

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
RAVEN ROOM
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2021**

Committee Members: J. McDougall (Vice-Chair), R. Amenyogbe, E. Fiss, J. Mahoney, A. Matis, and H. Nesbitt attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

Absent: R. Ellaway, D. Harrison, B. Phillips; and Councillors P. Lambur and M. Wong.

Staff: M. McGuire, Senior Manager of Current Planning and Urban Design; 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 4:37 p.m.

CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the September 21, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. INTRODUCTION

- a. Introductory presentation by staff.
- b. Applicant presentation.
- c. Clarification questions to applicant by the Design Review Committee.
- d. Roundtable discussion and comments.
- e. Recommendations and vote.

4. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Applications Referred to the Design Review Committee for Consideration:

4.1 Site: Tantalus Gardens (Missing Middle)

Background: M. McGuire, Senior Manager of Current Planning & Urban Design introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context:

- This proposal is for rezoning and development permit application.
- Site is made up of 4 lots: 2 lots located on Wellington Avenue are zoned for public assembly use, specifically as places of worship and are outside the Horseshoe Bay Local Area Plan (LAP); and 2 lots on Nelson Avenue are zoned for single family, which are included in the LAP.
- Displayed site context map: site across from Tantalus Park, Marine Drive Transit Corridor identified which is shown in Official Community Plan in consideration for “missing middle” housing.
- Proposal for 10 two-storey single family dwellings with basements and attached garages.
- Proposal includes driveway access, parking garages and parking perpendicular to street.
- Context of the LAP:
 - Displayed map showing excerpt from Horseshoe Bay LAP.
 - Council has directed staff to develop site-specific zones for the three different land use areas:
 - Row house Area
 - Multiplex Area
 - Infill Areas
- The two parcels located inside the LAP Boundary on Nelson Avenue are designated for infill housing to encourage smaller detached houses up to density of 0.6 Floor Area Ratio and 2 storeys in height. As well, the LAP includes direction District wide policies provided direction to develop portions off for sites that are outside the Local Area Plan LAP boundary; looking at housing forms that are compatible with housing on the inside of Local Area Plan.
- The LAP includes a number of specific design guidelines related to site design, building form and material that have been proposed.
- The two parcels outside of the LAP boundary on Wellington Avenue are considered in relation to community wide directions on:
 - allowing for increased “missing middle” housing options on Marine Drive Corridor;
 - policy for institutional site; priority for community uses; and
 - policy supporting sensitive infill housing options.

Project Presentation: A. Keller (Presenter) and P. Nilsson (Owner) provided a presentation, including:

- Resubmission proposal for a 4-lot land assembly; submitted an Official Community Plan amendment, rezoning, and development permit application.

- Provided site context including adjacency to the Marine Drive Transit Corridor and that it is split between the Official Community Plan and Horseshoe Bay LAP.
- Two assembled properties are covered by the policies outline in the LAP.
- Applicant provides overview of how the proposal meets the requirements of the Official Community Plan and LAP.
- Although first application received denial, guidelines are now defined in LAP.
- Revisions displayed in response from community and District input, who guided this application to achieve a new density plan; zoning changes between the existing site, the original submission and the current application remain as follows:
 - Total number of housing units is reduced from 14 to 10 infill homes;
 - Parking is no longer underground, positioned at grade with single-car garages per unit;
 - Total site area remains unchanged at 28,229 square feet; total buildable floor area is reduced from 18,995 square feet to 17,775 square feet;
 - Site coverage slightly increased from 33% to 38% due to parking at grade; and
 - Total Floor Area Ratio is reduced from 0.67 to 0.59.
- In order to achieve Floor Area Ratio of 0.59, the proposed setbacks take into consideration the historic cottages of this area; fosters socialization and wellbeing; delivers Floor Area Ratio below requirement; landscaping supports and encourages green communal outdoor spaces that promote socialization.
- Neighbouring sites will not be impacted by setbacks and elevations; no impacts to Tantalus Park.
- Infill homes step up the hill; set into natural topography in response to 40 degree grade change.
- 10 onsite parking spaces for residents and visitors.
- New sidewalks proposed on Rosebery Avenue and Wellington Avenue with 11 offsite (street) parking stalls defined.
- Landscape design focuses on livability and community connection; communal green space area; to be maintained by strata.
- Attention paid to screening property to adjacent homes at the rear property line by cedar fencing and planting of Red Twig Dogwood.
- Planting of native, sustainable, drought resistant species which will be supported by storm water retention and harvesting.
- Prior to formal adoption of LAP, it was acknowledged that the hillside on Nelson Avenue, Chatham and Raleigh Streets provided opportunity to create a distinct infill area of small homes with terraced detached homes that transitioned to neighbourhood.
- Hillside can provide for 2 – 3 detached homes on a single lot.
- Displayed rendition of housing reminiscent of Horseshoe Bay's historic cottages achieved through colour choice and material, glazing variations, asphalt shingles, cladding, metal roof and stonework.
- Elevations show large overhangs that reduce appearance of height; design came about from working group feedback

- All units are 1,700 square feet above grade and 1,100 square feet below grade; units area accessible; flush thresholds between rooms and front patios, 5 foot turning radius in front entrance and washrooms on main level; ceiling heights are 9 foot on main floor and doors to patio are eclipse style models.
- Environmental considerations: EV charging units, bike and scooter parking storage, complies with Step 4 of BC Energy Code.
- Achieves character of neighbourhood and unique character of individual units.
- Tantalus Gardens fosters community character and Bay Cottages, delivers a new green gateway; aligns with Official Community Plan and LAP for density; responds to “missing middle”.

Committee Questions:

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

- The parking configuration, does it follow the plan or is it departing from guidelines? *Provides offside parking and is a current plan. Accommodates two driveways facing Rosebery Avenue.*
- Is the proposed Official Community Plan Amendment to include the two lots in the Horseshoe Bay LAP? *This is coming ahead zones to be created, therefore this will be a separate Comprehensive Development (CD) Zone, but will match the site area for the zone.* Would it be an advantage for applicant to wait until these guidelines have been approved so they don’t have to apply for changes beforehand? *Staff team is working on the proposed zones for Horseshoe Bay and anticipate them to go to Council this year; the reality is that for Wellington Avenue they would have to go through rezoning regardless; felt that this process is appropriate to move project ahead; the fact that it straddles the boundary of the LAP is something that has been taken into consideration. Official Community Plan directions are community-wide and we do have transition direction for sites that straddle area boundaries.*
- For proposed secondary suite units, would council want to see some sort of housing agreement? *A Housing Agreement could be used, however, typically secondary suites in single family dwellings are permitted and not required to have a Housing Agreement.*
- The street parking is left over from when there was a church, will this be resident only or public parking spaces? *No it is public parking.*
- Are there any drawings that show the context in relation to the adjacent sites so we can see how it fits into the context? *No.*
- How is grading being dealt with and is there a grading plan; how is the 40-ft. slope being dealt with as this seems like a lot and there are no retaining walls; are they accessible? *Yes, it should be in application package, this can be provided. Retaining walls are between units displayed on the landscape plan.*
- What is the material accessible to the park on the landscape drawings? *Permeable pavers.*
- Drop in elevations seems to be a steep access road, can you confirm that slope? *Will check.*
- How is the driveway accessed? *Siamese access.*
- What is the building separation between the building at the north end and the adjacent property? *5 feet which matches the existing separation.*

- Do you need all the street parking? *This is a result of community input; public requested off site parking. Community will now benefit from sidewalks that will be built for pedestrian safety.*
- Basements in bedrooms – do they have windows? *Yes, there will be windows*

Committee Comments:

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

- Respect to contextual fit at LAP, think the form and coverage meets most requirements of Official Community Plan and LAP; in terms of architecture and materiality I think the proposal variations and choices seem to be of a high quality consistent of neighbourhood; speaking to landscaping the drawings seem to be schematic and need more detail showing elevations and retaining of planting to get a better idea of how grading relates to the building. Suggest more detail in landscaping be provided.
- I think this can be understood separate to Official Community Plan and LAP requirements but hard to understand in terms of these guidelines; concerned with setbacks particularly along north side; seems to close to adjacent site. Internal site planning, large strata requires communal space which should be incorporated and added to this project.
- In terms of driveways there are two paired driveways that are incredibly wide; seems like too much asphalt along the street; lack of integration with public realm. I think the treatment of parking could be improved in terms of neighbourhood green-boulevard and character. The setback to the front yard is extremely narrow; could benefit from more green space at the front.
- Support secondary suites but think that they should be accounted for; size of units perhaps too big and luxurious to meet guidelines.
- Think that there needs to be more context plans displayed; renderings need to include adjacent properties and landscaping; landscape plans do not display types of species; suggest adding species and details of site.
- Further work on sections showing grading would be useful; heights, labels, street names, relationship to area; overall I support look of project but landscaping and parking requires a lot of work at this point.
- Architectural styles are a plus to project; aspect of entrance should be emphasized from the street side. 3 bedroom units at lower level could have an additional washroom added and windows for light for better livability.
- Parking is not advantageous in this proposal; should be looked into. Materials should be identified on plans so that they can be referenced.
- It is unfortunate there is an extra level of information missing from this application that could fill in blanks for example grading and landscaping. Support overall but reservations due to missing information.

MOTION FOR 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 subject to the following:

- Project requires additional context for site plans and grading plans in order to hone in on the details of the application.
- Identify proposed setbacks from adjacent properties and property lines.
- Consider a more sensitive approach to driveway connections to the existing streets.
- Consider alternate layouts for offsite parking.
- Public realm should be considered more thoughtfully in regards to pedestrian circulation and typical city detailing.
- Consider the development of expanded outdoor amenity space.
- Submission of a landscape plan or site plan that clearly indicates grading information, adjacent property grading, materials and retaining wall elevation.
- Identify any proposed secondary suites and review for livability.
- Clearly illustrate how these units are accessible with the grading plan.

POLL VOTE CALLED FOR THE VOTE = 5
Require resubmission

CARRIED

4.2 Address: 2452 to 2496 Marine Drive (Mixed Use)

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

- Proposal is for a development permit which is the half of the south commercial block of Dundarave along Marine Drive and is a six-property assembly.
- Policies that guide the proposal under the Dundarave Development Permit Area; 4 subsections in guidelines to which projects are evaluated:
 - Context and site design
 - Building design
 - Landscaping design
 - Circulation and parking
- Existing Commercial 2 (C2) zoning limits height to a maximum of 2 storeys; this proposal is for a 3-storey building. Official Community Plan policies give consideration of a third storey; intent to achieve lower profile along Marine Drive.
- Three storey mixed use building; 2,700 square feet of commercial retail and office use space on ground floor; 55 residential units on upper floors; 145 parking spaces; office space at rear; bike parking 113 stalls; access to parkade from rear east side of lane.
- Parking is shared between residents, visitors and commercial tenants. Biking spaces are also included in proposal.

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

- Applicant reached out to community to try to understand Dundarave area; spent a lot of time with Planning Department to understand zoning.
- Objective of trying to maintain gateway which is a key element of the location of this proposal.

- Looked at all circulation paths and pedestrian movement; pathway between developments: one existing path will be maintained and improved, also have laneway which will be improved along 25th Street and Marine Drive.
- Parking was looked at as well as garbage deliveries; cut out laneway at rear to allow for more space.
- Along Marine Drive have set building back an additional 6 feet to increase depth and allow for additional seating and public realm opportunities. East corner seating has also been allowed for, pathway on east side allows for movement.
- Broke the proposal up into east and west blocks and at centre is housing component; entry on both sides. As continue west side, angle has been cut to allow for open corner so view is seen towards ocean; seating area incorporated.
- Commercial office area along 25th Street on lane side; another entry off Dundarave side includes elevator.
- Angled units on south side so as to provide variation and allow for views.
- Range unit sizes provided.
- Office stacks up on rear access of laneway; building setback along 25th; diversity in parapets heights and elevations.
- Cool and warm west coast colors incorporate which ties in the variety of material and design throughout building.
- Displayed walkway elevation on east side: framing of main entry with traditional canopies; railing textured; wood and concrete used; changes as you move along towards west; fabric and trellis type canopies used.
- Displayed rendering images of before and after; stepping and seating along sidewalk area.
- Looked at opportunity to bring in other elements: plantings, canopies, banners; provides texturing; stepping on corner side.

Project Presentation: K. Simpson (Landscape Architect) provided a presentation, including:

- Wanted to open up to public realm through step stone walls along plaza side that incorporate planters and seating area. Step down to navigate grading in area.
- Soft grasses and perennials to provide beachy vibe and public gathering area along open corner.
- The grade of 25th Street is approximately 11% is fairly steep, wanted to create a gentle slope; down 25th hit smaller plaza with opportunity for a bit of planting in this area.
- Providing a sidewalk in parking space along lane.
- Displayed elevation of stepping along Dundarave Lane.
- On rooftops have private patios separated by planting to provide privacy and shade; in middle is amenity communal space; trellis incorporated here.

Committee Questions:

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

- Will you be looking at facade articulation at entrance later as it seems to be lost? *Material is all glazing so it will stand out quite a bit; art incorporates which will stand out.*
- The patios on the roof top, there are trees; will these affect the elevation? *These are low level species and they should not be visible from street, Japanese Maple and similar species will be used. The building is setback so they should not affect view.*
- Am I reading correct that the majority of facade is hardy-panel and if not, what material is being used? *A cementitious board which is a clean and durable material; wood, brick and glazing also used.*
- C2 zone has no Floor Area Ratio is that correct, type of density has been approved in this area? *Density in the C1 zone is a function of building envelope. Difficult to compare with other buildings, have to keep in mind that this site takes up a lot of block; have reviewed how much floor area can be achieved to ensure proposing matched what was permitted by zoning.*
- Noticed retail area is almost three stories tall, do you have renderings of adjacent retail units in neighbouring buildings to compare? *Yes, the neighbouring buildings are approximately 18 - 25 feet tall; this proposal (retail) is 18 feet.*
- Do the guidelines in the Official Community Plan or Bylaw provide guidance in regard to the massing along the lane, street way expression along Marine Drive? Seems like when you get to lane this becomes a 4 – 5 story building; seems a considerable departure from guidelines. *Much more general guidelines in terms of massing and guidelines.*
- Are there any requirements for interior amenity space? *Yes, there is a multi-purpose room and access through the lane side for elevator; is for residents.*
- Other than art at central, is there any other art at public plaza space? *Yes, discussions around piece incorporated but there is the opportunity for this.*
- Which step code are you using? *Step code 2.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Entry will have a vestibule if over 100 square feet this should be looked into especially if adhering to Step Code 2; articulation of façade looks like it sticks out too much; rooftop spaces will have to be screened.
- The street wall along Marine Drive is too imposing and needs to be set back; I think the frontage along 25th Street is too high; I am not against overall height just the façade at 25th Street. The gateway element is not working as there is prominence on one unit; feel that the units at this end facing the public which is not appropriate. Don't feel the concrete modern concept is warm and welcoming as is neighbourhood of Dundarave. Think material pallet needs to be looked into. As there are so many white and grey colors, the character of Dundarave is lost in this project. Not convinced of its seaside character.
- A bold initiative; contemporary modern architecture can be done however, the third storey has to be set back both at Marine Drive and the lane as the third storey must be earned; the balconies are small and open space outdoors are valued; guidelines ask for a variety of roof forms. These should be investigated.

- Architectural expression is disappointing. Huge site so break should be mid-building to allow for movement mid-block; 3 metre setback at eastern end is not sufficient. The mid-building area should be open to the public as a substantial mid-block connection is needed. Public realm is not successful as it looks privatized, however the plaza is okay.
- Retail frontages seems excessive; appreciate stepping in and stepping out however, find there are too many elements. Overall the building is too much.
- Think the public realm is reasonably well handled however, the mid-block connection to laneway would be better than proposed left over edge plaza.
- The big architectural downfalls are where this project falls short; shoulder line at third floor must occur at Marine Drive and lane. Must break the height to scale to neighbourhood. Presently is long and horizontal building form. Massing and elevations should be re-thought to break up frontages; finer grain of building expression will keep in line with scale. Completely rethink the elevations with the breaking of the frontages, then introduce details. The small adjustments presented do not have a meaningful human scale. Get the massing right and then relook at the materials and textures. Needs big moves to resolve.
- There is quite a bit of work needed to fit into Dundarave context; address the street and public realm, 25th Street is interesting; the existing connection (to the east) is tight.

MOTION FOR 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 in response to the Development Permit Guidelines subject to the following:

- Building massing and scale:
 - Further consideration of the Dundarave Village context in the choice of building materials.
 - Consider third story setback on the Marine Drive and Laneway frontages.
 - Consider the massing expression in keeping with existing streetscape context. Provide streetscape context drawings and elevations.
- Public Realm:
 - Consider alternate location and rational for pedestrian mid-block crossing.
 - Consider the addition of public art in the plaza element.
 - Ensure the 25th Street and Marine Drive plaza design allows for easy and open access to the public.
- Building Materials:
 - Facade treatment to reflect the village character.
 - Provide elevation drawings that reflect the planted roof areas and how they interact with the street.
- Gateway:
 - Special consideration to the gateway at 25th Street and Marine Drive.

- Consider neighbourhood context and provide a response to the corner treatment to ensure that the building expression performs as a 'gateway feature'.
- Consider the creation of the architectural expression in relation to the public realm.
- Provide design rational narrative and sketches on future application.

POLL VOTE CALLED FOR THE VOTE = 5

CARRIED

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

6. NEXT MEETING

Staff confirmed that the next Design Review Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 21, 2021 at 4:30 p.m.

7. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the September 21, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 7:14 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Jason McDougall

Jason McDougall (Oct 25, 2021 13:59 PDT)

Acting Chair, Jason McDougall

Lisa Berg

Lisa Berg (Oct 25, 2021 14:09 PDT)

Staff Liaison, Lisa Berg