

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

ATTENDING: Mr. Jordan Levine (Chair)
Mr. Samir Eidnani
Mr. Darren Burns
Mr. Steve Wong
Mr. Charles Leman
Mr. Stefan Elmitt
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Mr. Tieg Martin
Ms. Diane Zoe Coop

REGRETS: Ms. Carolyn Kennedy

STAFF: Mr. Kevin Zhang
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Ms. Taylor Jenks
Ms. Robyn Hay (Item 3.a.)
Ms. Carly Rosenblat (Item 3.b.)

The meeting came to order at 6:05 pm.

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Darren Burns, seconded by Stefan Elmitt and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of October 11th, 2018.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

- Mr. Kevin Zhang thanked the panel for their commitment and input over the last year, he noted that it was the final meeting of 2018, and the group will reconvene in the spring for tours and awards. Mr. Zhang recognized the three members stepping down: Mr. Jordan Levine, Mr. Samir Eidnani, and Mr. Tieg Martin and thanked them for hard work. Staff will compile a list of all projects from last year with comments and send it out to everyone for tours, likely occurring in February or March, and awards in March or April. It was noted by Mr. Steve Wong and Mr. Jordan Levine that self

guided tours were preferable save for facilities that benefit from having a guide with a higher level of access.

- Mr. Kevin Zhang suggested that once a list of sites is compiled then it can be determined which facilities would be best viewed as a group.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 1044 Edgewood Road – Handsworth Secondary School Replacement

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

The Chair invited the applicant team to present. Kate Lemon and Witmar Abele on behalf of KMBR Architect, and David Jerke, Landscape Architect from Van Der Zalm introduced the project.

Questions were asked and answered on the following topics:

- The rendering doesn't show the elevation of the sidewalk /walkway across the main entrance, please explain further. Mr. Abele explained that there is a change in elevation of the walkway to indicate to the driver that they are entering a pedestrian zone.
- The playing field is at a different grade from the main building, is there a step down or is it sloped? Mr. Abele explained that there is no physical step, it is a slope and Mr. Jerke clarified that the slope will come from the exit of the building, and run between the steps, which will provide spectator seating.
- Is the playing field going to include a track because the site doesn't look like it will have the room? A track can be accommodated around the field. The School District is considering the feasibility and additional funding will be required.
- Does the layout accommodate a track because it looks tight between the sidewalk and the setback? Yes the track would affect tree retention, but there is sufficient room for a track.
- In regards to the parking variance is there any plan to have car share parking? Car-sharing has been looked at in regards to LEED points, but the applicant team hasn't finalized that aspect and therefore haven't included it in the Development Permit application, but it is being considered.
- Is there opportunity to have a First Nations artist to collaborate on the proposed artwork? School District staff have had discussions with First Nations artists and will continue to collaborate with them in relation to the proposed artwork.
- What is the lift used for near the east end of the building? It is both for students and equipment.
- Can you explain circulation on the second floor, if I need to get equipment to the second floor, can I use the lift? The lift can be used to get equipment up to the second floor.
- What is the room south of the electrical room used for? It will be a void space, the door will be removed in the revised plans.
- Is the design meeting the needs of the School District? The design has been tailored to meet needs of the School District.

- In regards to energy I don't see solar panels on the plans, could you speak to any concept of energy efficiency? We are designing above the LEED gold standard and have an energy consultant on the design team. HVAC and heating are designed for a high level of efficiency, but there aren't any plans for solar.
- Sun-shades are being proposed, but with modern glass are sun-shades really that necessary? Sun-shades are still effective, they keep solar rays away from the glass. The types of glazing that cut out solar rays often make rooms darker as they reduce daylight. More daylight can be utilized to counter the amount of energy used by light bulbs.
- Is there a need for emergency power in schools these days and where would the generator be stored? The School District has access to vehicle mounted emergency generator, the building will have a plug-in point.
- There are two roofing samples on the material board – can you explain the difference? The grey roof material is the majority of the roof and the red roof material is for a safety strip around the perimeter of the roof.
- Does the roof material meet LEED standards? It's the lightest type of aggregate which is beneficial but I don't believe we're pursuing that LEED standard for the roofing material.
- What is the purpose of the rooftop unit, best seen on the elevation drawing from the south? It is a mechanical unit serving the atrium.
- The bike enclosure looks like a fortress. How does the security access work? This still needs to be resolved, in another school we're working on, it is card access but depends how the School District wants to manage it.
- Is there a requirement for consultation with school security experts in regards to serious threats? Under DNV's planning process there is no requirement. – Sgt Bracewell will restrict comments to traditional crime prevention issues, not directly involved with active and deadly threats.
- Is there motion activated lighting on the site? The idea is to maintain lighting on the site until 11pm, but from an energy perspective it is preferable to turn lights off.
- How will the field be lit? The soccer field won't be lit, but we will be providing provision for the field to be retrofitted for lighting if and when funding is secured for the track and ATF field. The project is designed to mitigate light pollution.
- So after 11pm it will be dark? Yes.
- At the entrances off both streets, are there gates/barriers to prevent access? Yes this would be a standard of the school.
- Does the Edgewood Road retaining wall restrict sightlines and natural surveillance onto the property? Yes the elevation changes between the street and the property, stepping up to the site and limiting sightlines.
- Other than the main door, are the other doors on the ground level for general access to the building? The other doors (besides the main door) will act as emergency exits, and can be accessed only during school hours and when unlocked.
- Is there a defined territory along the west side of the property? I believe there is a fence to distinguish the boundary.

- Are there any anti-graffiti/ anti skateboard materials used in the design? The concrete blocks are finished with an anti-graffiti coating.
- What are the restraints around the setbacks on Handsworth Road and would there have been a preference to take parking away from the front of the building and put more parking along the west side of the site? The parking is designed based on functionality as some parking near the drop-off and pick-up area is desirable. This design also reduces the amount of parking next to the neighbours in the single family houses to the west. This secondary parking lot also provides some parking closer to the gym and theatre which is a good safety measure for after hours use.
- Is the “future addition” noted on the plans intended for a library? The “Future addition” is for more classrooms.
- What provisions do you have for fire-fighting? Is there a fire access route around the building? The only designated access route is at the front of the building via the drop-off and pick-up loop.

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

- The outdoor classroom space might be better sited on the south side of the building rather than the north.
- The bike cage, basketball court, and herb garden are all in the same area, but they aren't really connected. In the same way, the small courtyard on the south side of the building is very secluded.
- Consider how the bike cage could be integrated into the design more effectively.
- Mr. Tejada questioned how the refuse is going to function in its location.
- The west end of the building is natural and textured, however the east end is unresolved and appears to be the dead end of the building. More attention to character is required.
- The scale of the elevator cores and mechanical rooms do not appear to be representative.
- Concern that the building has too many grey tones, the material board shows a large chunk of wood but in reality it is mostly grey. In a school you want light, activity and spirit.
- More attention needs to be paid to the details.

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

- The electrical rooms appear to be undersized. The electrical engineer should look into this carefully.
- The idea of replacing parts of the mechanical room through the roof would be tricky, a freight elevator could potentially be used to accommodate this rather than landing the School District with the cost of cutting open the roof.
- Look at having a communications closet on the east end of the building.

- Entry point is functional with curved seating and overhead cover, and projection of the building but it's missing some soul or a welcome feel. The welcome pole is located on the south side of the building, but there should be some art on the north side.
- The location of the herb garden near the parking along with hodgepodge mixed use should be reconsidered.
- The grey external materials are overwhelming.
- There is a severe grade change on Edgewood, rather than developing the site as a level field and then have a steep drop at the edge, you could increase the grade change between the school and the field where the seating is proposed and it would make less of a drop at the edge of the property. What are currently islands of seating could be designed more continuously to handle the grade change better.
- The proposal responds well to neighbourhood context, celebrates outdoor space, and there is a good selection of materials.
- The raised herb planters, between parking and basketball may not be the right location.
- Ensure the south property line creates a visually interesting experience. Consider seating or stairs leading to seating along the field etc.
- Articulation of building is eloquent, material choice is very nice.
- The project has fallen short when it comes to energy considerations. Seems like little attention has been paid to energy.
- The large walls seem expansive and monochromatic, particularly at the entryway.
- Hardiepanel is going to read very dull.
- Not a fan of the V-shape columns, in comparison to the other shape of the entry way column which is a little more interesting. Reconsider the columns and tie them together with other angles in the project.
- Overhead doors are a safety concern with students/ kids.
- The interior interconnected floor space circulation isn't clear.
- Concern around the proximity of the garbage area to the creek and potential wildlife.
- Comments are restricted to traditional crime prevention and not deadly threats:
 - Positive access control through main entry, but weakened by access at opposite ends of the building.
 - Lighting plan is concerning. The building should be lit throughout the night.
 - Fencing is defining the territory but has to be checked and repaired on a regular basis or it ceases to be functional.
- Having the school a few metres closer to the Handsworth would have been preferred instead of the parking.
- Two divided sides of the building is interesting.
- The volumetrics aren't articulated strongly in the architecture. Don't see how the volumes relate to each other structurally.
- There are some unusual pinch points for example the vestibule or airlock at entry, leading to the technical areas of the school, it appears like there are some lockers in the middle of the corridor, appears tight, and not flowing.
- V-shape columns don't relate to any other design feature in the building. No architectural language being developed.

- The colours are too monotone/grey and overall the elevations don't show a lot of pattern/rhythm especially for the scale of the building. ADP typically expects more details in the drawings.
- Likes the V-shaped columns in comparison to a regular parallel structure.
- Support the comments on sustainability, cant support the building as there is nothing mitigating energy consumption.
- If you were to keep the grey palette, the large face could incorporate a variety of materials to make it appear like some sort of landscape, use horizontal features to lessen the flat feeling.
- The enormous roof could potentially be used for outdoor recreation.
- Appreciate the atrium, believe it will be used well for the arts.
- Made the observation that it is a relatively large site with a building that has been in its location for a substantial amount of time. It will be a big change to re-locate the building to the north side especially for neighbours, but the applicant was successful in managing to do so.
- Did well at breaking the building in two and creating a visual break.
- Support the comments made previously on the colour. Encourage the applicants to stick with the wood soffits or bring in other wood elements to soften things up. Example using timber in the V-shaped columns.
- This building will have to comply with part 10 of the code, and with all the proposed glass, there may be an opportunity to use the larger boxes on the east end of the building as platforms for solar panels or something similar.
- Agree that active deadly threats are of concern and it seems like it needs to be addressed. Wanted to underline the comment earlier by Sgt Bracewell.

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

- Energy performance
 - LEED gold – have been pursuing two programs above and beyond LEED but as the details haven't been finalised they didn't speak too much about it in the ADP presentation.
 - Have engaged an energy modeller who is providing constant feedback
 - Reduced the amount of glazing from the initial design, using triple plane glass and solar shading.
 - The School District has retained a sustainability consultant. The School District also is well-versed in energy-efficient building and has an interest in operating costs so are invested in including these practices.
- Will take into consideration materiality, introducing wood material, the same that is included in between floors, emphasizing horizontality, introducing warmth to the front entrance and will talk with the landscape architect to soften it up.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Mr. Charles Leman and **Seconded** by Mr. Darren Burns

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and SUPPORTS the general concept but recommends revisions to the proposal **and a further presentation to address the items noted by the panel** in its review of the project.

- Motion defeated 3 - 6.

Chair asked for clarification on the referral and advice on process.

Ms. Hay clarified that given the institutional nature of the building, the project is exempt from the requirement for a development permit for Form and Character however, the applicant is inviting the Panel's comments. A Council-issued development permit for hazard and environmental purposes, including a variance to parking and siting area provisions will be required.

There followed a discussion around timeline. In regards to the hazard and environmental development permit the application is meeting requirements, but based on timeline maybe the project should be encouraged to move forward.

There was a response that comments should be based on design not timeline.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

Moved by Mr. Jordan Levine and **Seconded** by Mr. Tieg Martin

That 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.

The panel recognized that the applicants are not required to undergo the form and character review process.

- Voted In favor 8 to 1.

The Panel indicated that the applicant is welcome to present the amendments to the panel if desired.

CARRIED

b.) 2900 Lonsdale Avenue - Development permit application for a four-storey mixed use building with commercial space on the ground floor and 15 residential units located above; underground parking accessed off of E Queens Rd.

Ms. Carly Rosenblat, Development Planner, introduced herself and the project.

The Chair invited the applicant team to present. Chad Mooney, Architect from KC Mooney, and Julian Pattison, Landscape Architect from Considered 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:

- Asked for clarification on the design of the green screen. Rather than materials planted sideways into the wall, it is made of plants growing vertically to create a privacy screen.
- Is there a materials board? Applicant provided this for the panel and noted that the glazing on the railing is a sandblasted finish, slightly blurring what is behind it.
- Commercial glass is silicone butt glazing, Soffits are made of wood softening the view as you look up. The rest of the material is concrete with metal supports for canopies.
- Why are you proposing access from 29th? Engineering has required this.
- Is there anything showing the view, or the horizon shots? It is a good view, but the picture provided is taken from the sidewalk, slightly higher and you see above neighbouring buildings and the mouth of the Burrard inlet.
- Is it a hybrid building? All concrete.
- In the loading bay do the trucks sit nose-in off the road? The loading area is leveled, the turning radius has been analyzed. The site might cause issues with trucks backing out or turning around.
- What kind of storm water tank is proposed? Proper tanks that can be cleaned out? Yes, and the plaza is on lift blocks as well.
- Trying to understand how the elevators work? Residents can use both elevators, one elevator is activated by a key card so wont be used by the public in the commercial area.
- Segregated garbage for residents/commercial? No they are combined, separate contract for any tenants creating an irregular amount of waste. Access to this space is at street level with a door.
- Is there another door at street level for commercial parking that will be closed after hours or will it be open access? If there is a restaurant open until later times we might have to work something out for those situations, but we aren't sure of the tenants yet so haven't included anything in the package.
- How are you going to make residential addresses visible to first responders amongst the trees and other signage? The 2900 Lonsdale address is largely written, we could do something at the corner of the plaza but it could misdirect responders.

- Can you describe the retail configuration and access to it? Mr. Alfonso Tejada made a comment that information is missing from the presentation such as interior floor plans and a proper description of green screen.
 - Retail entrances are off of 29th or the plaza itself.
- The CRU has a step-up off of 29th, will it be attached to the unit at the front? We're thinking this section of the building will be split east/west for two tenants. There may be stairs required to the second unit because of the grade change
- Can you elaborate on the garbage room? The room is in the first level of parking so garbage is taken down after hours in the common elevator and then moved across the building.
- When you go out the level entrance doors with garbage carts will those doors have operators on them or will the people going through them keep smashing open with the carts? We will have to be designing doors that stay open and are resilient.
- Currently there is no access to garbage from the northern unit to get to the elevator? No that will have to be looked at.
- What is the history/motivation behind the green roof? It's not a necessity but it allows us to retain some of the water and prevent it from feeding into storm water system. It is also attractive for people further up the hill and increases biodiversity. It hasn't been asked of anyone.

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

- Expressed concern with materials and presentation quality
- One element that is relevant is the intersection of 29th and Lonsdale which is the entrance to Queensdale. Closing the entrance of the plaza off may not be the best option. Have a clear presence into the street and a visual gate but not necessarily a built form gate. This will allow better sightlines to the address as well.
- The front needs to have some sort of modulation/articulation but it is too linear. It represents an office or institutional building because of the linearity rather than a residential building.
- Vertical and horizontal elements need to have a relationship, they currently are odd or out of place.
- Open plaza could be improved to increase visual access.
- Break up linearity of balconies rather than looking like a resort.
- Create vertical modulation of planes
- Eliminate inclined supports on the south side, the large black poles.
- Suggest an alternative treatment for garden boxes; the more green you have the more upkeep there is, but what happens when the green dries out? He questions how it will be efficiently maintained.
- This feature is going to continue around to the east side of the building, how will this be maintained.

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

- Like the look but its dishonest in that the elevator penthouse doesn't show in the elevation drawings
- The roof plan also shows a pad mounted transformer
- Haven't addressed how the kitchen is going to be vented.
- 3 extra parking spots than required, but no spaces indicated for the mechanical room, electrical room, and water entry room.
- Once all of these are considered how will the building actually look?
- Conflict with residential and commercial and double-user space, but the plan doesn't address this.
- Potential for smaller CRUs that may be better suited to the market
- Stairs all filter out in the stairway at the back, which won't work from a code standpoint.
- New building code means that with adaptable units the corridor size is changing. No two discharge points can occur within 6 metres of one another
- Might be worth bringing on a security consultant to avoid user conflicts.
- Signage is important, apartment signage should be clearly distinguished from commercial signage, guiding responders across the courtyard because of the distance from the street corner
- Homeless issue causes concern, potentially could secure parking with a gate during closed hours.
- Could open up the plaza entrance and remove the metal trellis.
- Vine screening looks heavy however, it is doubtful that it will be this lush forever.
- South and North elevations, consider more detail and articulation at pedestrian level
- Looking at the North elevation, the proportions look awkward.
- At the North elevation consider the parking ramp and what could be done to mitigate the view of the loading bay to passers-by
- Plant containers need more substantial species and planters could be enlarged
- Planters along grade change on Lonsdale, east edge of 29th would be more interesting if the irregular "blockiness" was brought to planters as well.
- Urban detailed plaza is nice, the grand entrance on Lonsdale is great but the entrance off of 29th is somewhat ignored, could be enhanced.
- Plant palette could be mixed up a bit more, something in all seasons.
- Increase articulation of the building, the fascia should be wrapped around and indented
- Green walls are suitable on the east side, but on the west side the planters won't allow a substantial enough root base.
- Plants on the west side are above glass railing and will burn out, they are exposed to wind and sun; they could be a shrub material instead to help address this.
- Planters with the poplars, they could be a bit bigger or a more significant species. If it was bigger you would have three significant trees and green up that side of the building.
- Poplars are short lived- and brittle wood, could look at a species more appropriate to an urban plaza.

- Reiterated Alfonso's comments regarding coming in with a detailed application, it is helpful to show how you have addressed comments from a prior presentation. Shouldn't be left to the panel to compare to old plans.
- One of the strengths is the urban plaza, taking advantage of the grade change and creating a natural screen.
- Suggested looking at the top of rail guards for herb gardens rather than green screens.
- Questioned whether graffiti could be removed from building materials.
- Great character with signage and small details, not a fan of the trellis which is inhibiting access.
- Second level has competing elements of commercial and residential, the commercial institutional feeling of the base is carried out through the whole building but there should be some articulation or delineation between the two.
- Lot of challenges with planning such as the functionality of the loading area, garbage access, code issues, and some issues that are not yet seen.
- There are some changes that have been made since the first presentation that should be recognized. However there are some modifications that are a step back. The trellises create a busy feel, the building itself is quite small, and therefore would recommend continuous horizontal lines to calm the design down rather than emphasizing these breaks.
- There are enough significant planning issues that they will impact the overall design
- The building itself is something we need so they don't want to discourage the project but there are some steps backward.
- Would have appreciated comparison between last and this presentation.
- Edwardian style is a silly thing to ask for, the plaza and design is ahead of the current design concepts for this area.
- The engineering requirements are nearly impossible to work with.
- Sign bands are spectacular, concrete and glass materials are great, and presentation and design are thorough.
- Don't see a point with the green roof, it is going to cost a lot of money and it is yet to be seen whether they are a sustainability asset.
- The green screens will inhibit the views offered in this area.
- PMT cannot be put into suspended concrete, it will have to be notched right into the foundation, applicant was encouraged to study this requirement because it may alter the design
- Second level retail doesn't make sense, seems more beneficial to bring the residential right over to the edge of the building.
- The building is forward thinking and will revitalize this neighbourhood; it makes a statement in this area.
- Green screens on the second level should be removed, using plant material that was suggested as hardier.
- Why is the proposal this number of levels? The applicant originally came in with 6 story residential, but it was not well-received so they came back with something that fits with current zoning.

- Agrees that the black struts on the south side second level are over-embellished.
- Agrees with the comments made expressing concern but still would support the building.
- Number of points made to functionality, it is worth repeating the issues as they will have an impact on the look of the building. Otherwise it achieves the goal of being a gateway plaza. Nice idea to have commercial use along that plane. Paying special attention to the planning components and a use that is in demand because having a vacant space in the building for months or years will really impact the benefit of this building.
- Commercial expressions are coming up too high on the building, the horizontal line above the third floor is weakened by the ones above, taking away from the impact of it.
- Not enough hierarchy in the design.
- With regards to the code, there are energy utilization requirements coming up, how are they and the Step code going to be addressed?

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

- Second floor commercial space facing east queens has a tenant already, the Taekwondo studio wants to stay in the neighbourhood, which is why that space is there and they feel comfortable it will function as anticipated.
- Apologized for not going through changes from old design, felt that the differences would be seen.
- In regards to the commercial residential conflict, under C2 zoning the building is supposed to be represented as commercial, yet direction is continuously given towards the residential design.
- Planters- the proposed size and soil is required to keep them safe – discussions about their resilience if irrigation fails.
- The idea is to have the green screen in front of the bedrooms not the living space, they were to help with the previous direction given to the applicant which was to create a vertical linearity to the building.
- Still have work to do with garbage handling and loading.
- Would like to express horizontality of building more, perhaps with low planter boxes.
- Expressed struggles with the direction towards an Edwardian style, if there is a chance to be freed of the traditional Edwardian style it would help.
 - Response from Alfonso that the intent is to include aspects of the style in a modern version, not to recreate an old-fashioned Edwardian style.
- Wondered if the direction being taken is along the right lines?

The Project team appreciated the comments and indicated that the design team will actively work towards improvements with the DNV.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Mr. Stefan Elmitt and **SECONDED** by Mr. Charles Leman

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.

Discussion:

The idea is supported, direction is clear, trust proponents to make the necessary adjustments before moving forward, it is assumed that the building won't be built with any code infractions.

Beautiful building, but fundamentally the duty is to make sure that the form accurately reflects what will be built. However we can't comment as once these functional forms are fixed this design may change.

Voted in favor 5 to 3

CARRIED

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

January 10, 2018

Chair



Date

Feb 14/19

