

The applicant team thanked the Panel for their comments.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

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

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. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

March 14, 2019

Chair

Date