

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
VIA ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION FACILITIES
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2021**

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

Staff: L. Berg, Senior Community Planner; and N. Allard, Committee Clerk, attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:37 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the November 4, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting agenda be revised as noted: Item 5.1 revised to 2367 Marine Drive; Item 5.2 revised to 150 24th Street.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the October 21, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting minutes be adopted 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: 150 24th Street** (Seastrand Apartment Balcony Railing Safety and Replacement Project)

Due to technical challenges Item 5.1 was considered immediately following Item 5.2.

5.2 **Address: 2367 Marine Drive** (Development Permit Amendment)

Background: K. Koufogiannakis, Assistant Planner, introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context:

- This is a development permit amendment to Development Permit No. 15-093, approved January 2, 2020. Review and support from Design Review Committee was initially provided in 2018.
- Fronts Marine Drive to the south and is located within the Duplex Development Permit Area, RD 1 Zone and is surrounded by: single family houses to the north and duplexes on all other sides.
- Proposed changes include exterior cladding materials, garage doors and windows placements, landscaping including driveway materials, and deletion of two accessory buildings in the rear yard.
- Displayed rendering comparing approved and proposed changes of units.

Committee Questions:

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

- Why are accessory buildings in the rear removed? *The accessory buildings were removed due to cost.*
- The new siding material looks lighter; are there any glare issues from the material? *Material is a matte finish so I am not anticipating any glare; is a flat exterior surface.*

Committee Comments:

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

- The roof is a shed roof; I think the thickness of roof should be increased to allow for proper drainage along fascia.
- Some variety in the middle between units would improve façade and give the two buildings an identity.
- Seems to be a reduction of the landscape area at the rear with the extension of the building.
- On the west side there is an existing tree that needs to be retained and there appears to be no planting along the fence line. Suggestion is to have some type of planting on the west side if the plans allow.

- The changes look acceptable and are minor in nature so no concerns.
- Cladding is well done even though new material is being proposed.
- Generally okay with the proposed changes in materials; it appears in the approved version that the windows wrap the corner and now this aspect has been eliminated. Perhaps a wrapped window on the upper floor could be added.
- In future, a shed/storage accessory building maybe added which would result in a loss of landscape area. Perhaps this should be considered when proposing to remove the accessory buildings.
- Do not see any objections to what is being proposed.
- *Applicant response: Changes partially a result of budget. Changes are modernized and keeping in line with a cleaner look; still trying to keep with this feel however with the use of a more contemporary feel. Window not wrapped around the corner on upper floor for privacy to adjacent neighbours.*

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 2367 Marine Drive application subject to the following items with staff:

- consider change in the variety of garage door treatment in order to differentiate between the units; and
- consider vegetation along the west fence line if conditions allow, to soften the fence presence.

CARRIED

POLL CALLED FOR THE VOTE = 5

5.1 Address: 150 24th Street (Seastrand Apartment Balcony Railing Safety and Replacement Project)

Background: M. Roberts, Planning Technician, introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context.

- Subject site located at the end of 24th Street on the waterfront; adjacent to the seawall and the multi-family site to the east.
- Building is known as the Seastrand; 16 story residential apartment with 114 units; built in 1963. When the building was constructed, the form and character permit development permit guidelines at the time had not yet been created.
- In 1983 a development permit was authorized to allow for balcony enclosures. Requirements of this permit included:
 - That the balcony enclosures align with the handrails spacing and were capable of sliding open.
 - Most of the enclosures consisted of 7 – 9 panels depending on the unit.
 - 1985 – Amendment to the development permit to require all enclosures be made of clear glass.

- 2018 – Director of Planning approved the consideration of 4 and 5 panel balcony enclosures.
- As a result of the above development permit history a large number of the balconies have been enclosed.
- District has received a proposal to upgrade all of the railings of the building due to life safety issues.
- Proposal is for two different types of rails:
 - Vertical cables – stainless steel.
 - Webnet pattern – equipped with fasteners; diamond pattern.
- Several of the units will have the guardrail height extended by up to 5 inches to accommodate balcony floor levels that have been raised when that balconies were originally enclosed.
- Proposed Elevations:
 - South – corners in webnet pattern; centres with vertical cables.
 - North – balconies in webnet pattern.
 - West – corners in webnet; centre with vertical cables.
 - East – corners in webnet; centres with vertical cables.
- Property is within the Ambleside Development Permit Area and is subject to the area specific guidelines; objective to ensure that building has a high quality of design and keeps in line with the surrounding developments.

Project Presentation: Cameron Robinson (Structural Engineer, Laterra Engineering) provided a presentation including:

- Owners seeking guardrail replacements.
- Guardrails require replacement as:
 - Current guardrails do not comply with BC Building Code.
 - Rails are aged; corroded, and missing top rail fasteners in various locations.
 - Existing balcony enclosures increase the floor height which makes the guardrail height non-compliant with code standards.
 - The variation in the enclosure construction and removal of, has created an inconsistent look to the building.
- Webnet will be used as a feature only in the corners to add character and contrast to the view. Primary interest for owners is visual; creates a clean, modern look with varied graduated coverage from bottom to top of panel in random pattern.
- Vertical cable guardrail in centre areas will provide clean line look. Height of guardrails will be extended in areas where the floor height has been raised such as for those units which had balconies enclosed.

Committee Questions:

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

- What is the potential for the design of the webnet (is there a custom design? Who is designing it?) *We will prepare four different random panels with the appropriate coverage (1 percent top, 20 percent middle, 50 percent bottom).*

- Who will be designing the webnet? *The manufacturer will provide models to the owners who will then choose.*
- I haven't seen this type of application on a tower; are there any issues with how ridged the materials are in this type of use? *I will be testing these aspects to ensure they are compliant. Vertical cables being proposed are 70-80 mm apart so they have to stretch quite a bit in order to meet standards. We will be testing this specifically.*
- Material being used is powder coated aluminum? *No – stainless steel with a polished finish.*
- How will the vertical cable be tested for compliance in terms of climbability? *Climbability as per the building code allows for 20 mm by 45 mm. We are going to make sure that the webnet is compliant with this specification.*
- The vertical cable are constantly under tension; the stress on the cables will be quite high. Will you test for these aspects? *I would not be able to get a 4 diameter bar to resist these loads therefore, I would have to enlarge that bar; this would take away from view. This system is durable and will require less maintenance than glass however there will still be maintenance involved. Vertical spacing between posts is 4 ft.*
- Has this treatment been used in Vancouver before, or on similar buildings? *I do not believe so which is why I have been consulted to ensure that the system meets code requirements. Tension will be enough that frequency will not be a concern. Many tests will be done to ensure the compliancy of these systems.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Disappointed; I have no doubt in confidence of the Engineer and information has been provided however, prefer a better design in terms of the whole building. The dynamic pattern is exciting but it does not reflect complete design of the original building. I think this all needs to be looked at from a design point of view before going to the manufacturer. Can't support proposal at this time for these reasons.
- Think the application of the steel and the longevity goes a step beyond in terms of materiality and will marry into the building. Nervous about it being untested at this point but understand that testing is to be conducted.
- Understand the need for safety and condition of the existing guardrails that require a technical response however, I think there is a missed opportunity as the design element has not been included for the overall building. Perhaps if this building was not as prominent (on the waterfront) it would blend in more, but given its location I think further consideration of design is required for the complete building. The proposal is unsatisfactory.
- Interesting transparency in renderings however concerned about the performance of the material. Not enough information to render an opinion on the structural soundness and visual presentation.
- A Building Envelope Consultant is needed in addition to a Structural Engineer, to look at finishing those units that have already been enclosed. Tying in the enclosures from those that are not enclosed is an important element of this project.

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 150 24th Street application subject to the following items with staff:

- engage with professional designer or consultant to provide more detail and a rationale for the completed look and overall intent with the greater building's presentation;
- provide a report from a Building Envelope Consultant; and
- consider a replacement to the existing panels, e.g. alternative colors.

CARRIED

POLL CALLED FOR THE VOTE = 5

5.3 Address: 6404 Wellington Avenue (Tantalus Gardens)

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

- Proposal was considered by the Design Review Committee in September 2021 and resubmission was recommended on specified items.
- Site includes two parcels on Wellington Avenue zoned for public assembly use which includes the former St. Monica's Church; two parcels on Nelson Avenue are zoned RS4 for single family use.
- The parcels on Nelson Avenue are included in the recently developed Horseshoe Bay Local Area Plan (LAP); parcels on Wellington Avenue are outside the LAP boundary. Portion of site along Nelson Avenue is within designated infill area; these areas have been forwarded to Council for November 8, 2021 (first reading) review as they will be pre-zoned.
- Displayed an excerpt of the plans from the revised proposal showing elimination and consolidation of the driveways and updates to the public realm designs.

Project Presentation: P. Nilsson (Applicant) provided a presentation including:

- In response to site context and grade, displayed rendering of elevation changes for the 6 units at the rear of property. Landscape and grading plan was not initially provided but now adds context and shows how site relates to adjacent properties.
- Provided proposed elevations and context:
 - Unit A: 193 ft
 - Unit B: 187 ft
 - The adjacent property slopes west to east at 199.6 ft to 182.6 ft and approximately the same 85 ft length.
 - Unit C: 182.5 ft
 - Unit D: 178.5 ft

- The adjacent property slopes west to east at 187.6 ft to 170.8 ft and approximately the same 80 ft length.
 - Unit E: 174 ft
 - Unit F: 168 ft
 - The adjacent property slopes west to east at 169.7 ft to 163.4 ft and approximately the same 85 ft length.
- Setbacks have been proposed as follows in response to request for setback information:
 - North side = 5 ft
 - South side = 5 ft
 - East side = 7 ft 3 inches
 - West side = 14 ft 7 inches
 - Units A & G are now equally setback from Wellington Avenue and in alignment with the adjacent dwelling.
 - South setback reduced by 1 ft to accommodate the relocation of the driveways off of Rosebery Avenue, creating a softer pedestrian experience.
 - Shortest setback on east of property has been reduced by 1 ft. This reduction is result of the 5 ft increase to the northern setback for Unit F. The longest setback at this unit is 24 ft 7 inches.
- Proposed changes to driveway off Rosebery Avenue and off site parking in response to Committee's suggestions to consider a more sensitive approach to these aspects:
 - One driveway connection off of Rosebery Avenue; all parking is accessed off Rosebery through a shared lane.
 - Off-site parking is now situated parallel to site off Rosebery Avenue; 7 off-site parking spaces available on perimeter of property
 - Driveways from Wellington Avenue and Nelson Avenue have been narrowed and separated from pedestrian pathways.
- In response to comments relating to the public realm and pedestrian circulation, the following changes have been proposed:
 - Wide driveways on Rosebery Avenue have been removed.
 - Perpendicular parking stalls have been omitted and replaced with parallel parking; limited to 5 parking stalls off Rosebery Avenue rather than 9; this has increased greenspace along boulevard and reduced hazard of pedestrian crossings.
- In response to expanding the outdoor amenity space, the following changes have been proposed:
 - Extensive planting throughout the site.
 - Key outdoor amenity space included at Corner of Rosebery and Nelson Avenue; swings incorporated to create a fun, social area.
 - Internal lane between housing units could be a basketball court.
 - Noted that Tantalus Park is located immediately across the street on Nelson Avenue; approximately two blocks away, Gleneagles Elementary School provides a playground and soccer field; skateboard and bike park approximately four blocks away; Gleneagles Community Centre and soon to be Horseshoe Bay Water Park in close proximity to site.

- In response to request for detailed landscape and grading plans, this proposal has provided:
 - Cross sections and grading plans have been updated to include spot elevations for existing roadways and sidewalks, adjacent properties and topographical drawings for retaining walls.
- In response concerns for secondary suite access and livability, the following were provided:
 - Grading plan clearly shows access to the secondary suites.
 - All lower level plans and site plan have been revised to indicate access to suites; exterior access defined.
 - Each secondary suite has two bedrooms with three piece bathrooms; each bedroom has light-well with two additional light-wells provided in living room. Internal access provided from above.

Committee Questions:

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

- Has the 12 ft setback along Rosebery Avenue been mandated, or can it be closer? *This is a 5 ft setback.*

Committee Comments:

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

- The front looks better; opens pedestrian sidewalk.
- Great presentation; all major concerns addressed. In the subgrade suites, the majority of light comes from the light-well and I am not sure how livable this is. Anything to increase light in suites is suggested.
- Thanks for providing drawings. Sidewalk has created opportunity for trees on Rosebery Avenue. *Why not keep sidewalk continuing onto Nelson? There is an existing sidewalk that meets this area, we are connecting to it.*
- Endorse this revised proposal; commend applicant on revisions made to respond to previous proposal. Noticed in the zoning report there was mentioned of licenced parking spaces. Would be great to explore the licenced parking stalls for this project.

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 6404 Wellington Avenue application subject to the following items with staff:

- investigate opportunities to improve daylight into the subgrade suites to improve livability.

CARRIED

POLL CALLED FOR THE VOTE = 5

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

NEXT MEETING

7. NEXT MEETING

Staff confirmed that the next Design Review Committee meeting is scheduled for December 9, 2021 at 4:30 p.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the November 4, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Don Harrison

Don Harrison (Jan 19, 2022 14:49 PST)

Chair, Don Harrison

Lisa Berg

Lisa Berg (Jan 19, 2022 16:55 PST)

Staff Liaison, Lisa Berg