

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
RAVEN ROOM (via electronic communication facilities)
THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 2021**

Committee Members: R. Amenyogbe; R. Ellaway; E. Fiss; D. Harrison; J. Mahoney; A. Matis; J. McDougall; H. Nesbitt; B. Phillips;

Absent: Councillors P. Lambur and M. Wong

Staff: L. Berg, Staff Liaison; M. McGuire, Senior Manager of Current Planning and Urban Design; E. Wilhelm, Senior Community Planner; and N. Allard, Recording Secretary.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the March 11, 2021, Design Review Committee Meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the February 18, 2021, Design Review Committee Meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

4. INTRODUCTION

The Chair outlined the meeting procedure.

5. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

5.1 2204 Bellevue Avenue and 177 22nd Street – 8 storey apartment building

Background: M. McGuire (Senior Manager of Current Planning and Urban Design) introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site, including site context and proposed development:

- Subject property is located at Southwest corner of 22nd Street and Bellevue Avenue. The site is relatively small site in context; 8,000 sq. ft., within walking distance to transit and local amenities in Ambleside Area.
- Site currently zoned for duplex and is developed with a duplex building with secondary suite. Duplex building is an anomaly in area as it is surrounded by apartments and high-rise buildings of various heights. Within Ambleside Apartment Development Permit Area (DPA).
- Proposal is for an 8-storey apartment building; Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 2.4; site coverage of 46%; height 31.5 metres; seven stratified apartment units with common ground floor amenities facing garden.
- Parking entry off 22nd Street with 18 parking stalls, storage, landscaping and boulevard improvements proposed.

Project Presentation: A. Baldwin & M. Richter (Architects) provided a presentation, including:

- Described the site and that it is an important connection between civic buildings to the north and to Centennial Sea Wall to the south; located next to the 22nd Street bike path.
- “Delta” approach towards environmental and ecological design is high in importance; project has been shaped by these values.
- Key elements of building include: the mass framed timber, use of low-carbon and sustainable materials, and Passive House certification. Roof-top solar panels for onsite energy generation. Proposal is a pioneer in Passive House construction and the use of mass-timber products.
- Entry for parkade off 22nd Street, western setback “forested” to screen from neighbouring building and to increase space for public realm.
- Public and living spaces proposed on south; bedrooms and private spaces located on north side of building to maximize use of light.
- “3-bar” design created towards Bellevue Avenue to provide more articulation to building. “Bars” pulled apart to create corridors to allow light to come through.
- Massing lifted off ground to deliver a covered walkway in order to develop public realm, views and access to south of building.
- Elevations & Design:
 - Main floor: entrance off Bellevue Avenue, common washroom, and bike storage to encourage alternative transportation.
 - West elevation: core wall broken into transparent screen, exterior stair and core wall to create a light shadow.
 - North elevation: expression of “3-bars”; limited to number of windows that can be placed on north facade so chose tall vertical windows that would contribute to ventilation strategy.
 - South elevation: delivers highest potential for solar heating; maximized glazing, and decks to provide access to views. Parkade screening ties into screening used on exterior stair.

- Placement of windows designed to allow for natural ventilation and solar heating throughout building. Individual HRV units will be incorporated to allow for more onsite generation.
- Primary materials: zinc in graphite, patina color to enhance richness of green in natural surroundings; terra cotta to add warmth; wood on exterior columns, soffit, entry and decks to express mass-timber building; salt stone used on cladding to tie into pavers and to create a direct link to the landscaping; and metal will provide a contrast at each level to transition to deck structures.

Paul Sangha (Landscape Architect) provided a presentation including:

- Overview of key aspects of landscaping implemented including connecting elements of foreshore and native species.
- Blend of hardscape and softscapes.
- A large section in the corner of lot will be reserved to create an inviting and welcoming space for public use.
- Seating area along sidewalk/seawall will be created from reclaimed materials to connect with aspects of foreshore environment.
- Native species grasses will be used to enhance biodiversity.
- Access to main lobby from Bellevue Avenue by way of a sinuous path surrounded by trees and granite boulders placed within common areas.
- Rear of lot will contain garden for residents of the building.
- Planting and tree species will consist of a mix of deciduous and evergreen including Maple and Cypress. Planting will replicate that of broader landscape.
- Landscaping will increase permeability, catch rainwater to be used for irrigation, increase canopy coverage by approximately four times, and increase plant biomass by approximately six to seven times.
- Displayed images showcasing spatial qualities of landscaping in the area. Building is almost diminished in scale due to coverage of trees to create feeling one is not in an urban setting.
- Overall objectives of design: primary public path to sea-walk connection; strong sense of integration of building into the landscaping; view from the south showcases wood materials; north elevations elegantly designed to enhance neighbourhood; and incorporation of landscaping within public realm will create sense that building is situated within a vibrant, setting.

Committee Questions:

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

- Clarify the cladding that makes up the exterior stair element and what the verticals are made of? *It is a terracotta product. It consists of a tube like material with a steel structure behind it.*

- What is involved in protecting the large tree on the property during construction? *Arborists will be involved in working with us and will direct on how to protect the tree.*
- How much of ground level amenity space is under the roof cover? *The entry area is covered and there is covered walkway area along the east and south sides of the building.*
- At the corner of 22nd and Bellevue, is that all to be a granular surface or is it a hardscape? *This is primarily a granular surfacing material; intent was to create as much permeable surface as possible and to get the feel of the beach at the corner.*
- What stage are the re-development plans for the Villa Maris and Shoreline Buildings neighbouring this lot? There were pre-application plans for redevelopment shown last summer (2020). *This site, along with the Villa Maris and Shoreline properties, are within Ambleside Area which is slated for the Local Area Plan (LAP). As far as projects for rezoning, there is a policy to determine if they can proceed prior to the completion of a LAP. Council determined the preliminary proposal for Shoreline would not proceed at this time. Council decided that the 2204 Bellevue/177 22nd Street proposal would proceed.*
- When this plan went to council in June it was to go to public consultation. What was the public's response and was the application changed to address the responses? *Applicant provided public consultation summary; most concerns identified were about the potential for view impact.*
- Were low-rise apartment forms considered in the planning of this lot and have you compared a low-rise design with the present design? *Yes, it was considered; however wanted to look at onsite energy generation and maximizing onsite energy generation which was best done through the use of a higher building form which allowed for the use of rooftop PV panels; also provided more area on the ground for planting including trees.*
- Proposed tower separation is well below guideline of Vancouver. Does West Vancouver have a minimum tower separation guideline, or guidelines for setbacks from the interior property lines? *No DWV does not have specific tower separation limits/guidelines; reviewed on case-by-case basis; the specific design has been considered based on the size of the site and the orientation of the adjacent Villa Maris development.*
- A portion of the exterior stairwell has been excluded from FAR of the building by the creating exterior steps. Is there an interpretation that would exclude a stairwell from being included in the FAR? *Detailed zoning review has not been completed yet. However, interpretation of the zoning bylaw would be site specific, and there would be a site specific zone created for the development.*
- Has a second elevator been considered to allow for accessibility in case the one elevator fails or is in use? *Has not been considered yet but can be looked into.*
- Are you committing to the highest level of certification and on-going monitoring required for Passive House certification? *Yes, we have committed to highest level of Passive House certification; strata to determine continuation with required monitoring to maintain the certification.*

- How will approach to parking and bike parking be dealt with? *Vehicle and bike parking is proposed on Level 1; proposal of two stalls per suite with support from public.*
- Visitor parking? *Yes, two stalls.*
- The proposed colour of the building in context with the character, colour and expression of buildings in the area seems to create a foreboding presence. Can you comment on this? *Think the natural materials used and dark colors respond well to the vegetated setting and natural landscape of the area.*
- Does the granular material used in the pocket garden at the intersection allow for accessibility? *Yes, there will be a road base beneath a fine granular surface so it will not track and can be accessible to wheel chairs/pedestrian traffic.*
- Will there be a binding agent used or will the material only be compacted? *Intent is to not use a binding component due to chemicals involved. The type of material used will prevent tracking (example: crushed basalt vs peat gravel).*
- What size is the outdoor private amenity and how will be primarily used? *Size is 22 ft. x 20 ft. Will be used as a covered area and sitting space that is vegetated.*
- Does the District have any guidance on livability or daylight angle that would help respond to the proximity issue of building separation (specific to the tower separation areas proposed)? *DWV does not have same horizontal angle of daylight requirements as Vancouver. There are guidelines in the Ambleside Apartment Development Permit Area that speak to these aspects in general way but not specifically.*
- Is the open stair area designed to be solely an exit? *Yes. The stairs could also serve as an entrance. Cover for weather protection.*
- The parkade seems to be steep in grade drop. Has grading been thoroughly addressed? *Yes. Grading to parkade is at maximum allowable slope.*
- Did you consider scissor stairs? *Yes. Proposed stair chosen to encourage people to use stairs instead of elevator and believed this option to be best suited to achieve this goal.*
- Has there been any geotechnical work done on this site in association with this proposed plan? *Yes. An initial geotechnical report has been provided.*
- Are there any concerns from neighbours/owners nearby regarding shadows that would be created by separation bars? *Not to neighbours to the south but have had conversations with owners of The Villa Maris. Conducted solar studies to show impact of proposed building in relation to the sun. Results showed that due to the differing angle of the two buildings there would be minimal impact of shadowing.*
- Has the use of zinc been commonly used in West Coast environments? *Cannot respond to West Coast as a whole, but zinc is a material we use commonly. Chose a patina product to improve durability and performance.*
- Was there a limit to the building height given the proposal is for only seven stories? *Could go up to 12 stories but height dictates allowable parkade space and only wanted one level for parkade.*
- How will pad-mounted transformer appear amongst landscaping setting? *Will be screened by taller bushes and vegetation.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Impressed with structure that you are proposing on such a small lot. Comprehensive proposal; like the high quality materials and sustainability objectives. Only concern pertains to exit stair which could be handled in a more discrete way. Perhaps tucking stairs in so as not to broadside neighbours to the west.
- Strong concept, like the implementation of elements of beach, good contribution to public realm. Concern in regard to the state of the existing tree and its declining health, this tree will require monitoring during construction.
- Lovely project and commend the design team for aspirations toward sustainability. Appreciate layby of the landscape area as there is a lot of recreation in this area. Like the stairway and how will encourage people to use stairs over elevator.
- Sophisticated and elegant design. My sense is that the neighbourhood is a very attractive pedestrian-friendly streetscape. Concern towards view loss due to the impact of a high-rise on this site, think low-rise should be considered to keep in context of neighbourhood. Site well served by transit so surprised by the number of parking spaces proposed per unit given vehicle impact of greenhouse gases.
- Building does not relate well in form or expression given views will be lost. Corner park area is a good idea but should be secured for public use. Welcome idea of public art space and suggest confirming a budget and meeting with Public Art Advisory Committee (PAAC).
- Corner court is 'welcoming mat' to the property; suggest consideration of concrete, or pushing back of granular material within property line. Outdoor amenity space seems to be undercover, suggest expanding landscape above parkade space through terracing. Overall great concepts.
- Like the choice of materials, expression of the building and sustainability concepts. Concerned about large tree and ensuring its survival, working with arborist is important and highly recommended. Transformer needs to be handled properly in terms of screening. Overall I support project.
- Colour of building is drab in relation to the colorful neighbourhood. Overall I like the concepts proposed and am supportive of this project.

Having reviewed the application and heard the presentation provided by The Applicants:

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee SUPPORT the application subject to further review of the following items by Staff:

- Consider stairway adjustments to lessen the impact to the adjacent building (The Villa Maris)

- Ensure measures are taken to protect existing Hemlock Tree so that is protected during construction
- Develop appropriate screening of transformer from Public view
- Existing path sidewalk connection; consideration of material used and transition from public space onto the property to obscure the property line boundary
- Secure the corner park space for future Public use

**POLL VOTE CALLED FOR THE VOTE
IN FAVOUR = 8
AGAINST = 1**

CARRIED

5.2 2346 Haywood Avenue – Infill Duplex

Background: Erik Wilhelm (Senior Community Planner) introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site contact, including:

- Subject property located just east of Dundarave Village, area comprised of RS5-zoned single family dwellings located to the east and west, provides neighbourhood context.
- Presently developed with small SFD that was built in 1951. In neighbourhood, houses range in date between 1924 and 2012.
- Existing zoning would permit: max FAR of 0.25; 2,900 sq. ft. dwelling, plus basement.
- Proposal for two-storey duplex with shared access from Haywood Avenue with FAR of 0.50 providing a total of 6,635 sq. ft. including basement.
- Architecture includes the use of cornices of different elevations, wrought-iron second storey railings, arches and stucco siding; only one parking garage proposed for each duplex, which meets minimum bylaw parking requirements.
- Perimeter landscaping, concrete pavers in driveway, and rear grassed area for each unit. 10 ft. setback on east property line to allow for designated right-of-way for storm line that the District requires access to.
- Requires an amendment to the Official Community Plan (OCP) to include the site within the Duplex Development Permit Area (DPA). Requires rezoning and development permit approval from Council.

Project Presentation: M. Thompson (Designer) provided a presentation, including:

- Provided background on proposal. During planning phase met with six residents who were interested in the same type of living options; identified that this type of dwelling is appealing as families want to find more affordable options for residing in West Vancouver.
- This proposal meets need identified in West Vancouver for greater densification.
- Other duplexes are being constructed in neighbourhood on Marine Drive.

- Engineering requirements for accessing the right-of-way challenging, building area has been reduced and has also impacted landscaping potential. Initial design was planned for 5 ft. setbacks; setbacks are now at 10 ft. on both sides of duplex.
- Provided overview of other projects in area: neighbour looking to build home with suite on ground level; roof top deck incorporated into design; neighbours to the west have indicated interest in developing a duplex.
- Landscaping: trees in front incorporated to mitigate the relationship of the adjoining buildings. Will provide screening to house and soften building appearance.
- Materials suggest values of owner not necessarily of modern style common to West Vancouver and surrounding neighbourhood.

Committee Questions:

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

- In terms of livability and light, has there been tweaking to OCP to allow for more glazing in low grade units? *Lot slopes from street gently to rear yard (elevation slope of 73 ft. – 65 ft.). In order to keep basement exempt, cannot be more than 3 ft. out of the ground. Windows cannot be placed on right-of-way side. These factors pose challenges. Neighbourhood Character Working Group provided recommendations which will go to council in late spring – has yet to be determined. These recommendations could affect increased light allowance.*
- Do you have an exit from the basement or are you planning on providing one? *Yes, the basement exit is the well at the rear.*
- There is a significant amount of paving to exterior front yard. Wondering if the landscaping is reflective of that throughout the neighbourhood? *Driveway and landscaping have been restricted due to requirements of zoning bylaw. Ideally would have liked to have two separated driveways to create perception of less concrete and a sense of ownership between two units.*
- How is this project contributing towards existing, coherent landscape and streetscape? *Applicant discusses proposed duplex in relationship to other homes in neighbourhood.*
- Part of this type of zoning is to fill the need for the “missing middle” scale homes. This is obviously a luxury home. *The OCP is general in terms of the guidelines it provides on middle-scale homes. The intent is to encourage more affordable options but this is done in a sensitive way.*
- Will the suites ever be registered as legal secondary suites? *As proposed one unit would have secondary suite legally while the other would not.*
- What consideration has there been to the entrance space and making it feel/look like an entry way? *The entry on the side has a recessed door to give semblance of a formal entry. The initial plan was to have a wider building which would accommodate a larger entry but unfortunately this was lost.*

- Did you consider native or regional species to be incorporated in landscaping so that this property would tie into the existing neighbourhood and local area? *The concept of landscaping chosen is to have low maintenance, mature trees and incorporate colour throughout the year that will contrast with the green of the area. We are not, however, opposed too incorporating native species.*
- Is the property required to have a single, shared driveway? *Yes.*
- Are there plans for extending the Duplex DPA and amending the OCP map, or is the objective to amend infill area in the neighbourhood? *This hasn't been decided on by Council. Recognizing directions of OCP and the site location.*
- Would there be a covenant for boulevard parking included in this plan given that the proposal is for four dwelling units, no lane access, and only two parking spaces? *Informal parking spaces could be allotted by the District but they could be used by anyone on street. As per Bylaw, only one parking stall on the boulevard can be allotted per duplex unit. Newer houses have similar parking in front boulevard (not covenanted).*
- What are existing duplexes typical Floor Area Ratios? *RD1, FAR 0.5.*

Committee Comments:

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

- In terms of scale and design this project does a good enough job to fit in with the overall neighbourhood not withstanding architecture and character. If possible, I would suggest that the applicant wait for Council to provide further direction on use of secondary suite.
- Imagine with entry proposed on the side of the building, it would be difficult to park an additional vehicle and still be able to access the entry.
- This project does not connect to the overall neighbourhood and plans for development on the street. Landscaping will not protect the screening of the front of building. Expression alone is nice.
- Defining an entry to the property could enhance the appearance and provide better screening of the front yard.
- Appreciate attention to detail in the design; I think this style is quite bold as it is not West Coast modern. Think design has been done well.
- Raising the building up would be a good way of providing more light; the intent to make the patio space for the suite as an undercut has been treated in best possible way given zoning requirements.
- Concerned about the scale of the driveway and the ability for pedestrians to use the sidewalk if parking were to be allotted to this duplex.
- Project does not fit within the guidelines of the OCP. The design is boxy and does not match the direction of the neighbourhood. I think that there needs to be clear guidelines that provide direction to keep in line with overall goals.
- A side door is not an acceptable option; front entry way must be visible to pedestrians.
- Given that this is going for rezoning and may be a precedent for development in the area, it seems this project is underwhelming and does not respond to the

street form or what potential could be achieved; approach is not as strong as it could potentially be.

- While developers are entitled to choice, within a duplex zone there needs to be integration into the area. This project fails to connect with the character of the area. Did not show how design fits in with character, zoning, or new bylaws.

RESUBMISSION

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

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee require RESUBMISSION of the application to address the following concerns:

- Basement dwelling units need more thought towards accessing natural light;
- Introduce native species to the plant palette and use plantings to integrate the building within the existing neighbourhood character;
- Architectural improvements to provide enhanced pedestrian realm in front and more identifiable front doors; and
- Align scale and massing with guidelines for the duplex development permit areas.

CARRIED

6. OTHER ITEMS

No items.

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions.

8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for **April 15, 2021**

9. ADJOURNMENT


It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the March 11, 2021, Design Review Committee Meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

Certified Correct:


Don Harrison (Apr 15, 2021 18:14 PDT)

Chair


Lisa Berg (Apr 16, 2021 08:15 PDT)

Staff Liaison