

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
March 9, 2023 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

- ATTENDING:** Mr. Jean-Pierre Mahé (JPM)
Mr. Joshua Bernsen (JB)
Ms. Alexis Chicoine (AC)
Mr. Brian Newton (BN)
Mr. Rafael Santa Ana (RSA)
- REGRETS:** Mr. Nathan Shuttleworth (NS)
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell (KB)
Mr. Kelvin Lit (KL)
Ms. Nancy Paul (NP)
- STAFF:** Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Mr. Kevin Zhang (Staff Liaison; Item 3)
Mr. Graeme Budge (minutes)
- APPLICANT:** Mr. Brent Carlson (Anthem Developments)
Ms. Danielle Dhaliwal (Anthem Developments)
Mr. Riaan de Beer (Anthem Developments)
Mr. Ryan Vanderham (Anthem Developments)
Mr. Dale Staples (Integra Architecture)
Mr. Michael Patterson (Perry and Associates Landscape Architects)

1. Panel welcome and dinner

Mr. Zhang opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

- Mr. Zhang initiated selection of new Chair and Co-Chair for the 2023 year.
- AC nominates JPM as Chair; JPM accepts nomination; carried.
- AC nominates JB as co-Chair; JB accepts nomination; carried.
- Attendance was taken and panellists and staff introduced themselves.

2. Administration

A motion was made by AC, seconded by JPM, and carried, to adopt the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of December 8, 2022.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) Address: 902 - 968 Lytton Street

Project: A Development Permit for Phase 2 of Seymour Estates which includes thirty-one 3-storey townhomes in 6 buildings.

Mr. Zhang, Development Planner, provided a brief presentation on the project.

- Presented site and adjacency context within the area, OCP and CD118 zoning properties including land use, density, setbacks, heights, vehicle and bicycle parking requirements – the project complies with the CD118 Zone regulations and no change to the Zoning Bylaw are requested.
- ADP reviewed Phase 1 of the project in July of 2017, and in June of 2021, and a Development Permit was issued in October 2021 for 341 residential units and a commercial space totalling a gross FSR of 1.37
- Phase 1 includes one six-storey wood-frame apartment with 119 units on Site 1, seven four-storey stacked townhouse buildings, and one three-storey townhouse building totalling 102 units at Site 2; and one six-storey wood-frame rental building with 89 purpose-built rental units and a commercial unit at Site 4.
- Phase 2 includes six three-storey townhouse buildings totalling 31 units at Site 3; each with a 2-vehicle ground-level garage; three street-level visitor parking stalls; density of Phase 2 (Site 3) is 0.87 FSR or a total floor area of 5,685.48 m² (61,198 sq ft).
- Identified three matters to be commented on by panel:
 - Interaction of the built form with the surrounding streetscapes
 - Location and treatment of the staging areas
 - Context of the built form within the larger Seymour Estates Project

Mr. Brent Carlson, Anthem Properties, introduced the project and consultant teams.

- Explained history of Anthem’s ownership of the property, the previously approved rezonings, and context of the development within the area

Mr. Dale Staples, Architect, provided a brief overview of the project and highlighted the following information:

- Explained the history of the project starting 7 years ago, rezoning and DP approval in 2021, imminent Building Permit for Phase 1.
- Key intent of Phase 2 is the answer to diversity of housing form, and a “breathing space” for the overall site, and to create a lower density area for the property.
- The retention of natural elements (trees) and grade influenced the building siting, site access and circulation along the internal strata streets east of Lytton St.
- Highlighted project statistics, pedestrian and vehicle circulation plan.
- Highlighted streetscape elevations, building row orientations to add light and views that penetrate across the site.
- Highlighted architectural character precedents, and circulated materials samples, and noted the materials and planting response to the Wildfire DPA.
- Highlighted CPTED strategy – orientation facilitates surveillance, access control, and territorial reinforcement.

Mr. Michael Patterson, Landscape Architect, provided a brief overview of the project landscaping and highlighted the following information:

- Explained the landscape plan, natural elements, tree retention, protection, and tree replacement plan along streets, with intent for leafy internal neighbourhood, and pedestrian connectivity along the sidewalks and internal mews.
- Highlighted that each unit has its own at-grade patio with unit access.
- Highlighted Lytton Street section, mews section, internal strata road section
- Highlighted landscape character precedents, the layered concept, and benefit to pollinators.
- Played a rendering fly-through of the site.

The Chair opened the floor to the Panel for clarification questions.

Q: Clarification of material changes from wood fencing to glazing – is that for combustibility reason?

A: Yes.

Q: How is grade change resolved at end of driveway between building 5 & 6, and 1 & 2?

A: applicant confirms retaining walls, and with guardrail where more than 2 feet.

Q: Is there an outdoor amenity space planned for the greater site?

A: Yes, several including a dog run and playground, shared throughout the other sites.

Q: Is there opportunity to have multiple sets of bollards?

A: No – defined by the space needed for vehicle three-point turning.

Q: Waste and recycling bins plan?

A: Staff requested staging areas for bins, not to be collected at each driveway apron. May evolve over time as per Strata.

Q: Is there enough spacing for people with mobility to move through bollards?

A: Yes, suitable for through-travel of pedestrians, bikes, mobility aides.

Q: What is the access option from internal mews around accessible unit to driveway?

A: Ramp that comes off the sidewalk to internal mews and zero-threshold patio access into accessible unit at north end of building 3.

Q: Is the zero-threshold access from unit to patio only present at accessible unit? It would add to general livability and universal design.

A: Not present in other units of building 2 & 3, but opportunity exists.

Q: Are all units of Phase 2 (site 3) market units?

A: Yes

Q: Is there any rental on the overall site?

A: Rent-to-own scheme for 25 units (fifteen 1-bedroom and ten 2-bedroom units) at Site 1; Site 4 includes 89 rental units, including 56 market rental, and 33 affordable rental; Site 2 includes a unit sold to Habitat for Humanity at below cost.

Q: Considering grade and solar orientation, has there been consideration for solar panels on roofs?

A: Not considered, but committed to Step Code 3 at rezoning stage, and effectively zero fossil fuels (ie. electric heat and hot water). It would be challenging to facilitate due to shading from the trees.

Q: Whereas it provides a good background for colourful landscaping at certain times of year, treatment of building ends at internal streets is very grey – is there opportunity for colour?

A: Wood tone materials is present to add warmth, and wood soffits are visible from pedestrian viewpoint.

Q: Are bollards removable for emergency access, and could street treatment be changed?

A: Yes, emergency services can remove. Original vision was loop-road, but district required bollard system.

Q: Why is accessible unit only accessible on first floor, and the garage includes only two regular car stalls?

A: Rezoning stage was the point for determining accessibility requirements, and they are evaluated on a project-wide basis. Accessibility measures are achieved on other sites: all units at Site 1 meet basic accessibility requirements, and 6 units meet enhanced accessibility requirements (District's definitions).

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

- A pleasing and nice presentation.
- Comments focus on residential character as it relates to the contextual fit, the site plan (layout) and the architectural built form.
- The site is very relevant as it is the last large piece of residential development that is constrained by the community and education facilities to the south, and the broader low-density neighbourhood to the northwest and northeast.
- District's vision was for the site to be a low-density connection to the surrounding properties, reflecting the original low-density context.
- Sites 1 & 2 involved a pedestrian level connection between the townhome-like buildings that face the streets – this began developing a synergy between the residential buildings and street character.
- Site 4, although significantly more constrained by its conditions, was also intended to create a street connection with the private strata road to its north. This was meant to be reflected on the south side of Site 3.
- Highlights OCP Guidelines for multi-family housing, and ground-oriented housing and multi-family housing.
 - Create a rhythm along the street frontage
 - Oriented towards, visual connection with, and front doors on the street
 - On corner lots – have units that wrap the corner and provide units or entrances facing both streets
 - Designs that celebrate unit identity

- Screened waste facilities sited for accessibility but not interfere with pedestrians
- Highlights elements of those Guidelines with respect to the project:
 - absence of residential integration with surrounding context as originally envisioned (ie. units are oriented internally and do not face to the street and other Sites; only successful at north side of Building 5 facing Site 2);
 - central access points at north and south sides of the internal mews are missing enhancements such as community seating and interactive elements;
 - missing continuous ring path around the east edge of Site 3 building 4;
 - lacking integration of staging locations and service kiosks with landscape or architecture.
- Site Plan urban design concerns include:
 - Explore options to create residential presence and sense of character at the few street frontages (ie. building end units fronting on internal ring roads, and units at corners);
 - Improve the community interaction points to be gathering clusters with seating;
 - Missing the interaction with broader site area which was understood to be initial concept for this Site 3.
 - Missing continual pedestrian link along ring road adjacent to building 4;
 - The staging areas should be integrated into site landscaping or architectural design
- Built Form & Character design concerns include:
 - Missing the sense of residential frontages to the street (the only points proposed are pedestrian access at the internal mews)
 - North & south facades facing streets are too blank and would benefit from access, fenestration, interaction, livability, to contribute to the residential character;
 - Revisit original intent to create a different-but-connected identity for the lower-height residential Site 3, that is distinguished but related to the other sites.

The following comments were provided from the panel:

- Like the grey and wood tones hinting at a west coast style.
- The “accessible” unit pertains to a bedroom and bathroom on ground level, but not upper storey – would benefit from addition of accessibility to other units for multi-generational family living.
- An accessible unit would benefit more from a zero-threshold shower rather than a tub which is an obstacle and even a hazard to accessibility.
- Zero-threshold design for patios across all patios is smart universal design.
- Future designs would benefit from stacked closets that plan for future lifts that allow people to live and age in place.
- The site would benefit from an accessibility link between buildings 3 and 4 - exterior access from mews/patio, to accessible pathway on north side of Site 3 (south side of interior access road).
- Appreciate the aesthetic of the connection to the street but would also appreciate privacy by varying the architectural style of roof tilts towards the street.

- Varying architecture of roof lines and varying finish textures/colours would help differentiate units, break symmetry, and create an independence of units within the broader form.
- Appreciate street trees, and diversity of plant palette including drought tolerant species.
- Appreciate low fences around units and patio edges which is more inviting and adds to permeability and “eyes on the street” concept.
- Would appreciate grading plan to help visualise topography and site contours, and understand how the buildings, ramps, and landscaping integrates into the landscape slopes.
- Likes the bollards traffic calming method and would appreciate varying street textures and sensations to activate the road and alert road users that youth will be playing in the area of the street.
- Appreciate stepping of roof elevations which makes more friendly to the street.
- Excited to see this model type in this neighbourhood, and has no issue with roofs, finishes, nor colours. Acknowledges constraints of this project and commends project.
- Recommends different treatment at bollard points to create a place base for kids, vary and soften surface, and better activate the area – eg. grasscrete.
- Accessibility suites represents a lost opportunity to connect to upper floors, and has no accessible parking stall.
- Would appreciate a building foreground/background colour contrast, and a more colourful palette at least at the building ends.
- Would appreciate orienting access (be it end-unit doors, or patio gates) to street, or glazing on building corners/street-ends in order to connect to the street.
- Suggests minimising/hiding splines.
- Would appreciate wood; addition of colour would help seasonal greying of our bioregion; but some panel members think that colour ages the appearance.
- Architecture should be self-sustaining and not rely on an external device to hide what is not right – ie. landscaping should be complimentary to the architecture, not used as a veil to obscure constraints or matters left wanting by unresolved architecture.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by AC and **SECONDED** by JB

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

None opposed

Applicant team hears the panel’s comments and thanks the panel, and looks forward to working with staff to address those comments and work towards a successful DP.

3. Business

- JPM suggests seeing Urban Design Staff's presentation ahead of time to provide better understanding of context – not possible, as staff should not be influencing panel's opinions.
- KZ reminds panel to make comments in relation to Form and Character Guidelines that communicate principles of OCP, rather than focusing on suggestions that applicants might act upon with expectation of approval.
- 2022 ADP Design Excellence Awards scoring to be done at next meeting April 13, 2023. KZ will circulate email to coordinate group tours if agreeable.


4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

To be determined.

Chair



for JP Mahé

Date