

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON  
June 14, 2018 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING:           Mr. Jordan Levine (Chair)  
                          Ms. Carolyn Kennedy  
                          Mr. Charles Leman  
                          Mr. Darren Burns  
                          Mr. Samir Eidnani  
                          Mr. Steve Wong  
                          Mr. Tieg Martin

REGRETS:             Ms. Diana Zoe Coop  
                          Mr. Stefen Elmitt  
                          Sgt. Kevin Bracewell

STAFF:                Ms. Tamsin Guppy  
                          Mr. Alfonso Tejada  
                          Mr. Adam Wright  
                          Mr. Kent MacDougall (Item 3.a.)  
                          Ms. Tamsin Guppy (Item 3.b.)

The meeting came to order at 6:06 pm.

**1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

A motion was made and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of May 24, 2018.

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION**

- Applications have been received for consideration by the Panel in the summer. The next meeting is scheduled for July 12, 2018. The panel discussed availability of members during the summer and it was determined that holding a meeting in July was more likely to have quorum.

- Ms. Tamsin Guppy reminded the Panel that the North Shore Innovation District is only a Rezoning application (without a Development Permit), and the intention of the Panel's review is to provide feedback to inform the Applicant's next steps.

### 3. NEW BUSINESS

#### a.) 3386 Gaspé Place - Rezoning with Development Permit for a three-storey, 44-unit Townhouse Development

Mr. Kent MacDougall, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Karen Smith from Engage Architecture and Florian Fisch from 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.

Questions were asked and answered on the following topics:

- Is there electric heat throughout the development? We're planning on achieving Step Code 3, as per the DNV requirement, and heating will likely be electric.
- Is the siding Hardy shingle and Hardy plank? Yes, we may use real wood shingle, but there are potential concerns over fire hazard. Real wood would be an upgrade, so it will be considered.
- How would you treat the outside corners with the Hardy products? You can lace the corners with Hardy, we have done it on another project, although it may still be done with wood at this point.
- Can you explain how you would treat the interface where two siding materials meet in the same place? There would be a rain water leader with a board that would allow for a transition in those areas.
- Have you included any sound protection from Mount Seymour Parkway? We will have to meet the DNV sound criteria, we have a large set back with a grade change, as well as landscaping and windows to mitigate sound.
- Is there enough room in the garbage and recycling room? Yes, a turning radius analysis has been done for Jitney trucks by Bunt and Associates.
- How do you provide wayfinding for first responders? There would be signage posted on the property as well as a primary fire truck lane at the entrance off Gaspé Place, as well as secondary access off Mount Seymour Parkway. We are continuing discussions with the District Fire Department to clarify details there.
- How will territoriality be defined with the public pathway cutting through site? Will this area be gated? We are not promoting having pathways gated through the project, there will be an aspect of inherent territoriality within the design of the project and the public/private definitions are clear, there will also be signage to assist as well as landscaping.

- How much public use are you expecting through the pathway that runs east to west? There are two 27 unit and 29 unit Townhouse projects to the east, so they will likely travel through from Gaspe Place, and at some point the adjacent properties to the immediate east may redevelop to add more pedestrian traffic.
- Is the Ground-Oriented policy for multifamily the only policy that this application is being compared against for the purposes of this Panel? Ms. Tamsin Guppy conveyed that the Guidelines for Ground-Oriented Housing is the key applicable design guideline related to form and character for this application.
- The plans indicate that there are EV Charging stations currently proposed to service 20% of residents, is the service going to be sized for 100%? Yes, the service will be assessed and sized appropriately, there are methods now to distribute power to more cars at different levels, including cycling through power, and lowering power levels if more cars are plugged in.
- Is there no gate for visitor parking? There is intended to be 3 residential gates in the parkade, they are not all shown in the drawing.
- Are some of the mechanical vents from the parkade placed on the landscape plan? The location has not yet been determined.
- Is there no requirement for accessible housing? Ms. Tamsin Guppy indicated that accessibility is optional for townhouse developments given that this building form is traditionally multi-storey, added to that this particular site is challenging due to the slope.
- Is there no elevator from parkade to grade? Not currently, access is being thought out and finalized for those units that do not have direct access.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Design Planner, provided the following comments for consideration:

- This is an interesting project that has evolved quite a bit and is nicely expressed in the model.
- The amenity space in the pathway corridor could be better designed to encourage people to pause and to better express itself as the heart of the development.
- Consider better integrating the amenity space with the pedestrian pathway, and potentially expanding the width of the space.
- The space on the Gaspe Place frontage, just south of Fire Lane next to the Hydro box is a challenging area. There is potential for a conflict for cars at the turning point on Gaspe. This area could impact mobility and clarity and also could affect the liveability of the unit just south of the Fire Lane Gaspe Place.
- The concrete retaining wall for the parkade concrete should be treated carefully. Consider changing colours, or adding planting materials to offset the visual impact.
- Consider emphasizing the transition between private and public space along the pathway. This may be achieved by adding a gate or through other means.
- Residential character is maintained on the buildings and units that are public facing along Mount Seymour Parkway and some of the units along the western pathway and Gaspe Pl. Ensure residential character is maintained and public facing along the east

edge units north of the parkade entrance along Gaspe as well as at the northwest unit along the western elevation/pathway.

- There is great diversity in the project and seems to fit well in the community.

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

- The roof access is considered a fourth storey but is currently under review with BC Building Code. The implications this may have from a BC Building Code point of view will be worth noting as the project progresses.
- The roof pop ups on Building 1 and Building 3 may be present challenges in terms of fire access as well as potential sprinkler flow onto windows.
- Consider adding an emissions buffer in the parkade to remove noxious fumes for better air quality.
- Location of parking venting will be important to determine.
- The mechanical and electrical service rooms are not labelled in the plans, ensure mechanical aspects of project are considered before designs are finalized.
- Ensure that the distance and width between Building 1 and Building 3 comply with code.
- The cladding is aesthetically pleasing, even though there are quite a lot of units in the development. The placement of the cladding is important so as not to be too repetitive.
- Only Building 1 and Building 3 have entrance area closets. Consider adding more closet space at the entrance to the units as the lack of it can lead to external space being used for storage which can become a conflict issue for the future strata.
- Nice overall design, the colour tones seem to contrast well. The craftsman style and accessibility to the trail are positive.
- The 25 foot grade change on the site is a challenge.
- There seems to be a lack of a central node within the site.
- The seating area in the public space is quite large, it could potentially be reconfigured to be closer to the play area thereby providing improved sight lines. The south set of stairs could be moved to better express that the play area is a central node.
- Consider varying the width of the pathways through the site to indicate a hierarchy of pathways by better delineating their importance as north to south and east to west connections – thereby making the public pathway connection more obvious.
- Consider changing the location of the bike racks away from the south of the driveway entrance, they may be better located near the trellis.
- Adding hedges could be a way to better separate public and private space
- Consider adding more variety of plant material and more shrubs for landscaping diversity.
- The overall proportions and quality of detailing nicely express the character of the buildings.
- Agree that there may be slightly more units than the lot will comfortably allow.
- The main unit off of Gaspe could be improved to recognise its central location near the entrance of the development.

- The external design of the corner units are treated well to ensure the materials wrap the corner, but the interior layout is a lost opportunity – these units could be better treated in order to make them special.
- Consider a stepped set back on the parking. The location of the parking ramp and wall at the main address seem to detract from the overall impression of the entrance.
- The placement of the buildings precludes there from being any noticeable hierarchy of the units.
- Consider using a different (higher quality) product than Allan block along the trail wall and adding trees to improve the impression of the southern and western frontages.
- The amenity space may primarily be used by young children given the proximity of the park, consider enhancing the play space and equipment with this in mind.
- Agree that the location of the garbage and power transformer impacts the overall impression of the entrance.
- The architecture, scale, texture, and variation are well thought out.
- Personal preference against roof decks, but the benefits are understandable.
- Consider improving the entrance and pathway through the development to the park as the project serves in part as a significant “front door” to the public space behind it.
- The compressed site layout seems to somewhat constrain the public realm.
- The overall building expression is nice, and seems to fit the context.
- Agree with concerns over compressed density on the site as well as suggestions from Panel members on improving hierarchy by widening pathways and otherwise, based on their hierarchical function.
- The timber detailing adds to the project’s success.
- One of the blues seems slightly too intense given the heritage/craftsman feel, although this may be variation between the model and the renderings.
- The model is helpful in order to speak to the site layout and overall design.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

**MOVED** by Mr. Charles Leman and **SECONDED** by Mr. Tieg Martin

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**

**a.) 2420-2468 Dollarton Hwy - Rezoning of Maplewood North Lands to the North Shore Innovation District**

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, reminded the Panel that this is a Rezoning application without a Development Permit, provided the general policy context and discussed what an innovation district is intended to be.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Oliver Webb from Darwin Construction and Mr. Jeffrey Staates with PFS and Craig Taylor with Taylor Kurtz Architecture 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:

- Why is “Internal Road B” not joining up with Berkley? We have indicated that there is currently a fire connection shown to the north west of the cul-de-sac on “Internal Road B”. We are in discussions with the transportation department about the character of the roads and how best to manage the number of intersections but considered this a way of reducing traffic speeds in the residential area.
- Where is the entrance to parking for the buildings in south east of the site plan? – The first entry into the parkade is on the west side of Building 5 in the south east corner, and another parkade entrance is proposed for Building 7 off of “Internal Road A”. We will also have parkade entrance from south west side of site. Surface parking will also be provided as shown.
- Which parts of the site are public vs private? The intention is that the entire site is essentially publically accessible and that community members are encouraged to come in.
- Ms. Tamsin Guppy explained that the proposed Berkley Road would be a public road.
- Is there a transit hub envisioned? We are currently in discussion with the transportation department, and are providing road geometry that would allow a natural bus loop though the site.
- How will this site connect to the park to the west? There is work underway with the District of North Vancouver to connect to the park and village centre to the west with a trail network in addition to the road network.
- Is the model representative of your master plan? Yes, albeit recognizing that as a general massing model it does not show the articulation of the buildings and has oversimplified the heights, for example Building 5 will step down to allow for solar access to the plaza.
- Can you speak to the hotel and ownership components of the project? There is a short stay hotel that will be integrated into the upper levels of the office building and will provide a place to stay for visiting employees. Approximately 75% of the residential units in the project will be rental and there will be opportunities for discounted ownership for people that live and work in the District.

- 19,000 square feet of retail seems small in relation to the overall square footage of the site, the amount of residential density and other uses of the space, do you think that that is enough? We wanted to keep in mind that the village centre is a 10 minute walk away so as not to compete with the retail aspects of that centre. Ms. Tamsin Guppy explained that although vibrancy is desired for this area including restaurants, café, corner stores, and public spaces, the intention is to complement and not compete with the village centre.
- What is the FSR? 1.2 FSR.
- What are the reasons for the form and function of the buildings in the North West corner of the site? One of the reasons for the building form is due to the adaptation to the steeper topography in the north. The uses are currently contemplated to be for a residential building and a spa facility.
- Is there a phasing plan? We are in discussions with the District of North Vancouver staff to phase in jobs and housing in a thoughtful way. Initial phasing would confirm roadways and areas around the plaza and residential buildings around the heart of the site, as well as buildings that prioritize jobs.
- Is there a view across the development? Yes, there are views of Burnaby Mountain, and in the north there will be views that will overlook the lower part of the site.
- What is the vision for how people move throughout this campus, in light of the open spaces? We want to emphasize that people and bikes are entitled to the street network and the campus throughout the site.
- How have you considered District Energy and other sustainability elements for this site? We are thinking about tapping into industries that are expelling waste heat and this may provide an opportunity to create a district loop of energy. It would be great if our spas could be heated by waste heat from industrial uses at another location in the Innovation District. We have a Metro Vancouver sewer line as a heat source, and conversations are ongoing. We are also looking at using CLT for office buildings and creating healthy buildings, sustainability is one of our guiding principles.

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

- This is an incredible project in many ways, innovation is a key principle here.
- It will be important to consider how this project can be part of the Maplewood Village Centre and fit with and shape the guidelines that we currently have.
- The scale and size, and varied uses of the project encourages us to consider new design guidelines.
- Consider how the parcels and building clusters will be connected, in addition to connections between buildings.
- Consider how people will orient themselves and find their way using visual links and reference points throughout the site. Consider how to maximize views into key open spaces, and how to visually link one area to the next.
- The size of the lawn seems appropriate to the adjacent buildings.

- It will be important to consider the daily function of the public plaza. Consider how it can serve to orient and connect people to different areas, and if there is room for a symbolic element here. Perhaps the hotel or other programming can be defined to activate this space throughout the day and evening.
- Consider how to best integrate the mix of uses so that the public spaces are lively and safe.
- The impact of high building heights would be mitigated by better articulation of buildings along the courtyard in the south east corridor.
- Given the proposed building footprints it will be important moving forward to ensure building designs at the DP stage are suitably articulated, or divided.

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

- The land use and density proposed seem appropriate for this location. What are the key objectives of this rezoning? Ms. Tamsin Guppy explained that the intention is to protect what is important for the community including the provision of innovative jobs and housing, as well as a vibrant public realm.
- There may be potential for taller residential buildings, particularly in the north.
- It is an exciting proposal with potential connections to amenities in the neighbourhood.
- There is potential to better connect the natural areas and wetlands by integrating the natural elements into the urban areas across the entire site so the entire project feels like it is connected to the natural setting.
- Consider how to safely manage heavy traffic off of Dollarton Highway with the pedestrian-orientated plaza.
- Consider adding an east-west connection over the creek that runs north-south to better connect the district.
- Consider expanding park and mountain views to the north from the plaza by widening the distance between Buildings 2 and 3. And likewise, consider how to maximize views from the residential area to the heart of the Innovation District.
- A key pathway running west towards the amenities of Maplewood Village Centre would best be illuminated as it will likely be well used throughout the day and night.
- Consider improving the integration at the edges of the site between forest land and urban land and between the park and plaza space to draw people towards the heart of the District.
- There is room for further articulation and variation in building form and heights.
- Consider how to bring a greater variety of uses to the area around the plaza to help enliven the space at different times of day and night, this may include adding more residential to the commercial and industrial buildings that face onto the plaza.
- Once the buildings have been better articulated, the spaces in between buildings could be better designed, including a finer grain street pattern and smaller parcels.
- Ensure that the built form near sensitive environmental areas is carefully coordinated in order to mitigate potential impacts on conservation areas, as higher density buildings are currently shown adjacent to wetland areas along the south.
- Ensure that wildfire hazard analyses have been carefully considered.



- A key to the project's success lies in identifying a suitable mix of uses in the site.
- There are challenges with the massing of the buildings in the south east and their proximity to each other and to public spaces on the site.
- Agree that the building clusters could be more varied in form and suggest that future design guidelines for the Innovation District look at building height variation and building articulation.
- Suggest that future regulations allow for flexibility and innovation and not be overly prescriptive.
- Buildings 15 and 16 along the northern edge of the park are quite long.
- The buildings seem to have an orthogonal design, which may not reflect a site that seeks to celebrate and protect wildlife and natural area, as you move forward consider how to break up the building footprints that are currently overly long and rectangular to better relate to the natural setting – consider not only building articulation but how to achieve a more organic flavour that better relates to the adjacent wetlands and natural areas.
- Agree that there is a need to open up the connection between the park and the plaza.
- There is an opportunity to shape the commercial, industrial, and residential tenants by refining the mix of land uses.
- Agree with concerns over limited retail space that could limit the amount that the streets and plaza can be animated. The ground plane is critical for the success of this project.
- Consider the ratio of service to rooms for the hotel to ensure that it is adequately sized for its expected use, as there may be potential for it to be increased in size.
- Consider how Berkley Road may create an automotive expression and divide the site.
- Consider overall design, access, and site planning as emerging from the topography and context (reference to Frederick Law Olmsted). The residential section in the North West of the site seems most successful in this respect.
- Important to understand how spaces will be animated.
- It is a challenge for a team to articulate such a large vision, but exciting and seems to be headed in the right direction.
  
- The Chair invited the Applicant to respond to the Panel's comments, and the following comments were provided:
  - Residential and student housing as well as industrial uses are envisioned to be integrated to avoid creating an office park. The full intent is to curate the use for the plaza. The Panel's comments are appreciated.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

**MOVED** by Mr. Darren Burns and **SECONDED** by Mr. Steve Wong

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and **SUPPORTS** the general concept, and looks forward to a presentation at the development permit stage that includes a review of the items noted by the Panel in its review of the project.

**CARRIED**

**4. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

**6. NEXT MEETING**

July 12, 2018

Chair



Date

