MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
Held on September 10, 2020 at the District of North Vancouver through Microsoft Teams

ATTENDING:	Mr. Eric Tinlup Ng Ms. Nancy Paul Mr. Don Aldersley Mr. Nathan Shuttleworth Ms. Riva Nelson Ms. Grace Gordon-Collins Mr. James Blake
REGRETS:	Sgt. Kevin Bracewell Mr. Andrei Chisinevschi Ms. Kim Smith Ms. Carolyn Kennedy
STAFF:	Mr. Kevin Zhang (Staff Liaison and Item 3.a) Mr. Alfonso Tejada

Mr. Kevin Zhang took attendance.

Mr. Don Aldersley opened the meeting at 6:07 pm.

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Ms. Riva Nelson noted three corrections to be made to the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of June 11, 2020.

A motion was made by Ms. Riva Nelson, seconded by Ms. Nancy Paul, and carried to adopt as corrected the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of June 11, 2020.

Passed

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

- Mr. Kevin Zhang and Mr. Don Aldersley explained the online meeting protocols.
- Mr. Kevin Zhang asked the panel members whether they'd like to continue receiving hardcopy packages. No change to receiving the hard copy packages was desired by the panel members.
- Ms. Riva Nelson queried whether not having the applicant PowerPoint presentation might help with technical difficulties. Mr. Kevin Zhang explained that the applicant presentation may contain different information than the hardcopy package so it is still useful. Mr. Zhang noted that the 15 minute time limit for applicant presentations will be better enforced.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 2055 Purcell Way – Detailed Application for Development Permit with variances to accommodate a 6-storey student housing building.

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Development Planner, introduced the applicant team, being: Matthew Emerson, HDR Architecture Associates Inc.; Ken Larsson, Connect Landscape Architecture; and Jim Alders, the Vice-President of HDR and principal applicant.

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

The Chair invited the Panel to ask any clarification questions of staff. The Panel did not have any initial questions for staff.

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.

- What are the strategies being used to achieve Step Code 4, in particular, with the mechanical system and solar shading?
    - Step Code 4 is being pursued as well as a LEED-gold equivalency for particular credits. First priority is for passive solutions.
    - All bedrooms have operable windows, there is no air conditioning provided to bedrooms (the duct-work for air conditioning is being placed now in case it is required in the future).
    - Heating is baseboard electric or hydronic heating.
    - In terms of solar shading, the depth of the articulation and wood shingles used on different façades provide shading for glazing. There is solar shading on the western and southern-facing glazing on the student towers. There may need to be triple glazing depending on energy models.
    - The building envelope has a minimum R-value and robust air-tightness requirements to minimize air leakage, thermal bridging, and loss through the building envelope.
    - LED lighting.
- Please elaborate on the hand-rails being used.
    - Sometimes for renderings the hand-rails are left out but the stairs would need to meet BC Building code/accessibility standards. The project team has worked with Capilano University's accessibility consultant, who provided a list of items to be included into the building.
    - The ramps were not able to be under 5% slope, however, they are still accessible and will have handrails. Overall, a brushed stainless steel handrail system is envisioned.
    - The project has a grading plan which highlights the tread riser-ratio in the seating slabs and the main circulation steps.
- Please further explain the servicing and loading requirements on the east side of the building and the lay-out rationale.
    - The area will be for private pick-up and deliveries.

  - The design does not change one of two of the existing entries into parking lot 2, except for the curb line slightly, to accommodate fire truck entry and loading requirements of the District.
  - There are two entry-ways through the private food/logistics area (for "clean and dirty" flow separation).
  - There is a space for individual trash and recycling bins, space to pull the bins out and for a compactor, and a ramp to help with access.
  - The secure bicycle parking is also in this area and has lighting and electrical service for e-bike charging.
- Is the building mass timber?
  - As the building is design-built, there is opportunity for mass timber. The building has been designed in a way to facilitate this including having a concrete base up to the second floor which would support timber framing above. However, the cost of this may be prohibitive meaning steel potentially could be used or, more unlikely, concrete.
- Is there an accessible route for someone living in the housing going to campus?
  - Yes, there is re-grading of the north portion of the side walk route along the northern façade. There will be an accessible route from the accessible parking stalls along Monashee Drive. As well, the building is publically-accessible, meaning one could go through the building to access the bus for example.
- Which entrance is the emergency first-responders entrance?
  - It is the northern entrance along Tantalus Road. It has the annunciator panel, the fire department connection, and it's within the distance that's required for the pull-off for the fire department access/truck.
- Would this entrance be assigned an address?
  - Believe so, although the campus as a whole is 2055 Purcell Way.
- Safety-wise, is there any separation between the first floor common area and the residential area above?
  - Yes, the residential area is electronically accessed by programmed card, so entry must be granted by someone living there.
- What's the concept for the green-roof?
  - It is intended with opportunity for some intensive. Functions as a low-maintenance amenity. Irrigation will have to be maintained.

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

- The building is setting a new prototype for student housing in an institutional context.
- The functional everyday access will become the secondary access due to the link with the centre of the campus.
- The staff parking/bike storage is far from the main entrance and conflicts with the loading area. People leaving their bikes will not be able to enter the building through the closest entrance but will have to go around the building. Further consideration to the functionality of the staff parking/bike storage location in terms of accessibility to the building in a safe and secure way should be considered.

- The two building layouts have a strong possibility to contain a court. The future development phase should build from the green court created in phase 1. This green court can "glue" the two buildings and make them more functional.
- The back loading area needs to have better security and control such as improved lighting.
- The built form is very nice as proposed especially with the integration of wood features to soften it and make it interesting. The compact shape of the built form with contrasting transparent terminations accentuating the vertical circulation creates a very distinctive character. The suggested termination of the blank west end wall (through a mural) creates uniqueness and should be an integral detail in the proposal.

The Chair offered an opportunity to ask questions of the Urban Designer. No initial questions were asked of the Urban Designer.

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

- The following general design comments were made:
  - The building is beautiful/elegant, the materials are well balanced, and the landscaping is sensitive to the surrounding nature. Works well with the concept plan.
  - The courtyard and dining pavilion are particularly well done, they create a nice public realm.
  - Fibre cement is a close approximation of the materials used on campus but pre-cast concrete panels would be far superior (durability and harmony with rest of campus).
  - Plantings would help to soften the transition between the forest and the concrete building.
  - The main floor of the building could have better over-all access and flow between different outside areas, for example, if wider corridors were provided, bikes could be wheeled through building to get from one side to the other.
  - A reduction in the amount of paving should be considered in the back area of the building. Could have improved landscaping.
  - Lighting could be improved in the cafe area.

- The following comments related to accessibility and accessible design elements were made:
  - The caretaker suite should be made accessible if possible.
  - The accessible route which requires one to go around the outside of the building is too far, it is desirable to have students with accessibility needs go with the regular flow of student traffic.
  - Consider lowering mailboxes for accessible level 3 students.
  - Consider tactile and brail markings for amenity rooms, public spaces (place brail beside the door), and use voice controls in elevators to announce the floors.
  - Consider where future ceiling lifts may be installed during construction.
  - All bathrooms and public amenities should have electronic pushbutton openings.

  - The seating-steps are concerning for those with low vision (the step down changes). Consider installing two handrails, one at each side-end.
  - Wood topping for courtyard seating creates a visual contrast for those with low vision.
  - Ensure access to tables for those in wheelchairs is provided.
  - The kitchen should use universal design elements such as side-opening counter-height wall ovens and side-by-side fridge and freezer combos.
  - Consider covering the access ramp into the building.
  - Use tactile pavers to break between bike and vehicle traffic.
  - Use adaptable door-handles.
  - Install grab-rails soon rather than later.
  - Use appropriate bed heights.
  - Accessible units should have ensuite bathrooms.
- The following comments were made in relation to the back loading area/bicycle parking area:
  - Try to provide as many bicycle parking spaces as possible.
  - This area and the path going in/out needs to be safe (improved lighting) and secure to guard against theft.
  - Direct access to bike paths from the storage area should be provided (route from the storage to the boulevard).
  - The recycle area is a more appropriate place for the bike cage.
- The path going down to the campus from the building seems narrow and goes through wooded area. Consider better lighting. Capilano University will have to make improvements here.
- New student housing projects seem to have individual bedrooms with a shared bathroom whereas this project has double rooms.
- The number of service rooms/space might need to be increased, such as the ducting going up from the kitchen area. Some campuses have student-cooking facilities out in the common areas, but to retro-fit it for ducting afterwards is difficult.
- The recess of the windows and wood shingles might not be adequate for shading.
- The east and west facing facades, in comparison to the north and south facing facades, aren't as strong. Encouraged to look at recessing windows more.

The Chair invited the applicant team to respond to the Panel's comments. Mr. Matthew Emerson thanked the Panel for their comments and explained that the comments are helpful and will help with improving the design. Mr. Emerson provided the following comments in response:

- A lot of the accessibility concerns will be in the design specifications but some great ideas were heard that can be incorporated. The ensuite idea for the accessible units can be looked at.
- The building is design-built and provides a higher level of detail than typical. What is approved under the Development Permit will be the approved design.
- A bicycle parking study was completed for this facility and the amount of bicycle parking provided is above and beyond what is required. 42 spaces will be indoors, off Tantalus Road and will have a secured area with a bike maintenance station.

- The staff parking in the back is for building facilities and maintenance personnel. The bike parking here is for those staff.
- A lot of effort has gone into building articulation in terms of heat, and consideration to operations, summer-time heating, etc. has been given.
- The decision to go with two-bedroom units was partially based on a student survey and how sharing bedrooms makes it more affordable. The second building will be designed for different needs, so a variety of housing with different price points will be provided over-all.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Mr. Don Aldersley and **SECONDED** by Mr. Nathan Shuttleworth.

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 District Staff, the items noted by the Panel in its review of the project.

CARRIED

3. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

4. NEXT MEETING

To be determined.

Chair

October 8/2020
Date

for Carolyn Kennedy