

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
October 8, 2020 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Andrei Chisinevschi
Mr. Eric Tinlup Ng
Mr. James Blake
Ms. Carolyn Kennedy
Ms. Nancy Paul
Ms. Riva Nelson
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell

REGRETS: Ms. Grace Gordon-Collins
Mr. Nathan Shuttleworth
Mr. Don Aldersley
Ms. Kim Smith

STAFF: Mr. Kevin Zhang (Staff Liaison and Item 3.a.)
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Mr. Daniel Broderick

Ms. Carolyn Kennedy opened the meeting at 6:20 pm

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Eric Tinlup Ng, seconded by Ms. Nancy Paul, and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of September 10, 2020

Passed

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

- Attendance
- Ms. Carolyn Kennedy queried whether there were any concerns with online meeting protocols.
- Mr. Kevin Zhang and Mr. Don Aldersley explained the online meeting protocols.
- Announcement regarding Panel Members coming to the end of their term: Kim, Riva, Don and James. James and Don have indicated they want to serve another term.

3. NEW BUSINESS

- a.) **331, 333 Riverside Dr; 340 Seymour River Pl; 2170 Old Dollarton Rd & 2171 Munster Ave – Preliminary Rezoning Application to accommodate two six-storey apartments consisting of seniors rental and market rental, 84 townhomes, and a childcare facility**

Ms. Carolyn Kennedy explained the order of events to the applicant.

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Development Planner, introduced the applicant team, being: Rebecca Chaster, Darwin Properties; David Jacobson, Darwin Properties; Bob Worden, RWA Architecture; Allan Seppanen, RWA Architecture; Derek Lee, PWL Partnership.

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Development Planner, introduced the project, gave a brief presentation about the project, and posed questions to the Panel for consideration.

The applicant team gave a presentation about the project.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel.

- Are the courtyards and pathways intended to be publically accessible or will there be an attempt to secure these courtyards?
 - They are currently proposed as porous with no gates, but there may be some indication that you're entering a semi private space.
 - No intention of closing off the pathways for private only use
- Is there a ramp option for access to the courtyard space?
 - There is a significant grade change in that area, so there are two elevators to access the courtyard. The east courtyard elevated is placed close to the street, accessible through the amenity space will be placed close to the street and have access to the parking level too
- Width of the seniors units
 - 14'2" module
- What's your thinking about children and playing outside. Are the kids expected to play elsewhere
 - What we are showing is a constellation of smaller courtyard spaces. What we would look at is how best to integrate a contained are with the daycare.
 - There will be some pockets within the development, that will be multi-programed
 - We have not yet done programming of the greenspaces
 - We have been in conversation with the school district, and there is some potential for play to be accommodated by the school grounds
 - The space between the buildings is bigger than the plan may suggest
- The seniors building seems to be on a podium relative to Old Dollarton road. Has the accessibility issue been addressed
 - Podium is strictly driven by the flood construction levels.
 - We need to provide well designed ramps to get up to the entranceway
- How many children will the childcare accommodate
 - 53 children approximately
- Is there going to be multiple addresses
 - 3 addresses
- What is the dimension between the two rows of townhouses.
 - We are working with 30' spacing between the rows.

- Munster connection labeled as traffic calming measures. What other strategies do you have?
 - At an early stage we are looking at a few options. If the intent is to be a shared street, minimizing the presence of curbing would be advantageous.
 - Materials such as asphalt with concrete banding to visually break things up.
 - Planting, introduction of planters, to give it a more pedestrian feel.
 - We will work closely with Engineering to discuss materiality.

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

- Contextual analysis: This is a very important project in conjunction with the project to the south, in the development of the Maplewood village area.
- This is a very vital project combined with the rest of the projects in progress.
- There is a topographic condition on the north side of the property, a very strong north south vehicle traffic route along riverside road
- Also important to consider the node of continuity for future development to the east
- Location of childcare centre on the northeast corner
 - This is located on a busy street. Access to the childcare centre will create congestion along riverside.
 - The location would be more suitable towards the west of the property, which is calmer and more open.
 - Will allow for easier pick up and drop off.
- Length of the buildings
 - We have established the 45m total length.
 - Recommend that the north east townhouse building should be broken up to ensure that the building façade does not exceed a length of 45m.
 - North east townhouses should also better consider the topography and vegetation and how it will affect the pedestrian access.
- Corner of Old Dollartan Rd and Riverside
 - Recommend a less hard edge for the senior's building at the corner of Riverside and Old Dollartan.
 - Also recommend breaking up the building with articulation. Reduce the massing
- Repetitiveness in building façade and massing scale transitions.
 - There is potential. There should be more flexibility in the roof lines and there should be more variety to avoid repetitiveness.

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

- Concern with the northern townhouse units that do not have any road access. There may be some issues from a code perspective, but also from an emergency access perspective. More thought should be given to the access of the townhouse
- Concern with the daycare location:
 - Concern noted regarding the drop off of the childcare centre, and the access to the townhouse parking area.
 - Very busy road along Riverside Dr.
 - Consider a designated pick up and drop off
- Security concern with the dead end walkway.
- Concern with the daycare location.
 - Unsure about the assumption of utilizing the playground of the school

- There are no elementary schools in the area as Kenneth Gordon is a private school – although it is School District owned property
- Concern regarding lighting of the play area for the park/school and its impact on the townhouses facing the school property
- Parking concerns along Riverside
- Concern regarding stepping stone landscaping as it is very challenging from an accessibility perspective
- Paving stones are difficult for accessible reasons. They heave, shift and are slippery.
- More contrast is needed for those with low vision people.
- The loss of curbs can be a challenge for those with low vision as they do not know when they are entering into a traffic area.
- While the proposal is under density, it does feel at the ground level a little dense.
- The corner of the senior building
 - Make something of the corner, perhaps by pulling back the building and providing public space at the corner intersection. Corner plazas don't work
 - Another comment found the midblock plaza is helpful as it feel less busy.
- Generally like the idea of having the daycare connect to the greenspace and integrating with the school facility to the north.
- Comment regarding the length of the unit.
 - The length of the building could be extended beyond the 45m but with better articulation
- Comment regarding the spacing between the rows of townhouses:
 - While it is 30', it does feel less. Encourage making this feel more spacious through intervention.
- The applicant should be very aware of the safety and security considerations surrounding childcare
- There is a section of parking that is not secured for visitors.
 - This should be well lit and have clear sightlines, perhaps through the use of convex mirrors
- Emergency access to the units.
 - Make it clear for emergency services to find specific units.

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

- Comments are very helpful at this time
- Wanted to highlight Riverside Dr
 - Agree that is currently not a pleasant place to walk
 - The plan for Riverside includes a widening of the road, a dedicated bike lane on the proposal's side of property.
 - Part of the idea behind the placement of the childcare location was to help improve the current conditions along Riverside Dr.

The Chair invited discussion amongst Panel members. No discussion.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Riva Nelson and **SECONDED** by Andrei Chisinevski

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and supports the general concept, and looks forward to a presentation at the detailed application stage that includes a review of the items noted by the panel in its review of the project.

CARRIED

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:49 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

To be determined

4