

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
NOVEMBER 12, 2015 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Kevin Harvey
Mr. Tieg Martin
Mr. Dan Parke
Mr. Samir Eidnani
Mr. Greg Travers
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Ms. Liane McKenna

REGRETS: Ms. Annerieke Van Hoek
Ms. Amy Tsang

STAFF: Mr. Michael Hartford
Ms. Natasha Letchford (Item 3 a.)
Mr. Doug Allan (Item 3 b.)
Mr. Erik Wilhelm (Item 3 c.)
Ms. Ashley Rempel
Mr. Alfonso Tejada

The meeting came to order at 6:03 pm.

1. MINUTES

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the minutes of the Advisory Panel meeting of September 12, 2015. It was noted through discussion that minor corrections were required and amendments were agreed to. The motion was passed to adopt the minutes as amended.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Michael Hartford announced that arrangements for the Advisory Design Panel Awards site tour would soon be shared and that a total of six sites are anticipated to be reviewed.

3. New Business

a. 1103 – 1123 Ridgewood Drive & 3293 Edgemont Blvd. – Detailed Application for OCP Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit for a 24 unit, 3 storey apartment building.

Ms. Natasha Letchford, District Planner, introduced the project and explained that the site is currently zoned RS3 (single family) and its OCP designation is RES2: Detached residential. It was noted that the proposal is consistent with the Edgemont Peripheral Area guidelines, but requires an OCP amendment and rezoning. A three foot wide road dedication is required to allow realignment of the right turn lane, bike lane, sidewalk and boulevard on Ridgewood Drive, and this had some implications for the site layout.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team to the meeting and Mr. Michael Cox of Gateway Architecture presented the project to the Panel noting the following key points:

- Site context along Ridgewood Dr. and Edgemont Blvd., bounded by single family, flanking the church on Edgemont Blvd. and across the street from the recently-approved Grosvenor mixed-use project;
- Proposal comprises a contemporary interpretation of rowhomes, including variations in heights with setbacks.
- Materials include granite, stained cedar shingles and cedar siding.
- Five buildings are proposed with two on Ridgewood Dr., one on Edgemont Blvd., and the other two internal;
- A plaza will be located at the corner of Ridgewood and Edgemont, and designed to match the new plaza across Edgemont;
- Parking includes 50 underground parking spaces for 24 units with the parking entrance in the form of a covered ramp situated as far as possible from the Ridgewood/Edgemont intersection. All units, with one exception, will have a private garage. The parking level also holds bicycle parking, a stormwater detention tank and recycling facilities;
- The project includes two fully-accessible units which would allow for installation of elevators. Three additional units have been designed to accommodate an elevator if demand is shown;
- Privacy issues for property to the south have been addressed with tree plantings on the south edge of the property.

Mr. Greg Travers joined the panel at 6:15 pm.

Mr. Cox introduced Mr. Peter Kreuk of Durante Kreuk Ltd, who presented the landscape design with reference to the following key points:

- Ridgewood Dr. -facing front yard spaces are designed as private spaces, which are fenced;
- Rear units are accessed from the courtyard and have private outdoor spaces to the south and raised landscape planters on the courtyard edge to increase privacy;
- A children's play area is proposed;
- Transition to the residential uses to the south includes a hedge and retaining wall, and there are some discussions with adjacent homeowners regarding ways to landscape these yards to improve privacy and continuity.

The Chair thanked the applicant for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel. Questions were asked and answered on the following topics:

- What type of seating will be in the public plaza? Custom benches.
- Will universal access be available in the courtyard? Yes.
- What are the sizes of the units? 1550 sq. ft. – 2300 sq. ft. including basement,
- What are the details of the accessibility features? Elevator access from underground parking, bathrooms which allow for turning circle, and master bedrooms with maneuvering space around the bed.
- Project includes colour on the streetscape, what about in the courtyard? Courtyard has been kept lighter as it is somewhat enclosed.

- Have noise impacts from Ridgewood Drive been addressed? Yes – techniques include enhanced glazing and confirmation will be provided at Building Permit stage.
- How has proximity to the church been addressed? A terrace wraps the corner and a large setback with plantings has been provided along the shared property line. The church has also been involved in the site planning discussions.
- What are the site conditions at the South property line? A mix of Allen block and poured concrete retaining wall.
- Why different retaining wall format and setbacks? Allen block could be used in all areas – the varied approach was felt to help reduce impacts on existing trees.
- How will unit addresses be identified for emergency response? Likely will be individual unit numbers and a common project street address.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Design Planner, made the following comments, referring to Development Permit guidelines from Schedule B of the OCP:

- Guideline B3.1. Context: The project blends well with existing residential uses and serves as an effective transition between single family residential and the nearby mixed use “Grosvenor” project. The project has an appropriate neighbourhood scale.
- Guideline B1.4 Building Separation and Outlook: Balconies are recessed into the third floor on both the front and the rear of the buildings - this has the benefit of improving sunlight to the inner courtyard and reducing mass on the street front.
- Guideline C2.6 Private Outdoor Space: The units are well-served by private outdoor spaces with access to sunlight.
- Guideline B1.4 Building Separation and Outlook: The courtyard is approximately 27 feet wide which is slightly narrower than the guideline suggestion. This narrower courtyard is due in part to required road dedication, but top floor balconies are set back, resulting in a 40 foot width at the upper level with enhanced sun penetration.
- Guideline B2.2 Corner Sites: The proposed public plaza, with the plaza across the street, creates an attractive green gateway to the community which will be an important feature of Edgemont Village.

In their review, members of the Panel noted the following comments and items for consideration:

- Project appears to have been thoughtfully designed and the design seems a good “fit” with the surrounding neighbourhood;
- The proposed site layout appears to create a courtyard space with a successful scale and the building stepbacks at the top floor are a positive element;
- Proportions are attractive, but the rear (courtyard) elevations of Buildings A & B seem somewhat too simple;
- There could be a benefit to providing more windows along the courtyard frontages;
- Vertical identity of the individual townhouse units is positive and there would be merit in avoiding horizontal lines such as the rain screen drainage in the final design;
- Window boxes proposed may create a maintenance challenge for the building envelope and need to be considered carefully;

- Consider fewer lights in vinyl windows;
- Additional colour variation would be a positive addition;
- The proposed mix of hard and soft landscaping is a positive aspect of the project;
- There are some possible overlooking issues with future development to the south and west which could be better addressed and privacy issues along the south property line could be better addressed with more space to allow a change of grade and a lower retaining wall;
- Units with Ridgewood Drive entrances could benefit from improved weather protection;
- There may be a need to reverse exit stairs to address door swings into courtyard area and a personnel door from the elevator enclosure is likely required;
- A connection between Buildings A and B may trigger different Building Code requirements that should be considered carefully;
- Parking garage entrance would be improved if were de-emphasized.

The Chair invited the project team to respond.

Mr. Cox thanked the panel for their constructive comments. Mr. Kreuk noted that he is happy to work with the property owners to the south to address the privacy concerns.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion.

MOVED by Dan Parke and **SECONDED** by Tieg Martin:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the application and recommends **APPROVAL** of the project **SUBJECT** to a presentation at the detailed stage that includes a review of the items noted in the Panel's consideration of the project.

CARRIED

b. 1401 – 1479 Hunter St & 481 – 497 Mountain Hwy – Preliminary Application for Rezoning and Development Permit for highrise and townhouse development with associated community centre space.

Mr. Doug Allan, District Planner, introduced the project and noted that the site is located on the south side of Hunter Street just south of Seylynn Park. The site flanks the District Operations Centre, with industrial uses to the south. The site is currently zoned EZ-LI and the OCP designation is Commercial Residential Mixed Use Level 3. The project proposes two residential high-rises: 15 and 26 storeys in height, connected by a townhouse podium, with a 20,000 sq. ft. community centre topped by four floors of apartments. The proposal complies with the maximum OCP density of 3.5 FSR but the two towers are in excess of the heights permitted under the Lynn Creek Town Centre Plan. The proposal includes provision of a pedestrian bridge over Lynn Creek. The project responds to the draft Lynn Creek Design Guidelines.

The Chair asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel and one question was raised:

- What is the timeline for the community centre and the bridge? The bridge is anticipated to be completed with this project. While the applicant would construct the community centre the space has not been programmed as yet.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Bob Worden of Ramsay Worden Architects to the meeting. Mr. Worden presented the project and noted the following key points in his presentation:

- Tallest building proposed is furthest away from Mountain Hwy. and will help create a frame for Seylynn Park;
- While towers are taller than specified in the plan, they are more slender, and have small floorplates of 6,000 and 7,000 square feet;
- At this stage, the community centre space is conceptual and more input is required from the District;
- Proposal includes a four storey podium of stacked townhomes between the two towers;
- A “mews” feature between the community centre building and the remainder of the project will provide access to parking;
- A conceptual stormwater management swale with water feature will be incorporated along the front of the property and proposed to discharge into Lynn Creek;
- Green wall features will add additional interest and soften sections of exposed walls;
- The community centre is set back from Hunter Street to allow for an urban plaza gateway feature at street level;
- The tower designs include repeated elements with similar materials being carried over to the townhomes. One of the material choices is metal siding to reflect the industrial area to the south;

Mr. Worden introduced Ms. Mary Chan, Landscape Architect, who presented the project’s landscape design with reference to the following points:

- Natural vegetation, stone and water elements have been incorporated into the design;
- The landscape approach is more natural along Hunter Street adjacent to the Park and adjacent to the creek with a more urban approach closer to the town centre;
- Community green spaces have been proposed in areas that receive good sun exposure.
- A street-friendly presence is proposed along Hunter Street to allow for comfortable building entries and an improved relationship to the public realm;
- Outdoor patio and living spaces are set back from Hunter Street by the proposed stormwater management swale to allow for a degree of privacy;
- Community garden plots, greenspace and fruit trees are proposed in a common outdoor area on the west side of the site for residents;
- An amenity room atop the podium will provide for a range of functions, with a nearby outdoor children’s play area;
- Lighting is provided for safe access as well as for unit identity at townhouse entries;
- Drought-resistant plantings are proposed.

The Chair thanked the applicant for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel. Questions were asked and answered on the following topics:

- How will parking on the north side of Hunter be handled? It is proposed to be angled parking broken up with landscaped islands.
- Will tree planting extend further into Seylynn Park than currently? Yes and will be consistent with District’s Seylynn Park Master Plan.
- Is the cul-de-sac publicly-accessible? Yes, but the design will have to be coordinated with the design of the proposed pedestrian/cycle bridge over the creek;

- Is additional detail on the community centre available? Mr. Allan responded that the space will have to be increased to about 24,000 square feet to accommodate a full size gym and likely, childcare space. A needs assessment is presently being undertaken to determine other uses but it is anticipated that the developer will provide the shell space that will be fitted out using other CAC funds;
- Is the location of the community centre approved? Mr. Allan indicated that the Town Centre Implementation Plan indicates that the centre could be provided on this site as proposed, or, on the other side of Mountain Highway but staff feel that the subject site provides a better relationship to Seylynn Park;
- Are there options for the “mews” element to connect to the south in future? It is possible, but relies on future development to the south. If connected, it could provide secondary access and an emergency access/egress route.
- Is the cul-de-sac area and adjacent water feature contingent on the District Operations Centre vacating the parking in this area? The cul-de-sac is not, but the water feature is.
- What is the rationale for the towers exceeding the suggested heights in the Implementation Plan? Maximizing the FSR on the site with smaller floorplates resulted in taller towers;
- Is there a rationale for the angular design of the towers? It's primarily to maximize views and assist in reducing the scale of the buildings;
- Are residential units above the community centre rental or strata? At this stage, strata units;
- Will the private and public recreation facilities be connected? Not intended to be;
- Do floor slabs project through wall system to serve as solar shading? The approach is unresolved at this point, but will not extend through walls unless necessary;
- How are upper townhouses accessed? From Level 2 of the parkade with exits to the top of the podium but code compliance issues require some further exploration;
- What is the direction for the material choices on the towers? Glass curtain wall system, with frame elements in painted concrete or a panelized siding system;
- What is the approach to green building design and window to wall ratio? This is still in the early design stage and energy modeling has not yet been completed;
- Would like to see more information on accessibility concerns, including how pedestrians will access the site and how handicapped parking will work? Parking has been addressed and is quite accessible, other items will be taken into further consideration.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Design Planner, made the following comments:

- the north end of the proposed community centre requires further consideration and design development to create a stronger sense of arrival and relationship to the park;
- the north canopy design above the community centre would benefit from incorporating a ‘floating’ design to accentuate identity;
- the parking entry ‘mews’ at 30 feet wide seems wide – a reduction in width might allow for an increase in the size of the community centre space;
- project design as currently proposed seems somewhat harsh, and would benefit from some softer building elements;
- the Mountain Hwy. frontage of the proposed commercial space needs to be opened up to the street with additional glazing;
- the metal siding material selected appears acceptable but a lighter colour would be recommended;
- some rationale is needed for the design of the upper storeys of the two towers and the differences in the landscaping approach between the two towers.

In their review, members of the Panel noted the following comments and items for consideration:

- Clarity is needed at the detailed application stage on what components of the project are within the applicant's control and which are up to the District, with specific reference to the proposed elimination of the Operations Centre parking;
- Detailing the curtain wall above the roof slab, as proposed, may be problematic;
- A member noted some fundamental concerns with the site plan suggesting that the taller building should be located closer to Mountain Highway and the Town Centre;
- Other members suggested the massing as presented seems to make sense;
- Some resolution is necessary on the purpose and format of the mews separating the east building from the remainder of the site – more attention should be given to this area so that it does not appear only as a dead-end access to the parking garage;
- It was suggested that more variation between the two towers is needed;
- The taller tower appears to have an abrupt relationship to the ground plane which should be reconsidered;
- A pickup/drop off location for the community centre should be considered;
- The upper floor of townhomes includes an odd left over patio space that seems unusable;
- Water elements along the frontage appear positive but the cascading water element may create a noise issue;
- Need to resolve exiting for tower stairs and exit separation for smaller tower floors;
- There is a need to review exiting from the spaces in the podium and the connection to the interior of the parkade as this could present both code compliance and security issues;
- Given the site complexity, there would be merit in considering a zoned fire alarm system;
- There may be value in considering common usage between the community centre and the private amenity facility – this could avoid duplication and assist in building relationships in the community;
- Could be merit in the community centre being located within the podium element with a wider space between the two proposed towers;
- Relationship between the small commercial space in the east tower and the community centre should be reviewed;
- It was suggested that a model be provided at the Detailed Application stage.

The Chair invited the project team to respond, they offered the following comments:

- The placement of the taller tower was intended to reduce shadowing of the park;
- The void spaces on the upper level townhouse patios are provided as part of the entrances, but there is probably room to expand and reformat these areas;
- The east building with community centre and residential uses is intended to continue the six-storey streetwall along Mountain Highway.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion.

MOVED by Samir Eidnani and **SECONDED** by Liane McKenna:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the application and recommends **APPROVAL** of the general concept of the project **SUBJECT** to a presentation at the detailed stage that includes a review of the items noted in the Panel's consideration of the project.

CARRIED

c. **1944 – 1976 Fullerton Ave – Preliminary Application for OCP Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit for phased townhome development**

Mr. Erik Wilhelm, District Planner, introduced the project and explained that the proposal includes two land assemblies totalling approximately 2.15 acres. The properties are currently Zoned RS3 (single family) and have an OCP Designation of RES2 to accommodate redevelopment to a townhouse density. The proposed OCP amendment and rezoning are consistent with the Lower Capilano Village Centre Peripheral Guidelines. The project is in two phases totalling 99, 3 storey townhouse units in ten buildings. The proposed FSR is just above the allowed 1.2, at 1.23 FSR over the two phases. Trails along the Capilano River are proposed to be improved and extended and a connection to the “Larco” site would be provided through the Glenaire cul-de-sac.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team to the meeting and Mr. Robert Ciccozzi of Ciccozzi Architecture presented the project with reference to the following points:

- The applicant is attempting to acquire the remaining properties on the Glenaire cul-de-sac and the four lots along Sandown Place, as well as the remaining lot on Fullerton Ave. Acquiring these properties would help provide greater flexibility in the site layout;
- As proposed, Phase 1 is an odd shape and so has some pinch point in the design – the design has responded to this configuration with angled building siting to avoid creating “face-to-face” units;
- A minimum setback of 4.5 metres is provided along Fullerton and Glenaire Drive;
- The courtyard at the centre of the site is designed as a meeting place;
- Ground-oriented townhomes are proposed on the outer edges of the project with stacked units to the interior of the sites;
- Parkade access available directly to ground-oriented units, while the parkade will have elevator access to the central courtyard;
- West coast contemporary influence created through materials, with special attention to articulated entrance areas. Materials include cedar panel, dark brick, roof top patios and deep roof overhangs for shading and weather protection;
- End wall features at the intersection will help to create a sense of arrival for Glenaire Dr.;
- An option is being considered to vary brick selections between buildings, but would like to keep colours the same to ensure buildings continue to appear as a cohesive project;

Mr. Ciccozzi introduced Ms. Meredith Mitchell of M2 Landscape Architecture, who presented the landscape design with reference to the following points:

- Design has been created to compliment the west coast style and will help to provide continuity and wayfinding in the project;
- Phase 1 proposal includes courtyard with the feel of a more urban space with gathering areas and seating interspersed with low planting so people can see each other;;
- Ground level units have outside spaces with hedges for privacy;
- Local plant materials area proposed with broad leaf evergreens, conifers, and ornamentals;
- Rear private spaces will be in the form of patios, not lawn;
- Grass mounds and grading with stepping stones will help to create playful landscape elements for children and there is potential for garden plots in Phase 1;
- 24-36 inch tall planters within Phase 2 will create separation for public and private spaces;

• Phase 1 entranceways will be slightly raised from street level in comparison to Phase 2; The Chair thanked the applicant for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel. Questions were asked and answered on the following topics:

- If the adjacent lots are acquired would that change the general approach to the project?
No – the layout might change, but not the buildings forms.
- Is fencing proposed along the north edge of the project between the river and public path?
A low fence is proposed. There is already significant separation from the trail.
- Are trellises proposed within the courtyard? No, only at the entrances to the courtyard;
- Are the buildings wood frame? Yes.
- Would future phases connect underground? Possibly, as sharing the garage area would avoid more ramps.
- Is level access proposed from the Glenaire Drive cul-de-sac to the courtyard? Yes.
- Window materials are shown as aluminium, but would windows this large be workable with aluminum frames? Yes, we think so.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, District Urban Design Planner, made the following comments:

- Addressing the site plan and the linkages with the networks of the existing community, including resolution of how residents will access the village centre to the south, will be essential to the success of the project;
- There is a need to consider how the edges of the project will relate to the neighbourhood – a more organic approach could be preferable, as well as the need to “wrap the corner” to have units facing both streets;
- Project needs to display more of a variety in rooflines, projection elements from facades, colours and materials to avoid being monotonous;
- Both phases need to reconsider courtyard elements, with the northern site courtyard ending abruptly at the east, and the southern site courtyard including two triangular spaces which do not provide a functional community gathering area.

In their review, members of the Panel noted the following comments and items for consideration:

- Phase 1 is very awkward in terms of the spaces between buildings – the proposed courtyard spaces are angular and somewhat harsh, and appear to be comprised of leftover spaces. If additional lots were acquired this could potentially help to solve the problem by reducing the awkwardness of the development site;
- Would be value in seeing images of unit outlooks into the courtyard as some of these locations appear tight and awkward;
- The Phase 2 component to the project seems to work better, but the proposed long narrow buildings create a long central corridor rather than a true courtyard – some breaks in the buildings or re-alignment would assist the courtyard layout;
- A good mix of unit sizes is proposed, which is positive;
- The proposed materials work well, but the project seems monotonous with excessive repetition;
- Proposed buildings do not successfully turn corners to address both streets;
- Shifting buildings to provide better sightlines might be a positive adjustment;

- The design includes many flat roof areas and ledges which could create maintenance challenges;
- Information related to rooftop access and drainage (rainwater leaders) would be beneficial;
- A variety of rooftop spaces, elements and designs should be considered.
- Crenellated element of cornice seems busy and unresolved and could benefit from reconsideration;
- There would be value in discussing park and trail linkage opportunities with Metro Vancouver;
- Four storey townhouse units are a challenge with regard to building code compliance and will need to be reviewed carefully, including the proposed roof access hatches;
- Having the parkade columns set back from the drive aisles would make the garage easier to use;
- Visitability for the handicapped to ground floors of townhouse units could use some examination, particularly for the bathrooms;
- More variation in the building and roof forms would be positive, including adjustments to more than simply colours and materials;
- Pathway widths within the development seem narrow and should be reviewed;
- A physical model is required at the detailed application stage;

The Chair invited the project team to respond, and expressed appreciation for the Panel's input and offered the following comments:

- A 99 unit project is not a large one, and the design team would prefer to include more subtle variations through colours and materials rather than dramatic changes which could clash in close quarters;
- There may be options to look into altering roof forms to provide more variation between buildings.
- The project team is pleased to look at further options for have the buildings "turning the corners."

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion.

MOVED by Tieg Martin and **SECONDED** by Dan Parke:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the application and recommends **APPROVAL** of the general concept **SUBJECT** to a presentation at the detailed stage that includes a review of the items notes in the Panel's consideration of the project.

CARRIED

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

January 14, 2016

Chair



Date

DEC 10, 2015
