

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
MUNICIPAL HALL ORCA ROOM
THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 2021**

Committee Members: D. Harrison (Chair), R. Amenyogbe, R. Ellaway, E. Fiss, J. Mahoney, H. Nesbitt; and Councillor P. Lambur attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

Absent: A. Matis, J. McDougall, B. Phillips, and M. Wong.

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

Presenters: F. Adab, R. Maruyama, M. Mortensen, M. Trudeau, R. Noghrekar, and P. Poostchi attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

It was Moved and Seconded:

WHEREAS the 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and Events (“order”) prohibits members of the public from attending committee meetings in-person until the order is rescinded or replaced;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 June 17, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting be held without in-person public attendance.

CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the June 17, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the April 15, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

4. INTRODUCTION

The Chair outlined the meeting procedure and agenda.

5. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

5.1 2905 Marine Drive – 8 Unit Townhouse Development

Background: E. Wilhelm, Senior Community Planner introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context: including the location, size and surrounding developments. The proposal includes one 3-storey building that houses 8 units with multiple street entrances to respond to neighbourhood context. Parking is provided in an underground parkade, accessed from 29th Street, with 10 stalls (8 dedicated stalls and 2 visitor stalls). Extensive perimeter landscaping; proposal is to retain large cedar tree on the west side of the site. Described the applicable Official Community Plan policies that guide the redevelopment of the site.

Project Presentation: M. Mortensen provided a presentation, including:

- An overview of role in the project; assisted applicant team with public involvement and have been working with community through open-houses, discussion with neighbours, email correspondence with public.
- Identified key interests of public:
 - Increasing the level of accessibility of units; stair free access; common area elevator
 - Privacy between units and neighbours
 - Tree retention
 - Introducing sidewalk and pedestrian crossing for pedestrian safety
 - Incorporating bike stalls and plug-ins for electric bikes
 - Addressing geothermal and solar energy options; will meet or exceed Step Code 3 requirements
 - Negotiated 10 parking stalls with church next door.
- Goal of fitting multi-family form into the volume of a single family form.

Project Presentation: F. Adab provided a presentation, including:

- Displayed context area plan, floor plans and unit-orientations, and unit pattern of entries.
- Second floor designed with large balconies and windows to allow for cross ventilation and the third floor incorporates deck space and a green roof.
- Total building area is approximately 30,000 sq. ft.; combination of 3 and 4 bedrooms and lock-off area.
- Underground parking area with visitor parking and 10 stalls for tenants; entry from 29th Street; bike storage and mechanical room; elevator provides access to underground parking.
- Intention of design: to create a building in harmony with surrounding area by designing a multi-family building that resembles a single family house.
- Design incorporates use of local material, detailing and traditional design for West Vancouver; natural wood and stone creates natural look; material color pallet create soft effect through use of dark and light shades.

- Displayed interface analysis of neighbourhood; attempting to not impact existing views.
- Believe that the design has achieved a sustainable building status; high performance lighting; building envelope in compliance with British Columbia Building Code 950.10; affordable units; natural lighting; all homes have efficient Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning Systems and Heat Recovery Ventilators.

Project Presentation: R. Maruyama provided a presentation, including:

- Displayed landscaping slide showing exterior on the offsite; alignment on 29th Street and Marine Drive with sidewalk street-corner connections; boulevard with lawn/trees.
- Landscaping offsite consists of supportive terraces.
- Access from street to entrances and back patios created with use of 2 x 2 herringbone unit pavers will be used in rear and along side walk-ways.
- In rear, patios will be made with an Epay Wood 2 x 2 floating system and geo-tech fabric recommended by an Arborist to protect the existing tree root system.
- Comments have been made concerning the connector walk-way to patios should be differentiated so perhaps another color paver will be used here.
- A sitting area has been incorporated in the designated amenity space.
- Proposal attempts to establish a non-aggressive approach around the tree; perhaps will use bark mulch to make it appear woody.
- Existing trees around north edge will be retained.
- Comment was posed about reinstating shrubs into landscape; challenging to do this given that they would have to be stored off-site during construction; this has been tried in many cases and has been successful but is dependant on developer maintaining plants during this stage.

Committee Questions:

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

- The Committee has not been asked to provide feedback on density (Floor Area Ratio and 3-storeys). Is density considered non-controversial given it has not been commented on? *Focus of review is on design and context, which relate to density.*
- This development has been classified as a townhouse, as opposed to a cluster house. Is this because of the ground-level entrances? *“Townhouse” is used as entrances are from grade-level; apartments would have to have shared corridor; it is the terminology used for this proposal.*
- Noted you are using interchangeably 'adaptable' and 'accessible' and I am wondering what the difference is and what kind of commitment you are making in using these terms? *Adaptable is correct term.*
- What is the intent of the pathway that runs along the west side along the fence? *Allows for access from the north and an entrance to the courtyard and sitting area; provides a quiet space.*

- Is the path material differentiated from the material surrounding the tree? *Yes, wanted to use a different granular material such as bark mulch around tree; brushed stone on walkway could be used.*
- Did you consider planting adjacent to the fence? *There is a fence there and a rock wall; can become invasive to the root system when you try to plant around tree so the easiest option was to place granular landscape material in this location.*
- Will the fence have an enhanced treatment? *Yes.*
- The item in the key that is identified as # 1, is that entire area intended to be lawn? *Yes, it is municipal boulevard along 29th Street and is usually grass.*
- Concerning renewable energy options and Step Code 3 requirements, will you chose to stick with the requirements of Step Code 3 rather than combining these? *Yes, I was referring to building envelope.*
- Why has the transformer been installed above ground where it is visible rather than underground? *Transformer came late in plan; if not acceptable Planning has advised that it could be placed underground.*
- Believe as per Building Code requirements, the space between the electrical room and exterior has to be protected against the elements. Could you consider using a material that would be suited to the exterior elements in this area? *Yes.*
- Would you consider having solar panels on the roof-top? *Yes.*
- Suggest that the ramp coming down from the street to parkade may need to be considered as it must be a 6 – 8% slope (presently indicated as approximately 5% slope). *Yes however, the present slope works well and do not want to raise the ground floor.*
- What is the intention with heavy utility cables that run north-south on 29th Street? *Our electrical consultant reviewed the situation of the transformers; the cables will be removed from the street to the building however we have not reviewed the cables along 29th Street. Requires discussion.*
- Will the sidewalk extend north on 29th Street and west on Marine Drive as presently there are no sidewalks now? *Yes, this has been proposed; as currently planned the sidewalks will abruptly stop after the development site on the west side of the boulevard.*
- How close is the excavation to the large Cedar on the west side? *The parking plan shows the protection zone of the root system indicated by a red line. This plan is the response to the protection of the tree during excavation and has ben reviewed by an Arborist.*
- Will the height of the building be addressed in the future, and if so how? *The diagram of the north elevation shows the neighbouring pitched roof in line with the roof of this proposal; attempted to keep with existing single-family character.*
- 8 units seems a lot for this site. Did you consider a smaller unit number for this building, example: 5 or 6 units? *Floor Space Ratio and setbacks were parameters for the design. Attempting to be affordable and compliant with Official Community Plan.*
- Are there any rare trees being lost on site during excavation (example: Arbutus)? *There will be some trees lost along 29th Street but most will be kept*

including non-mature trees. Believe most trees are traditional broad-leaf evergreen trees. Biggest challenge is preservation during construction.

Committee Comments:

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

- Support this application for the density, height and landscape design.
- Would like to confirm that the door openings will be accessible.
- Suggest exploration of the roof forms; the mansard roof appears clumsy and does not complement the building.
- If the pad-mounted transformer cannot be located underground, perhaps public art and screening could be added around it to screen it.
- Overall the design, height and massing are fine; concerns about the adaptability meeting requirements to make the units accessible by means of the doors, and patio entrances; disappointed that you have to go outside to access the elevators however, I understand the challenges.
- In terms of keeping inline with Altamont guidelines and the state-like character, this building seems busy; appears there are too many colors, types of materials, and roof lines; suggest to simplify.
- Support this proposal. On Marine Drive and 29th Street frontages I counted about 20 trees and 3 species, would be interesting to consider increasing the diversity of the species for visual impact and survival issues.
- Consider an enhanced treatment for the fence along west edge.
- Consider public art and screening around the pad-mounted transformer should it not be buried.
- Good design overall. The units will need to have a way of being addressed/identified. *The District will respond to addressing during the building permit phase.*
- Design is improvement to what is existing presently; proposal shows an attractive building. Would like to see utility cables buried; as far as height, I would suggest leaving to the District and community. Support the application.
- Agree with a lot of the above comments made; I think it is a bit fortress-like so softening the appearance is recommended.
- Think the large trees will be difficult to maintain over the course of construction causing stress on trees. Consulting with an arborist and following maintenance is crucial to tree preservation.

SUPPORT

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

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee support the application subject to the following considerations by staff:

- Make sure adaptability on north side ground floor units meet or exceed the British Columbia Building Code 2018 requirements.
- Explore different treatments of the roof elements to simplify the overall appearance of the facade.

- Consider incorporating public art to help conceal the transformer located on Marine Drive, if it is not located underground.
- Consult with Arborist to plan for preserving large trees during construction phase.
- Increase diversity of tree species planted along Marine Drive and 29th Street frontages.
- The fence on western edge should be enhanced to ensure its visual appeal.
- Encourage that the utility cables on 29th Street are buried.
- Consider simplifying the overall material pallet used.

CARRIED

**POLL VOTE CALLED FOR THE VOTE
ALL IN FAVOUR = 6**

6. OTHER ITEMS

E. Fiss requested discussion of submission requirements at the next meeting.

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

8. NEXT MEETING

Staff confirmed that the next Design Review Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 15, 2021.

9. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the June 17, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Don Harrison

Don Harrison (Aug 4, 2021 13:32 PDT)

Chair

Lisa Berg

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

Staff Liaison