

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
RAVEN ROOM
(Via electronic communications facilities)
THURSDAY, JULY 15, 2021

Committee Members: D. Harrison (Chair), R. Amenyogbe, R. Ellaway, E. Fiss, J. Mahoney, H. Nesbitt, 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; and N. Allard, Committee Clerk, 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 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and Events (“order”) prohibits members of the public from attending committee meetings in-person until the order is rescinded or replaced;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 July 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 July 15, 2021 Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the June 17, 2021 Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

4. INTRODUCTION

The Chair outlined the meeting procedure and agenda.

5. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

5.1 5665 Westport Road – 9 Unit Duplex & Triplex Development

Background: L. Berg, Senior Community Planner introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context:

- Context Map displayed overview of subject site on Westport Road; access off of Marine Drive that carried through to the highway.
- BC Hydro Right of Way bisects the site.
- Eagle Creek runs through lower corner of property.
- Proposal is for a 9 – unit development: three duplex buildings and one triplex building all in 3-storey formats.
- Common driveway access leading from Westport Road to 17 parking spaces within private parking garages for each of the units.
- 4 surface visitor parking spaces distributed around site.
- 4 lock-off units (self contained suites) that could be used for caregivers, family or rental purposes.
- 3 questions looking for direction on from Committee Members:
 - Does proposal respond to neighbourhood context in terms of architecture, site planning and materiality?
 - Does the proposed landscaping and tree retention plan integrate well with the surrounding site conditions and the public realm?
 - Are the grade differences adequately dealt with between the buildings and remainder of the property; and is there adequate buffering and screening in place?

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

- Greg Nielsen is client and well known Developer in West Vancouver. This is his first multi-family development proposal. Objective is to design building in line with Official Community Plan Guidelines.
- Subject site is complicated with many restraints: BC Hydro Right of Way runs diagonally through property, creek runs perpendicular to the Right of Way, many trees, and steep sloping site pose limitations as to what can be developed.
- No other surrounding properties that would be affected by this proposal which poses a unique opportunity.
- Site is close to bus stops.
- In terms of Official Community Plan policies, this is an ideal site that is believed to have no adverse effect on neighbouring houses.
- Have met with the Horseshoe Bay Business Association to get input; there is a need for affordable housing in the area; as a result of this meeting, rental units in the form of lock-off suites have been added to this proposal.
- Displayed overview of proposal: 9 units; designed to create a sense of communal living in form of gathering area and cluster townhomes; amazing views.

- Fire truck access is a challenge in terms of the roadway & grading restraints that will need to be worked out.
- Displayed elevations of buildings; attempt to blend architecture into existing site; west coast vernacular style with butterfly wings has been chosen and style is conducive to surrounding natural area; introduced as many natural building materials as possible.
- Applicant will try to reduce massing where possible.
- Ramp off of Westport Road introduces driveway to the existing grade.
- Double car garages with lock-off garages at grade access to the South.
- Visitor and disabled parking incorporated on site.
- Duplex in corner is situated on the only developable portion of site.
- Retaining wall displayed in plan will be covered in greenery.
- Design has respected streetscape and trees; will be peek-a-boo views from duplex cluster; ensuring Westport streetscape remains more or less unchanged is an objective; development sheltered behind trees.

Project Presentation: J. Corlett (Landscape Architect) provided a presentation, including:

- Displayed site plan showing overview of landscaping on site.
- Intent to reduce impact to the already existing vegetation, including trees on site. Protection plan for existing trees during construction phase will be introduced.
- Native shrubs and trees ranging in height will be incorporated to add diversity.
- Taller tree species will be planted at bottom of retaining wall to provide screening. These trees will be planted in pots as soon as possible to allow for faster growth and screening of large concrete wall.
- In terms of tree protection, the Wildfire Hazard Development Report has directed as to what types of tree species can be planted and the location of the trees. A number of Coniferous Species have been removed from plan and replaced with Deciduous at recommendation of Environmental Department, in accordance with Wildfire Hazard Development Permit Area Guidelines.
- Aesthetic planting planned to line the driveway and to the North.
- Where there are areas close to the building and due to Wildfire Hazard Development Permit Areas, we have removed vegetation and added natural boulders.

Committee Questions:

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

- How did you get to this proposal; what were the steps you took to get to this concept in terms of site options? *Site options were to do a 2-lot subdivision with 4 units; was on eve of approval and my client asked if this was the best use of site development, taking into consideration the Official Community Plan's objectives; given challenges of site mentioned, we were left with a small footprint in order to*

achieve this. Site constraints ultimately drove the proposed project. We did go through 20 other site reiterations and ended up with this plan.

- *Can you speak about the Storm Water Management on this site? There seems to be a lot of paved surface. The paved surfaces are permeable. Due to proximity of creek, onsite Storm Water Management is important; we want to recharge the ground water as much as possible; a Civil Engineer has been hired and has provided a Storm Water Management Plan; a retention tank has been incorporated into this plan.*
- *How does retaining wall treatment work and is there any terracing? Cross sections provide detail and respond to this; at walkway and amenity there is a step down; trying to screen wall with greenery. Intent is to have the wall lowered with existing topography, have green buffer; balance of how tiered wall is and how much greenery is incorporated. Have included species such as huckleberries at base of wall to provide screening by time they reach maturity.*
- *Plans show that this is an urban environment and not a green forest as was stated. Is there an opportunity to incorporate more tree growth between roadways and buildings to achieve the forest feel? One has to visit site in order to understand the forest that exists on this site. With creek, forest views and open design between buildings, I do not believe anyone would feel congested.*
- *Is there pedestrian access to creek so that it can be enjoyed by residents? Currently, there is not a developed trail. From Environmental Perspective access to setback areas are not typically allowed or encouraged by the District. This topic is worth discussion if felt it would make the site more livable. In addition to rezoning of this property, there are a handful of development permits associated with this site; as part of these Development Variance Permit's there are strict regulations as to what the District will permit.*
- *What material is roadway and would you explore the use of stamped concrete to enrich the texture of the road and to lessen the sound of tires? Permeable Asphalt is presently proposed.*
- *Do you have a dead end at Duplex 3 and if so how is the roadway fire truck accessible? Yes, there is a dead end here however, there is a 90 metre back up space to allow for a fire truck to turn around.*
- *There is a lot of white hardy panel used as a material. What is your thought process upon using this color of material and having small overhangs in a wet climate? Trying to find right balance of using natural materials and trying to brighten things up. I understand contrast used in west coast style but we have diverted from this concept so as to make it brighter in the dark forest setting. In terms of overhangs, small were chosen due to constraints of Right of Way.*
- *Will there be any blasting required at this site when you do foundation work? Yes, in particular the southern duplex cannot have a lock-off into the hill. Plan has been carefully designed so that the back of hill will be blasted as minimally as possible. Other developments have much more blasting involved in comparison. Doing everything we can do to mitigate the visual of blasting.*
- *For the lock-off units can you walk us through what you are picturing in terms of livability? This responds to affordable housing options in area brought up by Horseshoe Bay Business Owners and residents. Displayed view of unit layout including Murphy bed; indoor space created to blend into to patio area; space can be used for caregiver, in-laws, older children, rental. To be clear these are not stratified.*

- Can you speak to vision of the tops and surfaces of the retaining walls? Is this cast-in-place concrete exposed on top of the wall? *At this point they will be concrete but we will be discussing these aspects as we move forward with the plan. Suggestions made as to incorporating planters into wall design; dripping of water on wall could provide water staining/moss. What is not being seen in the plan is that these walls will be covered in greenery.*
- When it comes to tree retention in the Right of Way, it appears the trees are close to the duplex at the South. Has the arborist talked about what is involved in maintaining trees and if they can in fact, be retained? *The new Wildfire Development Permit Requirements have made tree retention challenging as they have asked for a lot of trees to be removed and trees cannot be planted next to buildings. This is a rock cliff which is not a typical scenario. When we are blasting I am confident that trees that have been slated to be retained will be.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Suggest cascading the retaining wall and exploring options for trail access to the creek.
- I think that doing something different with the driveways would be beneficial in softening the appearance of the landscaping and making it look less like a driveway.
- Concerned in regards to spatial separation between the duplex and triplex; space seems a bit tight. Suggest to increase outdoor spaces with larger patios, outdoor play areas and communal areas. Stairway poses a challenge in utilizing outdoor space due to situation.
- I think the approach to coordinating with a Civil Engineer for the Storm Water Management is important. The communal space seems tight between the buildings; would suggest creating an alternative space in Right of Way; opportunities for seating and further thought into this part of the design.
- Greater articulation at the entrances, increased definition through grading and/or use of alternate materials are suggestions to incorporate into design.
- Exploration of the use of the creek and outdoor usable spaces are suggested; overall support for this project.
- Addition of a driveway texture and a common usable outdoor space are recommended.
- Recommended that Applicant requests that the District allow a trail to the creek so that people do not trample upon the land attempting their own trail systems.
- I think that the materials blend in however, perhaps there are too many materials in the mix. Would recommend eliminating white hardy board. Otherwise I support this project.
- Westport Road is a bit of a race track; I would suggest lines of site coming out of the driveway to allow for visibility in this area.
- No elevations or perspectives of adjacent properties relative to the proposal have been shown. I am curious about the situation of other developments in the area and neighbours perspectives. *Neighbouring property to the north is setback so they would not be affected. I can guarantee you that the building to the North is situated above this proposal.*
- I agree with comments to soften areas built of concrete; generally I like the proposed common area situated amongst trees and buildings. The idea of a

trellised sitting area I would recommend incorporating into the design. The details of retaining walls should have some sort of treatment such as capping detail. I like the finishes and do not have an issue with the white color. I like simplicity and incorporation of the lock-offs. I support this project.

- Incorporation of more common space is suggested as well as a trail system down to the creek. I like the idea of the lock-offs and the size of the suites.
- Question from presenter: is there an opportunity to create an open space within Right of Way's to allow community to congregate? *According to Right of Way Agreement nothing can be constructed here but perhaps this can be explored further.*

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:

- Explore the possibility of expanding outdoor space both in the communal space as shown and different parts of the property not currently accessible.
- Explore treatment of the paving material on the driveways to soften the look and to create a graduation between the driveways and the entrance to the units.
- Consider extending canopy protection over the entrances to the units.
- Explore the line of site access in both directions onto Westport Road to minimize poor visibility for vehicles entering and leaving the property.
- Consider treatment at the top of the retaining walls to create a cap and provide an architectural element.

CARRIED

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

5.2 Lot 8, Evelyn by Onni – Multi Family Development

Background: L. Berg, Senior Community Planner introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context:

- Displayed overview of site located adjacent to Taylor Way and south of Arthur Erickson Place; Evelyn Drive to the North.
- Displayed detailed map of what has been going on at site:
 - Buildings already constructed: to north are cluster houses; multi family buildings are located to the south; to north-east are recent single family houses.
 - Active building permits are in place/or pending for: remaining 6 single family dwellings on lot (total 8 in this configuration); 4 units within townhouses slated for area to the East.
 - Lots slated for single family and/or duplex development: total 16 and 4 units; presentation centre will be constructed here; future developments have not yet been permitted.
- Two public pathways that connect through the site in a North-south direction:
 - 1) *Village Walk* - along Keith Road to Park Royal South.
 - 2) *Evelyn Walk* – starts at Keith Road and connects to an expanded walk segment with ramp and stairway system to make it accessible too rear of Park Royal South via Vista Way.
- This is the last proposed multi family building for this site.
- Rezoning of site is proposed to allow for rental units to be increased to 89 condo units and 136 additional rental units (225 Units Total). Proposing that rental units be rented at below market value.
- Present zoning is for 350 units; rezoning would increase to 456 units.
- Proposal includes a 9-storey apartment building that is split between 3 wings. Buildings numbered 1, 2, and 3. Each wing is connected by a set of 3-storey townhouses.
- Underground parking; driveway to West shared with lot 7.
- Looking for feedback from Committee on:
 - Site planning, arrangement, building massing
 - Consideration of how proposal responds to the public realm
 - Pedestrian experience and quality of the landscaping design
 - Overall architectural design and material
 - Comments on residential townhouse experience and arrangement of buildings.

Project Presentation: M. Wilby (Architect) provided a presentation, including:

- West half of building fronts onto Arthur Erickson Place and the East, onto Evelyn Drive.
- Proposal aligns with lots 5 & 7 which set precedence for this development; north-south concept with terracing towards the South and connected by townhouses.
- Opening is created by stopping townhouses between buildings 1 & 2 to create an open space and for break down of massing.
- Townhouse being 2-stories, creates an opening.
- The East side of building 3 fronts onto Taylor Way with 4-storey building.
- Internal courtyards and natural vegetation; view optimized by north-south design and Southerly aspect.

- In Regards to pedestrian experience, each townhouse is close to the street; entry is unique to each building; opening with a lot of glazing and canopies that engage the street fronts.
- Same material and color pallet as was used with lots 5 & 7; creates continuity.

Project Presentation: P. Kreuk (Landscape Architect) provided a presentation, including:

- Patterns from Landscape are continuing along same lines as those in lots 5 & 7.
- Each streetscape has entrance with water feature, gate, patios and hedging.
- Planting all selected in such a way that layers are created and building appears stepped back.
- A lot of pedestrian linkages such as those to Park Royal North and South and those linking to Taylor Way; further discussion needs to be had regarding pedestrian access from lower level to Park Royal parking area.
- Taylor Way entrance poses as a challenge due to steepness of slope; access to gym amenity area is off Taylor Way.
- Courtyard developed in natural character with pedestrian access; gathering areas; steep slope.
- Incredible decks on units; perimeter planters are trademark feature of this development that run over each terrace.
- Storm Water Management has been dealt with to some degree; has been done on other lots within the development.

Committee Questions:

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

- What amenities are being incorporated and what do you imagine lounge spaces will be used for? *Some of rooms will be multipurpose, change rooms, yoga studio etc. Some areas still need to be worked out but there will be a large amenity area. Due to challenging site, had to figure out a programming that would be geared to underground activities and not require a ton of light. Trying to integrate spaces and keep them fluid, for example having movable walls and generous decks which can be opened. Stacking has been incorporated as it provides privacy and shields from noise.*
- What provisions have you made for biking? *We have bike storage in parkade. Majority of people will come from location from Park Royal so this room is easily accessible from the trail end. Also have included smaller bike rooms that will provide further bike storage to the parkade level room.*
- Would you say massing is significantly different from other buildings near this one? The height of the building from the Evelyn Drive and Taylor Way corner appears rather daunting. *The building opens up to 6 stories but it is stepped back from corner so it provides some relief by this stepping effect. Height is mostly at the back side towards Evelyn Drive. From pedestrian aspect, the overpass is more extreme in appearance than the building height.*
- How does this building meet the objectives of having a unique design and yet fitting in to the character of the site? *In all projects at this site the objective was to*

create uniqueness and at the same time have the buildings fit together to create a neighbourhood. By adding a subtle unique feature to each building, an individual character can be achieved while still having cohesion throughout the neighbourhood.

- *Within the masterplan, what are those aesthetic unique aspects that differentiate the buildings? Each entry has a subtle variation but keeping in nature of that established along Arthur Erickson Way. I would use the term 'distinct' rather than 'unique'. Trying to keep horizontal lines mixed with natural elements and patios on rooftop; amenity space for Cliffside building on top. Wanted to stay in line with buildings 5 & 7; each entry creates the identity of the building. We have tried to keep streamlined design that differs from the Cliffside building.*
- *What is overall approach to accessibility? We have an entrance off Taylor Way that is accessible; an entrance off building three lobby will be accessible with access to the elevator and amenity area. We are required by level two accessibility standards, which are a higher standard (reference District of North Vancouver Accessibility Standard); 20 percent of units have to be adaptable but there are no fully accessible suites; further discussion on accessibility will be had.*
- *What are sustainability requirements? Trying to move towards low carbon energy systems and trying to decrease the use of gas. This building from envelope perspective, is hard to build and makes it challenging to meet Step Code Two Building requirements. Looking at insulation and reduction of window systems but the building design would look completely different if windows were decreased; we are however, trying to reach Step Code Two requirements and still keep the aesthetic.*
- *Would you consider public arts as a way to define one building from another? Yes, this could be explored.*
- *Looking at the main floor, the corridor looks very long. Would it be possible to adapt the entries to recess so that corridor does not appear so long? Yes, this can be looked into.*
- *Are there retention ponds for the Storm Water System? Yes we are working with District and Cressey Engineering on these. They are retention ponds.*
- *Are there any outdoor spaces that are accessible or are they all stair access? I think this is something that could be explored more. Due to topography, an accessible space, if created, would be small. Thinking of extending accessible pathways.*
- *Lower Right of Way path is completely accessible to lot 5 however it ends in a staircase. Why is this? We want to talk to District about connecting these two pathways (identified on plan) that appear on the Right of Way for the storm system so that the pathway will be fully accessible.*
- *Are the soil volumes increasing from previous designs and will the tree systems be maintained by these systems? Yes.*
- *This was supposed to be a two building site, and now proposal is for three buildings and the open space has been decreased between some buildings. Why is this and will you let the public know? The masterplan was built on a concept but it was expected to change due to review requirements etc. This will be the first time the applicant has sought more density than indicated on the masterplan. There will be a public hearing for this however, in general I think this building respects the overall direction of the initial plan. Council did approve a master plan change.*

- Is there any soundproofing proposed for building 3 due to proximity of Taylor Way? *Yes we are getting an acoustic study on this to ensure that the requirements are met and noise is kept minimal.*

Committee Comments:

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

- I do not have issues with massing arrangement or character. I think there is an opportunity to link amenity areas with landscape areas. I would suggest the Planning Department work with applicant to create a better pathway, communal spaces and split the amenities amongst the buildings. Incorporation of art is highly recommended. Overall I am in support of project.
- I support this project and think the massing is well done. Would look at exploring more definition in uniqueness and character between buildings.
- Public arts, communal space in courtyards, a dry-stream water feature and making this proposal more livable are suggestions to incorporate. Overall I support his project.
- Landscaping is good response to architecture; I think green fingers at the rear are interesting. Monotony should be explored and the introduction of lobby entries could be distinguished by a stronger sense of identity.
- I support project. Suggest working with the Planning Department to develop adaptability and accessibility which would lead towards more creative response to amenities such as covered outdoor areas.
- Site context is the main concern in the courtyards and the fingers of the buildings. Space has been sacrificed between building two and lot 1 & 7. Otherwise, I support the project due to creation of affordable rental market housing.
- I support project; proposal has a different profile than the other buildings; downtown feel to it; agree with comments of outdoor spaces being accessible.

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:

- Work with the Planning Department to further enhance accessibility within the outdoor amenity space.
- The indoor amenity areas should tie into the outdoor landscaped areas.
- Consider more identifiable components to distinguish townhouse units and the lobby entrances.
- Work with Engineering to extend the southern walkway to Taylor Way with a barrier free connection.
- Consider incorporating a public art component at the southeast corner of Taylor Way.
- Consider a dry stream water feature in the outdoor amenity area to make a more livable space.
- Consider recessing doorway entrances of the units along the lengthy hallways.

CARRIED

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

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

NEXT MEETING

7. NEXT MEETING

Staff confirmed that the next Design Review Committee meeting is scheduled for September 16, 2021 at 4:30 p.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

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

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Don Harrison

Don Harrison (Sep 23, 2021 20:13 PDT)

Chair

Lisa Berg

Lisa Berg (Sep 27, 2021 10:57 PDT)

Committee Clerk