

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
JANUARY 11, 2018 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Jordan Levine (Chair)
Mr. Tieg Martin (Vice Chair)
Mr. Craig Taylor
Mr. Laurenz Kosichek
Ms. Amy Tsang
Ms. Diana Zoe Coop
Mr. Samir Eidnani

REGRETS: Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Mr. Steve Wong
Mr. Stefen Elmitt

STAFF: Ms. Tamsin Guppy (Item 3.b. - 3.i.)
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Mr. Kevin Zhang
Ms. Casey Peters (Item 3.c.)
Mr. Adam Wright

The meeting came to order at 6:00 pm.

1. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made and carried to adopt the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of December 14, 2017, with the following addition on Page 3, bullet point 5:

“One panel member noted, this was not the best place for a pub due to conflicts with the residential component of the project.”

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) Design Panel Awards Nominees List

The Panel had reviewed five projects completed in the last year, listed in the following table:

2017 Design Panel Nominees

“Horizon/Seylynn Village Phase 2” - 650 Seylynn Crescent
“Delbrook Community Centre” - 851 West Queens Road
“Edgemont Senior Living” - 3225 Highland Blvd
“Mills House/Lynn Valley United Church” - 3205 Mountain Hwy
“Walter’s Place” - 1325 Draycott Rd

The Chair opened the floor for discussion about the projects eligible to be considered for a Design Excellence Award. Panel members summarized their site reviews from the self-guided tour and shared their scores for the projects on a number of evaluation categories. Each of the Design Panel awards nominees was discussed, and average scores were tabulated. Key comments and average scores for each nominee are highlighted below:

“Horizon/Seylynn Village Phase 2” - 650 Seylynn Crescent

- The building had interesting massing and was well-detailed.
- The site-planning was well done.
- While well done, there was nothing exceptional in the design of the building or the landscaping that makes it award worthy.
- Would have benefitted from more attention on landscaping and public art.

Average score from Panel: 6.78/10

“Delbrook Community Centre” - 851 West Queens Road

- Great civic function and facilities, an asset to the community.
- Fenestration offers enjoyable transparency, connection to community.
- Circulation challenging due to nature of site.
- Open, clean, attractive design.
- Strong design for such a challenging site.
- Great integration on Public Art.

Average Score from Panel: 8.35/10 (2017 Design Excellence Award Winner)

“Edgemont Senior Living” - 3225 Highland Blvd

- Heavy timbers, warm lighting, and seating creates an inviting entrance.
- Massing and roof line broken-down well.
- Cohesive identity and personality could be more clearly conveyed.
- Transparent corner connects residents to community.
- Room for more organized and consistent materials.
- Innovative artwork.

Average Score from Panel: 6.78/10

“Mills House/Lynn Valley United Church” - 3205 Mountain Hwy

- Strong entrance.
- Layout could be more intuitive.
- Enjoyable public art.
- Massing somewhat constrained.
- Landscaping integrated well.
- Sharp contrasting colours.

Average Score from Panel: 6.64/10

“Walter’s Place” - 1325 Draycott Rd

- Successful form and composition.
- Strong massing language.
- Heavy timbers and colour contrast nicely executed.
- Clean, creative design.
- Strong design concept but poor execution, would have benefitted from more careful attention to detailing and enhanced landscaping.

Average Score from Panel: 6.93/10 (Honorable Mention)

A summary of the 2017 Design Panel Nominees and their average scores are listed below:

2017 Design Panel Nominees	Average Score
650 Seylynn Crescent “Horizon/Seylynn Village Phase 2”	6.78
851 West Queens Road “Delbrook Community Centre”	8.35
3225 Highland Blvd “Edgemont Senior Living”	6.78
3205 Mountain Hwy “Mills House/Lynn Valley United Church”	6.64
1325 Draycott Rd “Walter’s Place”	6.93

Through discussion and review of the Panel members’ scores it was concluded that the following Nominee would be eligible to receive a 2017 Design Excellence Award:

- **“Delbrook Community Centre” - 851 West Queens Road**

The Panel also wished to commend the efforts of the following Nominee by offering an Honorable Mention for design excellence:

- **“Walter’s Place”** - 1325 Draycott Rd

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner, explained that the 2017 Advisory Design Panel Awards are expected to be presented by Council to the project teams at North Vancouver District Hall, on March 13, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting (of the 2017 Panel) was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON
JANUARY 11, 2018 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

ATTENDING: Mr. Jordan Levine (Chair)
Mr. Tieg Martin (Vice Chair)
Ms. Amy Tsang
Ms. Diana Zoe Coop
Mr. Samir Eidnani
Mr. Charles Leman
Mr. Darren Burns

REGRETS: Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Mr. Steve Wong
Mr. Stefen Elmitt

STAFF: Ms. Tamsin Guppy (Item 3.b)
Mr. Alfonso Tejada
Mr. Kevin Zhang
Ms. Casey Peters (Item 3.c)
Mr. Adam Wright

The meeting came to order at 7:10 pm.

b.) Inauguration of New Panel Members

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, discussed the role of the Panel and invited existing and new Panel members to introduce themselves and describe what they see as their role in the Panel.

Ms. Tamsin Guppy welcomed both Mr. Charles Leman and Mr. Darren Burns as the newest members of the Panel, who were both nominated by AIBC for positions as "Architect" each were and appointment to two-year terms by District Council.

Ms. Tamsin Guppy advised that the Panel required a Chair and Vice Chair for the 2018 term and nominations for these positions were discussed.

Mr. Jordan Levine was nominated for the position of Chair. Mr. Levine accepted the nomination and was acclaimed in the position.

Mr. Tieg Martin was nominated for the position of Vice Chair. Mr. Martin accepted the nomination and was acclaimed in the position.

The Panel discussed the style of meeting minutes and agreed that adding a summary of items on the final page of the minutes may be redundant and could lead to misrepresentations as information and items are synthesized and interpreted.

Ms. Tamsin Guppy indicated that in order to limit the length of meetings, that it would be important to limit meeting agendas to include a maximum of three (3) small or medium sized items, or two (2) large items. As a result of cutting back on meeting length so that meetings do not extend for more 3.5 hours, a second meeting may occasionally be required. When required it was suggested it be scheduled on a successive Thursday evening.

Ms. Tamsin Guppy reminded the Panel members of the materials available to them including:

- Electronic links to all relevant design guidelines
- A binder on all design guidelines
- A copy of sample panel motions
- A list of panel members

The offer of individual binders or resource materials for Panel members was made, and it was noted that anyone who at any time would like their own copies of materials just has to ask staff who will be happy to provide it.

Ms. Tamsin Guppy asked the panel if they were satisfied with the cold suppers provided of sandwiches and salads. The Panel agreed to continue these cold suppers. Ms. Guppy suggested that Panel members speak to her if they have any catering preferences for future meetings including switching to hot meals or varied meals in the future.

The 2018 Advisory Design Panel Schedule was distributed among Panel members, and given the year's holidays all meetings can occur as normally scheduled on the second Thursday of the month.

c.) 340 Mountain Hwy & 1515-1537 Rupert St - Detailed Planning Application – Rezoning and Development Permit for a stacked townhouse development

Ms. Casey Peters, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team from who held a presentation on the project. Peter Hildebrand from Iredale Architecture and Daryl Tyacke from ETA Landscape Architecture presented the details of the project and noted changes that were made from the preliminary application.

The Chair thanked the applicant for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel. The following questions were posed by the Panel:

- Which lots adjacent to the project site will be assembled in the future? Four lots to the east of the site on Rupert St.
- How will the lane be affected? The lane south of Rupert St. will remain open in the short term and will be assembled with the site to the south in the future.
- Is the garbage accessed through the courtyard? Yes
- Is that a closet under the stairs in level three? Yes

- What type of trees will be planted, and how high will they grow? Ginkgo, approximately 25 feet.
- Some rooms in the parkade are not labelled. The rooms will likely be bike storage.
- Will the electrical room be located in the parkade? No, because of flood hazard.
- Is the only electrical room at the courtyard level? There is another one at the main entrance next to stairwell.
- Can you explain the east elevation and amenity space? That's a private patio space for one unit in the rear of the building. The east face is limited in terms of the unprotected openings that we can have.
- Is there centralized hot water? Yes, in-floor heating with in-unit gas-fed boilers. The heating system will be able to tie into district energy when available.
- Is there a municipal requirement for a side yard setback or a zero lot line on the east elevation? The municipality is requiring that the driveway access be shared (underground) but that the buildings be distinct.
- Has project been brought for code review? Yes.
- Are you proposing a living wall feature? No, a glass feature wall instead.
- Could you tell us about the materials? We wanted to have a timeless look, and link to an industrial character, with beige brick, dark fibre cement panels, and corten-steel.

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

- Exterior design is repetitive and not in keeping with the Lynn Creek guidelines for asymmetrical design.
- The building needs to "turn the corner" at Mountain Hwy and Rupert St.
- The urban streetwall should have upper storeys setback. The proposal achieves this on the north elevation but not on the west elevation.
- The proximity of the buildings across the courtyard is problematic and at odds with the design guidelines. As the courtyard is enclosed on all sides the light in the courtyard and to the lower units will be very limited.
- East façade will be clearly seen from adjacent park and requires better detailing.
- Materials are not in accordance with the design guidelines which emphasize wood, steel, concrete, stone, and natural materials.
- The building does not read as a residential building.

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

- Additional clarification required on landscape plan as it is difficult to determine location of the trees in the courtyard.
- Additional review of the parkade to address usability including door conflicts.
- Given space constraints, and landscape berm, drainage may benefit from pavers on pedestals.

- Given that this project is proposing to share driveway access and connect the two parkades, consider addressing the security between the parkade and rest of site, as well as future connections to neighbouring site – fire alarms on the two projects will need to be connected.
- Need to ensure emergency response clearance in exterior. Existing condition would provide challenges for emergency responders.
- Reconsider garbage location as the courtyard location could be challenging.
- Look at the insulated assemblies that also have venting and coordinate with the sprinkler design. Would benefit from a review from a sprinkler engineer.
- Concur with Mr. Tejada's comments with regards to the repetitious modulation on the Rupert Street elevations which is reinforced by the narrowness of the windows. There is an opportunity through modulation to keep the style of the proposal but address the design guidelines for the area.
- Overall width of the building isn't excessively long, garage element is only non-detailed façade.
- Unit entries still feel like they are commercial store fronts.
- Support the design to define the private space using landscaping within the courtyard without adding additional barriers which might block light. The courtyard design offers opportunities for socialization.
- Ensure that water feature is safe for small children.
- May want to consider another screen element than Oakleaf Hydrangea, as it may be challenging in winter.
- A model would have helped with the review of this project.
- Consider route of venting for gas-fed boilers.
- Future heat exchange room and water entry room may present a challenge given the proposed headroom limitation.
- May need to review door swing plans, and potentially introduce pocket doors to mitigate conflicts.
- Shadow studies are not complete and as provided highlight concerns about lack of light in the courtyard.
- East elevation will be the dominant view from the park. Majority of panel members expressed concerns that not enough has been done to modulate this elevation and properly finish this view of the building.
- Support expressed for the formality of the project.
- Entrance needs refinement to be successful.
- Painted glazing feature could be fantastic – printed or blasted, perhaps water running through it. This feature could enhance the entry experience.
- Tight, well-planned units, but not at the expense of some luxury.
- Diverging from the design guidelines may be acceptable as we are looking for a variety of architectural character in this urban centre. There are simple and strong aspects to this approach.
- Aluminum guard rails – may not look as nice as steel.

- Challenge yourself to maintain your vision and character, but also align with the design guidelines.

One of the panel members who was unable to attend the Advisory Design Panel meeting emailed in the following comments for consideration:

- Exterior materials would be enhanced by further clarity. Renders, elevations and schedules would be improved by more detailing, completeness, and consistency.

The Chair invited the project team to respond. The team appreciated all of the comments from the Panel and were happy to continue to challenge themselves in improving the design. The project team explained that they have a better understanding of the context and the suggestions of the Panel and that they can improve the east façade greatly while taking into account the function, context and the design guidelines.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Ms. Amy Tsang and **SECONDED** by Mr. Samir Eidnani:

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

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

6. NEXT MEETING

February 8th, 2018


Chair


Date