

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2022

4:30 PM VIA ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

(Members of the public may hear, or watch and hear, the meeting by attending the Atrium in the Municipal Hall, or via electronic communication facilities through the link provided on the Committee's webpage)

Note: Council Committee meetings are conducted in accordance with Council Committee Procedure Bylaw No. 5020, 2019 (as amended), subject to the discretion of the Chair.

CALL TO ORDER

1. Call to order.

Note: Chair will confirm that the meeting is being conducted via electronic communication facilities, pursuant to s. 5.7(b) of Council Committee Procedure Bylaw No. 5020, 2019 (as amended).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

2. **Approval of February 10, 2022 Meeting Agenda**

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the February 10, 2022 Design Review Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

3. **Adoption of January 13, 2022 Meeting Minutes**

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the January 13, 2022 Design Review Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

INTRODUCTION

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.

APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

5. Applications Referred to the Design Review Committee for Consideration:

5.1 Address: 2195 Gordon Avenue (Parcel A)

File No.: 05.1010.20/21-189
 Development Type: 2 non-market rental apartment buildings (6-storeys) including an adult day centre
 Development Approval Required: Development Permit
 Applicant: BC Housing
 Architect: RLA Architects Inc.
 Landscape Architect: eta landscape architecture
 Staff: Erik Wilhelm, Senior Community Planner

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Design Review Committee support the 2195 Gordon Avenue (Parcel A) application subject to further review of the following items with staff...

OR

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Design Review Committee require resubmission of the 2195 Gordon Avenue (Parcel A) application to address the following concerns...

OR

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Design Review Committee do not support the 2195 Gordon Avenue (Parcel A) application as presented due to the following concerns...

5.2 Address: 2195 Gordon Avenue (Parcel B)

File No.: 05.1010.20/21-190
 Development Type: 8-storey strata apartment building
 Development Approval Required: Development Permit
 Applicant: Darwin Properties
 Architect: Merrick Architecture
 Landscape Architect: HAPA Collaborative Landscape Architecture and Urban Design
 Staff: Erik Wilhelm, Senior Community Planner

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Design Review Committee support the 2195 Gordon Avenue (Parcel B) application subject to further review of the following items with staff...

OR

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Design Review Committee require resubmission of the 2195 Gordon Avenue (Parcel B) application to address the following concerns...

OR

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Design Review Committee do not support the 2195 Gordon Avenue (Parcel B) application as presented due to the following concerns...

5.3 Address: 671, 685, 693 Clyde Avenue and 694 Duchess Avenue

File No.:	05.1010.20/21-185
Development Type:	6-storey “micro-suite rental apartment
Development	DP, Rezoning, and OCP amendment
Approval Required:	
Applicant:	Park Royal Shopping Centre
Architect:	DA Architects + Planners
Landscape Architect:	Vaughan Landscape Planning & Design
Staff:	Erik Wilhelm, Senior Community Planner

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Design Review Committee support the 671, 685, 693 Clyde Avenue and 694 Duchess Avenue application subject to further review of the following items with staff...

OR

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Design Review Committee require resubmission of the 671, 685, 693 Clyde Avenue and 694 Duchess Avenue application to address the following concerns...

OR

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Design Review Committee do not support the 671, 685, 693 Clyde Avenue and 694 Duchess Avenue application as presented due to the following concerns...

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

6. Public Questions

NEXT MEETING

7. Next Meeting

The next Design Review Committee meeting is scheduled for March 9, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

8. Adjournment of February 10, 2022 Design Review Committee Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the February 10, 2022 Design Review Committee meeting be adjourned.

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
VIA ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION FACILITIES
THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 2022**

Committee Members: D. Harrison (Chair), R. Amenyogbe, R. Ellaway, E. Fiss, A. Hatch, S. Khosravi Kermani, J. Mahoney, H. Nesbitt, L. Xu; and Councillors B. Soprovich and M. Wong attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:36 p.m.

2. ELECTION OF CHAIR 2022

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT Don Harrison be elected as Chair for 2022.

CARRIED

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT Roger Amenyogbe be elected as Acting Chair for 2022.

CARRIED

3. COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2022

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee Meeting Schedule for 2022 be adopted as follows:

- February 10, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.
- March 9, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.
- April 21, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.
- May 19, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.
- June 23, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.
- July 21, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.
- September 15, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.
- October 20, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.
- November 24, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.
- December 7, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.

CARRIED

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT

1. all remaining Design Review Committee meetings, including subcommittee meetings, for 2022 be held via electronic communication facilities only;
2. the Atrium in the Municipal Hall be designated as the place where the public may attend to hear, or watch and hear, the Design Review Committee and subcommittee meeting proceedings; and
3. a staff member be in attendance at the Atrium in the Municipal Hall for each of the scheduled meetings.

CARRIED

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the January 13, 2022 Design Review Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

5. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the December 9, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

6. 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.

7. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Applications Referred to the Design Review Committee for Consideration:

7.1 Address: 2711 Rodgers Creek Place

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

- Proposal is for a 19-unit apartment building located in Area 3 of Rodgers Creek.
- Since 2008, development has ensued in Areas 1 and 2, to east of site; Area 4 is nearing completion; sporadic development in Area 3, 10 single family homes and four town house units have already been built; subdivision process for Area 5 and 6 are underway currently.

- Site surrounded by trees to west, north and east of site within the bordering parkland and is currently vacant. It exhibits steep slope within barren portion of lot and less slope in vegetated areas of lot.
- Chippendale Road is an arterial road that connects Upper Lands from east to west and links with Cypress Bowl Road, northwest of this development.
- Rodgers Creek Place is a meandering cul-de-sac with single family lots (no homes built on them yet).
- Site and surrounding area is zoned Comprehensive Development Zone 3; allows for a multitude of different housing forms.
- Upon creation of subdivision and respective covenants registered on Land Title, this lot has always been envisioned as a site for development of an apartment building due surrounding tree cover, prominent corner and the slope of site.
- Folio Studio Architecture has submitted proposal for a six storey format building with an underground parking garage; includes mix of two and three bedroom units ranging from 924 square feet to 2,258 square feet; extensive corner and perimeter landscaping with a focal covered entrance feature with a nearby accessible elevator.

Project Presentation: M. Geller (Advisor to Owner) provided an introduction including:

- The subject site is challenging but has a lot of potential.
- When purchased site spoke to British Pacific Properties as to what was meant by *Contemporary Alpine Character*; was pointed out that 15 years ago it was thought that buildings in this neighbourhood would look like those in Whistler. Decision was made to go towards a more Contemporary West Coast aesthetic.
- Intent in design is to achieve simple lines, large overhangs, and use of stones and materials that reflect a natural setting mixed with a contemporary style.

Project Presentation: F. Xu (Architect) provided a presentation including:

- Presentation will include challenges related to the site, rationale of design and renderings of the proposed building.
- Displayed overview of property with aspects from Rodgers Creek Place looking southeast of site and from Chippendale Road looking north.
- Site has a 28 metre (98 foot) change in elevation from the north to the south and from east to west of site. Topography has therefore, been a major influence in the design and landscaping.
- Displayed slide of siting rationale; explored two options: 1) lowering the building into the ground and keeping lobby at street level; or 2) raising the building which would result in less site disruption and excavation.
- Decided on the following design features: raised entry level, terraced landscaping along street and rear sides, entrance that will include an elevator at the street level, wide frontage along Rodgers Creek Road and narrow frontage along Chippendale Road, stepping back of building massing along top of building, incorporation of large angled balconies and contoured roof shape to create a dynamic view from the street.
- Design inspiration came from modern buildings of nearby sites; all contemporary modern in design.

- Displayed renderings showing angled balconies and dynamic roof overhangs; shallow and wide building; terraced landscapes; non rectangular roof which gives appearance of sloped roof; entry area with wood entry and exterior elevator.
- Due to lobby being higher than street and to minimize site disturbance, an entry stairway has been introduced along with terraced landscapes, outdoor access elevator and an entry canopy.
- In terms of material very conscious of need to create a non-combustible building that meets Wild Fire Development Permit Area Guidelines while also blending into the environment; stone, wood-looking panels and steel utilized to achieve this.
- Considerable attention given to sustainability: considerable natural ventilation into units (eighty percent of units have windows on two sides); balconies and overhangs allow for optimal solar potential, allowing shading in summer time and low angle daylight input in winter; working with Professional Energy Consultant to meet the Step Code 2 and low carbon requirements.

Project Presentation: T. Martin, Landscape Architect provided a presentation including:

- Three objectives driving the landscape design:
 - Thoughtfully integrating the grading
 - Supporting and bolstering the architectural form
 - Blending into the forest surroundings
- Displayed birds-eye view showing hedges in front of building, architectural walls stepped towards street, evergreen shrubs provide greenery in frontage and side the main entry stairway.
- Due to Fire Smart requirements unable to plant conifers; broad leaf evergreens will be comprise most of the hedges and shrubs.
- Planting lines will obscure the main parkade entry wall and provide various colors throughout year.
- Entry driveway composed of permeable paving to create infiltration.
- Stepping concrete walls on east side of driveway will have hedges in front to screen them.
- Landscaping in front is mostly mass plantings supported by hedges along the walls.
- Non-podium planting is low to allow for views off of the patios.
- Perimeter walk way on east side of driveway will wrap around the building, exiting in the southwest edge of site to match the neighbouring grades.
- Two type of architectural walls that will be used in the front:
 - Smooth finished casing-faced walls around driveway
 - Block concrete walls will be used for the main landscaping
- Terrace rear area will provide space behind building and link to the surrounding landscape. These walls will be shotcrete and will provide a natural rock appearance; planting in this area will be native species (vines, maples, ferns) as well as Ash and Oak Trees; no coniferous to Fire Smart Guidelines.
- Other Fire Smart requirements: spacing of planting at least 1.5 metres from building, minimum distance of trees to the building as well as between trees, and decorative gravel mulch to enable fire suppression.

- Laurel and Box Wood used in front yard as main hedging materials as well as Rhododendron, Xalia and Daphne.

Committee Questions:

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

- Can you talk about the wall materials being used; have you incorporated any natural stone or locally quarried rock into the design? *In rear yard plan to use structural wall shotcrete as this is only way to build into slope; along front yard using casing-faced walls for structural integrity; intent to hide wall in greenery; in frontage using block wall that will be filled in – is quite narrow and will hedge in front of walls to screen them; while request for natural stone, we will plan to disappear the walls in greenery.*
- Noticed an entry feature is to be incorporated. What will this feature be? *This is a concrete wall built out with stone veneer.*
- Are soffit lights to be included and are they part of the Dark Sky Policy? *General intent is not to have any up-lighting, trying to keep lighting to minimum.*
- In presentation package it was mentioned that this will be the only apartment building in Rodgers Creek Area 3. Is there a covenant that prevents applicants from rezoning and building more apartments in this area? *In immediate vicinity there is a 20-unit subdivision; all buildings to the east are single family dwellings and to southeast of site are townhouses; this will be primary apartment complex.*
- What is the required level of the Step Code? *The Step Code requires Step 2 plus low carbon energy system.*
- Did you explore the possibility of having a terrace on the roof that would enhance the character and use of the upper space? *Cannot due to Fire Smart regulations which do not allow for plants in certain locations; rather we chose to utilize space surrounding the building.*
- It looks like the visitor parking area outside the parkade is constricted; has this been looked into? *Inside of parkade is standard size. We will work with Planning to ensure requirements are met.*
- Did you consider a canopy over the parkade entrance to protect entry from climatic elements? *We have parking entry with rolling gates; beside parking area is an entrance door with a covered entry.*
- Regarding parkade entrance, in the architectural drawings there was one green wall with an elevation of 12 feet in height. Does zoning bylaw permit 10 or 12 feet wall height? *This is part of the main building so the height is compliant with the zoning for the building.*
- What type of planting will be on the green wall? *There are two options we have proposed: 1) Suckering Vine; 2) Virginia Creeper.*
- Is the planter on grade or a slab? *On grade; podium is aligned with the parkade; vines would grow out of a thin planter.*
- What is the status of the unopened road to the west of the site, indicated on the site plan? *Legally this is still an unused right of way; it forms part of Chippendale Road Park and is to remain as forest cover.*
- Is there a reason the balconies on east are bigger than the others, which are thinner? *Yes, it was intended to have variations in sizes of balconies to comply with setback requirements.*

- What was rational behind plant distribution on façade of walls of the penthouse? Can you provide rational of the distribution of materials displayed on the elevations? *Intent was to introduce stone veneer material; needed vertical articulation and the stone connects the penthouse with the entry level and creates an articulation of interest.*
- Are two elevators required for this building? *Yes.*
- The trees are not rendered on the 3D images, correct? *Not on front but they are on rendering on side yards.*
- On landscape plans I did not see Sweet Gum Trees. Where are they located on plan? *On the east side of plan; they are the very small type.*
- Is there permanent irrigation? *Yes, that is plan.*
- I do not see any site amenities included in proposal (trail, benches for people to use). Will these aspects be incorporated into plan? *There is an amenity room to the right of the entrance along with picnic tables outside near the entrance. Seating has not been included.*
- Any consideration to use real wood in materials? *Due to Fire Smart we cannot use real wood.*
- How many adaptable units are there? *4 of the units are planned to be adaptable. (which equates to approximately 21% of the units)*
- Are Fire Smart Regulations dictating why this is not a wood building? *Wild Fire Hazard Development guidelines encourage the use of other materials.*
- What are you planning to use for soffits? *Longboard; something non-combustible.*
- Is this the first multi-unit development building in Cypress Village, and will this project become a precedent for other developments? *No, others have been done; within area three however, there are only townhouses approved; but this is not a front runner; there is precedent set. This area is not considered Cypress Village.*
- The Upper Lands specifies two hundred units per gross acre; how does this project fit into this specification? *Looking at density within CD3 zone to make sure it is compliant; also look at covenants; I am not looking at a broader unit count in that manner.*
- How does this structure embody Contemporary Alpine Character? *This was a terminology used 15 years ago; in subsequent years it has been determined that the desire should be for Contemporary West Coast architecture.*
- Apart from recycling areas, is there any bear deterrent program? *The only bylaw is that the garbage area has to be enclosed, and closer to the parkade area to make it easy for trucks to access; cannot plant bear attractant plants.*
- Can you elaborate on non combustible, white and black cladding material? *It is a concrete based material; will be using rain screen system along all sides of wall.*
- Does project just meet requirements of the Step Code, or exceed the minimum codes? *It exceeds the code; low carbon matches Step Code 2.*
- How would one take their bike from the bike room to the street? *There is a room along the street side and the main door access for bikes to go through. One can also use the interior elevator to transport bikes.*
- There was mention of using site regenerated rock. Which wall is this for? *Not sure as we do not know how much rock will be generated on site. If we do use any it will be on the left side.*

- What is permeable material of driveway? *Permeable paver will be used (10 cm thick). Below paver there will be crushed gravel; clear crush will allow water to infiltrate; perforated pipe will take any excess water away.*
- From perspective of District should Alpine or Contemporary West Coast Character be used? *I would have to go with Contemporary Alpine Character with recognition of West Coast Character.*
- Is anything going to be built to the north of site, or will it remain forest? *Nothing will be built directly to the north; the closest in proximity to the north would be Cypress Bowl Road but no buildings. North of that there is a cul-de-sac which is zoned for four to five single family lots with discussion of multifamily in this area; currently zoning does not allow for multifamily in this area.*
- Where is Pike Creek? *Flows the east of site and then turns into Pike Creek to the south.*
- Where will site drain to? *A storm water management detention tank will collect rain water which will slowly release into the District system. None will go into the creek.*
- On north side, are you worried about ground water penetrating? *Have a specialist and water main cut off drain on this side to collect this in a trench drain.*
- Did you consider solar panels for the roof? *No, because we have limited unit numbers, great sunshine through units, roof side limitations and material restrictions; as a result we thought it would not be a good idea. We will provide a rough-in for future solar panels should they be incorporated later on.*
- Would you consider tenant use in the front southwest corner? *We have the patio on the podium; due to slope this area is presently not accessible.*
- Proposal package indicates units being 1,000 square feet or less, but floor plans state 1,600 square feet. Can you explain this? *Upper level has larger units but there are 6 units which meet the floor area within the CD3 zone which requires a minimum of 30% of apartment units must not exceed 1,001 sq. ft.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Understand the challenges involved in meeting Fire Smart requirements and using bear deterrent material; consider exploring ways for diversifying vegetation at the front of property.
- I support proposal for Contemporary West Coast Design; consider what will happen if one elevator is out of commission. *There is a link between entrances to access both elevators to address this.*
- I think more displays of the terracing would be beneficial; more lateral flexibility could help distinguish the building; seems as though the ashlar fascia (Granite Cladding) is being used to mark the entrance but on sheet A3-01 the stone butts into a wood material; consider using the same material to extend down the elevation and the proportions of materials being used.
- Proposal is successful in terms of offering smaller units.
- Good presentation; complex site; landscaping does not include amenity for the residents; consider making a playground, or family area. The stairs from road way are quite a long distance to walk for residents.
- Consider the usability of the site; corner of Chippendale Road could be enhanced through use of art.

- I understand challenges with Wild Fire Hazard Requirements. At entrance with wide staircase suggest rearrangement of trees; instead of having parallel and structured stairs suggest incorporating other stair layouts to add interest to the journey going to upper panel.
- Parkade entrance is very narrow, especially at visitor parking area. Outdoor amenity area would benefit proposal.
- The massing and west façade facing street looks high and bulky; need to see more steps at west façade. Most renderings are of top floors; suggest to have three top levels set back at each level.
- The building needs a stronger and more inviting entrance. Wide panels at west side from far away appear sharp; perhaps move white panels to the entrance to draw attention to this point.
- Entry stairs look too sharp and too high; suggest using L-shaped or zig-zag stairs. Weather protection for stairs suggested.
- Parkade has unnecessarily narrow entry; ensure that two cars can pass one-another. Design of north façade could have more renderings displayed; appears plain and blank which is contrary to the District guidelines; different façade colors could be incorporated. Distribution of façade panels appear random; appreciate natural looking colors and materials but perhaps limit these; stone material on top does not appear right; consider masonry materials on lower portion of building.
- Clarity from the District on Contemporary Alpine or West Coast Modern Character would be useful; character is not clear. Seems neither characters are being met; imposing building; not convinced about the massing. Would like to see the landscape plan with all of the species identified and displayed on rendering. Want to ensure lock blocks will be covered by greenery and that species planted in front will achieve this.
- Concur with comments. As far as resident amenities, the new Trestle Bridge and trail systems have been developed nearby.
- East and north elevations need more work; south and west sides seem resolved; appreciate transition from square retaining walls to natural and informal shapes to the south; perhaps add more wood to east end where elevator is; exposed mass timber columns on balconies could also be a way of adding character to the 'Alpine' feel of the building.
- I like the angular roof form; could be exaggerated more. Don't think the Allan block meets either characters trying to be achieved; perhaps could use a different material. In terms of placement of cladding, wood is suggested in the centre; stone appears random.
- Opportunity for more identity and place making using natural features such as boulders could provide an identity to the development; if possible have friendlier entrance onto the street front.
- Architects response: *chose massing and material organization as east, north and west side as these sides are surrounded by forest; top level segment material organized to be black tone; stone organized vertically to continue to bottom; reason that the entry is wood is that the glass combined with wood in elevator create a warm, light look. We will consider all comments. Overall this is a simple building that tries best to have articulation at top and bottom, and reduce massing.*

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

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee support the 2711 Rodgers Creek Place application subject to further review of the following items with staff:

- Explore ways to increase tree and planting species diversity, to achieve a more naturalistic aesthetic in line with the Contemporary Alpine Character.
- Redesign lock block walls with natural or reclaimed stone from site where possible.
- Consider including more amenity space for residents, especially family oriented features such as playgrounds.
- Redesign entrance stairway to include a mid-point resting area and revise stair geometry to break up the linearity and integrate plantings along edges.
- Redesign front entrance to make a stronger and more inviting presence, with increased weather protection.
- Consider making the parking entrance wider to accommodate two cars passing.
- Design development to study the façade materials to make it a more consistent, simplified approach.
- More differentiation required on the north elevation through use of different materials; masonry look material needs to extend all the way down from the top level.
- Work with District to clarify the expression to be consistent with the guidelines around Mountain Forest Character and Contemporary Alpine Character.
- Work with the District to ensure massing complies with the guidelines.
- Explore cladding on elevator to be more in line with the Contemporary Alpine Character.

CARRIED

All in Favour = 8

8. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

9. NEXT MEETING

Staff confirmed that the next Design Review Committee meeting is scheduled for February 10, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the January 13, 2022 Design Review Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Chair, Don Harrison

Staff Liaison, Lisa Berg

DRAFT