

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
MAY 11, 2017 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Craig Taylor (Chair)
 Mr. Laurenz Kosichak
 Ms. Amy Tsang
 Mr. Steve Wong
 Mr. Stefen Elmitt
 Mr. Samir Eidnani
 Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
 Ms. Diana Zoe Coop
 Mr. Tieg Martin
 Mr. Jordan Levine

REGRETS:

STAFF: Ms. Tamsin Guppy
 Mr. Nathan Andrews
 Mr. Alfonso Tejada
 Ms. Natasha Letchford (Item 3.a. & 3.b.)

The meeting came to order at 6:00 pm.

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made and carried to adopt as circulated the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of April 13, 2017.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A binder of Design Guideline materials have been made available to Panel members at the meeting as well as online.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) 1031 – 1045 Ridgewood Dr (Boffo 2): Detailed Application for OCP Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit – 25 unit townhouse development

Ms. Natasha Letchford, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context for the project.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Craig Taylor of Taylor Kurtz Architecture and Design introduced the project. Mr. Taylor noted the following points in the presentation:

- The project proposal is consistent with the guidelines for Edgemont Village.

- The contemporary design provides another alternative form and character in the Edgemont residential periphery.
- In response to comments received from the neighbourhood, roof decks facing Ridgewood Dr. were removed.
- The natural topography of the site allows for good daylighting and has shaped the built form.
- Vertical cadence is emphasized in the massing to tie the project together as a whole.
- Bench space at each node within the site will be provided to enhance the space, circulation, and connection to others in the complex.
- Garbage and staging space has been developed to retain neighbourhood aesthetic while still providing the necessary functionality.
- Accessibility to the site for motor vehicles is off of Ridgewood Drive; pedestrians and cyclists can access the site off both Ayr Avenue and Ridgewood Drive.
- There are numerous spots for children to play within the site as well as outdoor space for social gatherings.
- Private garages will be provided with direct access to the units.
- A variety of elevations allow for subtle differences in building design and massing.
- The material palette for each building has a different colour scheme and Hardi-Panel siding to provide similar yet contrasting design.
- The Edgemont Village: Plan and Design Guidelines calls for buildings that abut a corner to wrap the corner.

The following remarks were made in regards to the landscape plan:

- The landscape plan utilizes the natural slope to enhance edge plantings and more specifically practical seating area design.
- Mailboxes are thoughtfully placed near the elevators to provide ease of access to all.
- An array of patio pavers extending out from the outdoor living space and naturalistic play elements helps to define the pedestrian realm.
- The planting scheme along the south side of the site factors in daylighting and ensures limited growth.

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:

- What type of heating source will be used for the development? Hydronic heating is proposed to heat all units.
- What is the plan to address the change in grade along the site? There will be retaining walls in some areas to help alleviate the slope differences.
- Is there a proposed height for the retaining walls? Yes, the retaining walls will follow the grades and range in height between 4 ft. and 6 ft.

- Is there a plan in place to retain existing trees? Yes, the parking garage layout is pulled back to cause less impact to existing trees to the south.
- Will there be visitor parking? Yes, 6 visitor parking stalls have been included in the parking plan.
- Is the garbage room in the parkade? Yes, on garbage day there will be adequate room to stage and is intended to look like a residential entry for aesthetic purposes.
- Is Passive House Design part of the plan? Currently building to Green Gold.
- Have site services been considered? The sanitary connection will be off of Ridgewood Dr.
- Buildings 1, 2, 3 off Ridgewood Dr have adequate accessibility for emergency responders but what about buildings 4 and 5 since they accessed from within? Further development will need to be explored for emergency response to all units.
- Will the buildings be on a suspended slab? No, development will be on terraform.

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

The main issues include:

- The northwest corner needs to be reviewed because the current use of material and design is too monolithic.
- Work on the continuous flat vertical corner element and use the southeast side as an example for improvements.
- Transition pieces need to better incorporate public space amenities and connections.
- The use of metal cladding should be reconsidered as it does not fit the character of the area.

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

- The overall design is well thought out and successfully executed. Nice cadence and rhythm to the architecture.
- The assortment of vertical elements on the buildings is very nice.
- Grade change addressed on the south side is really well done.
- The courtyard plan is well executed in terms of open space to building proportion.
- The northwest corner is overstated and monolithic. Consider making changes to the corner such as clearstory windows, stepping back the top floor, providing different landscaping, or introducing another material. Consider the south east corner as an example of a successful corner.
- Bike parking and planters could be divided and placed at various points around the site.
- Consider increasing the mix of plantings along Ridgewood Dr.
- The dark cedar siding is quite exposed so it could be a maintenance issue.
- The type and design of elevator or lift needs to be reviewed to determine the most effective service for the development.

- By incorporating paving patterns cadence is created which adds to the quality of pedestrian oriented spaces.
- Outdoor furniture with arm and back rests would be preferred to enhance comfort and quality of each gathering space, particularly in the public realm.
- Circulation area and staging area are well done.
- Entry closets could be reviewed for building code requirements.
- Consideration for art like the metal trees along Granville Street in Vancouver is recommended to highlight the northwest corner of the site.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Mr. Taylor, project architect, acknowledged the Panel's suggestions, and thanked the Panel members for their comments.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Steve Wong and **SECONDED** by Stefen Elmitt:

THAT the ADP has reviewed 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

b.) 1131 Frederick Rd (Argyle Secondary School): Development Permit process for replacement of existing secondary school

Ms. Natasha Letchford, Development Planner, introduced the Argyle Secondary School project and explained the context. Because of the institutional nature, the development is not subject to the Form and Character Guidelines but encourages feedback from the Panel.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team and Mr. Mark Hamilton of KMBR Architects introduced the project. Mr. Hamilton noted the following points in the presentation:

- The site is surrounded by single family residential development.
- The forested areas and creeks running along the western and southern parts of the site are important for learning opportunities as well as sustainability goals.
- Grade change from the north to the south is approximately 8 metres so various access points have been developed to ensure connection for all.
- Geotechnical reports highlighting the mix of soil conditions impacted the site planning of the school.
- Siting the building to southeast allows for development of learning areas along the forested area at the south end of the site.
- With the repositioning of the school, parking for 130 vehicles is proposed at the north east corner of the site with access from Frederick Road.
- Having the school setback away from Frederick Road gives a greater buffer to the residential neighbours to the north.
- Shadow analysis doesn't affect any surrounding residential areas with the new placement of the school.
- Inspiration of the building design is the wilderness surrounding the site.
- Design inspiration comes from the north shore bridges and the forest of Lynn Canyon.
- Materials include metal cladding, brick, wood, and glass.
- Outdoor learning communities with First Nation circles will be included in the Design to establish gathering spaces throughout the school.

The following remarks were made in regards to the landscape plan:

- Existing trees will be protected as much as possible to retain the greenbelt along the western and southern portions of the site as well as any other significant trees on the site.
- Native flora and fauna species will be used as part of the landscape plan.
- Outdoor classrooms with southern exposure and daylight are planned to connect to nature.
- CPTED elements have been considered to make sure edges work well.
- Viewing decks along the creek are proposed for educational purposes as well as diversifying the land form.
- Features like amphitheatres will help alleviate steeper grade changes and create usable space.

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:

- How were school classroom sizes and the types of programs determined? Numerous consultation meetings were held with the Province and stakeholders to find the right balance for the new Argyle school.
- What is the distance between façade and edge of roof overhang? The overhang is approximately 3m.
- Will Kilmer Creek at its highest volume be an issue for the school? It will be built to easily accommodate 200 year flood events.
- Will the occupant load be different with the new layout? No, the occupant load is planned to be the same.
- What is the timeline for construction? The construction phase of the project is planned to commence in 2018 and last approximately 2 years.
- Is there a crime and safety prevention plan in place? Will there be places for “duck and cover” in case of shootings? A program for security aspects of school design beyond the CPTED measures under discussion with ADP has been the focus of a separate set of design discussions.
- Is there general access for the public on the various pathways around the school? Yes.
- Are steel and timber the main materials being used? Yes, required to be non-combustible.
- Will there be sufficient washroom access for the public adjacent to the sports field? Yes – the funding for this portion is under discussion with the District of North Vancouver.

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

- The open space is great but the arrival points need to be more direct.
- Development of the parking lot layout should be improved to include pockets of greenery.
- Amphitheatre space is a great concept but still could be improved to connect the varying levels of activity.

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

- Excavation and construction will be challenging due to the proximity of the new school to the existing school.
- Shadow studies should include trees.
- The massing and articulation of the building is confusing – in particular, the main school entrance is lost and needs to become more of a focal point. Consider simplifying the entrance.

- The south entrance also needs additional attention to ensure it is easily identifiable and useable.
- The wood elements feel “added on” and are not well integrated into the design.
- The overhangs need more thought – many of the entrances currently do not have any overhangs to provide weather protection. Overhangs on the roof lines need to be less of an aesthetic highlight and more of a functional one.
- The stratification of materials is a problem, consider instead celebrating the form of the building.
- Efforts to retain and celebrate the forested areas are appreciated.
- Energy efficiency should be considered given the size of the project.
- Having a learning environment at the edge of the greenbelt is a great idea but security and territoriality for the school occupants versus the public realm need to be considered in more detail.
- Consideration should be given to improving the path of the creek so that it meanders more along the western edge of the site and looks less like a drainage ditch.
- At the moment the parking lot appears to be ‘embraced’ and ‘celebrated’ – further work is needed to reduce the prominence of the parking lot.
- Speak with law enforcement for CPTED issues and to ensure a plan is in place for security measures.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. Mr. Hamilton, project architect, acknowledged the Panel's suggestions, appreciated the comments and was happy to take them into account in the Design development.

Before a motion was proposed Ms. Tsang inquired with the rest of the Panel to see if all members were comfortable that future design development be monitored internally with District staff. The answer was yes.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Laurenz Kosichek and **SECONDED** by Samir Eidnani:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal, commends the applicant for the quality of 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

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

June 8, 2017



Chair

JUNE 8, 2017

Date