

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
October 14, 2021 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Andrei Chisinevski
Mr. Eric Tinlup Ng
Mr. Rajesh Kumar
Ms. Carolyn Kennedy (Chair)
Ms. Nancy Paul
Mr. James Blake
Mr. Don Aldersley
Mr. Nathan Shuttleworth
Ms. Grace Gordon-Collins
Ms. Alexis Chicoine

REGRETS: Sgt. Kevin Bracewell

STAFF: Mr. Kevin Zhang (Staff Liaison)
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Ms. Emel Nordin (Item 3.a.)
Mr. Andrew Norton (Item 3.b.)
Ms. Afrooz Fallah

GUEST: Mr. Kelvin Lit (incoming ADP panel member)
Mr. Jean-Pierre Mahé (incoming ADP panel member)

Ms. Carolyn Kennedy opened the meeting at 6:06 pm

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

- Attendance
- Mr. Kevin Zhang thanked the panel members, Mr. Andrei Chisinevski, Mr. Eric Tinlup Ng, Ms. Grace Gordon-Collins, and Ms. Carolyn Kennedy, whose term with the District of North Vancouver's Advisory Design Panel will be terminated by December 30, 2021.
- Mr. Kevin Zhang welcomed two new panel members, Mr. Kelvin Lit and Mr. Jean-Pierre Mahé, and invited them to introduce themselves.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Don Aldersley, seconded by Ms. Nancy Paul, and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of March 11, 2021.

Passed

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 2320 Emery Court – Development Permit Application for 46 Townhouse Units

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

Ms. Emel Nordin Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context and posed questions to the Panel for consideration.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team; Bob Warden of *RWA Architecture*, Alexa Gonzalez of *Durante Kreuk Ltd.* introduced the project.

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

- What material is used for the surface of the pedestrian pathway?
 - It will be saw cut concrete for the circulation paths.
- Are there any accessible parking and visitor parking considered for this development?
 - Yes, they have been considered.
- The stepped front door might be challenging even for able-bodied people. Is the step really required?
 - The illustrations and renderings are not up to date. Up to 80% of the steps have been removed from the site plans and the units have a sloped entry (3%) to the front doors.
- Have the requirements including the distance from the fire lane to all portions of townhouses and turning maneuvers been considered?
 - Yes, all the fire safety requirements have been considered in the design and it has been approved by the fire department.
- What amenities have been provided for the amenity area, picnic area, and children's play area?
 - The main goal for this proposal was to have a cohesive master plan with connected community gathering spaces. Lot 1 which is the rental building, features a large children's play area with multiple pieces of equipment in a natural play theme that backs up onto the forest itself and is fenced in along the Kirkstone forest area. This is accessible from every lot. Lot 2 which is the three taller apartments, has the swimming pool, arts and crafts room, indoor kitchen and dining area, seating area with a fireplace, gym facility, and all the facilities will be accessible to all four phases of the development. For the picnic area adjacent to Lot 3, picnic tables will be situated in that area and the project arborist will review the locations to ensure minimal impact to the critical root zones.
- Are there any considerations to have the laundry area at the same level as the bedrooms (where the laundry is generated)?
 - The proposal is inclusive, and two options have been provided for townhouse units. For units facing lot 1, the laundry area is on the lower level, however, the remaining units have the laundry area at the same level as bedrooms. The first option (i.e., laundry at the lower level) would be more appropriate for families with active lifestyles for example parents/teenagers coming back from mountain biking, hockey, or other kinds of sports and needing to change their clothes and

place them in the laundry area once they enter the home. The other option would be more suitable with families with small children or sedentary lifestyles.

- What is the size of the private patios? Are they paved or could they be planted?
 - The patios are roughly 12 by 12 feet. The details are not finalized but they are likely paved, and large potted plants could be placed by the owners (not the strata).

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

- The project requires a possible simple solution to create identity and privacy. There is no need for substantial design change in the built form but more in the finishing details.
 - Identity
 - Variation in building design has not been implemented. There should be subtle design variation between neighbouring buildings to avoid repetition while maintaining harmony to the streetscape.
 - Different door colour from the next units and perhaps some extra colour palette should be added to the current one to avoid monotony and repetitiveness and create differentiation in character at the pedestrian level.
 - Privacy
 - Privacy between the units has not been considered. Access to the units requires privacy. The little wooden fence proposed as a divider is not acceptable.

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

- Well put together package.
- The unit front entry separation for side-by-side entries is an issue and should be resolved by the applicant's team.
- The stepped front door is challenging for wheelchair and stroller's access and flat entrances are highly recommended.
- The lack of colour to differentiate the units should be acknowledged especially for children and people with cognitive challenges.
- Zero-threshold (curb-less/walk-in) showers are encouraged. It is safer for kids and allows people to age in place safely and with dignity.
- Patio benches will be most useful if they have full back support and armrests to assist in sitting and standing. People with mobility problems and visually impaired individuals often need side-arms to help them sit down and get up.
- For the picnic tables, an extra overlap on the end should be considered for extra chairs or a mobility device. It is encouraged to have at least one spot open without a seat and would be accessible for wheelchairs.
- Reconsideration of the colour palette might be a possibility.
- Public art could be accomplished in this project.
- Wayfinding signs and other possible coloured pieces/signs and shrubs' arrangement might be alternatives to improve the units' diversity.
- Adjusting the door alignments to have one point in the middle of the unit to continue the whole way through may eliminate the side-by-side entries and alleviate the privacy issues.

- Providing clear paths and outstanding signage through the townhouse development is the fundamental fact that should be considered to ensure all emergency responders could access each unit as soon as possible.
- More variations in the buildings' façade and in the planting species are recommended.

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

- Mr. Chris Lee of *Mosaic Homes* thanked the panel members for their comments and mentioned that the concerns will be addressed in the final submission. He added that the team are very conscious in selecting the type of plant species so there are different blooming patterns and the introduction of several colours will create variations to the building frontages.
- This development is offering a distinctive building form with townhouses on parkade rather than typical slab on grade townhouses. The courtyards and front entries are other advantages of this development which make this project unique.

The Chair invited discussion amongst Panel members. No discussion.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Ms. Alexis Chicoine and **SECONDED** by Mr. Eric Tinlup Ng and Mr. Andrei Chisinevski.

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.) 2045 Old Dollarton Road – Rezoning and Development Permit Application for a 36 Unit 5 Storey Apartment Building with a Commercial Space

Mr. Don Aldersley and Mr. Nathan Shuttleworth recused themselves from the discussion citing a conflict of interest.

Mr. Andrew Norton, Development Planner, introduced the project, and explained the context, and posed questions to the Panel for consideration.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team; Amir Farbehi of Inspired Architecture, and Caelan Griffiths of *PMG Landscape Architects Ltd.* 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:

- Provide further information on the floor plans including the parking levels.
 - The project architect presented the floor plans and unit layouts for reference.

- What is meant by the commercial units have barrier-free access from front and back? Are the entrance doors to be power-operated / automatic doors?
 - Barrier-free design means allowing proper and safe access to units by providing curb-less areas, ramps, passenger elevators to overcome a difference in level. Regarding the power-operated or the automatic doors, they could be a possibility but the details have not been considered yet.
- How are the bicycle stalls designated for the units?
 - This has not yet been defined but they would be separated between commercial and residential uses. Bicycle parking will meet policy requirements.
- Is the project seeking any variances for any applicable bylaws?
 - No, the project is fully compliant with all the applicable bylaws and no variance has been requested at this stage.
- Why do most of the units face north and east where the sunlight would be minimum when facing west or south could lead to better results?
 - The project is impacted by the surrounding developments overlooking the residential units. Therefore, the units have been designed to mitigate privacy issues. Furthermore, there are solid walls at the west perimeter and the units have been positioned along the north and east to avoid facing such a view.
- In the rendering it seems the soffits are made of wood, is that correct?
 - No, the soffits are made of metal but the finishing would be like wood.
- What material would be used for decorating elements?
 - The details are not final yet, but they are large supplies and will be compliant with the BC Building Code, especially the regulations in the fire code.
- It seems the fifth floor projects out at the corner? What is the rationale for the volumetric difference at level four versus level five?
 - There are two alignments shaping this corner, Old Dollarton Road and Seymour River Place, and the panel advised to have a smooth curve at that corner so we developed this design concept.
- What material is proposed for the Commercial Retail Unit canopies?
 - It would be metal and glass all the way the CRUs.

The panel asked the following clarification questions of Mr. Norton:

- Are there any requirements for planting the boulevard trees along Seymour River Place?
 - There is currently a discussion with the District landscape/streetscape designer and there is a desire to see some trees along Seymour River Place but there are no specific requirements in terms of the number of trees and the species type yet. Staff are discussing the setback requirements and will confirm what space is available for planting.
- Are there any considerations to save the few existing trees?
 - The existing trees are not considered protected trees based on the District's Tree Bylaw, thereby retention is not required. A final landscape plan is to be submitted by the applicant's team. Staff will seek an appropriate planting scheme.

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

- The previous staff recommendations in the preliminary submission have not been followed. As mentioned, the two edges merge in one point and it is really important to create a connection at this corner as a focal point.
- Corner treatment needs to address the turning edge of the site either with a round form or rectangular frontal plane that helps to create an urban corner.
- There are some discrepancies in the architectural plans and landscape plans which should be resolved in the final submission.
- The cavity as shown on the site plan has no function. The idea of public art might seem interesting but the location is misplaced. This cavity may be a perfect location for a restaurant or uses that active the space. The current design doesn't achieve any success in terms of use and form.
- The proposed location for the Pad-Mounted Transformer (PMT) is challenging and will block access to the adjacent CRU. The location needs to be re-considered.
- The corner should not respond to any of the adjacent streets but it should be a completely separate identity creating unity and making a very strong statement as a focal point and an urban corner.
- The current corner design at the upper floors and its connectivity with the body of the building seems unreasonable and it appears that the top corner is floating over the lower levels with a different vocabulary which is confusing rather than unifying.
- The articulation of elements connecting the built form should be reassessed.
- The building's street frontage needs to create a related geometry that connects with the future neighbouring development.
- Overall detailing of the project including the entrance detailing should be re-evaluated.

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

- The majority of the panel supported the comments from Alfonso Tejada, expressed reservations about the overall design composition and disappoint that a number of comments from previous panel review were not addressed.
- The current building corner and design elements does not blend well with the overall West Coast contemporary design of the building.
- Wider bicycle stalls should be considered for adaptable units as they will not be used just for storing bicycles but also different mobility devices.
- The furniture proposed for the rooftop garden will be most useful if they have full back support and armrests to assist in sitting and standing. People with mobility problems and visually impaired individuals often need side-arms to help them sit down and get up. The tables should consider extra overlap on the end for extra chairs or a mobility device. It is encouraged to have at least one spot open without a seat making it accessible for a wheelchair.
- It was noted that the pathway along the sidewalk is proposed to be stamped concrete rather than paving stones. Stamped concrete is low-maintenance, affordable, and has

excellent performance and longevity. Paving stones could eventually settle unevenly and cause tripping and rolling hazards.

- Relocating the PMT is highly recommended to not block the CRUs.
- The boulevard trees, especially along the bike route are essential, and panel members expect that the dialogue between the applicant and the District would result in a better landscape plan. Additionally, the adjacent developments are contributing boulevard trees and the same pattern should be continued.
- The proposed roof garden element is a wonderful amenity and the District should encourage such amenities in future developments.
- The context is very important for this project and two adjacent developments should be taken into consideration. The proposed development does not fit well within the wider site context in respect of design balance and material selection.
- The proposed built form, design detailing, proportions and material selection is confused and unbalanced and needs revision. There are too many conflicting styles and materials proposed.
- The building's corner design needs to be simplified.

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

- The applicant's team mentioned that there is not enough information regarding the detailed design and the proposed materials for the adjacent developments on the District's website and the designers are not willing to share their information. The Chair asked the Development Planner to share the required information if possible. Andrew Norton confirmed that all the required information is available in the public domain and he will help the applicant to find that information.

The Chair invited discussion amongst Panel members. No discussion.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Mr. Eric Tinlup Ng and **SECONDED** by Mr. James Blake.

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 the review of the project.

CARRIED

3. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:46 p.m.

4. NEXT MEETING

To Be Announced

Chair 
for Don Aldersley

Date Dec 9 / 2021