

## **MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

**ATTENDING:** Mr. Joshua Bernsen  
Ms. Emily Blair  
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell  
Mr. John Gilmour  
Mr. Robert Greene  
Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia  
Ms. Mahnaz Mohamadloo,  
Mr. David Parke  
Ms. Farnaz Sharifi

**REGRETS:** Mr. Tieg Martin  
Mr. Stuart Rothnie

**STAFF:** Ms. Tash Cheong (Staff Liaison), Development Planner  
Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner  
Ms. Jessica Lee, Community Planner  
Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Development Planner  
Ms. Yan Zeng, Manage of Development Planning  
Ms. Afrooz Fallah, Planning Assistant  
Ms. Dorin Vaez Mahdavi, Planning Assistant

**APPLICANT:** Mr. Craig Taylor (TKA+D Architecture and Design Inc)  
Ms. Jennifer Stamp (Groundswell Landscape Architecture)

### **1. PANEL WELCOME AND DINNER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 PM by Vice-Chair Mr. John Gilmour, who presided in the absence of Chair Mr. Stuart Rothnie. Mr. Gilmour conducted attendance and noted that Panel member Mr. Tieg Martin was unable to attend but had submitted comments and questions in advance for the Panel's consideration during the meeting.

### **2. ADMINISTRATION**

The minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting held on April 10, 2025, were reviewed. Mr. Gilmour read the comments submitted by Mr. Tieg Martin, and Ms. Tash Cheong, Staff Liaison, revised the minutes accordingly. A motion to adopt the amended minutes was moved by Mr. Robert Greene, seconded by Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia, and carried unanimously.

Mr. John Gilmour invited staff announcements. Ms. Tash Cheong informed the Panel that planning for the ADP Design Excellence Awards is underway. Although the event is tentatively scheduled for July, the date may shift to September. To maintain momentum, voting will occur prior to the ceremony. Ms. Cheong also provided an overview of the awards process and

evaluation criteria for members unfamiliar with the format. A follow-up email will be sent to those who were unable to attend, outlining key details and the next steps.

The ADP Design Excellence Awards recognize completed projects that demonstrate excellence in architectural and landscape design. This year, three projects are eligible for award nominees:

1. 267 Orwell Street – Salal Apartments: *A social housing development located in Lynn Creek Town Centre. Originally reviewed by the ADP in June 2020.*
2. 1500 Fern Street – Apex Towers: *A 32-storey residential tower in Seylynn Village, Lynn Creek Town Centre. Presented to the ADP in December 2017.*
3. 2410 Dollarton Highway – Maplewood Fire and Rescue Centre / Station 1: *A District-owned facility, presented to the ADP in February 2019.*

Panel members are encouraged to conduct self-guided site visits to support their evaluations. For those unable to visit in person, images and presentation materials will be provided.

Ms. Cheong clarified that a minimum average score of 7.5 is required for a project to receive a Design Excellence Award. Projects scoring below this threshold may still be recognized with an Honourable Mention for specific design merits. As in previous years, the Panel is not obligated to present an award if the criteria are not met.

### **3. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **a.) Official Community Plan (OCP) Update Presentation**

Ms. Jessica Lee from the District's Community Planning Department delivered the presentation, with support from Ms. Tamsin Guppy, who is involved in the associated zoning bylaw update

Ms. Lee provided an overview of the OCP update process and its alignment with recent provincial legislation, including Bills 44, 46, 47, and 16 and clarified these legislative changes require municipalities to update their housing needs reports, Official Community Plans, and zoning bylaws to accommodate projected 20-year housing targets. Key implications include pre-zoning for residential growth and modifications to public hearing requirements, especially for transit-oriented developments.

The District's current OCP, adopted in 2011, concentrates 75–90% of new housing in four key growth centres: Lions Gate/Marine Drive, Lynn Valley, Lynn Creek, and Maplewood. This urban structure was reaffirmed during a 2021 review and will continue to guide future growth planning.

In October 2024, the District identified a five-year housing need of approximately 7,400 units and a 20-year housing need of 22,369 units, using a standardized provincial methodology. To explore how this growth might be accommodated, the District developed three conceptual land use scenarios:

1. Scenario 1 – Concentrated Growth: Focuses on intensifying development within existing growth centres through higher densities and taller buildings.

2. Scenario 2 – Expanded Centres: Proposes slight expansion beyond current centre boundaries to allow a broader mix of building forms, blending mid- and high-rise developments.
3. Scenario 3 – Distributed Growth: Suggests allocating up to 25% of growth outside the centres along key transit corridors and select neighbourhoods, supporting a more even distribution of housing forms.

*To view a webinar on these scenarios or learn more about this work you can visit the OCP Update webpage at: [Official Community Plan Update 2025](#) or watch this [video](#).*

Ms. Tamsin Guppy provided additional context regarding transit-oriented planning. She referenced a collaborative workshop held prior to the 2011 OCP, where the District worked with TransLink and the City of North Vancouver to explore how land use changes could better support transit infrastructure. She noted that growth in key centres such as Maplewood, Lynn Creek, and Lions Gate—along the Marine Drive/Esplanade Corridor/Main Street—has already contributed to improved transit service, including the introduction of the RapidBus. This demonstrates the effectiveness of concentrating density along transit corridors.

Ms. Guppy emphasized that the current OCP update builds on this principle, aiming to further support and encourage long-term transit improvements. While the timing of potential future projects like SkyTrain expansion remains uncertain, the planning approach is designed to lay the groundwork for such opportunities in the future.

Ms. Jessica Lee clarified that under new provincial legislation, municipalities are now required to update their Official Community Plans every five years. This ensures flexibility to incorporate new data and evolving community needs over time.

Ms. Lee elaborated on Scenario 3, which explores a broader distribution of growth—allocating approximately 25% of new housing outside major centers to areas with existing amenities and minimal infrastructure constraints. Examples of potential expanded growth areas include Lynn Valley (noted for its amenities), Edgemont, Queensdale, Parkgate Village, and corridors like Lynn Valley Road and Mount Seymour Parkway. She emphasized that these are preliminary suggestions, pending results from public engagement.

This scenario also considers introducing low-density multi-family housing types—such as duplexes, triplexes, and multiplexes—in areas like Norgate, Pemberton Heights, and Keith Lynn. Feedback from the community will help determine the suitability of these areas.

Ms. Lee also outlined concurrent work streams, including:

- Tenant protection measures aligned with new provincial authority.
- Affordable housing strategies, such as exploring inclusionary zoning.
- Transportation network planning, to address potential impacts of increased density.
- Simplification of single-family zoning, to improve flexibility and future housing options within those areas.

Ms. Lee concluded with an overview of the public engagement process, which ran throughout April 2025 which included a 4-week online survey, 3 in-person open houses, 5 virtual information sessions (3 on OCP and 2 on single-family zoning), and 4 community pop-up events. Engagement feedback is currently under review, and a refined land use scenario along with an engagement summary will be presented to Council before summer 2025. The updated OCP and bylaw package must be fully adopted, including public hearings and all readings, by December 31, 2025.

The team is currently analyzing the engagement results with consultants and aims to present a refined land use scenario and engagement summary to Council before summer 2025. The District must adopt the updated OCP and associated bylaws by December 31, 2025, including all readings and a public hearing.

Panel members were invited to share their perspectives and ask questions, particularly regarding how the proposed scenarios align with community goals and development potential.

Mr. John Gilmore raised concerns about housing affordability, pointing out that despite new supply, developers face difficulty selling or renting units. He asked whether the OCP addresses this.

- Ms. Lee clarified that affordability could refer to ownership or lower-income rental housing and acknowledged the complexity of the issue.
- Ms. Tamsin Guppy echoed that affordability is a complex issue. She explained that the District uses the concept of a housing spectrum to guide its planning, aiming to deliver a range of housing types that meet diverse affordability needs. This includes everything from supportive and social housing units rented at subsidized rates to townhouses that, while not inexpensive, are more attainable than single-family homes.
- Ms. Guppy noted that the Official Community Plan (OCP) supports this diversity through land use designations, while zoning work is exploring additional tools such as inclusionary zoning. Inclusionary zoning may require a portion of new housing developments—typically 10% of units or floor area—to be offered at below-market rates, which are defined as a percentage (e.g., 10–20%) below local median rents. She concluded by highlighting the Province’s broader goal of increasing housing supply as a key strategy to improve overall affordability.

Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia asked if changes are planned for single-family housing.

- Ms. Guppy outlined proposed zoning updates, noting that 20,000 District lots are single-family. Many existing single family zones date from the 1960s. Key changes being considered include:
  - No longer exempting floor space because it is in the basement and encouraging suites to be above ground to improve livability
  - Reduce front yard setbacks (e.g., smaller front yards) to support functional home design in a manner that reduces impacts on rear yards.
  - Taller building forms, including potential third storeys
  - Larger coach houses for multi-generational use

- Ms. Guppy emphasized these changes would occur gradually, as currently only about 50 single-family lots are redeveloped each year.

Mr. Robert Greene raised the issue of resilient building standards, referencing the post-fire rebuilding challenges in Lytton. He noted insurance policies often limit reconstruction to previous standards, not improved fire-resistant ones. He inquired whether resilience is being considered in the District's planning and policy updates, specifically in relation to how new developments or redevelopments can be better prepared for future disasters such as wildfires.

- Ms. Guppy responded that the District has long prioritized natural hazard planning. Several Development Permit Areas (DPAs) are in place to address wildfire, flood, debris flow, and slope hazards and emphasized:
  - Permits require engineering reports to ensure resilience
  - Density limits are in place for high-risk areas
  - Staff are exploring further integrating key Development Permit guidelines into zoning bylaws for stronger enforcement

Ms. Lee reiterated that the meeting was primarily an update and encouraged panel members to submit additional questions via Ms. Tash Cheong.

Ms. Guppy explained that zoning updates will be phased, starting with single-family zones. Multi-family and mixed-use zones will follow as the OCP provides clearer direction and the team plans to return to the panel to provide updates as the Zoning Bylaw update process continues.

Mr. John Gilmore concluded by emphasizing the importance of ongoing updates, noting that single-family areas will evolve significantly with changes such as raised basements, coach houses, and laneway homes. He thanked staff for the presentation.

#### **b.) 1310 Monashee Drive - Development Permit for a mixed-use development with 303 rental units and 805m<sup>2</sup> commercial space**

Ms. Tash Cheong clarified that Ms. Yan Zeng, Manager of Development Planning, would be providing an introduction and contextual overview of the project on behalf of Ms. Erin MacGregor, the Development Planner assigned to the application.

Ms. Zeng proceeded to present the project and requested the Panel's feedback on the following key aspects:

- The suitability of the building's materiality in relation to its intended function.
- The appropriateness of the institutional character within the surrounding context, including the effectiveness of the courtyard as a semi-private outdoor space for residents.
- The proposed landscaping treatment along the east elevation and its interface with the BC Hydro right-of-way.

The Vice Chair welcomed the applicant team: Mr. Craig Taylor of *TKA+D Architecture and Design Inc.*, and Ms. Jennifer Stamp of *Groundswell Landscape Architecture*, who introduced the project.

The Vice Chair thanked the applicant team for their presentation and invited questions for clarification from the Panel.

**Mr. John Gilmour:**

- **Q:** Do the additional bedrooms suggest that the units are designed for families with children? Are there any restrictions on family occupancy? Is the unit layout a quad-style configuration?
  - **A:** The units are primarily designed for student housing, with most layouts featuring four bedrooms that share a kitchen and bathroom. While the design supports student living, there are no occupancy restrictions—faculty, staff, or families could also live in the units. The layout promotes shared living and includes a central courtyard but lacks the individual entrances or buffers typically found in family-oriented housing.
- **Q:** Is there a janitorial room in the building, equipped with a sink and floor drain for cleaning purposes?
  - **A:** Yes, a janitorial room will be included in the parkade.
- **Q:** Are children expected to live in the development, considering the absence of a playground or child-friendly amenities?
  - **A:** While children and families are not restricted from living in the development, the expectation is that the majority of residents will be students. Although there is no designated play area, the site offers generous open space.
- **Q:** What is the projected affordability of the units? Are there any rental rate estimates?
  - **A:** Affordability provisions are detailed in the housing agreement. At least 50% of the units must be reserved for Capilano University affiliates. The remaining units may be rented at market rates, with 27 of those designated as non-market units and the rest offered at a prescribed affordable rate.
- **Q:** Is the average rental rate per square foot known at this time?
  - **A:** No, the average rental rate per square foot is not yet available.
- **Q:** Is the unit pricing based on market demand?
  - **A:** Yes, pricing is primarily influenced by market demand.
- **Q:** Are construction-cost estimates available?
  - **A:** Construction costs are still being assessed, and more details will be available at the building permit stage. Costs remain high, though some trades are seeing slight reductions. There is still uncertainty due to external factors such as U.S. tariffs.

**Mr. Robert Greene:**

- **Q:** Was mass timber considered for this project?
  - **A:** Yes, mass timber was considered; however, the associated construction costs were not conducive to maintaining affordability, so it was not pursued.

- **Q:** Do the units include laundry and storage facilities?
  - **A:** Yes, each unit will include in-suite laundry. Additional storage will be provided in the parkade.
- **Q:** Is the bike room located at grade level?
  - **A:** Yes, the bike room will be located at grade level.
- **Q:** Was consideration given to accommodating delivery services?
  - **A:** Yes, delivery services were anticipated and will be accommodated as needed.
- **Q:** The lighting over the breezeway looks interesting—how high is it?
  - **A:** The lighting above the breezeway is approximately 7 metres high. The project's code consultant has confirmed that there are no clearance concerns for fire truck access.
- **Q:** Was public art considered as part of the project?
  - **A:** Public art was not initially a requirement, and ultimately, available funds were redirected toward delivering rental units. As a result, no public art is planned for this project.

**Sgt. Kevin Bracewell:**

- **Q:** What is the distance from the tree line to the side of the North and South buildings, particularly regarding the heavily wooded areas and walkways?
  - **A:** The distance from the side of the building to the edge of the tree line is approximately 4.7 meters (about 15 feet).
- **Q:** Does the building have two entrances?
  - **A:** Yes, there are two main entrances: one for the North building located on the roadway, and another for the South building located in the quadrangle. These entrances are the major access points, particularly in case of an emergency response.
- **Q:** Just to confirm, this development is not under the administration of Capilano University (CAPU), and security services will not fall under CAPU's purview, correct?
  - **A:** Yes, that is correct. While students will live in the development, it will not fall under CAPU's administration, including its security services.
- **Q:** What is the lighting treatment for the north and south sides of the building?
  - **A:** While the details are still being finalized, the landscape lighting plan includes:
    - Soffit lighting in the wood soffits of the building.
    - Low-voltage, low-level lighting in the landscaped areas.
    - Wall cast lights, microlights embedded in pavers, lights in the socket of the trellis, and freestanding bollard lights.
    - Additional lighting in the public realm.
- **Q:** When you say soffit lighting, do you mean within the architectural cavities, and will this be applied to the north and south sides of the building?
  - **A:** Yes, soffit lighting refers to those cavities. On the north side, the lighting is primarily landscape-based, with some soffit lighting features. The north building includes a maintenance-only path (a non-combustible fire support area) with limited access and will include appropriate lighting during the building permit stage. On the south side, bollard lights are used along the pathway, and building

facade lighting is also incorporated and hedges will be planted along the property line. The overall lighting strategy is dark-sky friendly, with no overhead floodlighting. All lights are low-level to minimize light pollution and respect the nearby residential units.

- **Comment:** A general caution was raised about site access and human behavior. Even if areas are not designed to be accessible or do not include formal pathways, people often ignore these boundaries. It is important to consider how individuals might interact with the site, regardless of design intentions.

**Ms. Farnaz Sharifi:**

- **Q:** Why is the Floor Space Ratio (FSR) approximately 1.7? Was the option of taller buildings, such as up to 15 stories, considered?
  - **A:** The FSR and building massing were determined through a contextual analysis of the surrounding area, particularly the Capilano University campus across the street. A substantial increase in building height—from six to fifteen stories—is considered out of scale with the area. Additionally, the site is adjacent to a cemetery to the north, and higher development was viewed as inappropriate. The design aims to maintain compatibility with the neighbourhood context.
- **Q:** Is it still possible to alter the building's massing at this stage of the process?
  - **A:** The current zoning under Comprehensive Development 141 (CD 141) allows for a maximum of six stories. Changes to the massing may still be considered if they fall within the parameters established during the rezoning process.
  - A significant increase in height is unlikely to be feasible at this stage. However, moderate design refinements—such as changes to building articulation, balconies, or unit layouts—may still be explored, particularly for the 65 four-bedroom units.
- **Q:** Are modifications to the unit designs possible, especially for family-oriented units?
  - **A:** Yes. There is some flexibility in the design of the four-bedroom units. Layout and balcony adjustments may be considered, provided they remain consistent with the Form and Character Development Permit Area (DPA) guidelines.

**Mr. Joshua Bernsen:**

- **Q:** Are there any specific tenants or target demographics identified for the proposed units?
  - **A:** The client is currently in discussions with various potential tenants. Potential uses may include a café, among other options.
- **Q:** Is the outdoor space designed to accommodate potential tenants, such as through patio areas?
  - **A:** Yes, there is currently a rear patio area. The layout may be adjusted slightly as the design progresses to better support tenant needs. This space is expected to evolve to accommodate future tenants as required.
- **Q:** Could the outdoor space support uses like cafés or restaurants?
  - **A:** Yes, the outdoor space has the potential to accommodate a range of commercial uses, including cafés and restaurants. The design approach



emphasizes flexibility and adaptability to meet tenant requirements and promote long-term resilience.

- **Q:** Are there any furnishings planned for the public realm along Monashee Drive?
  - **A:** No furnishings are planned within the public realm on the District property. However, feedback may be provided during the Development Permit (DP) process, and Parks and Recreation may suggest some furnishings at a later stage.
- **Q:** Are the interior furnishings, such as hammocks and chairs, movable?
  - **A:** Many interior furnishings, including hammocks and chairs, are movable. However, some items—such as long benches and tables—will be fixed in place for durability and usability.

**Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia:**

- **Q:** Why is the ramp located on the northwest side of the site? Wouldn't the southwest side be a shorter and more efficient path?
  - **A:** The northwest side is indeed the highest point and the longest stretch on the site. This design choice dates back to 2021. It was noted that placing a ramp directly at an intersection is generally discouraged for safety and functional reasons.
- **Q:** Why are balconies not considered appropriate for student housing?
  - **A:** Balconies are typically avoided in student housing due to safety concerns, particularly related to mental health and the potential for self-harm. While similar risks exist with windows, those can be mitigated through design controls. Although this development is not exclusively a student residence, the design seeks to prioritize safety while also supporting visibility, interaction, and engagement with the public realm.

**Mr. Tieg Martin:**

- **Q:** Will the residential units be designated as student accommodations managed by Capilano University, or are they intended as market rental or ownership units available to the general public?
  - **A:** At least 50% of the residential units are required to be reserved for Capilano University affiliates. The remaining units may be rented at market rates; however, of these, 27 units must be designated as non-market.
- **Q:** How will the Proponent ventilate the generator room, including intake and exhaust air and engine exhaust?
  - **A:** The generator room ventilation, including engine exhaust, will be directed to the roof level and discharged away from residential windows or occupied spaces. This approach is intended to minimize impacts on residents.
- **Q:** Is there any intention or expectation that any of the Commercial Retail Units (CRUs) will be occupied by food service tenants?
  - **A:** Yes, food service tenants are being considered for the CRUs.
- **Q:** Why does the rooftop equipment appear partially screened in drawing A13, with other equipment shown as unscreened?

- **A:** The drawings are still at a preliminary stage, and not all rooftop equipment has been fully detailed or coordinated at this point.
- **Q:** What type of elevator is planned for the commercial area, and where will the control room be located?
  - **A:** These details have not yet been finalized.

**Mr. David Parke:**

- **Q:** Are you primarily following the BC Building Code (BCBC), specifically Section 3.8, for accessibility?
  - **A:** Yes, the project primarily follows BCBC Section 3.8. In addition, the team is working to meet the District's Accessible Design Policy and enhanced accessibility and adaptability requirements, with specific implementation details currently in progress.
- **Q:** Is the project aiming to comply with CSA/ASC B651:23 Standards for accessibility?
  - **A:** At this stage, the team is unsure whether the project will follow CSA B651-23.
- **Comment:** Mr. Parke highlighted the importance of providing an elevation drawing to better assess the accessibility and adaptability of the proposed suites. He noted that such a drawing would help illustrate how the design meets the requirement for 5% accessible units and how adaptability is incorporated into the remaining units. Mr. Parke also pointed out some ambiguity in the definitions of "accessible" and "adaptable" units, including the specific benchmarks used. He recommended clarifying these definitions to ensure a shared understanding as the project moves forward.
- **Comment:** A concern was raised that no marked pedestrian path exists between accessible stalls and elevator lobbies. The recommendation was made to add a designated pedestrian crossing to improve safety and accessibility for users of those stalls.
- **Q:** What materials are being used for the pathways and corridors in exterior amenity areas?
  - **A:** The design uses a mix of materials:
    - Unit concrete pavers
    - Colour-cast in-place concrete in the public realm, chosen to match the wood soffit and create a warm appearance
    - Thicker concrete pavers in areas subject to heavy loads (e.g., BC Hydro trucks)
    - Thinner unit pavers in less intensive areas
 The team avoids flexible paving over suspended slabs due to settlement risks and issues with vehicle loads, such as turning fire trucks.
- **Q:** Will the courtyard amenities be accessible, including seating and barbecue areas?
  - **A:** Yes. Although the barbecues are not shown yet (early design stage), the plan is to use electric barbecues and position them at counter ends to allow bar seating and wheelchair access. Movable furniture will be used to ensure adaptable and inclusive access, as opposed to fixed concrete picnic tables that can limit accessibility.

**Ms. Mahnaz Mohamadloo:**

- **Q:** Have specific buildings or units been designated for student use versus public use? Could non-student units be designed differently—for example, with balconies or larger living areas for families?
  - **A:** No, the units will not be differentiated based on occupant type. All units—whether designated for students, faculty, staff, or the general public—will have the same design specifications and layout. This decision was made to avoid complications related to vacancy management. Differentiating units by demographic (e.g., student vs. family-oriented) would make it difficult to fill vacancies consistently and maintain operational viability. Initially, 75% of units will be allocated to Capilano University affiliates, but long-term occupancy will stabilize at 50%. Although the team considered assigning one building (North or South) for student housing and the other for market units, this approach was ultimately rejected due to similar concerns over flexibility and vacancy management. The goal is to maintain flexibility in unit occupancy across all demographics, rather than customizing units for specific groups.
- **Q:** Is there any consideration for bringing natural light into the long interior corridors—such as by adding windows at corridor ends—to support resident well-being and mental health?
  - **A:** Currently, the design does not include windows at the ends of corridors. As of now, the only natural light might come from the top floor. Adding natural light would likely require substantial redesign, including possible relocation of stairwells or other major layout changes. That said, the design team is open to exploring this further during the next phase of refinement.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, provided a detailed presentation on the proposal, offering both recognition of its progress and constructive critique aligned with the Official Community Plan (OCP) Development Permit Area Guidelines.

Mr. Tejada acknowledged the evolution of the design from its earlier, more traditional residential concept to the current iteration, which adopts a more institutional tone. While the quadrangle-style layout remains consistent with common student housing typologies, he expressed concern that the rigid and elongated massing of the two primary buildings—approximately 60 and 90 meters in length—creates a monolithic appearance. This unbroken form significantly exceeds the recommended 45-meter guideline for mid-rise buildings and undermines the pedestrian experience and human-scale development. He recommended introducing visual breaks approximately every 45 meters to reduce perceived bulk and enhance the overall user experience.

In terms of architectural expression, Mr. Tejada observed that the proposal lacks variety and depth. The dominant black and white material palette, although visually striking, results in abrupt transitions and a "tuxedo-style" aesthetic that feels superficial and out of context. The articulation was compared to wallpaper rather than being an integrated part of the building envelope. He encouraged the design team to refine the use of materials and consider a more

nuanced, residential character to better align with the vibrancy and identity of the Capilano University campus.

The courtyard—positioned as a key feature of the development—was also critiqued for its functional ambiguity. While it receives ample sunlight and has potential as an active outdoor space, the adjacent patio near the Commercial Retail Units (CRUs) is in permanent shade, limiting its viability for café or restaurant uses. The diagonal pathway through the courtyard was described as visually appealing but lacking in purpose, with no clear destination or amenity anchor to support intuitive wayfinding or meaningful use.

From a landscape and sustainability perspective, Mr. Tejada noted the need for improved clarity and planning around the green space adjacent to the BC Hydro ROW. The transitional zone beyond the property line appears unresolved, which may pose long-term management and aesthetic challenges. He advised clearly defining this edge and establishing a plan.

Lastly, security concerns were raised regarding the southern edge of the site, which features limited visibility and access control. Without deliberate design strategies to manage access and improve surveillance, this area could become a safety concern. Incorporating Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles was recommended to mitigate these risks.

In summary, Mr. Tejada recognized the proposal's alignment with campus housing typologies and its potential to support university-affiliated residential needs. However, he urged the applicant to consider targeted refinements in the building form, architectural articulation, landscape integration, courtyard programming, and site security. These enhancements would help ensure the project not only meets policy guidelines but also delivers a more welcoming, livable, and contextually responsive environment for students and the broader community.

The Vice Chair thanked staff and invited comments from the Panel members.

**Mr. Joshua Bernsen:**

- The catenary lighting feature was appreciated for its inclusion but noted that it currently ends abruptly at the building edge. It was suggested that extending the lighting into the public realm would enhance the overall animation and better highlight the courtyard entrance.
- The planter at the building's edge was identified as creating a narrow and less welcoming entry. It was recommended that this transition be reconsidered to improve accessibility and create a more seamless visual connection between the building and the street.
- Suggestions were made to refine the streetscape along Monashee Drive, particularly regarding the type and appearance of site furnishings. Thoughtful consideration of these elements could strengthen the identity of the development. Additionally, it was recommended that the material selections in the courtyard and along adjacent walls be clarified to enhance visual cohesion between the building and surrounding landscape.

- While larger gathering areas were present, there was a noted lack of intimate, quieter spaces for small groups or individuals. It was emphasized that providing a broader range of social spaces would better support diverse social needs within student housing.
- The transition between the formal lawn and the naturalized landscape near the power line right-of-way was observed as abrupt and unresolved. Further refinement of this area was suggested to ensure a more seamless and integrated landscape design.

**Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia:**

- The overall design was acknowledged as well-executed, with concerns raised primarily regarding the building's massing and extended length. It was noted that the current scale is larger than what is typically seen in the surrounding area. However, splitting the structure into smaller volumes would increase construction costs. As an alternative, it was suggested that incorporating articulation or other design elements along the façade could visually break up the building's length and address the massing concerns.

**Mr. John Gilmour:**

- The material palette of the building was discussed, with a preference for the white cladding over the black. It was questioned whether the strong contrast, described as a "tuxedo" effect, was effective. The material expression was suggested to benefit from further refinement.
- The U-shaped layout was positively noted, especially the central courtyard, which was valued for its ability to foster community. The amenity spaces, such as the gym and barbecues, were appreciated for supporting the transition between indoor and outdoor areas.
- Regarding the east end of the courtyard near the right-of-way, the natural grass area was highlighted, with a proposal to add informal recreational features like a bocce court or casual seating.
- Security concerns, particularly in the parkade, were emphasized, noting that such areas are often targeted for theft or vandalism. It was strongly recommended to incorporate robust deterrents, such as reinforced doors or barriers, from the outset to prevent issues rather than responding to incidents after they occur.

**Mr. Robert Greene:**

- The overall landscape plan and lighting strategy, particularly the catenary lighting over the breezeway, were praised. However, concerns were raised about the building's institutional appearance, especially due to the lack of visual breaks along its extended façade beyond the recommended 45-meter guideline.
- To address the monolithic feel of the building, it was suggested to incorporate public art or creative lighting features. An example was provided from 60 W Cordova Street in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside, where vertical, solar-powered illuminated art panels depicting supportive human silhouettes successfully helped break up the building mass and reflected a community-focused vision. The design team was encouraged to explore a similar approach.

- The neutral colour palette was commended, with dark and light tones considered timeless and more durable than trend-driven hues. Artistic elements in the lighting design were suggested to add vibrancy and contribute to the building's identity.
- Finally, the inclusion of recreational features such as a soccer or bocce court in the green space at the end of the courtyard was supported, seen as a positive way to foster community interaction and leisure.

**Mr. David Parke:**

- Concerns were raised about the building's large and stark appearance, particularly the lack of colour. While neutral tones were recognized for their long-term appeal, it was suggested that adding some variation in colour could improve the aesthetic and make the design more welcoming to a wider range of residents over time.
- The diversity of suite sizes and configurations, particularly the mix of family-oriented and student-focused units, was appreciated. However, concerns about noise and privacy were highlighted, especially due to the irregular schedules of students. Shared spaces, like the courtyard, may amplify these challenges, emphasizing the need for effective sound management to ensure a comfortable living environment for all residents.
- Security was also raised as a concern, especially around the open area near the BC Hydro infrastructure. Additional protective measures, such as fencing, were recommended to enhance safety.
- Lastly, it was suggested to add sheltered seating along Monashee Avenue to improve the public realm and provide a comfortable space for people to gather and relax.

**Ms. Farnaz Sharifi:**

- Expressed agreement with the District's Urban Designer regarding concerns about the overall massing of the buildings, particularly highlighting that many of the north-facing units may not receive adequate natural sunlight.
- Regarding the courtyard, it was noted that its success is uncertain at this stage. Depending on the final design and programming, the space could either become a vibrant and inviting amenity or, conversely, turn out to be noisy, dark, and windy. Careful attention to design and material choices will be crucial in shaping the quality of this space.
- To create a more welcoming and uplifting atmosphere, it was recommended to incorporate warmer colours into the building elevations. Moving away from a dominant grey and black palette, which can feel cold and institutional, in favour of tones that evoke warmth and optimism was suggested.

**Ms. Mahnaz Mohamadloo:**

- Raised concerns about the livability of the proposed building, particularly with regard to anticipated noise levels. It was noted that the high activity levels, typical of a student-focused environment, might discourage longer-term tenants, particularly non-students, who may be deterred by disruption and might only stay for a few months.
- To address this, it was suggested that the top floor be reserved for market renters, with a dedicated rooftop amenity space for them. This would provide a quieter, more private

retreat, especially as the central courtyard below may be used by children and families. The need for organized and supervised play for children, which could complicate shared amenity spaces, was also emphasized.

- Expressed concern about the building's internal corridors, with one estimated to be around 100 meters long. It was recommended that natural light be introduced into these long hallways—either through design revisions or compensatory measures in adjacent units—to prevent the corridors from feeling dark, oppressive, and institutional. The importance of these changes was emphasized for the physical and mental well-being of the residents.

**Sgt. Kevin Bracewell:**

- Clarified that comments would focus solely on public safety and crime prevention, rather than architectural or design matters unless they directly impacted safety outcomes.
- Highlighted that the project introduces a new form of student housing into a predominantly rural area, presenting unique safety challenges, including risks from both unauthorized human activity and potential wildlife incursions due to the proximity to forested areas. Safety planning should address both human and animal access management.
- Raised concerns about site lighting levels, noting that while reducing light pollution is important, adequate nighttime illumination is crucial for safety and visibility, particularly in relation to wildlife presence and surveillance needs.
- Emphasized the importance of clearly marked, well-lit primary entrances to both buildings, to facilitate quick and accurate access by first responders. This is especially critical as the absence of balconies removes a common visual cue for emergency services.
- Noted that unlike a typical university campus, this development will not have on-site security or access control infrastructure. Despite this, the development is expected to attract similar patterns of use, such as after-hours social activity, and should be designed with these risks in mind.
- Strongly recommended secure bike storage, particularly in the underground parkade. This includes the installation of robust locking systems, security fittings, and crime prevention plates, citing a recent nearby theft incident involving approximately \$30,000 worth of electric bikes and scooters.
- Supported the decision to omit balconies from the student housing units, agreeing that minimizing opportunities for unsafe or inappropriate use is essential. Concluded by urging a proactive, prevention-focused approach to safety and crime mitigation.

**Mr. Tieg Martin:**

- The proposed materiality appears appropriate and compliant with the Development Permit (DP) area guidelines.
- The institutional character of the building, given its location on a university campus, is not inherently problematic. However, whether the courtyard design qualifies as an acceptable alternative to DNV Guidelines A2.2 and B3.14 largely depends on the intended use of the residential units. If the units are purpose-built and managed as

student residences by Capilano University, the approach may be acceptable *provided* that the courtyard functions as usable, all-season outdoor space—which is not clearly demonstrated in the current design. If the units are market rentals or for purchase, this approach should not be accepted.

- Regarding the landscape design along the statutory right-of-way (SRoW): while it appears that no permanent structures (e.g., retaining walls) are proposed, it's unclear how the steep grade at the northeast corner of the North Building will be stabilized and maintained using soft landscaping alone.
- The landscape plan lacks covered seating areas. As a result, the courtyard seating appears unusable during wet weather.
- There is no demonstrated provision for intake, exhaust air, or engine exhaust ventilation for the generator room. There are also no vertical service shafts above it, and limited space at the parkade ramp to route ductwork without compromising the ramp width. This could impact the north and west elevations of the North Building.
- If any Commercial Retail Unit (CRU) is intended for food service use, there appears to be no accommodation for NFPA-96-compliant kitchen exhaust systems, including ducting to the roof or rooftop make-up air units. No allowance for duct penetrations is shown in the elevations or renderings. If these systems are not fully integrated into the CRU space, external ducting could negatively impact building form and character. Additionally, proximity to residential windows and potential air intake must be addressed to avoid issues with air quality and noise.
- There is currently no designated space for an elevator machine room (if hydraulic) or a control closet (if MRL). This issue may be resolved without sacrificing a parking stall but needs further clarification.
- The north elevation of the South Building omits three required exit doors—two from the parkade and one from the residential occupancy area.
- The landscape stairs on the west side of the site appear unnecessary and could be avoided:
  - The northern set could be replaced with a gently sloped walkway, eliminating the need for dual handrails on the adjacent short ramp. There seems to be enough space between the vehicle access and CRU entry to support this.
  - The southern set leads to a sunken patio, which lacks proper guardrails along the southern edge and doesn't align well with the CRU's south wall doors. Consider maintaining the patio at CRU floor level and resolving the elevation change with planter walls and guards, which are required anyway.
- The parkade exhaust grille should be located off the walkway to allow it to be elevated. This avoids design limitations related to grate opening sizes that can pose risks to stiletto heels.
- The presence of three single gates in the site walkways is unclear, as they do not fully enclose any areas. Moreover, most north building courtyard entry doors are double-width. Consider either widening these gates or removing them altogether.
- The residential entrance to the South Building may lack visibility from the street. Enhancing the adjacent side wall with a distinctive feature or signage could improve



wayfinding. A similar treatment could be applied to the North Building's main entry for visual balance.

- The Level 1 bike room in the North Building is accessed via a single 935 mm wide door. This narrow access could lead to long-term damage. Widening the door—and possibly relocating it to the south wall to improve passive surveillance—is recommended.
- Lowering the clerestory windows in the bike room would improve visibility into the space, enhancing user safety and meeting CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) principles.

### Further Discussion

The Vice Chair invited panel members and staff to share their comments and engage in further discussion.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada suggested introducing a third material, ideally with a natural or wood-like aesthetic, to soften the contrast between the two dominant cladding materials of the building. He clarified that the material does not need to be real wood but should convey warmth and reduce the institutional feel of the façade. He also proposed that, even in the absence of balconies, thoughtful variations—such as vertical elements or projections—could be used to add visual depth and break down the building's overall massing. This would help create a more human-scaled design without requiring significant structural alterations.

Ms. Yan Zeng reflected on the North Shore's typical architectural style, which often integrates community-focused and campus-like qualities. She expressed concern that the proposed large, monolithic building form contrasts sharply with the area's more nuanced, wood-accented design. She referenced other developments that have successfully balanced simplicity with thoughtful massing strategies. A key issue raised was the institutional and repetitive appearance of the building façade. Ms. Zeng warned that this could negatively impact the mental well-being of residents, especially younger students. She emphasized the need for more articulation and material variety to make the student housing feel more welcoming and livable.

Mr. Robert Greene supported the call for greater warmth and variety, specifically recommending the use of colour to enhance the building's character. He noted that small, well-considered colour interventions can help offset the institutional tone without requiring significant design changes.

Mr. Greene also encouraged incorporating playful or whimsical design elements, such as surface treatments or art features, to help foster a stronger sense of place and identity for the residents. These elements could be lightweight interventions that contribute to a more engaging, human-centered experience.

Mr. Gilmour noted the social and lifestyle benefits of balconies, acknowledging their value in enhancing livability. However, he also recognized the cost implications, suggesting that the inclusion of balconies could increase construction and maintenance expenses, which may

impact affordability. He observed that their omission could offer practical advantages, including reduced risk of water ingress and simpler long-term upkeep.

The conversation then turned to energy performance standards, with a discussion on the project's alignment with BC Energy Step Code Step 3 and the potential shift toward Step 4. Staff indicated that simplified façades and the absence of balconies may be strategies used to achieve higher energy efficiency. While these measures support sustainability goals, it was cautioned that prioritizing energy performance too heavily could compromise the architectural quality and the overall experience for future residents.

### Summary of Panel Consensus Items:

- **Building Massing & Form:** The applicant team should explore addressing the excessive building massing by introducing visual breaks every 45 meters to align with established guidelines. This can be achieved through vertical articulation, material changes, or segmentation of the façade to reduce the perception of bulk and improve the pedestrian experience without requiring major structural alterations.
- **Architectural Articulation & Materiality:** A third, warmer material should be integrated into the façade to soften the stark black-and-white contrast and bring the design in line with its context. Design revisions should incorporate playful or student-oriented accents and depth-enhancing elements to avoid a flat, institutional appearance and create a more welcoming, human-centered architecture.
- **Courtyard & Outdoor Space Design:** Revisit the courtyard design to include a destination feature along the diagonal path, introduce covered and intimate seating zones, and add seasonal functionality. Enhancing sun and shade balance near commercial patios and integrating casual, interactive elements like games or informal gathering spots may significantly boost usability and vibrancy.
- **Landscape & Site Integration:** Develop a cohesive landscape strategy that clarifies slope transitions and edge conditions, especially near the BC Hydro corridor. This may include reducing or reconfiguring stairs for accessibility, better integrating natural and formal landscape zones, and coordinating plantings and edges.
- **Security & CPTED Principles:** Security measures should be prioritized by embedding CPTED principles across the site, particularly in under-observed zones like the southern edge and internal corridors. Enhancements should include increased lighting, better sightlines, secure and visible bike storage, and clear wayfinding using signage and distinct entry design features to improve both safety and user orientation.
- **Liveability & Residential Experience:** To enhance liveability, the design should address the institutional tone of interior corridors through lighting and aesthetic improvements.

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

**MOVED** by Ms. Farnaz Sharifi, and **SECONDED** by Mr. Robert Greene:

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**

The motion was carried unanimously.

#### 4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

#### 5. NEXT MEETING

The next ADP will be on June 12, 2025.

*as amended.  
signed on behalf  
of chair, Stuart Ronie*

Chair

*Tash Cheong  
staff Liaison*

Date

*May 15 2025*