

MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON March 13th, 2025 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER

ATTENDING: Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia
Mr. Stuart Rothnie
Mr. Tieg Martin
Ms. Emily Blair
Ms. Farnaz Sharifi
Ms. Mahnaz Mohamadloo
Cpl Paulo Arreaga

REGRETS: Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Mr. Joshua Bernsen
Mr. John Gilmour

STAFF: Ms. Tash Cheong (Staff Liaison), Development Planner
Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner
Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner
Ms. Mina Sami, Planning Assistant

APPLICANT: Shane O'Neill (Public Architecture)
Kristin Defer (ETA Landscaping)

1. PANEL WELCOME AND DINNER

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 PM by Mr. Stuart Rothnie, ADP chair, who then took attendance.

2. ADMINISTRATION

A motion was made by Tieg Martin, seconded by Koosha Kheradmandnia, and carried, to adopt the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of February 13, 2025. No comments or changes were requested for the minutes.

Staff Announcements

Ms. Tash Cheong, staff liaison, provided a brief overview of the Design Excellence Awards which will likely take place in May of this year.

- A panelist suggested that the ADP could review past projects from over 10 years ago and assess how these projects have been executed and performed over the years, highlighting lessons learned from previous developments. Staff acknowledged this suggestion and would consider making changes to the parameters of the awards in the future.
- A panelist suggested that the ADP consider selecting ADP items from previous year (regardless of their occupancy status) for the awards. Staff acknowledged this

suggestion, however, confirmed this would not be a possibility given the items brought forward to ADP are conceptual and nominations must have achieved occupancy in order for panelists to engage in an in-person evaluation of the site.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) Lillooet Road Housing Site – Development Permit for 188 affordable rental units across two six-story buildings on District owned site

Staff Introduction:

Ms. Tash Cheong, Development Planner, introduced the project with a brief overview of the background, timeline of the District-led application, and the existing site context. She concluded with a description of the site, a summary of the planning proposal, affordability requirements, while also setting the expectations for the built form guidelines for this project.

Staff sought input from the Panel on the following:

- How do the proposed materials, colours and textures contribute to the articulation and character of the built form?
- How can the District and the applicant collaborate to enhance the boulevards and edges of the site?
- Do the lobby entrances stand out sufficiently within the overall design?

The Panelists were invited to ask any clarifying questions.

- A panelist inquired about the site's slope and grading percentage.

Applicant Presentation:

The applicant, Shane O'Neill, Architect highlighted the design objectives of the project and provided a general overview, including the site context and analysis, design rationale, materials, and other relevant details. Kristin Defer, Landscape Architect, then presented the landscape strategy, covering exterior landscape lighting, the planting plan, indoor and outdoor amenity spaces, accessibility, and public improvements.

The Panelists were invited to ask any clarifying questions.

- A panelist asked if the renderings represent the final design or if they are still in progress.
- A panelist asked about the number of units.
- A panelist requested more information about the enclosures on the roof and the equipment. Additionally, they sought clarification on whether the public west-to-east pathways include stairs or ramps.
- A panelist inquired about the exposure of the parking structure in relation to the slope of the grade. They also asked about the bicycle parking ratio in relation to the BC Housing policy and sought clarification on the tree replacement policy.

- A panelist asked for the design rationale behind choosing balconies with picket or glass. They also inquired if the architect is following the BCBC 2024 standards.

Urban Design Presentation:

Mr. Alfonso Tejada presented to the Panel and sought input on the following:

- The roofline and its integration with the building's form.
- Material choices and how they complement the building's form and define its planes.
- The articulation of the building forms, especially at the bending points.
- Accessibility of the site and its connection to the surrounding environment.
- The impact of wind on the building's design and performance.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada invited the Panel for further comments.

Summary of Panel Commentary and Consensus Items:

The Chair thanked staff and the applicant team for their presentations and invited comments from the Panel.

Summary of Panel Commentary:

- Panelists noted that the project generally works well, with a thoughtful approach to the complex site and its various constraints. They highlighted that the form and massing of the development are well handled, but further design development is needed to address minor variations in materiality and use.
- Panelists commented on the building's materiality, acknowledging the good work done but suggesting opportunities for enhancement. They recommended incorporating vertical or horizontal lines and exploring options to adjust the materiality, particularly at the building corners. They emphasized creating a consistent approach to where these materials are used throughout the building, such as the materiality of the inset balconies and how it transitions to the exterior.
- Panelists suggested that both building entrances be enhanced and made more prominent. Specifically, they recommended improving the North building lobby by refining its materiality, lighting, and overall definition. A panelist also proposed relocating the South building entrance to the center of the building and emphasized that the two entrance lobbies should be more visible, potentially through changes in material or color.
- Panelists suggested that the roundabout drop-off and pick-up area could be enhanced and differentiated by altering the pavement leading to the lobbies or adding green spaces in the center. It should be more closely linked to the courtyard character rather than the street character.
- A panelist noted that, in regard to the building's affordability, the maintenance of the proposed green areas should be considered.
- Panelists suggested that the garbage loading area be redesigned to improve functionality. One panelist recommended considering pick-up locations in the on-street visitor parking area, while another proposed relocating the garbage staging areas to a more enclosed space, such as the north side of the parkade access.

- Panelists generally agreed that the parking design works well but suggested some improvements. A panelist proposed exploring relocating the parking access to a more central location on the site to provide equal access to all parking areas. Additionally, a panelist commented on the parking ratio, while another suggested considering partitioning the bicycle storage into smaller rooms with digital access in the parkade.
- Panelists discussed the articulation of the balconies and their impact on the courtyard. One panelist highlighted the effect of the projecting balconies, noting the lack of regulation on what can be placed or done on them, which could lead to visual distractions.
- A panelist suggested widening the boulevard by shifting the sidewalk back and adding larger trees.
- Panelists suggested that adding stairs on the south side of the property, near the existing bus stop, could enhance accessibility.
- A panelist commented on the public realm and landscape, suggesting the addition of more urban agriculture pots on the site or within the existing community garden on the north side of the property.
- A panelist commented on that the pathway/short-cut from the bus stop on the south side could benefit from improved lighting to enhance safety.
- A panelist commented on how the building name could potentially unify the building and recognized that CPTED principles had been considered.
- A panelist suggested enclosing the east side of the property to create more privacy.
- Panelists commented that the courtyard is well-balanced, with thoughtful design, including shaded areas. However, one panelist noted the absence of covered outdoor amenities and pointed out that the outdoor seating area is too close to the edge of the north building, which could create discomfort. Another panelist suggested adding more play areas for children, such as flat areas suitable for playing with balls. Additionally, it was noted that the north building lacks direct access to the courtyard.
- A panelist commented on the shadow study for the courtyard and the building's location, noting that it could create wind tunnels.
- A panelist noted that, based on the shadow study, a few units in the north building cannot receive sunlight.
- A panelist commented on the bike paths and general movement around the street edges, ensuring visibility when merging the parkade entry with the street.
- A panelist praised the integrated approach between the applicant and district to work on the boulevard, with tall trees that provide shade.

Summary of Panel Consensus Items:

- **Building materiality:** The building's materiality should be enhanced by incorporating vertical or horizontal lines and adjusting materials, particularly at building corners. A consistent approach to materials should be maintained, especially in transitions at inset balconies.

- **Building entrances:** Additional refinement of the entrances should be reviewed to enhance materiality and lighting. The visibility of both entrances can be improved through adjustments in material or color.
- **Balcony articulation:** The articulation of balconies should be reviewed, particularly in terms of their impact on the courtyard.
- **Boulevard enhancements:** Opportunities to widen the boulevard should be explored by shifting the sidewalk back and adding larger trees to improve both aesthetics and functionality. Determine the feasibility of adding stairs to the south side near the existing bus stop to enhance site accessibility.
- **Drop off/pick-up area:** Review options to make this location more defined and further linked to the character of the courtyard as opposed to the roadway.
- **Courtyard design and outdoor amenities:** Refine design to incorporate a covered outdoor amenity area and urban agriculture where possible, and review outdoor seating area locations to maximize resident privacy.

The Chair then invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Tieg Martin, and **SECONDED** by Koosha Kheradmandnia:

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and **recommends APPROVAL of the project SUBJECT to addressing to the satisfaction of staff** the items noted by the Panel in its review of the project.

CARRIED

None opposed.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

The next ADP will be on April 10, 2025

Chair (staff liaison)

Chair

signed on behalf of chair - as concurred.

April 14/2025

Date