

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
APRIL 9, 2015 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Kevin Hanvey
 Ms. Liane McKenna
 Mr. Dan Parke
 Ms. Amy Tsang
 Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
 Mr. Greg Travers
 Ms. Annerieke Van Hoek

REGRETS: Mr. Samir Eidnani
 Mr. Tieg Martin

STAFF: Ms. Lilian Arishenkoff
 Mr. Michael Hartford
 Ms. Alex Anderson

The meeting came to order at 6:05 pm.

1. MINUTES

The Panel reviewed the minutes of the meeting of March 12, 2015. A motion was made and carried to adopt the minutes as circulated.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a. 1503-1519 Crown Street – Preliminary application for rezoning to allow for a 48 unit, six-storey residential building

Ms. Lilian Arishenkoff, District Planner, introduced the design team and gave a brief introduction to the project. Ms. Arishenkoff noted that the site is designated in the Official Community Plan as RES 6, which allows for a maximum 2.5 FSR and maximum six storey height. The zoning for the site is currently RS4, and is a part of the Lower Lynn Town Centre local plan. Ms. Arishenkoff provided the context for the site, noting its location on the corner of Crown Street and Mountain Highway and that the site consists of four single family parcels, totalling 0.4 acres. The surrounding area is single family residential, with the area to the west as industrial. Crown Street was noted as important pedestrian and cycling link.

The built form guidelines were reviewed, with a note that corner sites are to be designed to have strong massing on both corners, ground level entrances should address the street and have a specific identity, exposed parkade walls should be screened, driveways are encouraged to be formatted to consider future shared access, and that consideration should be given to providing onsite play areas and communal outdoor space. It was noted that this project is a 6 storey wood frame building comprised of 47 units. The FSR is 2.5 and the development has 64 parking stalls, an equivalent of 1.36 stalls per dwelling unit.

Questions of clarification were asked of Ms. Arishenkoff on the following subjects:

How does the number of provided parking stalls relate to the District Bylaw requirements?

Answer: This requirement is governed by the parking reduction policies for locations within Frequent Transit Network Areas, which allow the consideration of a lower parking ratio subject to submission and acceptance of a Transportation Demand Management Plan. Generally two spaces would be required under the Zoning Bylaw. The application proposes 1.36.

Are there specific Built Form Guidelines for a six storey building which specify a 4 storey mass and a 2 storey stepback? No – the guidelines are not this specific regarding the building articulation for a six-storey form.

The Chair thanked Ms. Arishenkoff for her presentation, welcomed the applicant team to the meeting, and outlined the procedure to be followed in reviewing the proposal.

Mr. Reza Salehi, Project Architect, reviewed the location and context of the site. Mr. Salehi noted that the site slopes gradually from north to south and moderately from west to east. Vehicle and pedestrian access will be from Mountain Highway. It was noted that the allowable buildable area on the site is 43,300 square feet. Mr. Salehi reviewed the parking calculations, storage, and locker layouts. It was noted that the units range from 1 to 3 bedrooms, and from 450 to 1180 square feet in size.

Mr. Salehi reviewed the site plan, noting dedications required on Crown Street and Mountain Highway. The site is located within the Creek Hazard Development Permit Area, and the applicant team has been working with Northwest Hydraulic to determine that the minimum building elevation. Accordingly, the applicant team is proposing to set the main floor two feet higher than the average existing grade of the site. It was noted that units on the main floor have large, wrap-around patios with direct street access on both sides. Access to the lobby is in the middle of the length of the building, and the top of the access ramp is covered with solid canopy to define the entry to the building. The ramp to the parkade off Crown Street is covered with a trellis to the end of the ramp. There are two levels of underground parking; garbage and recycling are located on the first level, while locker and bicycle storage are on both P1 and P2. Visitor parking is secured with a separate overhead gate for security.

Mr. Salehi noted the change in mass and scaling as the building gets higher in elevation and that an emphasis has been placed on a design that is contemporary, using a combination of scale and solid frames, and a focus on the corners. A combination of glass and Hardi Panel in two different colors is proposed.

Mr. Daryl Tyacke, Project Landscape Architect, reviewed the site layout for the Panel. Mr. Tyacke noted that the materials take cues from the different parts of the building. Each unit has a large outdoor lawn area and there are raised planters clad in stone. Plantings around the base of the building provide a successful interface between the private and public areas. A corner feature on the site is proposed with a sitting wall and plantings.

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

Questions of clarification were asked of the design team on the following topics:

Can you clarify the grading at the south and east sides of the site and identify how much exposed wall there will be? Answer: Approximately two feet of exposed wall.

Does the south side landscaping step up from the patios? Answer: Yes.

Will there be a fence along the lane? Answer: Yes.

Where will bicycle parking occur? Answer: The intent is for 3 foot by 6 foot lockers to be provided in the parking garage for each unit.

What is the height of the underground parking entrance? Answer: It has a 7 foot clearance.

Will the balconies have a level threshold? Answer: 10% of the units are adaptable units and these will have a level threshold.

Was parking access from the lane ever considered? Answer: No, the lane is proposed to be closed.

Is the building at maximum height? There is no specific maximum height, but standard ceiling heights have been proposed.

The base of the building is natural stone, however at the north and east elevation this stone is not continuous – why is that? Answer: The stone does need to wrap around -it will run a few feet on the east and then come to an end before the south elevation.

Is shared driveway access identified on the plans? Answer: Yes.

The Chair thanked the applicant team, and asked for the District Urban Design Planner's comments. Michael Hartford noted that Mr. Frank Ducote was unable to attend to the meeting, so Mr. Ducote's comments would be read into the record of the meeting.

It was noted that there are many positive aspects to this application, such as the layered landscape, as well as the corner public realm element and the orientation of units to both abutting streets. The setback at the sixth floor and the solar shading on the south and west elevations were acknowledged, as well as an appreciation for the natural stone finish at the retaining wall and the building base.

It was suggested that further analysis take place of the proposed front and rear setbacks, as well as the proposed material selections and colour relationships. Moreover, it was noted that wrapping the stone cladding around the south side of the building would be a positive change.

The Chair thanked Mr. Hartford for the comments and invited comments from Panel members.

Overall, Panel members thought the building mass was appropriate for the location. General appreciation was expressed for the proposed sixth floor setback, but the applicant was encouraged to explore options for a lighter expression of the sixth floor with an exploration of options for greater articulation of the roof to provide more interest.

It was suggested that the prominent north-west corner had been resolved to some degree, but that more could be done in this portion of the building given its relationship to two important streets. Related to this, it was suggested that the applicant consider adding some vertical elements to the publicly-accessible area at the south-east corner of the intersection, as well as options for children's play in this location.

Support was expressed for the use of natural wood in the project, and while more timber elements were encouraged, it was suggested that care is necessary in how this wood will be maintained. The use of wood at the entry locations as an identifier works well, however, on the south and east elevations, the use of wood elements could use some further exploration. There was an encouragement toward more differentiation in materials for levels two through five, and overall, it was concluded that that a clearer rationale for the use of various materials should be provided.

It was suggested that the east elevation could benefit from additional refinement, compared to the north, south and west elevations, and that the south elevation would benefit from the continuation of stone cladding at the base of the building.

It was noted that there is a need to confirm that the proposed bike storage and household storage can work in the space allotted for these functions.

An appreciation was noted for the use of solar shading proposed in the development.

It was suggested that the landscape treatment of the at-grade unit patios is positive and that the incorporation of lawn areas and terracing in relation to the street is well-designed, but the south side units could benefit from more tree and shrub plantings, rather than simply lawn.

There was general agreement that the Panel would like to see a detailed model at the next review of the project, as well as further information on how the finish materials will be installed.

The Chair thanked the Panel and asked if the applicant team had any comments in response.

Mr. Tyacke thanked the Panel for their comments and responded to the question regarding lawn maintenance, noting that this would be handled by the strata gardener.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and invited the Panel to compose a motion.

MOVED by Amy Tsang and **SECONDED** by Liane McKenna:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the application, supports the general concept, and looks forward to a presentation at detailed stage that includes a review of the items raised by the Panel in its review of the project at the preliminary application stage.

MOTION CARRIED

b. 1175 Lynn Valley Road – Detailed Application for Development Permit for mixed-use development of six buildings with 360 dwelling units and 50,100 sq. ft. of commercial space

Mr. Michael Hartford, District Planner, introduced the project by giving an overview of the site context and surrounding area. Mr. Hartford noted that the site is located at the north side of E. 27th Street and west of Mountain Highway. Mr. Hartford noted that the OCP designates the property “CRMU3” as part of the Lynn Valley Town Centre at a maximum FSR of up to 3.5. Zoning on the site is currently CD80 with the rezoning approved in 2014. Mr. Hartford

reviewed the new roads proposed: Valley Centre Avenue at the west edge of the site and Library Lane and High Street B in the east portion of the site.

The site is regulated by the Lynn Valley Flexible Planning Framework which was endorsed by Council following the adoption of the OCP. Mr. Hartford noted that this portion of the town centre is defined in the planning framework for a maximum height of eight storeys, with up to twelve storeys being considered in certain areas, including the subject site.

The Lynn Valley Town Centre Guidelines which are currently at a draft stage have been provided to the applicant, and the objectives of weather protection, children's play areas, and a sense of individuality for commercial units have been noted for consideration.

The applicant is proposing an FSR of 2.36, with parking in the redeveloped portion of the shopping centre to be underground. The green building target is LEED "Gold" or equivalent. Public art is a requirement of the project and the applicant has begun the process of finalizing a public art plan. The District is currently reviewing the project against the Official Community Plan and the applicable Development Permit Area guidelines, as well as the development covenant registered at the rezoning stage.

Mr. Hartford noted that the project came before the Panel in February, and the Panel requested to see the project again. Since that time, the applicant has been working through the items noted by the Panel, in collaboration with District staff.

The Chair thanked Mr. Hartford for his presentation, welcomed the applicant team to the meeting and outlined the procedure to be followed in reviewing the proposal.

Ms. Karen Wiens Suzuki, Project Architect, reviewed the context of the site, noting the natural elements incorporated into the site and the pedestrian-friendly nature of the layout. Ms. Wiens-Suzuki outlined the process that the applicant team has undergone in incorporating Lynn Valley resident feedback at the rezoning and public realm stages of the project.

The site plan and building layouts were reviewed, with particular attention to the changes made in response to the nine points of the Panel's comments in the previous meeting. Ms. Wiens Suzuki reviewed the transit hub proposal and the consultation that has taken place with Coast Mountain Bus Company. It was noted that the public plaza at the corner of Mountain Highway and 27th will relate directly to the CRU frontages and tie into the transit hub.

Ms. Wiens Suzuki noted that the applicant has focused on creating increased differentiation between buildings, particularly in roof forms, and that the frontages of the commercial units will be differentiated through animation and colour, as well as materials. It was noted that the team has tried to address concerns regarding solar shading and management of snow build-up, and specific shading and snow management elements were reviewed.

Ms. Wiens Suzuki walked the Panel through each building, highlighting the changes and amendments made in response to the Panel's prior review. Finally, Ms. Wiens Suzuki spoke to the public art approach, noting that the art locations have been selected and the applicant team has begun the process of review.

Ms. Cheryl Bouwmeester, project Landscape Architect reviewed the changes to the landscape plan that were made in response to the Panel's prior comments. Ms. Bouwmeester noted the provision of plant material and hedging at the roof level of the north side of the project to increase privacy. Other areas with increased conifers and other plant materials were noted as

techniques to provide additional screening. It was noted that the planting has taken the form of bands and clusters, and that the focus now incorporates more natural materials at the building base and on the boulevards. In response to concerns regarding the landscaping for the podium rooftop, the applicant team has gone back to a more curvilinear and organic approach.

Ms. Bouwmeester concluded that in response to the need for revisions at the corner of High Street and E. 27th Street the applicant team has allowed for children's play that focuses on creative elements in the landscape design as well as natural plant materials.

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

Questions of clarification were asked of the design team on the following topics:

Can you clarify the material for the timber elements at the top of the building? Answer: These are not wood – it is a steel finish material that wraps the structural elements.

Was consideration given over-height parking in the garage areas? Answer: Yes, this has been considered and is available in both the commercial and residential parking areas.

Was scooter mobility considered? Answer: Storage of these devices has not been reviewed in detail, and any location would need to consider provision of charging facilities.

The Chair invited Mr. Hartford to read into the record of the meeting the comments of Mr. Frank Ducote, District Urban Design Planner. Mr. Hartford noted a comment that the increased size and improved layout of the public plaza at the northeast corner of E. 27th and the High Street (Valley Centre Avenue) looked like a positive change to the project, as well as the adjusted townhouse entries from E. 27th Street and from Library Lane.

It was noted that with regard to differentiation between phases and buildings, this objective has been partly achieved through the proposed contrasting roof forms with simplified flat roof elements for the low buildings and compound pitched roofs for the taller ones.

The Chair thanked Mr. Hartford for his comments and invited comments from Panel members.

Overall, the Panel commented that the changes proposed appeared positive and expressed appreciation for a clearly-articulated presentation that reviewed the issues identified and the responses to them.

The changes in roof forms were noted as being positive for helping to achieve differentiation in the buildings. Buildings D and F were noted in particular for their improvements. Some concern was expressed regarding the proposed use of asphalt shingle roofing.

It was suggested that varying the "beltline" between Buildings B and C could help to provide greater differentiation between these two tall buildings.

Building E was noted as still appearing to be a very long structure. There was an acknowledgement that resolving this is a difficult task and that significant work had been done to improve the appearance and impact of the building. It was suggested that exploration of additional techniques to break down the mass would be a benefit.

It was suggested that the changes to the podium roof look very positive to accentuate and differentiate the open and enclosed spaces. Related to this, it was questioned whether green roof elements had been explored for the other portions of the project.

A Panel member commented that the public plaza at High St. and E. 27th St needs to function successfully as a gateway to the commercial core of the town centre and it was encouraged that strong elements be incorporated to fulfil this objective.

With regard to the colour and material palette, Panel members noted appreciation for the changes made, but suggested that even bolder colours and further differentiation in colours could be positive.

The Chair thanked the Panel members for their comments and asked if the applicant team had any comments in response.

Ms. Wiens-Suzuki noted that the project team appreciated the comments and that the project will continue to be refined. The team will review options for the roof materials between metal and asphalt; and that while there are some limitations on the level of differentiation possible, they will explore options to further distinguish Buildings B and C. It was noted that the applicant is proposing some areas of planted roofs on all the buildings.

The Chair thanked the applicant team and invited the Panel to compose a motion.

MOVED by Liane McKenna and **SECONDED** by Annerieke Van Hoek:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the revised proposal and recommends APPROVAL of the project SUBJECT to addressing to the satisfaction of staff the items raised by the Panel in their review.

MOTION CARRIED

4. NEW BUSINESS

None

5. ADJOURNMENT


A motion was moved, seconded, and carried to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

May 14, 2015.


Chair


Date