

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
VIA ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION FACILITIES
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2022**

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

Staff: L. Berg, Senior Community Planner (Staff Liaison); M. Chan, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer/Director of Corporate Services; M. McGuire, Senior Manager of Current Planning and Urban Design; 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 4:40 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

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

CARRIED

L. Xu absent at the vote

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

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

CARRIED

L. Xu absent at the vote

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: 2195 Gordon Avenue (Parcel A)

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

- Displayed overview of proposal area: site approximately 1.76 acres; surround by a variety of buildings and uses including Pauline Johnson Play Field, Kiwanis Senior Housing, Ice Arena, St. Stephen's Church and single-family homes.
- Site is in flat and walkable area close to community amenities, transit and services.
- Site was purchased by the District in 2014 from Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH); former buildings were demolished in 2019; presently site is vacant.
- In July 2020, following a public consultation process, the District Council approved a rezoning and Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment; rezoning enabled the subject proposal to be considered; OCP amendment introduced a Development Permit Area applicable to this site.
- This site is within Ambleside Local Area Plan Boundary.
- OCP policies applicable to this site include:
 - 2.17e. - supports securing new non-market and market rental housing units;
 - to provide a range of housing forms to meet community needs, including adaptable units;
 - to use surplus District owned land to increase the availability of diverse and affordable housing.
- The proposal site is subject to a site specific Development Permit Area created to through collaboration of urban design staff and an architectural firm whom created a set of guidelines as follows:
 - Creation of a West Coast Contemporary expression
 - Use of quality material with sustainable design
 - Well laid out parking and landscaping design
- Zoned CD61 (Comprehensive Development Zone 61).
- Site will remain District owned with a long-term lease agreement arrangement.
- Two residential buildings being proposed on this site, to provide a total of 156 units:
 - Building A: includes Adult Day Centre that is approximately 3,000 square feet; fronts towards 22nd Street; market rate for rental to be determined; 96 units.
 - Building B: contains 60 rental units; primary access off 22nd Street.
- 30 percent site coverage, underground parking accessed from 22nd Street on Parcel B; easement agreement will allow for access through Parcel B; 147 parking stalls; 234 secure bike stalls; 24 short term bike stalls.
- 1.5 meter height variance proposed.
- Boulevard upgrades at 22nd Street to improve pedestrian experience.

Project Presentation: P. McLaughlin (President, Kiwanis North Shore Housing Society) provided an introduction:

- Primary objectives:
 - create affordable options for families;
 - create a sense of community;
 - build a sustainable development; and
 - delivery of an Adult Day Centre for VCH.

Project Presentation: E. Van der Putten (Architect) provided a presentation including:

- Displayed site aspects showing views of the immediate and broader context.
- Retaining wall situated on site will have an impact on development.
- Zoning CD61 define where buildings can be situated.
- Design aimed toward a West Coast Contemporary expression through incorporation of wood, heavy timber, glass, outdoor/indoor elements through landscaping and interior finishing; use of bricks, stones and metals.
- Inspiration behind the design of this project came from natural surroundings including forest, rock, North Shore mountains and skies.
- Parcel A includes two 6-storey buildings: Building A & Building B (Darwin Project on Parcel B).
- Attempting to pull back upper storey to integrate with buildings to the east and to soften the massing; also a requirement of the CD61 Zone.
- Cladding will be wood tone with panelling on the façade provides a contemporary form; entry canopy with columns creates forest feel.
- Request from VCH to have entrance to Adult Day Centre discrete while also creating a residential feel for residents; handi-dart entry and level sidewalk elevation.
- Displayed rendering of rear elevation of Building A showing set backs at top storey; excellent light flow throughout various seasons; canopy for the amenity building; garden plots.
- Building B entry is similar to that of building A with heavy timber appearance; differentiation of buildings through use of slightly different tones; entrance patios for ground oriented units.
- Provided explanation of selected materials: light colored roof for low albedo, wood tone cladding, dark metals, and upper storeys are light tone to reference skies and reduce appearance of massing with dark tones on lower portion of buildings.
- Design of entry point connections that will connect Building A and B to amenity area via a landscaped pathway; loop pathways will encourage residents to be active.
- Both buildings designed to City of North Vancouver Adaptable Level 1 (minimum).
- 147 vehicle-parking stalls; 234 secure bike stalls; 3 accessible vehicle stalls.
- Elevators provide access to all parking and floors above.

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

- Landscaping designed to encourage residents to gather and socialize.
- Native planting and flexible spaces contributes to neighbourhood character.
- Amenity space includes a garden space for residents to use; private spaces for ground floor residents; trellis and dining area.
- Focused on planting of native and low maintenance plant species.
- Tree planting supports year-round color; appropriate for smaller spaces so as to maximize outdoor use of space.

Committee Questions:

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

- How much space is between the two buildings facing each other? *18 metres from building B to C, and 12 metres from Building A to Building B at the upper storey; at lower levels 10 metres.*
- How much is setback at the top levels of the buildings? *Setback at least 2 metres at 22nd Street; to north setback is about 1.5 - 2 metres; east setback is less than a metre. Challenges with a wood frame building made us keep with vertical stacking; wanted to keep two metre setback to west but we could not do so on some of the other sides in order to keep more units.*
- Has there been discussion with the District about the columns that are encroaching into the parking stalls? *The zoning bylaw regulates column placement.*
- Did you explore having an outdoor amenity area on the rooftop? *Yes, we moved away from this option due to affordability for client including ongoing maintenance and having to bring an elevator up to the roof.*
- Does Kiwanis also own the other Kiwanis facilities also on District leasehold land? *This will be the first District-owned leasehold property for Kiwanis.*
- Did the above influence design rational? *Not at all; the buildings were designed for future, long-term use.*
- On the renderings, the architectural examples look more attractive than the proposed buildings; have you incorporated some of these elements into the proposal? *These images are not our own images; we are trying to pick up elements of these buildings and incorporate them into our design such as the use of wood and roof design.*
- One of the guidelines is to ensure massing and scale are responsive to the neighbourhood; both this proposal and Parcel B are sizable developments. How do these structures reflect on those buildings to the West of 22nd Street? *Site is within Ambleside Local Area Plan; given densities being proposed it is likely that a change of land use will be expected. Single-family interface may in the future change.*
- Why did you go to 6 storeys whereas, Darwin is at 8 storeys? *Council approved the density in this area, including pre-zoning for the height; this proposal came in after the zoning was already determined.*
- What is the wall off of 22nd Street, in front of the amenity space, made of? *It is currently a fence/screen that needs to be head height; hoping to soften the*

appearance with landscaping; in future it will likely be made out of aluminum; this is a requirement from VCH.

- *Roof top amenity area will not be done due to expense, is that correct? It is a cost aspect but also due to maintenance as it increases risk of potential damage; challenges with roof top patios due to mass which requires a lot of structural and seismic consulting.*
- *Is there any regulation preventing the entry ways from the porte cochère from being angled, or are they perpendicular to curb? For CD61, the porte cochère does not have to provide for a setback; there is nothing in the guidelines that speaks to configuration of this aspect specifically.*
- *In the guidelines, the applicant is to provide metal or fibreglass windows. Is this a suggestion only, or is it a firm requirement? Yes, it is a suggestion.*
- *On Building A, did you consider extending the entrance canopy over the driveway to protect residents from climatic elements? Tried to incorporate this; challenge was that driveway is quite large; to have structure off the site it would then be on municipal land.*
- *Looking at the daycare centre, I do not see any provision for a bedroom, in cases where residents feel uncomfortable or need assistance. Did you consider this? Design regulations come from VCH; we did incorporate a quiet space which could function in a similar way.*
- *How do residents access the courtyard, especially from the adult daycare? VCH stated it does not want program users to mix with public, as they have to be under strict supervision; adult care facility is private for this reason.*
- *I do not see a place for children to play. Is there a playground area in this design? There is a playground offsite nearby. Onsite there is a play area for toddlers ages 1 – 4; also a small play structure and nature area which they can use. Older children would have to go offsite due to space.*
- *Are you worried about glare from the use of the white panels? Not reviewed the glare aspect specifically but in using these panels in other projects I am familiar with them and they are more of a matte white which does not create a significant amount of glare.*
- *Is there a fence on the eastern property, or can one walk between areas? Integrating landscaping between properties and have it collectively available to residents for connection. There is a pedestrian connection between projects to encourage residents to use.*
- *Will the boulevard on 22nd be wider in the future? To be determined by District but it will have parking pockets and landscaping along with a walkway.*

Committee Comments:

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

- *Outdoor amenity area does not appear to be enough to support this development; access between two buildings needs to be provided; separation between Buildings A & B does not seem sufficient; encourage applicants to work towards finding a greater distance in setback on Building A; columns should be between parking stalls or not there at all; suggest making the top level lighter in color with less glazing to reduce appearance of massing; encourage use of wood material and a stronger expression.*

- Overall, supportive of this project; suggest exploring opportunities of integrating public art and seeking advice from Public Art Committee; screening of garbage area, trellis or hydro kiosks is an example of where art wraps could be used; I support the increase of height and separation of building setbacks; suggest differentiating buildings by use of different colors/panels for example to distinguish them from one another.
- Support affordable housing projects such as this one; like the material pallets which respond to the guidelines and achieve the West Coast character; I would not modify material pallet; the column grids in entry could be changed; could consider a bit of separation amongst buildings to distinguish them from one another; screening of garbage area could be effective; it would be easier for vehicles to enter site if the driveway was slightly angled; support height variation and massing due to constraints posed by applicant.
- Challenging project which designers have done a great job with proposing; suggest providing a covered access between Buildings A and B to protect residents from elements; suggest creating a connection from the amenity area to the garden; exterior stairs going to the parkade via the ramp need to be covered by building code.
- I support project and applaud wood building; covered access over the entrance to the adult day care is suggested to protect from rain/elements.

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

It was Moved and Seconded:

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

- Investigate an extended rain canopy over the drop off area at the front of the adult daycare.
- Work to differentiate the two entrances to define between the users. Consider placement of columns to achieve this.
- Consider changing the angle of the porte cochère to assist in the ease of the exit and entrance for vehicles.
- Meet with the Public Art Advisory Committee to explore opportunities to integrate art with the public realm.
- Encourage more use of the wood material to create a stronger expression.
- Review the upper level storey setbacks with the guidelines.
- Explore connectivity between the two buildings to provide weather protection.
- Review unit alignment in the two buildings to increase privacy.

CARRIED

L. Xu absent at the vote

5.2 Address: 2195 Gordon Avenue (Parcel B)

A. Hatch recused himself from consideration of Item 5.2 (conflict of interest as he knows the Architect of the project).

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

- This proposal is for an 8-storey building to work in conjunction with Parcel A.
- Roof top amenity patio on building for private use; also a south-facing shared amenity area on site.
- Proposal has a Floor Area Ratio of 2.68; square footage: 76,000 square feet; 40 percent site coverage; compliant with CD61 height regulations; 116 parking stalls, 89 secure bike storage stalls in parkade.
- Parkade entrance is located north of the building; shared parking access by means of an easement agreement.
- Displayed ground level rendering showing entrances along Gordon Avenue; streetscape along Gordon Avenue to remain the same.
- Roof top amenity area provided with both shared and private areas; total of 5 amenity areas.

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

- Proposal is for an 8-storey market condominium achieving Step 3 with a low carbon energy system.
- In terms of architecture and inspiration, looked to high integration of nature; use of natural materials.
- Mixed types of buildings in surrounding area provide a rich context to site.
- Site Zoned as CD61; 58 units; 76,700 square feet of floor space proposed.
- Buildings similar but not identical.
- Displayed setbacks showing 18.25 metre distance between buildings.
- Views of UBC, Burrard Inlet, mountains are taken advantage of with the roof top amenity area.
- Proposal conforms with the following guidelines:
 - Entrance Lobby addresses civic scale
 - Bottom of building clad in basalt to ground and make appearance of townhouses
 - Ground floors with private doors that exit onto terraces
 - Wet Coast Character; recessed balconies that give perception of indoor/outdoor living space.
 - Light, glass top of building that is set back to minimize appearance of massing.
 - Solar shading on South side.
 - Landscaping abides to setbacks; rooftop and ground are landscaped to provide optimal planting.
 - Roof top has both indoor and outdoor portion for residents; also ground floor amenity garden area that covers parking area.
- Modifications to be proposed to guidelines:
 - Modest encroachment of bay windows into the 2 metre setback.

- Addition of roof top pop-ups; shared amenity that includes washroom and storage area to make this amenity area more usable throughout year and keep space discrete.
- Environmental performance, high performance envelopes and low carbon energy systems as well as Indigenous stewardship were important aspects in this development of the design.
- Materials convey both international and local character through the use of timber, concrete, glass and siting of building within nature. Local basalt provides dark material; glazed brick provides modern/simple look; wood soffits and trellises add soft West Coast element.
- Decks integrated with outdoor spaces to provide protection from weather and solar shading.
- West elevation split in two so as to allow light to come in through corridor on all levels.
- Displayed rendering of main entrance doors off of Gordon Avenue; terraces immediately adjacent; limited glazing; weather protection canopy extending from second floor; north corner at 22nd Street that is defined.
- Sustainability aspects: underground parking, green roofs so that storm water retention is high, public transit nearby, good airflow throughout building.
- Accessibility aspects: Seamless transitions for accessibility from entrance way to street and to units; ground floor units are CNV Level 3 accessible, elsewhere in building units are Level 1 accessible.

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

- Displayed site plan showing ground orientation of patios. Tree planting along Gordon Avenue with five new trees proposed on frontage to soften appearance.
- Design attempting to integrate landscaping into street-front.
- Rear amenity area that looks onto the lawn that can be used as a multipurpose space.
- Proposing a series of stacked bleachers for shielding of noise from the street; planting proposed to provide architectural screening.
- Upper terrace has small amenity area with mixed uses; small seating area for eating and socializing; ornamental grasses for buffering while still letting in views.
- Displayed lighting plan providing overhead light from trellis to driveway entry to parkade; roof deck will have discrete lighting.
- Sections along the edges of Gordon will have ornamental planting on
- Proposing a basalt face wall at property line with a bit of planting to provide transition from public to private area.

L. Xu entered the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

Committee Questions:

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

- Is it necessary to provide 3 levels of underground parking? *If this was downtown Vancouver we'd be looking at providing a reduced number of stalls but with the size of the units, we feel the number of parking stalls is appropriate for West Vancouver. According to initial geotechnical analysis, there are no ground water concerns for the proposed parkade.*

D. Harrison left the meeting and did not return. R. Amenyogbe assumed the Chair.

- Did you explore having the majority of the levels at the 2-metre setback and other levels at recessed setbacks? *Explored multiple setback options. Intent of design was to achieve a popping-out of building rather than being recessed.*
- No visitor parking on site? *Not on site, but there is street parking available in the neighbourhood.*
- Were there any traffic studies done to determine the effect of how two parking stalls per unit would impact traffic in the area? *Yes, marginal increase of traffic with the additional stalls was determined in study.*
- Are there no adaptable units in this project? *All units are Level 1 by CNV Adaptability Standards.*
- What kind of sustainable approach did you take other than the Step Code requirements? *Conducted an energy model study of the building; looked at air tightness and R-values; used energy model approach. Using an air cooling system run off electricity rather than fossil fuels.*
- Is this a leasehold development? *Yes.*
- Given the 22nd and Bellevue proposal a number of weeks ago will there not be the same issues with this building? *The application is for a development permit that must meet guidelines, it is not a rezoning.*
- The landscaping along the boulevard is typical. Did you discuss the minimal boulevard development with staff? *We looked at opportunities for street parking; have not explored the corner plaza; would like to hear recommendations from the committee.*
- How many outdoor bike stalls are required? *12 class B bike stalls are required outside the entrance and 1.5 in the basement.*
- Could you expand on the use of plants? *A combination of native indigenous and ornamental planting to provide color are being proposed; planting will be supported with an irrigation system.*
- Along Gordon Avenue is the idea to have a lawn directly facing to the street? *Planting of hedges and ornamental grasses are proposed here.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Regarding 2-meter setback on the top level, suggest having the District provide rationale behind this; suggest increasing common amenity area atop building; centre could be dedicated to the public so that they can benefit from the view; four amenity spaces at each corner of rooftop such as penthouses. Would be nice to see photo views rather than just renderings for details.
- Parking columns encroach into the parking stalls; need clarification from the District on guidelines. *Requirements for columns within the parkade are*

provided in the zoning bylaw. In support of more parking stalls, but need to review the traffic study.

- Attractive project that distinguishes itself from the rest of projects; I am in favour.
- Consider visitor parking; landscaping looks great; consider wider sidewalks if possible; overall in support of this building.
- Consider public art elements within public realm; perhaps along trellis or walkway areas; suggest meeting with Public Art Committee to incorporate these elements.
- Is there a gym amenity area? *Amenity area is geared towards being a family area.*
- In the future the native plants should be considered with existing plants in mind; I feel bike parking area is very crowded; perhaps look at having bike parking on the corner of Gordon and 22nd and integrated as part of the plaza, or on the North side by garbage area. I love the rooftop garden.
- Consider having art incorporated into the public plaza; main entrance could be emphasized as presently appears hidden so that people can locate it.
- *Applicant response: envisioned setback as an edge to the building; want to be able to inhabit this area by having an indoor/outdoor area. Appreciate comments especially that of the indoor/outdoor corridor.*

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

It was Moved and Seconded:

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

- Review the upper storey setbacks in context with the guidelines.
- Consider increasing the shared outdoor amenity area at the roof top level.
- Review the column locations of the parking area to meet the zoning bylaw.
- Review visitor parking requirement and if possible increase the number of visitor parking stalls.
- Review wider sidewalk along Gordon Avenue and study the provision of the garden plaza.
- Consider more use of native and drought tolerant plants.
- Review the location of the visitor bicycle parking at grade.
- Review the boulevard treatment at the corner of 22nd Street and Gordon Avenue.
- Meet with the Public Art Advisory Committee to explore opportunities to integrate art with the public realm.

CARRIED

D. Harrison and A. Hatch absent at the vote

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

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

- Proposal for a 201-unit rental apartment on Clyde Avenue just north of Park Royal.
- Site has an L-shaped configuration; located on east side of Taylor Way; site comprised of four legal lots, three of which front onto Clyde Avenue and the other fronting onto Duchess Avenue.
- Site surrounded by Taylor Way to the west; 5-storey building to the east; single family dwellings to the north and northeast of site; south of site is flat and presently serves as an auxiliary parking site for Park Royal.
- Site is situated on the southern edge of the Taylor Way Local Area Plan (not ratified) and just north of the Marine Drive Local Area Plan boundary.
- Due to close proximity of Taylor Way and Park Royal, it is assumed there will be an increase in density in this area in the future.
- Proposal includes: 201 market unit, 175 of which are micro-units and 26 adaptable units; approximate FAR of 2.04; 6-storey building with roof top amenity area; outdoor amenity area in northwest portion of site and a courtyard on southern area of site.
- Parking area with 51 vehicle stalls; 304 bike stalls.
- Potential for boulevard upgrades, including side walk upgrades.
- The southern portion of site is within the Clyde Area Development Permit Area (DPA); this DPA supports a range of uses and require a well landscape street scape; also supports provision of community benefits such as creating rental buildings.

Project Presentation: M. Ehman (Architect) provided an introduction including:

- Provided design objectives of this proposal:
 - Addressing urgent need for affordable rental housing in West Vancouver.
 - Optimal site given proximity to Park Royal and the transit hub on Marine Drive and Taylor Way; recreation facilities nearby.
 - Micro-unit concept designed to include murphy beds, dining room table, storage, standard size appliances; increased to 27 adaptable/efficient units in building; indoor and outdoor amenity of 300 square metres on ground floor as well as amenity spaces on each floor.
 - Sustainability achieved through Step 3 low carbon energy system; integrating reclaimed wood from historic Park Royal building. Accommodating parking stalls, reduction in parking count based on a traffic study.

Project Presentation: R. Komnatsky (Architect) provided a presentation including:

- Height of this building is indicative of neighbouring buildings.
- Envisioning pedestrian realm improvements along Taylor Way as well as a bicycle path along Marine Drive and Taylor Way.
- Reviewed site context.
- Site planning strategy: do not intend to build on the north part of lot; this area planned to become an amenity area/green space for residents.

- Idea of a southern courtyard incorporate for maximum solar exposure.
- Western edge with existing ramp poses a challenge.
- 6-storey building proposed with a rooftop amenity and underground parking space; landscaping with lots of greenery.
- Displayed plans showing basic form comes out of micro-unit module; 350 square foot units; 26 adaptable units; outdoor and indoor amenity areas; exit stairs which encourage residents to be active; Clyde Avenue units will have patios; North side patios will be smaller in size due to lane setback.
- 35 micro-units per floor; each floor equipped with an amenity area.
- Roof level to be accessed through an elevator.
- Parking accessed from southeast corner of site; reduced parking ratio of 0.2 stalls per unit; 0.05 visiting parking stalls; providing 1.5 bike stalls per unit with stacked bike storage configuration.
- Displayed rendering of future site context: heavily vegetated area with single family, senior living and apartment buildings.
- Used balconies to articulate building; breaking down of massing; use of materials.
- Displayed views of the building: rooftop, glass balconies, prominent corner, diagonal pathway, planters on rooftop, colored glass along stairway that ties in and brings character to neighbourhood.
- Materials used: composite metal panels, prefinished siding, glazing, metal frames and wood canopy.

Project Presentation: M. Vaughan (Landscape Architect) provided a presentation including:

- 8-foot sidewalk added to create stronger connection to neighbourhood.
- West of project is sidewalk at Taylor Way which will be demolished and replaced with an overpass; this will be stepped back from the road; landscaped buffer will provide optimal appearance and safety.
- Vegetated bank on the north side retained; at south, a fitness area incorporated with outdoor exercise equipment.
- Plaza on the south will be used for people arriving at the building and will be used as a gathering area for public and residents.
- Entire roof is public resident amenity area; creation of 12 community gardens; series of small and medium size dining areas; sun area with lounge chairs will be incorporated.
- Planting themes will be indigenous along with ornamental; consistent with themes at Park Royal; combination of flowers and native species that will all be drought tolerant.

Committee Questions:

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

- Is there concern from the District in terms of having all studio size units? *Support for smaller units proposed to Council; general support; fit well with housing market in Park Royal Area. Studio units are in demand; these units are*

opportunity for front line workers in West Vancouver to live in community where they work.

- *Is it possible that the ramps could be taken down in the future? Ramps support integral role in traffic management. Until there is a viable way of circumnavigating these intersections then they are crucial. I cannot comment as to whether they will stay. Perhaps long term they could be dismantled.*
- *Are dishwashers being proposed in the units? Yes, they were missed in drawings.*
- *Shading; is it in reference to balcony overhangs? Yes.*
- *Are you looking at headlights in terms of studies? Yes, good point will look at this.*
- *Did you look at West Coast design and other examples in Taylor Way? We wanted to look at the emerging character of the area; proposal is for a micro unit but is also West Coast in expression with warmth though use of wood. We feel it is an appropriate style of architecture for setting.*
- *The single-family houses to the north, are there plans for these being rezoned/redeveloped? Yes, at some point these will be rezoned in the foreseeable future. Land use densities would likely increase from single family.*
- *Is there a shadow study? It was not include in the package.*
- *What type of projects inspired this design and what type of character are you looking at? Contemporary West Coast design is the objective.*
- *How much is spacing from exit to Park Royal and then to the units? 4.5 metres at the closest point.*
- *Did you consider privacy in the architectural plan for those units closely situated to the street? Will consider this further.*
- *Will you prioritize work force tenants? We did state that employees working in West Vancouver would be prioritized through an incentive program.*
- *Appreciate amenity space on top levels; why did you not incorporate indoor amenity area at top level? Cannot have occupancy at top level or it would be considered a 7-storey building.*
- *What is intent of guidelines to have setback at second storey? To provide a guideline of second story patio that would overlook streetscape.*
- *Did you study the buildings to the north to ensure this building fit in context with them? Yes, we have looked at these buildings. For most part, north area is heavily vegetated which shields those buildings from this building and vice-versa.*
- *How do you provide privacy for upper units in courtyard as they do not appear to have privacy screens? We have to refine this; given these are rental units, they are geared toward a more community oriented feel. There is a mix of balconies with privacy and those without.*
- *What kind of function are you thinking of for amenities that do not have natural light? Work spaces, movie/digital engagement space.*
- *How many shared car stalls will you provide for this project? We have not started exploring yet. Stalls are rented; if there is demand for more shared stall space, it will be incorporated. There is ample car share in the immediate neighbourhood.*
- *The ground to the parkade is at 10 % transition; did you consider bringing it down to 6%? That is possible to soften the transition.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Highest degree of design has been requested in the guidelines; I do not think this application's design meets West Coast design nor has harmony; in terms of articulation and stepping back I feel the facades are quite flat. Suggest recessing balconies on upper floor; a lot of colours and materials make appearance look busy. Address safety in terms of guardrails; glass stair wells are a nice feature; I like the glazing; tops are heavy in comparison; 75% reduction of parking is significant but I am not sure of District's guidelines for parking. Overall, I would like to see this project resubmitted.
- Agree with the busy appearance of this project; good core components but too many ideas; materials used break up building in pieces; like the two glass towers; perhaps this is opportunity to have an artist look at color pallet; advice is to simplify project and reduce number of design elements.
- Like the idea of the outdoor space on the south side however, I feel like the landscape package is not complete; I did not see the enlargement of the courtyard design and how trellis integrates with this outdoor area; I like the idea of the outdoor gym, perhaps this could be incorporated into the courtyard area.
- Rooftop design appears plain; perhaps stacked planting could provide buffering as from west side the aspect looks awkward; would like to see a detailed planting list.
- Piece that seems to be missing is inspiration; have to have shadow study to see impact of building on neighbourhood; suggest making simpler design with fewer materials and colors; suggest having access to natural light in amenity areas; suggest softscapes on rooftop rather than hardscapes; privacy screens between upper balconies would be beneficial, or delete the balconies altogether.
- Suggest having a more elegant building; provide more car-shares for the project. I would like to see project resubmitted.
- Think this is a commendable project given challenges of site and proximity to Park Royal/Taylor Way; like the outdoor area on northwest corner and rooftop garden; I am in support of project.
- Think this is a very interesting project with restrictions of the ramp; the units are typical and I understand the concept of the micro-units but they are not expressed from the façade; suggest having the southwest corner units so that they are not laid out with kitchens back-to-back; this way the corridor will be positioned towards the courtyard.
- Inconsistency of railings; suggest using the same material; suggest decreasing the noise from the cars off Taylor Way by fixing a screen on the east side of the ramp.

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

It was Moved and Seconded:

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

- Review the elevations, simplify and articulate the building form with special attention to stepping back form and arrangement and expression of balconies, considering both articulation of building form and privacy.
- Consider simpler and more harmonious material and colour pallets.
- Consider privacy screen on single balconies or use of Juliette balconies.
- Consider more elegant form for entrance identity.
- Review the location of amenity rooms to provide natural light and ventilation.
- Review car share possibilities for the building.
- Provide inspiration images for building character conforming to guidelines and emerging character of the neighbourhood.
- Provide further information related to acoustic measures, potential glare from the off-ramp, a shadow study of the building, and site sections showing properties to the north.
- Provide more softscape on the rooftop amenity areas.
- Provide enlargement of the courtyard and more details of the landscaping plans.
- Provide information on the safety and CPTED measures for the Park Royal off ramp.
- Provide landscape details of the north trail.

CARRIED

D. Harrison absent at the vote

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Staff noted that an email from J. Timmer regarding 2195 Gordon Avenue was forwarded to committee members.

7. NEXT MEETING

Staff confirmed that the next Design Review Committee meeting is scheduled for March 9, 2022 at 4:30 p.m.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

It was Moved and Seconded:

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

CARRIED

D. Harrison absent at the vote

The meeting adjourned at 9:21 p.m.

Certified Correct:



Roger Amenyogbe (Mar 30, 2022 23:04 PDT)

Acting Chair



Lisa Berg (Mar 31, 2022 06:32 PDT)

Staff Liaison