

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
MUNICIPAL HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2020**

Committee Members: D. Harrison; A. van Hoek; J. Levine; L. McKenna; A. Matis;
B. Nelson; B. Phillips; and Councillor S. Thompson.
Absent: J. McDougall; and Councillor P. Lambur.

Staff: L. Berg, Senior Community Planner, Staff Liaison and Recording Secretary, and
E. Wilhelm, Senior Community Planner.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:37 p.m.

2. ELECTION OF CHAIR FOR 2020

2.1. Chair

L. Berg (Senior Community Planner) called for nominations for the position of Chair
of the Design Review Committee for 2020.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT A. van Hoek be appointed as Chair of the Design Review Committee for 2020.

CARRIED

A. van Hoek assumed the Chair.

2.2 Vice Chair

A. van Hoek called for nominations for the position of Vice Chair of the Design
Review Committee for 2020.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT L. McKenna be appointed as Vice Chair of the Design Review Committee for
2020.

CARRIED

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the February 20, 2020 Committee Meeting agenda be amended by deleting
the HAC appointments and that the agenda be approved as amended.

CARRIED

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the January 22, 2020, Design Review Committee Meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

5. OTHER ITEMS

5.1 APPOINTMENT OF HEAD PURSUANT TO THE *FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT.*

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT pursuant to section 77 of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the Design Review Committee designate the Corporate Officer of the Corporation of the District of West Vancouver as the Head for the purposes of the Act.

CARRIED

5.2 REPRESENTATIVE APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEES:

Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee:

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT: B. Phillips be appointed as Architect to the Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee; and J. McDougall be appointed as Landscape Architect to the Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee.

CARRIED

INTRODUCTION

6. Introductions and meeting procedures.

L. Berg (Senior Community Planner) outlined the meeting procedure statement.

7. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

7.1 RODGERS CREEK LOT 3 MULTIFAMILY – THE HAWKSLEY

Background:

L. Berg (Senior Community Planner) introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site including site context, previously approved Development Permit and the proposed amendments.

Project Presentation:

J. Wexler (Vice President of Development British Pacific Properties) and A. Sepan (Architect) provided a presentation, including:

- Overview of previous Committee consideration and Council approval.
- Responding to market conditions, construction costs and building efficiency within the approved building envelope.

- Described proposed changes including additional units and floor area.
- Displayed before and after renderings of the building, including site conditions and grades, road grades, and existing trees that define the site.
- Overview of the proposal in context of the design guidelines for Rodgers Creek and surrounding approved projects.
- Described the approved amenity building on the site.
- Displayed view studies and context images.

Committee Questions:

The Committee went on to question the presenters, with the applicants' and staff responses in *italics*:

- Materials, what are they and any changes? *Cement panel product, but typically similar.*
- Have the floor plans changed? *Slight changes but generally the same.*
- Neighbourhood, any changes proposed in the area? *Not to the housing above Chippendale, same project that was previously reviewed by Committee. Working on construction on Lot 2, so may see some proposed changes. On February 10, 2020, Council changed units overall to Areas 5 and 6, but unit count remains the same.*
- Community amenity building, for Hawkley or neighbourhood? *All of Area 6, described what it contains. It is unchanged and should provide adequate amenity for the community.*
- Have homes behind sold? *No, not started construction yet.* What level were the view studies from, looked like 3rd level? *Studied from 2nd floor from houses above because those are where the living space are.*
- Layout impact, Unit C (east end of east building) how is access to parking provided? *There is an elevator on west end of tower, access via a corridor that leads there, but can also access stairs to parkade. The access also has direct outdoor access.* Further discussion ensued on the access from this unit.
- Quite a few additional parking spaces added, would it fill the space between the amenity building and how they relate? *Grades difficult so parkade footprint must be blasted. The extent is absolute minimum, but is beginning to encroach on amenity building, most is added on the east building on P3. Invisible, as it is added under the plaza.* Will you have fill and planters on plaza to allow for above-ground landscaping? *No changes to previously approved landscape plans.*

Committee Comments:

The Committee went on to provide comments on the presentation, including:

- Addition in terms of massing is moderate and within the profile of the existing street. The proposed amendment is modest and acceptable. Materials appear to be generally unchanged and no concerns. Additional parking but wouldn't be overbuilding in order to market them, thus support the parking and increasing the marketability of the units.
- Architectural expression has not deviated from the previously approved and appears to be an attractive building. Positive move to add the additional floors to

add units for economic imperative and positive social benefits. Minor increase is reasonable compromise without excessive view impacts. Planning and programming, previously had a greater separation of uses, but Unit C has a poor relationship to the other units, so it seems to be out of context and finishes may be compromised.

- Proposed changes do not seem to negatively impact views, support even with additional units as green space being retained, with high quality for residents. Gives different alternatives for how outdoor spaces are used for a range of on site activities. Continues to give high quality.
- Commendable to add more units within same relative space. Like new profile stepping west to east, the half-step is positive and adds interest.
- Market may be driving the forthcoming changes, adding more units is positive. Great increase in parking relative to costs, consider more EV charging to encourage that use. *Applicant notes that Rodgers Creek 50% has rough-in for charging so buildings are designed for that, so each stall could have an EV charger and large solar panel installation to embrace electrification.* Is there transit yet? *Memorandum of Understanding with Translink has been secured with Cypress Village subsidized by BPP.*

Having reviewed the application and heard the presentation provided by applicant:

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee SUPPORT the application for Rodgers Creek Lot 3 Multifamily – The Hawksley.

CARRIED

7.2 GENTLES COTTAGE, 4441 PICCADILLY NORTH

Background:

E. Wilhelm (Senior Community Planner) introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context and that the Committee had requested a resubmission at the December 2019 meeting to address a number of items. Number of units unchanged but FAR reduced, rooftop decks removed and green roofs expanded, buildings setback and setbacks increased, dedicated visitor parking and landscape adjustments. Trail removed through ROW south to Marine Drive.

Project Presentation:

T. Ankenman (Architect) provided a presentation, including:

- Provided an overview of how the proposal was revised to address the comments and recommendations made by the Committee.
- Proximity to west property line increased between duplexes and townhouses. South property line setback increased. Described particular setback increases and distances.
- Reduced duplex height and massing.
- Rooftop access removed from duplexes, kept some skylight and glazing into the units.
- Discussion on garage door architecture and in response have recreated garage doors with inspiration by the Hunt House by Craig Ellwood.

- Reviewed conflict between duplexes, adjusted windows and added a garden setting and offset doors and windows.
- Added two visitor stalls at the west end of the site and clarified on plans where visitor parking is located.
- Glass to wall ratio reviewed and reduced where appropriate, also reduced the length of the glass guardrails and added revised material and colours for identity.
- Proposing lantern but in a smaller fashion to provide light well down stairways.
- Side glazing has been reduced, more conservative approach, added sunscreen on all south facing windows.
- Displayed landscape and tree plan for clarification. Developed a thorough existing tree plan and exposed bedrock, shallow soil areas. Many trees on site have been topped and recommended to be removed. There is a covenant on title to provide views for properties to the north.
- Provided clarification on storm water management strategy.
- Addressed daylighting of storm water plan with a rain garden collection channel.
- Adding 76 trees.
- Redesigned pedestrian circulation, provided information on public and private areas.
- Revised lighting plan in attempt to address neighbour concerns, clarified lighting integrated with stone wall and decorative lighting details, opportunity to put seasonal lights in driveway lights.
- Reviewed paving patterns proposed and landscape plans.
- Provided 3D “fly-through” program of the rendered project.

Committee Questions:

The Committee went on to question the presenters, with the applicants’ and staff responses in *italics*:

- East side setback that did not change? *Comments mostly directed elsewhere, there is a large setback to that neighbour as well as trees.*
- West side, confident that the drainage will go to the retention pond in the centre of the property? *Grades being leveled on the bench to create condition to bury retention tank and create the pond. Infrastructure is well below ground. A lot of exposed bedrock now, attempting to contain that runoff in situ via green roofs and perimeter drainage. The uninterrupted part along west intent is to forge that to allow for plantings. Central grade road east to west? So it goes along that? It is at existing grade so using existing slopes and downhill terracing. Does it all run back to centre? No, the lane access is fairly flat, only slight curves for traffic control. Idea is all permeable and runoff collected along road trench and added to centre.*
- Gap between lower duplexes, eight feet now is that was there before? *Yes, but concern was lack of study of overlook from windows. Windows are now staggered and landscaping for privacy added. Reviewed for privacy conflicts.*
- Visitor parking proposed, there are 13 spaces allocated, but some appear in awkward spaces that may conflict with garage parking. *Two on west and duplex parking and the parking next to heritage home, is there some for visitor and some for units. There are tandem and right angles that could cause conflict. Architect gave overview of how parking is suggested to work. Did not design a*

parking lot for visitors, proposed to use parking for visitor next to the applicable units. Should be ample opportunity for visitor parking.

- Height of retaining wall north side of lane adjacent to heritage home, 9 feet tall. Is there a need for the height of that wall? *It varies, 9 feet is the high point. It is the existing wall. But it is being removed and replaced and pushed in by two feet. Attempting to keep the wall so that we do not impose on property to the south.*
- Outdoor patios for duplexes, looks like a lot of concrete and hard surfaces, have you considered another material to avoid concrete? *Yes, agree we may be oversized and can revisit. Landscape plans show wood, can be reduced. Note taken and agree.*
- Question of fire truck access. *Applicant responded with requirements. Do not need hammerhead and have reviewed with Fire Dept.*
- Cross section, sunshade on south face on townhouses, how do they function? How far do they project? *Have not completed design, but will be adequate to provide sunshade protection. Reviewed general locations of where they are located.*

Committee Comments:

The Committee went on to provide comments on the presentation, including:

- East side elevation as you walk down pathway looks like two sets of trees in a tight space. Not sure of tree species, concerned about room for them. Smaller areas looking at vine maple and Japanese maple and Japanese snowbell. Unit 101 with shared amenity space looks like has little privacy, review that.
- Ambitious and complicated, appear to address concerns raised. Success will be on the landscaping, need enough planting to achieve all of this with being on a rocky slope.
- Changes are a significant improvement, particularly with southern units. Skylights and eliminating roof gardens are good moves. The approach to the heritage with railings and copper doors to garages are excellent.
- Significant amount of hard surface on this site remains. Consider concrete or stone walls and look at changes to access to units to those spaces. The roadway access point with access creates a barrier, encourage to minimize and lower walls but deal with grades. A different visitor parking approach to rental units should be re-evaluated. There should be allocated parking given there are rental units involved. In addition to changing the hard surface area into something softer, review landscaped palette in context of this site should be more native as you have an exotic scheme proposed.
- Good project for many reasons and offer comments, but landscaping seems foreign in the natural context. Size of garages wonder if enough room for larger vehicles plus garbage and recycling collection containers, etc. Give more thought to heating and cooling, assuming they will need to be cooled given the southern exposure. Like idea of garage door being integrated but not sure how will function with snow, so give consideration to that as well. Lower units next to property line, under the HRA alternate setbacks are proposed. Concern with context with setbacks and massing with the neighbouring house to the lower east. Materials and colours be used to address adjacency. Massing, changes and setbacks have improved.

- Significant rework, good improvements particularly setbacks. Site coverage and density and architecture improved. Concerned with parking especially with heritage house. The shown parking does not look like it will work, needs further design development. South decks and retaining walls look to be significant improvement, look at simplification, pulling decks back a bit, but a vast improvement.
- Significant improvements and commend applicant on addressing the comments made, especially with the setbacks. The plan fits a lot better. Also concerned with parking arrangement.

Having reviewed the application and heard the presentation provided the applicant:

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee SUPPORT of the application for the Gentles Cottage at 4441 Piccadilly North subject to further review of the following items with staff:

- review of parking at cottages and the parking stalls at the west property line next to the driveways for conflict;
- simplification and reduction of decks and retaining walls south of the duplexes;
- review of materials and colours on east façade of duplexes to address adjacency and response to neighbouring property;
- minimize amount of hardscape surface and retaining walls as much as possible; and
- encourage use of native plant materials.

CARRIED

7.3 NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER WORKING GROUP DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

Project Presentation:

T. Dodd (Chair of Neighbourhood Character Working Group) provided a presentation, including:

- Provided background and purpose of the working group, membership and meeting schedule including additional workshop.
- Attempting to identify problems in neighbourhoods and develop a set of draft recommendations including building size, landscaping, neighbourhood consideration and housing diversity.
- First draft has been published and is a continuing work in progress.
- Set of recommendations to encourage:
 - smaller homes on smaller lots;
 - increased landscaping and reduced hardscape, including boulevards;
 - neighbourhood context and communication; and
 - housing diversity
- Recommendations in attempt to maintain single family “feel.”
- Presented to Heritage Advisory Committee.

- Opportunity to present to Committee and how to fit in with the role of the Committee.
- Discussed dual-stream permit application process potential.

Committee Questions:

The Committee went on to question the presenters, with the applicants' and staff responses in *italics*:

- How was the group formed? *By Council.* How much engagement have you done with the community? *Surveys and public meetings. Described amount of feedback received from the public.* How is information being put out to increase your sample sizes? *On Westvancouverite and Communication Department assists the working group. Reaching out to design professionals in the community. Suggestion to have drop-in style open houses, i.e. at the Community Centre, etc. Looking to refine our recommendations next phase and will be going back to public with more advertising.* Consider how to achieve your recommendations, such as subdivisions and floor area requirements and grade requirements should be looked at. Consider a two-tier process for bonusing suites and coach houses to achieve that. Review bond program for landscaping, there is one now you must post a bond for single family.
- Lots about floor areas and basements, etc. do you get into traffic calming and streets? Opportunity to do temporary patios on the streets, things like that. Does your mandate cover that? *Not ruled out if it is contributing to character, we could look at that.* How do you find a way to deal with the cheating and getting around rules? Are you recommending enforcement? *Most recommendations are in attempt to deal with closing loopholes. Looking at trying to limit those things.* Have you thought of incentives? *That is a gray area as character means different things to each person. Looking at interesting face to street, coach houses, ideas to encourage the good and discourage the unwanted. Some regulations discourage renovations such as triggering servicing upgrades.*
- Have you come across ways to capture the flavour of the existing neighbourhood without getting into expensive measures, such as surveyors, that a typical home designer could use? *The issue is there are over 20 neighbourhoods that overlap, each have a different "flavour" and are different areas. To come up with one size fits all, so trying to relate to lot size and boulevards. So not thinking style, you're looking at form, etc. Yes, looking at context with neighbourhood. Section on limiting roof impact with different designs, those can be effective to being passive response to the sun, etc. and reasons for that.* Wondering why those are infractions in the overall height? *It is how the roof elements present to the street and the neighbours, that is how we are approaching it. Not trying to stop vaults, just how they present to the neighbours.* Is there a sense of future looks, any descriptions of scales that people can be planning for? *Looking at doing best practises for people in certain neighbours. Most prevalent where smaller cottage areas are being redeveloped. Not trying to stop change but look how the character will end up looking.*
- Existing definition of neighbourhood character? *Just started thinking about that, it is talked about in the OCP. Based on what we have heard we would like to add in context and boulevards. Working on a better definition.* Landscapes may be naturalistic or built out with the era of the houses, is there any priority setting

to continue that approach? *Yes, we are looking at how the character of the boulevards is impacted by current regulations. Looking at ways to being more practical of what you can do to maintain and enhance boulevards. Many of our neighbourhoods are focused on large-scale views. Does your group discuss that? We stayed away from trees, looking at setbacks with views and neighbours but that is where we are at. Looking at views of house next door rather than the actual view. Interested in thoughts on street-widths. Any feedback about street-widths from the public? Not really, lots of discussion about the treatment such as sidewalks, no sidewalks, ditches, etc. Happy to see hardscape come up in review as it is also a visual issue as well.*

- *Have you taken a leadership position on climate change? Only that we support smaller houses and density. It is not specifically noted in the recommendations through an environmental view. Also we encourage renovations where new houses would be higher energy efficient but more concrete.*
- *A lot of work on building bulk and perception from the street did the group look at FSR exemption reductions; look at more flexibility by moving massing around through setbacks? This could be considered for increased setbacks between houses and opportunity for increased landscaping, could also help with views for the neighbours. See where you are going with the roof forms, could be other ways on how that guideline is drafted and formed. Hard to be prescriptive, but less.*

Committee Comments:

The Committee went on to provide comments on the presentation, including:

- *West Vancouver reviewed guidelines before when “monster homes” started in the past. Trick is to not be too prescriptive. You are looking at a tiered-approach, and different approaches, but caution to proceed with just assigning FAR. It becomes more complicated. Smaller lots should have different setbacks than larger lots. Like idea of different permitting processes to encourage the character you are trying to achieve. Struggling to get information for example with the duplex process. Could look at reduced permit fees for smaller houses or utility upgrade fees. On the landscaping, frustrated with cheating and maintenance. It can be quite unique to each property, may be a need to create a guideline, could be options. Don’t want to be prescriptive so that things don’t start looking ubiquitous. Transitions in setbacks are important, especially where there is transition from single family to multi-family, bylaws say you can only be five feet away, and there should be variation. Retaining wall regulations, including materials, should be looked at as well as they affect grades and landscaping and can result in visually tall walls. Traffic calming is a good suggestion as it could be integrated with the boulevard. There are some implementations, but could be looked at. Enforcement is difficult, how to do without causing problems with the neighbours. Variety of character in the boulevard is tricky.*
- *Not sure if zoning is part of your mandate, but land assemblies going on. Referenced Hollyburn Mews as a good example of neighbourhood character. Anything to encourage walkability and calm cars. Laneway houses need to be more encouraged. Regulations included in FAR penalizes that. They seem not cost effective.*

- As part of outreach approach UBC Landscape Urban Design students to look at precedent in other areas for a series of character studies. In building there is a 1-year warranty review, and identify any shortcomings. Rather than that the neighbourhood or community attend that to look at it from the neighbourhood mandate point of view. Look for ways to integrate the neighbours into the process, rather than just design professionals or staff.
- Encourage consideration of neighbourhood inventories. Look at those 23 or more neighbourhoods and put some definitions around them. That could inform the building envelopes, unique features or other things. Also would encourage about the landscaping of the boulevards within a neighbourhood. One of the other ways inventory could be helpful is you could look at lot sizes and look at the planned unit developments. There is merit of doing something different over there, would allow you to make recommendations around that based on unique circumstances and a layered approach.
- Three important areas: neighbours, boulevards and landscaping. Demonstrate leadership on climate change. New houses will or may have low-carbon footprints, so highlight and leverage it rather than make it onerous. Many studies on villages, town centres, focus on particular areas in North Vancouver and they look at on an inventory perspective as different areas have different things going on and you may want to bolster that.
- Inspired by efforts in housing diversity category and reminding by recent applications we have seen with duplexes and coach house with the formulation of guidelines, encourage you to do some synergies going on between these efforts. Your approach to bring another scale in the neighbourhood (like laneway houses) is good.
- Other issues raised such as single family dwellings do not require an architect so that can be hard to change, but recommend some of the things as it would be good to be out there. Designers may want to do the right thing but may not know. A good set of guidelines could help with that. Providing multiple units or more housing will cause friction but applaud for addressing issue. Important to talk about neighbourhood character there needs to be space for innovation and ideas. It doesn't need to mean keeping everything the way it is. Define the neighbourhood character and that will help those designing the plans.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT having reviewed the draft recommendations presented by the Neighbourhood Character Working Group, the information be received, with thanks.

CARRIED

OTHER ITEMS

8. REPORT, ITEMS REFERRED OR UNFINISHED BUSINESS

a) Council Committee – Overview, Framework and Administration Council Committee Procedure Bylaw No. 5020, 2019

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the materials were received for information.

9. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

A. Nickleson, a neighbour within proximity to the proposal for 4441 Piccadilly North, provided comments on the NCWG report and the findings of the Heritage Advisory Committee as context for the application.

10. SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

The 2020 Design Review Committee Meeting schedule was not included in the package and the Committee moved for adoption at the next meeting.

11. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the February 20, 2020, Design Review Committee Meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Certified Correct:


Annerieke van Hoek (Aug 19, 2020 12:27 PDT)
Chair


Lisa Berg (Aug 19, 2020 07:35 PDT)
Staff Liaison

DWV-#4068549-v1-drc_minutes_2020_Feb_20

Final Audit Report

2020-08-19

Created:	2020-08-18
By:	Mandy Emery (memery@westvancouver.ca)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAy-WMWIKVdMtsmfGuluZW-6fVReUIIR0w

"DWV-#4068549-v1-drc_minutes_2020_Feb_20" History

-  Document created by Mandy Emery (memery@westvancouver.ca)
2020-08-18 - 8:53:16 PM GMT- IP address: 206.108.31.29
-  Document emailed to Lisa Berg (lberg@westvancouver.ca) for signature
2020-08-18 - 8:54:16 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Lisa Berg (lberg@westvancouver.ca)
2020-08-19 - 2:34:07 PM GMT- IP address: 206.108.31.29
-  Document e-signed by Lisa Berg (lberg@westvancouver.ca)
Signature Date: 2020-08-19 - 2:35:29 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 206.108.31.29
-  Document emailed to Annerieke van hoek (anneriekevanhoek@gmail.com) for signature
2020-08-19 - 2:35:31 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Annerieke van hoek (anneriekevanhoek@gmail.com)
2020-08-19 - 6:26:22 PM GMT- IP address: 174.7.102.172
-  Document e-signed by Annerieke van hoek (anneriekevanhoek@gmail.com)
Signature Date: 2020-08-19 - 7:27:57 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 174.7.102.172
-  Signed document emailed to Mandy Emery (memery@westvancouver.ca), Lisa Berg (lberg@westvancouver.ca) and Annerieke van hoek (anneriekevanhoek@gmail.com)
2020-08-19 - 7:27:57 PM GMT