

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
MUNICIPAL HALL RAVEN ROOM
THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 2021**

Committee Members: R. Amenyogbe, R. Ellaway, E. Fiss, D. Harrison, J. Mahoney, H. Nesbitt, and B. Phillips attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities. Absent: A. Matis, J. McDougall; and Councillors P. Lambur and M. Wong.

Staff: L. Berg, Senior Community Planner; E. Wilhelm, Senior Community Planner; and N. Allard, Recording Clerk, attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

Presenters: C. Burgers, Architect; and R. Brown, Architect, attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:35 p.m.

It was Moved and Seconded:

WHEREAS the March 24, 2021 Order of the Provincial Health Officer on Gatherings and Events (“order”) prohibits members of the public from attending committee meetings in-person until the order is rescinded or replaced;

WHEREAS the District of West Vancouver is required to prohibit in-person attendance at committee meetings pursuant to the order; and

WHEREAS the District of West Vancouver has enabled public participation at committee meetings via electronic means to ensure openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability, including via the use of live streaming (video and audio) for public viewing, and electronic communication facilities (video-conferencing software) for public participation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the April 15, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting be held without in-person public attendance.

CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the April 15, 2021, Design Review Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the March 11, 2021, Design Review Committee meeting minutes be adopted as amended.

CARRIED

4. INTRODUCTION

The Chair outlined the meeting procedure and agenda.

5. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

5.1 2833 Chippendale Road – 12 unit townhouse development

Background: E. Wilhelm, Senior Community Planner introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context, including:

- Described proposed site location and area and provided the background of the Rodger's Creek Development and overall access. Noted the site is currently vacant and sloped approximately 45 ft. downward from highest point in a north to south direction. Surrounding development context is a four unit townhouse development to the east and single family on all other sides.
- The proposal is for a three storey, 12 unit townhouse arranged in three primary buildings with two driveway entrances to a covered parkade area. There are street-side front door entrances for six of the units, ample peripheral landscaping, contemporary architecture, FAR 0.06; two parking spaces per unit and two visitor parking stalls.
- New development within this area of Rodger's Creek to comply with guidelines of Development Permit Area UL 8.1.

Project Presentation: R. Brown and C. Burgers, Architects, provided a presentation, including:

- Provided overall site context, soil conditions, and visual of the three-storey development to the east.
- Inspiration from hillside sloping garden-scape and contemporary form.
- Presented early sketches showing roof-scape garden; showed conceptual image of building.
- Current zoning allows for three duplexes (a total of six units) with FAR potential for 3,000 sq. ft. per unit; given the need for higher density/smaller units, the applicant proposed a terraced housing complex to suite this concept.
- There are three buildings and within those buildings there are two levels above the parkade; each level has two units for a total of 12; each unit has three bedrooms; units are approx. 1,500 sq. ft.
- Deep units with wide terraces set to allow for views and sunlight; creates a stepping effect so all sides of building would have views.
- Cross-sections display how sunlight comes down through units on all sides.

- Displayed model views:
 - View of building set into hillside.
 - Street view shows park-like setting in front entry and housing setback from street.
 - Birds-eye view shows front porch vibe; demonstrates how building compares to neighbouring houses.
 - View from above (north/uphill aspect).
 - Elevations and sections showing steps into hill.
- Materials chosen: cedar siding (there is potential to use stucco), galvanized aluminum windows, exposed concrete; high performance glazing and paver-stones for outdoor terraces.
- Each unit has two parking spots, bike storage, and a mechanical room underneath stairs; shared garbage and recycling area.
- Inclusion of elevators to access Level 2; ramp for Level 1; stairs also lead from rear to upper levels.
- Showed layout of units: Level 1 & 2 units are mirrored.
- Provided overview of landscaping: seating area in front; rear private gardens for Level 2 units; landscaped walkway and stair access on both sides for Level 2 units.
- Front cavities in boulevard and front yards have been placed to allow for gathering rainwater and decreasing pressure on storm water system. Bridges incorporated in the design to allow for resident interest and water flow within concept.

Committee Questions:

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

- What occupies the spaces located behind the parking stalls that are identified on the site plan as white squares? *That is the Level 1 crawl space.*
- In the unit at grid line E-F, the bedroom shows to have a small window. How do you feel space will feel due to the small window? *Would be nicer to have wider windows but there are clerestory windows as well along side which allow plenty of light; the windows referred to are small to allow for privacy.*
- The proposed plans do not appear to include accessibility for wheelchairs; is there adaptability in incorporating accessibility measures into this proposal? *Will have to be further looked into; believe there will be adaptable elements incorporated in the design but not certain to what extent.*
- Does the storm water system also take run-off water from the roof or does it just manage the landscape storm water? *It manages all of the storm water on the site, including the roof, terraces, and hard-surface run-off.*
- Are there other sustainability elements around passive strategies (HVAC as example) that have been considered? *Achieving Step Code 5 and requirements are quite rigorous; aim to go beyond these requirements in terms of sustainable strategies.*

- At the southwest units there are some hydro chambers. Are these projecting above the ground? *Yes, those are hydro kiosks that have to be above ground and on the edge of the street. We will try to mask as best we can.*
- The land rises quite abruptly to west of site; will this impinge on views and suitability to the end unit? *Slope stays consistent as it progresses west. There is a steep embankment further west however, it should not impede the west facing units' views.*
- This proposal slightly exceeds the unit cap within the zoning bylaw. What is the percentage that it is exceeded for the overall area? *Zoning CB3 has a unit cap within this zone. Zoning amendments would need to increase to allow for six more units; rezoning to match the proposal.*
- How are you responding to having a distinct identity and visible unit entrance numbers with the surrounding trees and landscaping that are being proposed? *In the middle area, the pathways to the front doors are offset from the front entrances to create a more private entry; this area could allow for seating to be placed in the front, especially on the south side we favoured livability over directly visible entrances; entrances are still visible but landscaping can now be usable and will enhance the residents space.*
- The site is steep (45%) and there are a number of steps; would you consider having benches in the middle area, or a rest spot incorporated for seating? *That will be considered, thank you.*
- The top/back units that have elevators at the garage level. Is it possible to consider incorporating a private stairway leaving from garage in case elevator fails that would serve both units? *We will explore this however, grid-line 2 is at the setback and we would like to avoid any variances.*
- Is it possible to have blocked glass lights in the washroom to allow for more light in this area? *An additional skylight in bathroom maybe better suited to allow more light without having fireproofing or code issues.*
- Did you investigate what you need to do to bring you to Step Code 5? *We are working with an Energy Advisor on this; there are opportunities to make this building better than Step 5 at minimal costs; required to meet Step Code 5 for the building permit.*
- On the contour plan it appears there is a small creek on the west side. Do you know if there is a water way here? *There are no watercourses on this property. Perhaps it is a ditch put in for drainage on site.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Like the project; think that attention to design detail and layout are well thought out; placement of overhangs and landscaping will create a nice environment for residents; supportive of the project.
- Skillfully addressed slope context; project will connect well with the single family dwelling development across from Chippendale; think it was inventive to do a stacked building; materials are elegantly used and I appreciate the use of concrete at the building base; enthusiastically support this proposal and the variances and rezoning amendments.

- In reality, entering will be done through the parking level. Hope you will have identifiable entrances through the rear as I think people will be using these due to the proximity of the parkade; will have to ensure sufficient lighting throughout units.
- Suggest skylights to be used in inner spaces on the upper level.
- Think project is thoughtful; like the material pallet and masses; makes sense to put more units on site and they appear modest; prefer cedar rather than stucco; some way of incorporating adaptable features should be a part of this proposal.
- In terms of landscaping, there could be more substantive planting such as trees as the area has been stripped down; overall this is a lovely project. *Limited in planting trees due to height restrictions.*
- Proposal provides a good response to challenging site conditions; plant selections and material choices will anchor project into its context. Support this proposal.
- Adjacent to the lot is a lookout point; view will be equally spectacular from these units; terrific proposal.
- Good project with nice views; only thing to consider in landscaping: concrete in garage could be textured or covered with vines to screen.
- Support project and think it is attractive; like use of front gardens which have neighbourhood feel that is lacking up the hill in other developments; I would like to see you take advantage of solar aspects within the design.

SUPPORT

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

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee SUPPORT the application subject to further review of the following items with staff:

- Entries to the upper units and from the parking level need to be well identified.
- Entry levels to the upper levels from the outside need to be emphasized.
- Use of glass blocks or skylights to increase light entry to the rear part of the units.
- Attention to making adaptable features on the upper units for a variety of mobility impairments.
- More attention to the planting on the east and west boundaries to anchor the site to its context and support habitat creation.
- Consider texturing the concrete facing the street on the parking level; or planting with vines to soften the mass of the concrete wall.
- Consider having a resting spot along the exterior stairs on the east and west sides.
- Provide bollard exterior lighting in the rest area spots.

CARRIED

**POLL VOTE CALLED FOR THE VOTE
ALL IN FAVOUR = 7**

6. OTHER ITEMS

There were no reports/items.

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for May 20, 2021.

9. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the April 15, 2021, Design Review Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm

Certified Correct:

Don Harrison
Don Harrison (Aug 4, 2021 13:31 PDT)

Chair

Lisa Berg
Lisa Berg (Aug 4, 2021 13:33 PDT)

Staff Liaison