

MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON April 10th, 2025 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER

ATTENDING: Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia
Mr. Stuart Rothnie
Mr. Tieg Martin
Ms. Emily Blair
Ms. Mahnaz Mohamadloo
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
Mr. Joshua Bernsen
Mr. John Gilmour
Mr. David Park
Mr. Robert Greene

REGRETS: Ms. Farnaz Sharifi

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

APPLICANT: Victor Jeon (Applicant)
Steve Watt (Architect, Integra)
Samantha Hunt-Weeks (Landscape Architect, Prospect & Refuge
Landscape Architects)

1. PANEL WELCOME AND DINNER

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM by Mr. Stuart Rothnie, ADP chair, who then took attendance.

2. ADMINISTRATION

The minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting on March 13, 2025, underwent review. Panelist noted that some minor edits were required:

- Page 4 of the minutes – top of the page, first point regarding bicycle parking: A Panelist suggested partitioning the common bicycle storage room into smaller, individual bike storage areas, each with digital access, rather than having one large, shared space.
- Page 4 of the minutes – middle of the page, comment on the south pathway: A comment was made that the shortcut from the bus stop to the south side of the building could benefit from improved lighting to enhance safety.

Page 4 of the minutes – middle of the page, comment on the building name: name could potentially unify community and CPTED principles had been considered.

A motion was made by John Gilmour, seconded by Koosha Kheradmandnia, and carried, to adopt the amended minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of March 13, 2025. The minutes will be amended as per Panelists' comments and Ms. Tash Cheong will sign on behalf of Mr. Stuart Rothnie.

Staff Announcements

Ms. Tash Cheong introduced the two new panel members, Mr. David Park (Accessibility Representative) and Mr. Robert Greene (Public Arts Representative), who then introduced themselves. This was followed by a roundtable introduction.

3. NEW BUSINESS

- a.) 3428-3464 Mount Seymour Parkway – Rezoning and Development Permit for Proposes 29 townhouse units (including six lock-off suites) within four buildings, which step down in height from three storeys to two storeys. Parking for 52 vehicles (46 residential and six visitor) is proposed in a single-level underground parkade**

Staff Introduction:

Mr. Liam Butler, Development Planner, introduced the project with a brief description of the existing site context in relation to the proposal, followed by the existing general policy framework and development context. He concluded with a description of the site, a summary of the planning proposal, and set the expectations for the built form guidelines for this project.

Staff sought input from the Panel on the following:

- Is there an opportunity to relocate the mailboxes and provide a ramp from the main access point off Mount Seymour to the internal landscaped courtyard? This would improve accessibility.
- Could the rooftop railings be broken up to reflect the vertical division created by the town homes facing the rear lane?

The Panelists were invited to ask any clarifying questions.

- A panelist referred to the previous application, asking if it had received comments. They inquired whether the current design is a modified version of the previous proposal, or a completely new application submitted by a new applicant.

Applicant Presentation:

The Architect, Steve Watt, highlighted the design objectives of the project and provided a general overview, including the site context, site circulation and access, massing, design rationale, exterior façade materials, and other relevant details.

Samantha Hunt-Weeks, Landscape Architect, then presented the landscape strategy, including the landscaping plan, street trees, internal pathway to the central courtyard, and outdoor amenity spaces in the central courtyard, such as benches and kids play area.

The Panelists were invited to ask any clarifying questions.

- A panelist asked whether the planting shown in the renderings match the species noted in the planting plan.
- A panelist inquired about the material used for the two-meter steps leading up to the southern two buildings.
- A panelist asked whether the parking ventilation system is being proposed at this stage.
- A panelist asked what type of elevator is being used in connection to Parkade.
- A panelist asked whether the kids play area is elevated or at grade level.
- A panelist inquired about the material used for the fence on the west side.
- A panelist requested more information about the alternative solutions and travel distances for the northern suites.
- A panelist sought information about the multi-use pedestrian lane on the west side of the property.
- A panelist asked whether there is any delineation or gating between the rear lane and the residential units.
- A panelist requested clarification on DNV's requirements for the temporary parking and loading area at the front.
- A panelist asked how the entry from the main road is identified for first responders and also recommended incorporating wayfinding signage for units on the site.
- A panelist asked about the lighting plan for the common walkway and central courtyard.
- A panelist asked whether the pathway north of the site will eventually become part of the laneway as the adjacent property is developed.
- A panelist inquired about the construction cost per square foot.
- A panelist sought confirmation on whether the pathway on the east side can be used by moving trucks.

Urban Design Presentation:

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

- The building's materiality, specifically how the materials on the north side turn around the corners to the east side.
- The connection between the rooftop railings and the vertical divisions created by the townhomes facing the rear lane.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada invited the Panel for further comments.

Summary of Panel Commentary and Consensus Items:

The Vice 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 functions well and that the design integrates appropriately with surrounding developments. They expressed overall support for the massing and felt that both the public spaces and interim areas were thoughtfully designed.
- Panelists generally agreed that the rooftop railing could be stepped back and broken up to reduce its visual impact. They noted that the continuous eave line below the rooftop decks creates a formalized elevation with a pronounced cornice line, which strongly defines that side of the building.
- Panelists generally agreed that relocating the mailbox and adding a ramp would enhance accessibility. One panelist emphasized that the ramp should be at an accessible grade to ensure its feasibility. Another panelist suggested to eliminate the second door of the elevator and provide an accessible ramp to replace the steps
- A panelist noted the importance of articulating the upper level of the building and suggested that wrapping the material around the corner in a more deliberate way—rather than simply transitioning to wood cladding at the ends—would strengthen the design. They supported the idea of continuing the material used on the vertical column edge onto the adjacent flank wall.
- A panelist recommended careful consideration of the parkade ventilation system and its location, noting it is typically placed on the opposite side from the air intake as this may conflict with the landscaping.
- A panelist suggested exploring the use of wall-mounted heat pumps within the parkade to improve functionality and space efficiency to avoid fan noise and space requirements comprising the landscape plans.
- A panelist recommended using precast concrete planks for stair construction, highlighting their durability for code compliance and safety.
- A panelist noted that the location of the elevator control closet should be reviewed during the DP process as it could impact the form and character of the building.
- A panelist raised concerns about the northeast corner of Building 2, where the garbage staging area is located, stating that Hardi-Panel Siding over a rainscreen is not an appropriate material choice and recommending concrete cladding instead for durability.
- A panelist suggested using step-integrated concrete lighting as a more visually integrated and effective alternative to bollard lighting.
- A panelist suggested incorporating a more artistic design feature instead of the wooden trellis entrances on the north and south sides of the building, as well as integrating artistic lighting elements as a form of public art.
- A panelist noted that providing direct access from the north units to the parking area leads to alternative solutions.
- A panelist noted that the rooftop glass railing is properly designed and securely fixed to meet safety requirements.

- A panelist noted there was a discrepancy between the architectural rendering and landscaping drawings; the architecture drawings shows horizontal fencing along the road, while the proposed landscape features vertical elements. They noted horizontal fencing should be used to match the building's form.
- A panelist pointed out that the layby at the front poses a potential conflict for cyclists along Mount Seymour Parkway. The rear lane at the back may provide an alternative location for this use that is close to an accessible entry to the building, which minimizes this conflict. A panelist noted that the entry trellis is set back, but it could be enhanced by bringing it forward to better lead into the building.
- A panelist noted that having two gates in the parking is a good idea and works really well.
- A panelist noted that building identification and wayfinding signage are important elements that should be explored—particularly to assist first responders. A panelist also noted that the signage should indicate the location of the accessible units on the site.
- A panelist suggested that lighting treatment in the common walkway should be designed to avoid casting dark shadows on people's faces, allowing for clear recognition of individuals approaching. It was also recommended to extend appropriate lighting to the garbage and recycling area to discourage unauthorized access by individuals searching for recyclables.
- A panelist noted that reducing the number of parking stalls for transit-oriented reasons could help lower construction costs.
- A panelist noted that having a courtyard would enhance social interaction among neighbours.
- A panelist noted that there is no access lane, right-of-way, or marked pathway from the accessible parking stalls to the elevator.
- A panelist recommended that the recycling and bike storage areas be equipped with automated doors to ensure easy access for individuals using wheelchairs.
- A panelist noted that the concept of a lock-off suite is an excellent idea, particularly for individuals with disabilities who may have support workers.
- Panelists noted that the play equipment in the small play area is a great feature and recommended adding informal seating or benches for parents, which would be beneficial.
- A panelist suggested that the entrance canopies appear somewhat heavy and could be redesigned to feel lighter and more refined.
- A panelist noted that the massing of the stairs leading to the rooftop patios on the rear units is too dominant. The access to the sundecks, which are at bedroom level, requires residents to pass underneath the stairs, making the layout feel awkward and poorly resolved. As a result, the bulk of these rear stairs is visually significant and impacts the overall design.

Summary of Panel Consensus Items:

- **Building roofline articulation:** The applicant should consider stepping back the rooftop railing and visually breaking it up to reduce its impact and better reflect the vertical divisions created by the townhomes facing the rear lane.
- **Building mailboxes relocation:** The applicant should consider relocating the mailbox and adding a ramp at an accessible grade to improve accessibility and ensure it is functional for all users, if feasible and the grade allows it
- **Accessibility improvements:** To enhance site accessibility, the applicant should consider incorporating improvements to the underground parking to include an access lane or marked pathway from the accessible parking stalls to the elevator. The recycling and bike storage areas should also be equipped with automated doors to ensure easy access for individuals using wheelchairs.
- **Material articulation:** To strengthen the design, the upper level of the building should be more deliberately articulated by wrapping the material around the corner, rather than simply transitioning to wood cladding at the ends. Continuing the material used on the vertical column edge onto the adjacent flank wall is also recommended to create a more cohesive and intentional expression.
- **Safety and Security:** Enhance lighting throughout the site by designing common walkway lighting to avoid casting dark shadows on faces, ensuring clear recognition of individuals. Extend appropriate lighting to the garbage and recycling area to discourage unauthorized access. Consider using step-integrated concrete lighting as a visually integrated and effective alternative to bollard lighting.
- **Public Art and Placemaking:** Incorporate artistic lighting elements or a more expressive design at the wooden trellis entrances on the north and south sides of the building to contribute to a sense of public art and placemaking.
- **Courtyard Design and Amenities:** To enhance the courtyard area, consider adding informal seating or benches near the play equipment to support parents and caregivers. Introducing a well-designed courtyard space can further encourage social interaction among neighbours.
- **Wayfinding:** Incorporate clear building identification and wayfinding signage, including indicators for accessible units, to improve navigation and assist first responders.
- **Rooftop staircase:** the applicant should consider modifying the overall design of the exterior rooftop staircase to minimize bulkiness.

The Vice Chair then invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Robert Greene, and **SECONDED** by Tieg Martin:

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 7:25 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

The next ADP will be on May 8, 2025

Phy.

Chair

*signed on behalf
of chair
Tash Chrong
(staff liaison)*

may 9 2025

Date

