

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
February 10, 2022 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Kelvin Lit (KL)
Mr. Joshua Bernsen (JB)
Mr. Jean-Pierre Mahé (JPM)
Mr. James Blake (JBI)
Ms. Nancy Paul (NP)
Mr. Don Aldersley (DA)
Mr. Rajesh Kumar (RK)
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell (KB)
Ms. Alexis Chicoine (AC)

REGRETS: Mr. Nathan Shuttleworth

STAFF: Ms. Emel Nordin (Item 3)
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Mr. Dejan Teodorovic
Mr. Kevin Zhang (Staff Liaison)

APPLICANT: Mr. Reza Salehi, Architect
Mr. Daryl Tyacke, Landscape Architect

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

- KZ introduces the meeting and thanks panel members.
- KZ takes attendance and notes Nathan Shuttleworth is absent.
- Staff and panel introduce themselves to one another and welcome three new members.
- Announces that a chair and co-chair nominations are needed and outlines process for electing a chair.
- Alexis Chicoine nominated James Blake as Chair, the panel unanimously votes in favour of Mr. Blake.
- Nancy Paul nominated Don Aldersley as the co-chair, the panel unanimously votes in favour of Mr. Aldersley.

Mr. James Blake opened the meeting at 6:26 pm.

- KZ discusses procedural aspects and structure of the meetings.
- ADP awards will be happening in April 2022. KZ will distribute projects which were completed in 2021 and were previously reviewed by the Panel.
- JPM asks if there is a handout to provide if there are minimum requirements to provide to members; larger scale unit plans with furniture.
- KZ asks what Panel members availability will be on April 14 (Thursday prior to Good Friday).
- Members did not express concern over April 14th meeting date.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Don Aldersley to adopt the amended minutes seconded by Rajesh Kumar, and carried to adopt as amended the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of December 9, 2021.

Mr. James Blake welcomed applicant team explained the rules of procedure for the ADP meeting.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) Address: 1541– 1557 Bond Street – 6:37 p.m.

Project: Detailed Application for an Official Community Plan (OCP), Rezoning, and Development Permit (DP) Application(s).

- **Proposed is a 6 Storey wood-framed – 65 unit market rental building.**

Ms. Emel Nordin, Development Planner, provided a brief presentation on the subject project.

- Provides overview of the OCP and zoning of the properties including land use, density, dedication for green spine, and surrounding context.
 - Surrounding context includes single family homes, (recently completed 7-storey) Creekstone Care Centre, and (under construction 6-storey) Pivot rental building.
- Provides overview of application details, which include:
 - 65 market rental units within a 6 storey wood-framed building.
 - One level of underground parking containing 28 parking stalls (0.43 sp. / unit) and 1.6 bicycle parking spaces / unit.
 - Underground parking access from the north west on Bond St to be shared with future development site to the west.
 - 2.65 FSR and approximate gross floor area (GFA) of 4,600 m².
- Indicates that the proposed development requires an OCP Amendment and Rezoning to support the desired density.
- Provides overview of Lynn Creek Town Centre Implementation Plan and notes that property is within the “Residential Neighbourhood Area” of Lynn Creek.
- Notes that the applicable Development Permit Areas are form and Character of Multi-family buildings, Energy and Water Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction and Protection from Natural Hazards (Creek Hazard).

- Notes that this is a revision of a previous detailed application considered by the ADP in April 2019. Provides an overview of the previous panel comments and how the current proposal has responded including:
 - Revisions to the colour scheme and materials;
 - Improved screening of the garbage and utility areas on the project frontage
 - Revision to the front entrance canopy, and;
 - Improvements to accessibility including the accessible paths of travel and circulation in the outdoor amenity.
- Seeking input on relationship to adjacent sites; recently completed Creekstone Care Centre has a reduced setback to the shared property line (8-10ft.).
- General feedback on colour palette and materials used.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team: Reza and Daryl.

The applicant, Mr. Reza Salehi, Architect provided a long and detailed presentation highlighting the following information for the panel to consider:

- Original proposal was to develop this with BC Housing, however DNV preference was for rental units;
 - The revised proposal is 100% market rental units.
- Notes DNV requires a 5m dedication for green spine and requires the developer to construct the lane and shared vehicle access to underground garage.
- Notes single family homes to the north, east and west are designated multi-family.
- Floor Space Ratio (FSR) is based on precedent of nearby residential project at Oxford and Main St.
- Primary access is from Bond St and secondary (pedestrian) access is provided from the green spine.
- Vehicle access is off of Bond Street and provides a shared access for the future development site to the west.
- The development will put emphasis on bicycle parking, and will provide EV chargers for all spaces and bike repair station.
- TDM strategies proposed to justify reduced parking rate.
- Residents will be provided 1 yr. transit pass.
- Residents will have option of parking with their rental unit to provide flexibility for lower rental rates.
- 1 storage locker per unit provided.
- Project located within Flood hazard area;
 - Consultant recommended 7.4m Flood Construction Level (FCL) – ground floor units, mechanical and electrical rooms are all located above the recommended 7.4m FCL.
- Promoting affordability through efficient design and unit mix.
- Units meet accessible design policy requirements.

- 5 units include enhanced adaptable features (7% DNV requirement is 5%).
- Massing is along Green Spine due to longer frontage than Bond St.
- 16 – 56 ft setback along south property line to provide buffer to care centre.
- The current proposal has relocated the stormwater detention tank to the underground parking to open up outdoor amenity space.
- All units have access to outdoor space.
- Ground floor units have their own patios facing Bond St – or Green spine.
- Two metre wide on-site landscaping adjacent to green spine.
- Highlights colour palette and materials.
- Will meet Step 3 of StepCode and have low carbon energy system.

Alfonso asks the applicant to show all 4 elevations.

Mr. Daryl Tyacke, Landscape Architect provided a brief overview of the project landscaping.

- Will likely increase the street trees on Bond St. from 2 to 3 Street trees, lots of utilities are in the boulevard.
- Due to tight servicing on-site landscape options are impacted.
- There is a gentle slope within the setback to the green spine.
- Rear amenity space has been adjusted to make a more accessible design.

Chair opens up floor to Panel to ask questions.

Q: Nancy: Question for Daryl – landscape changed quite a bit – asked about material change from previous design. Daryl clarified that the design which she is referring to was a different project. Nancy confirmed and asked for some clarification on proposed materials used for surface.

A: Daryl indicated that it is Heavy timber with concrete banding. Noted that intent was to acknowledge historic logging and forestry industry.

Q: Jean-Pierre: Parking Level – intrigued by shared access ramp and asks Planning staff if this been done with other residential projects in North Van.

A: DNV staff indicate that they are not aware of any which have been built, however several have been considered or approved. Design involved a retaining wall which is designed to be torn down in the longer term to provide access for multiple parking areas.

Q2: Design on parkade – is there a gate to separate the two parking areas to ensure that only the residents have only access to their buildings parking.

A: Reza confirms that the two parking areas would be separated by a gate. Also notes that they are the owners of the adjacent property as well and will ensure gates are installed to separate two parking areas.

Additional discussion ensues between panel members, staff and applicant on the location of the proposed gate and future gates. It is determined that the location of the gate shown on the proposed development would need to be relocated once the adjacent property to the west gets developed. The applicant confirms that this is correct.

Q: Alexis: Accessible features, will amenity room have automatic door on bathroom.

A: Reza notes that this door is not automatic and requires fob.

Q2: Is the underground door to access the elevators accessible?

A: Reza yes.

Q3: Do enhanced accessible units have automatic doors?

A: Reza yes.

Q4: Are all accessible (enhanced + others) units 0 threshold

A: Yes, no more than 0.5 inch.

Q5: Wood decks will sink – with concrete between the wood this can create a tripping hazard.

A: Notes heavy timber will not warp as easily and will be hung off concrete strips. Hanging off the concrete strips will allow to maintain connection and levelness.

Q6: Why does one elevation (east) have a box outline?

A: Reza – East elevation has 3 frames and middle section (box outline) which separates two frames and does not have its own shape and the intent is to emphasize the two opposing frames.

Q: Joshua: What is the timeline for completion of the green spine and is there ability to add benches.

A: Emel notes that the District has detailed design drawings for the green spine. Timing of implementation will depend on timing of adjacent development to the east in order to secure their dedication and construction costs. In the interim it will developed to a temporary standard to provide pedestrian access. The detailed design includes seating nodes and street furniture.

Q2: What is the slope of the ramp at the front entrance?

A: Daryl does not know exact slope but indicated a change of approximately 18 inches and estimates a max slope of 8.3%.

Q: Rajesh: Why is there only common laundry – 6 machines for 65 units does not seem like it is enough.

A: Reza notes that 6 machines is sufficient. Assuming individuals do laundry once a week 65 units allows for 9 units to be doing laundry each day, 6 machines for the number of units is sufficient.

Q2: Unit B10 – Bedroom does not have window and unit faces SW. There is only 1 small window in the whole apartment.

A: Reza notes that there is sliding glass door in bedroom which faces living room.

Comment: Rajesh: Would like to see sun and shadow studies with neighbouring buildings shown on adjacent properties. Showing only a shadow without neighbouring buildings does not provide enough context.

A: Reza notes that the shadow study is a required by the District does not include a requirement to include adjacent buildings.

Q: Kelvin: Are any other perspective views, additional two views would be helpful.

A: Reza confirms only 2 renderings were submitted.

Q2: Asks for clarification on why there is a ramp from visitor parking to elevator or if a ramp is even necessary.

A: Reza notes that this is a pedestrian ramp which is needed to get from visitor parking spaces to get to elevator lobby. Notes that the elevator lobby is at a lower elevation than the visitor parking spaces.

Comment: Suggests that based on cross-sections a ramp may not be necessary and that there is sufficient head room to have parking contained on one level which would remove the need for a long ramp.

A: Reza notes that it needs to be sloped to the east side to get head room along the eastern face where the 2.0 on-site landscape buffer is required. That 2.0 m. buffer is sloped down to meet the green spine.

Q3: Is the setback of the adjacent building going to impact the amenity space at the SW corner, does it make sense to flip the design to have amenity space to orientate to green spine.

A: Reza notes that they are doing the project on the adjacent parcel and they have coordinated the location of the amenity space to ensure there is no building abutting the amenity space proposed on this project.

Q: Jean-Pierre: Is there ability to get natural light into bicycle parkade?

A: Reza will explore this option but notes that there is limited amount of parkade which is at grade and able to receive to natural light.

Q2: Can glass doors windows be added to laundry room?

A: Reza yes to adding glass.

Q3: Has concern about 1 BR units being called 1 BR without having window / ventilation?

A: This is up to the owner at the marketing stage.

Comment: Notes the DNV must have some requirements regarding habitable bedrooms.

A: Reza notes that past projects in the District have included units which do not contain windows in the bedroom.

Q: Sgt. Kevin: What is security fence constructed of?

A: Reza: 2x2 post and frames and wire mesh in-between.

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

- Disappointed on submission package which did not use a consistent orientation on drawings.
- Disappointed on the quality of presentation.
- Three issues:
 - Setbacks, backyard garden, architectural articulation.
- Setbacks – notes that this property has a lane along the south property line which would have provided an additional setback to the recently completed Creekstone Building. When this property was purchased the laneway was included with the development site. The consolidation with the lane has brought this building significantly closer to the Creekstone building.

The issue of setbacks is important as the size of the building has increased and the building envelope itself has also increased.

Backyard garden / Courtyard: notes that locating the garden area to be adjacent to the green spine would have been preferred. However the previous ADP did accept the current location. Having the amenity space in this location requires the adjacent development to create an open space which abuts the amenity space.

- Architectural Articulation: Have upgraded elevations which were previously shown as blank walls. However the east elevation lacks articulation and appears as a large solid wall. This is an important elevation as this is what will be seen from the green spine. How

this building interacts with the Creekstone building is very important as both buildings face the green spine.

- Setbacks: The footprint of the building has increased which has resulted in setbacks which are less than what was originally proposed.
- Would like the panel to comment on the massing and character of the building.
- The ramp to access the building is required to allow waste collection to occur safely.

Comments from all members of the panel

Alexis: Appreciates entry level access and ramps but consideration should be given to all rooms, storage, utilities and recycling room, laundry, amenity spaces to ensure automatic doors.

All residents will be coming with their hands full and automated doors are the way buildings are being built today.

Don: no comments.

Kelvin:

- 1) Unclear about changes to remove walkways from ground floor units to spine.
- 2) Wayfinding on ground floor to access green amenity space is confusing and inefficient.
- 3) Form and Character is facing park and care centre, both of these are important areas, i.e. public views and opportunity to open up the building. The form and character is only shown in two perspective renderings. It is difficult to envision the two sides of the building which have not been shown in perspective drawings.
- 4) Building is overhanging the ramp, may not be desirable.
- 5) Geometry is not the most efficient and leads to some narrow unit designs.
- 6) Fibre cement panel being proposed is a fairly cheap material. It is only 6mm and not very durable, and it is not colour fast, so if it chips you would see grey.
- 7) Mentioned accessible ramp in the parkade, reviewed sections and does not believe a ramp is required. Is not convinced about getting rid of two levels of parkade, if it is a rental for families they need enough parking for 2 and 3 bedroom units. Providing just 1/3 of parking spaces may not be enough.
- 8) Using wood studs with insulation cannot achieve R22 with insulation proposed, will be losing a lot of energy.
- 9) Column at corner façade is blocking view and awkward.
- 10) Roofline is a little thick and clashing with main roofline.
- 11) Materials are clashing and are quite contrasting.

Rajesh:

- 1) Should review floor plans and architect should provide expertise on smaller units.
- 2) All of the kitchens appear to be a different design.
- 3) Rendering showing surrounding context show very similar designs, more consideration should be given to design to make a 'signature' building. Particularity if you are developing

the adjacent property a coordinated design should be considered to enhance the overall appearance of this area.

Joshua:

- 1) Shared driveway is a good idea and, bicycle parking and transit oriented direction is a positive mindset. Great opportunity to improve bicycle connectivity around town.
- 2) There are some inconsistencies between the landscape and architectural plans as noted by Daryl earlier in the presentation.
- 3) Updated landscape plan is improvement; it is at one plane and is more open. Appreciates design and use of heavy timber, different seating areas and moveable seating are a positive.
- 4) Would like to see a backed version of benches with wood toppers and an arm rest for accessibility.
- 5) Appreciates landscape palette.
- 6) Location of amenity needs to be better evaluated with shadow study from neighbouring properties.
- 7) Planting on the east side is all the same type, opportunity to diversify plant species in response to building articulation.
- 8) Surface mounted benches can provide informal park space along the green spine.

Jean-Pierre:

- 1) Livability – recommendation to add glazing to interior common rooms to improve visibility/natural light.
- 2) Unit configurations - two that come together at an inside corner are the most challenging to make livable. Would recommend a suite layout drawing to make sure they can be furnished. Encourage planners to request this at future stages.
- 3) Perspective – lot is happening with the upper roofs, should simplify roof to provide more prominence and make the corner more dramatic.

Nancy:

- 1) Given the site constraints Daryl has done a great job. The green spine will be a bonus, it would be nice to see design from District.
- 2) Concern about using heavy timber in the long term over water retention and slipping hazard. Will it stand the test of time.

Sgt. Kelvin:

- 1) Security fence needs to be robust material. Bike theft on the north shore is problematic.
- 2) Access door from visitor parking goes past bike storage, should have secure locking system. Underground parking is where most crime occurs in new buildings.
- 3) Need to examine how you will manage safety and crime when the adjacent parking lot is being constructed.

James Blake:

- 1) Agrees with Kelvin about parkade and shares concerns over wood deck as a slipping hazard.

Reza and Daryl

In response to Kelvin –

- 1) Why not access from patios to green spine.
 - a. DNV does not allow access across the 2m landscape setback.

Emel – Clarifies that District does allow access through the setback but does not permit stairs or structures to be within the setback.

- 2) Access to amenity is in response to two different access points.
- 3) Will provide additional renderings.
- 4) Second floor unit is cantilevered over the ramp.
- 5) Ramp is required to go lower towards east property line to provide adequate headroom.
- 6) 2 x 6 walls can provide R22 - it has been done in the past and is reviewed and approved by energy consultant.
- 7) Black trim along the stone façade was chosen to match window trim.

Reza also responded to Alfonso's comments.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Don Aldersley

That the ADP has reviewed the proposal and **CANNOT ENDORSE THE PROPOSAL IN ITS PRESENT FORM**. The ADP recommends reconsideration of the proposal and the submission of a revised design and a further presentation that addresses the following major concerns: parking, setbacks, density.

DEFEATED

MOVED by Rajesh and **SECONDED** by Kelvin

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.

CARRIED


6 in favour 2 opposed (AC), (JB).

3. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:26 p.m.

4. NEXT MEETING

To be determined.


Chair _____ Date March 10 / 2022
Sir James Blake