

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
VIA ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION FACILITIES
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2021**

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

Staff: L. Berg, Senior Community Planner; E. Syvokas, Community Planner; H. Gabrie-Ho, Planning Technician; and N. Allard, Committee Clerk, attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:38 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the December 9, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the November 4, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting minutes be amended by:

- Adding Eric Fiss as an attendee at the November 4, 2021 meeting

AND THAT the agenda be approved as amended.

CARRIED

4. 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.

5. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Applications Referred to the Design Review Committee for Consideration:

5.1 Address: 2170 Marine Drive

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

- Proposal is for an exemption for a development permit for property located in a small commercial area on the south side of Marine Drive between 21st Street and 22nd Street. It is zoned Commercial 1 and is developed with a one-storey building.
- Surrounding Land Uses include: The West Vancouver Community Centre on the north side, apartment buildings to the south, commercial buildings on either sides of subject site and low-rise multi family buildings located further to the east and west.
- Proposal is to combine the existing to commercial units into one unit and to upgrade the façade of the existing building, including alterations to the existing windows and doors, exterior cladding, canopy and signage.
- Upgrade includes changing the doors from two entrances to one entrance, changes to window pattern, exterior cladding material from cinder blocks to an aluminum composite system, reducing the size of the existing canopy so it only covers western half of entrance and removing canopy signs for two businesses and replacing with one window sign for one business.

Project Presentation: P. Guimond (Architect) provided a presentation including:

- The building remains the same as the existing building in terms of the geometry and floor plan as well as height will; change to façade, new cladding material.
- Upgrade will allow building to fit into east and southern neighbourhoods, including the West Vancouver Community Centre to the north.
- Intent is to make changes simple and fit into neighbourhood character.
- Amalgamation of two units into one; entrance is now closer to the street.
- Outdated canopy has been removed.

Committee Questions:

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

- Can you provide a design rational and why this proposal meets the guidelines? *We downgraded our design; it was a small proposal so have supplied necessary drawings.*
- Is there no treatment to windows or is it up to tenant to decide if they want to close up the glazing? *We have an interior designer working on this project; nothing was proposed for window treatment; store front façade will open to interior. There will be reception area and waiting area on the inside. We want to have the patients behind windows to have access to the view of mountains.*

- Two accent lightings were to be decided upon by owner; is there a cash allowance in the contract? *This came out of design intention; our first wish was for the geometry we were hard pressed to find something that was effective.*
- Regarding the cladding: says it is silver aluminum; will it appear metallic or reflective; shiny or matte? *It will be a silver cladding that is matte. The builder of this project is also the builder of the project next door. We have discussed the use of material so as it would match the neighbouring building.*
- Not clear on the site plan; are the shrubs and bushes being removed in the front for parking stalls? *There are no parking stalls in front. Parking is all in rear laneway.*
- In terms of ground plane, nothing is changing? *Nothing is presently proposed however, I have discussed with the owner having some landscaping done.*
- How are the panels equipped on the building; are they exposed clips or hidden? *Hidden; will keep the panels as thicker type.*
- Did you consider having a glass canopy over the windows so that one is not exposed to the elements? *Not considered as windows are facing north so not a lot of sun; wanted to keep design simple. There is some protection in entrance door but I did not see need to protect windows.*
- Is there any grading information shown on the site plan? *No changes to the site itself therefore survey not provided.*
- Are there any accessibility issues? *No. Followed accessibility code from BCBC 2018. Everything is accessible. From sidewalk to door is level; no change to elevation.*
- Are there materials shown on plans? *Yes, on A1. The building is simple.*
- Is the cladding exactly the same as the structure to the east? *I do not know if it will be exactly the same but it will be similar. There maybe some minor visual qualities, as we wish to have building have its own identity.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Applaud the idea of giving new life to an older building. Would have been nice to have more perspective of how building relates to others in the neighbourhood.
- Disappointed that signage opportunities are not being considered.
- In terms of landscaping at entry, I think that this should be looked at so as not to confuse people entering the area; also will make the building appear less tired. Overall I support application.
- Support application; echo previous comments in relation to landscaping. Landscaping could greatly benefit the design.
- Agree with comments of landscaping; treatment to landscaping would benefit this project. Cladding is acceptable as long as there is use of a composite material with hidden reveals.
- Overall concern is with how far design has progressed; there are a lot of promises and trust with the designer; cladding and lighting have not yet been committed to.
- Needs to be some work done to the landscaping as overgrown shrubs are not doing favours to the area; there could be a cost effective way to help soften this this modern building.

- The front entry cannot be lost in the arrangement; suggest changing the color of the column in front in order to visually bring out entrance and make it different from the building. Planters could be incorporated in design to soften appearance.
- Realize that this is a small project however, think that with more detail this could be better reviewed.
- Support the scheme for repurposing the building; I question quality of some of the materials being used and whether they meet standards. Perhaps more detail could be provided.
- Canopy over door seems inconsistent with the building character. Perhaps lighting could be looked into rather than allotting this money towards a canopy.
- The design is an obvious improvement to what presently exists; there is some degree of consistency with neighbouring property to east. As far as landscaping goes, whatever is placed there in future should coincide with decorative grass and concrete to give site a consistent appearance from the sidewalk. Otherwise proposal is fine.
- Support proposal but agree with landscape concerns raised above.

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 2170 Marine Drive application subject to further review of the following items with staff:

- Provide significant plant material and hard landscaping at the front of the site to soften the relationship between the street and the building entrance;
- Consider a different color for the post at the entrance to the building to assist mobility and access issues for visually impaired members of the public; and
- Provide more information about the materiality of the cladding and lighting to ensure that it is of calibre consistent with the concept drawings.

CARRIED

POLL CALLED FOR THE VOTE = 6

5.2 Address: 2378 Marine Drive

Background: H. Garbiec-Ho, Planning Technician, introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context:

- Proposal is for a duplex development permit for a site that is located east of Dundarave commercial village. It is zoned RD1 and is presently developed with a single family dwelling constructed in 1940.
- Single family and duplex homes are located north, east and south of the site along Marine Drive and Bellevue Avenue. Dundarave Village Point, a multi family apartment building, is located west of the site.
- Context: Bus stop located on Marine Drive in front of subject property and site within walking distance to Dundarave Village, Transit, the Sea Wall, Schools and the Community Centre.

- Proposal is a two storey duplex each with a secondary suite, detached parking garage and shared access off of Dundarave Lane.
- Side entrances are proposed for the duplex dwellings and entrances to the secondary suites are proposed off the rear.
- Architecture includes the use of trellises, cedar siding, wood trim, panelling and balconies with railings.
- 1 parking space provided for each duplex and secondary suite unit (meets minimum zoning requirement).
- Landscaping includes screening, use of paver stones, and a rear landscaped amenity area for each secondary suite.
- Duplexes adhere to Step Four of the BC Energy Step Code, exceeding minimum Step Three requirement.

Project Presentation: K. Memary (Designer) provided a presentation including:

- Displayed existing image of present building with access off of Marine Drive.
- In terms of context, subject property is situated next to “Westside Village Point”, a mixed use building with relatively complex massing in respect to proposed project. Hedging along Marine Drive.
- West coast style buildings with flat and pitched roofs built in 1980’s; mix of duplexes and single family.
- The proposal revision was for the following changes:
 - Flat roof to pitched roof
 - Addition of more wood work
 - Retaining hedges
 - Emphasis on front yard and entrances; introducing side entrances and incorporating landscaping.

Project Presentation: Saroush Ghadi (Landscape Architect) provided a presentation including:

- Due to location of site being closely situated to Marine Drive and bus stop, privacy is a concern. Intend to retain the laurel hedge in the front of property line to provide screening from street.
- To minimize interaction between entrance bus stop and side walk chose to create an entrance at the north with a decline down to a focal point at the centre where ornamental planting will be incorporated.
- Trellises with gates and posts create privacy and intimacy in garden area.
- Sunken patios meant to use only by the residents of the units; gates will create separation between public and private space.
- Objective to create a coherent and clear interaction from Marine Drive to the site.
- Illuminated pathway leads to primary entrance on the side of property.
- Secondary suite units are located on the south side of site.
- Limited space from garage to building at the south due to decision to create a more functional space in the rear for secondary units.
- Planting decisions based on Arborists review; one important tree we wanted to retain on property; other than shrubs, most of plans are subject to removal; perennials, ornamental grasses and trees to be planted in front yard.

Project Presentation: K. Memary (Designer) provided a presentation including:

- Displayed:
 - comparison of existing to proposed laneways; complex building; designed to break down massing;
 - elevations showing streets, bus stops, laneway and garage;
 - rendering of yard, landscaping and light into building; pathways to entrances displayed;
 - floor plans identifying living area, main floor with three bedrooms; upper floor is open concept with living dining and kitchen; large deck;
 - open area for secondary suites; and
 - site plans, cross sections, assemblies and garage drawings.

Committee Questions:

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

- Can you provide an overview of the window layout for the suites? *Bedrooms get light from a 5 foot x 4 foot window well in addition to a clear story window in the basement entrance with glazing. Living room also has a window at the side well. Height of front window is narrow due to planter being installed in this location. We are ensuring that height of plant does not exceed window height. Planters are typically put in to qualify for basement exemptions.*
- What is the setback at the east and west of property? *6.25 feet (minimum 5 feet) at east and 6.21 feet at west, combination is 12.46 feet.*
- With setback that you have proposed does that offer chance to provide sufficient windows? *Could have more windows however chose not to for privacy of residents. Open concept at top floor so have more glazing and sun at the south.*
- Could someone walk over light well of suite from the front door? *There is a removable grill for emergency only at this location.*
- Is floor space ratio at maximum for this site? *Yes plus bonus density by achieving greater sustainability (as permitted by Zoning Bylaw).*
- Is the proposal at maximum height for this site? *No, we are at 24 feet 8 inches (max is 25 feet).*
- The light wells on the top floor (displayed in cross section number 1) over the stair would it make sense to integrate a sky light to allow for more natural light? *Have thought about this however, we have a window in the living room and kitchen to provide natural light. We spoke to client and they preferred no skylight due to noise of rain.*
- Regarding the side fencing material, provide detail on what type of material will be used? *Perhaps similar size fence will be installed in wood; at other side there will be a retaining wall.*
- In the presentation did I understand the secondary suites can only be accessed from the lane? *No, the suites are not limited to lane access. The easier access for the suites is from Dundarave Lane; for visitors coming to the suites the obvious access would be from Marine Drive.*
- Are you at maximum limit of basement light wells? *We are at the maximum limit on the sides. At front we are allowed more but there is a planter.*

- Did you provide a rendering of the windows in comparison to the neighbouring buildings in order to show overall privacy of buildings in relation to one another? *No.*
- For the garage design you have opted for a square garage; this design does not take advantage of setting back the sides. As a result the yard space for eastern suite is much smaller. Have you considered off-setting the garage to create more space? *Attempted to create slab of garage in one level to have smooth distance to lane and driveway. Could set slab at two different levels however, main concern was to create the feel of a single family dwelling therefore opted for this layout.*
- With light wells for windows and access to suite has there been allowance for drainage in case of heavy rain? *We have a drain in all of light wells.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Pleased to see what you have done with lighting to access the basement suites; this fits in with eclectic design of 2100 Block.
- Thoroughly detailed package; suggest to remove the planter and increase the window height for the secondary suite. *High space building limitation is reasoning behind the planter.* Perhaps you could ask for an allowance. *We are on a limitation timeline; under pressure to submit the building permit with asking for variances; making lots of changes will delay the project further.*
- It is a shame that with a grade advantage the suite can not have windows that open out. This would make suite more livable. In meantime to help window, could reduce upper unit decks to allow for more light in suites.
- Project fits well in streetscape. On the secondary suite and first floor the washroom fixtures are on the main wall next to living area. Would you consider flipping this layout so one cannot hear the noise? *Yes, if the door allows, (this is a fire rated wall) could do this. Balance between swing of door and noise of washroom fixtures.*
- Think that it is unlivable to live in these dark suites but I understand that the design is due to requirements. No other comments.
- Think that the openness of floor plans and layout of suites have been designed well in consideration to challenges of site. Like the landscaping in the way of the pavers mixed with planting in order to make a compact single family feel. Finishes and scale are pleasing.
- Think the project is well thought out and responds to guidelines and neighbourhood context. In support of this project.
- Seems a long way to walk to the main dwelling but allows for a more livable secondary suite. Suggest offsetting garage to allow for more exterior space. This has been done in many cases in West Vancouver and is a typical method done in Dundarave and Ambleside.
- Have concerns about the planter and the grade at entrance to suite. Overall, I support proposal.
- I support changing garage layout so that it is offset in order to increase outdoor space for suite.

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 2378 Marine Drive application subject to the following items with staff:

- Explore options to maximize lighting into the secondary suites in ways such as decreasing the overhangs in the decks above;
- Ensure drains in light wells are a size to adequately handle high rainfall events;
- Consider reversing the fixtures in the powder rooms on the upper floors so that they back on the central wall; and
- Consider off setting the garage to maximize the garden space in the eastern secondary suite.

CARRIED

POLL CALLED FOR THE VOTE = 6

Can definition of window wells be redefined by District Staff to allow for more livable secondary suites? *The Neighbourhood Character Bylaw will be changing the end of January and addresses some of these issues.*

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

7. NEXT MEETING

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the next Design Review Committee meeting be scheduled for January 13, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.

CARRIED

8. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the December 9, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 5:48 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Don Harrison

Don Harrison (Jan 19, 2022 14:53 PST)

Don Harrison, Chair

Lisa Berg

Lisa Berg (Jan 19, 2022 16:56 PST)

Lisa Berg, Staff Liaison