

MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON June 12th, 2025 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER

ATTENDING: Sgt. Kevin Bracewell
 Mr. John Gilmour
 Mr. Robert Greene
 Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia
 Mr. Tieg Martin
 Mr. David Parke
 Mr. Stuart Rothnie

REGRETS: Mr. Joshua Bernsen
 Ms. Emily Blair
 Ms. Mahnaz Mohamadloo,
 Ms. Farnaz Sharifi

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

APPLICANT: Mr. Byron Chard (Chard Developments)
 Mr. Mark Whitehead (Musson Cattel MacKey Partnership)
 Mr. Grant Brumpton (PWL Partnership Landscape Architects)

1. PANEL WELCOME AND DINNER

The meeting was called to order at 5:58 PM by Mr. Stuart Rothnie and attendance was taken.

2. ADMINISTRATION

The minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting held on May 8, 2025, were reviewed and amended. A motion to adopt the amended minutes was moved by Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia, seconded by Mr. Tieg Martin, and carried unanimously.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) Design Excellence Award (2024)

Ms. Tash Cheong initiated the discussion by thanking attendees and confirming site visits and provided a refresher on the evaluation process and criteria for both new and returning panel members. She presented visuals of the projects and outlined the evaluation format, inviting members to provide scores along with high-level commentary. The Awards recognize completed projects that exemplify excellence in architectural and landscape design, with three projects eligible for nomination this year.

1. 267 Orwell Street – Salal Apartments
2. 1500 Fern Street – Apex Towers
3. 2410 Dollarton Highway – Maplewood Fire and Rescue Centre / Station 1

Ms. Cheong clarified Projects considered for an award must have previously undergone ADP review and now be completed and occupied and explained that a project must receive a minimum average score of 7.5 to qualify for a Design Excellence Award. Projects scoring below this may still earn an Honourable Mention for specific design merits. As in past years, the Panel is not required to grant an award if the criteria are not met.

1) 267 Orwell Street – Salal Apartments

Project Overview:

Salal Apartments is a non-market; social housing development located in Lynn Creek Town Centre. It was previously reviewed by the ADP in June 2020 and is one of three nominations for the 2024 Design Excellence Awards.

Panel Discussion Summary:

The panel acknowledged the project's thoughtful design within the constraints of a modest budget. Discussion points included:

- *Positive Elements:*
 - Creative use of limited resources.
 - Balcony projections that maximize interior living space.
 - Use of perforated metal for screening without compromising visual aesthetics.
 - Variation in balcony proportions adding architectural interest.
 - Courtyard space intended for residents with some successful design elements.
- *Criticisms & Limitations:*
 - Landscaping design was conceptually sound but poorly executed, possibly due to budget constraints.
 - Issues noted with cast-in-place concrete, irrigation equipment placement, and lack of cohesive detailing.
 - Concerns about the outdoor amenity space lacking secure and deliberate design.
 - Observations of unsecured gates and infrastructure (e.g., visible transformers) detracting from the experience.

Scoring and Decision:

Panelist scores averaged 6.7. Panel members agreed that the project demonstrates strong creativity and achievement in delivering a visually engaging, affordable housing solution within strict budget constraints.

2) Project Review: 1500 Fern Street – Apex Towers

Project Overview:

Apex Towers is a 32-storey, 274-unit mixed-use residential development located in Seylynn

Village, Lynn Creek Town Centre. It represents the final phase of the larger redevelopment of the Town Centre. Originally presented to the ADP in December 2017, the project was developed by Denna Homes with architectural design by DA Architects + Planners and landscape design by ETA Landscape Architecture.

Panel Discussion Summary:

The panel acknowledged the project's significant visual presence as the tallest building in the Town Centre—intended to serve as the apex and visual anchor of the area. Key comments included:

- *Positive Elements:*
 - High-quality material selection and attractive form when viewed from a distance.
 - Architectural scale and massing were appropriate for the neighbourhood context.
 - Strong visual appeal in its skyline presence and planning logic for this phase of Seylynn Village.
- *Criticisms & Limitations:*
 - Landscape elements such as precast benches appeared disconnected from site logic; bench placements seemed arbitrary, particularly along sloping streets.
 - Landscaping overflow and poor coordination between furniture and planting made some seating areas awkward and impractical.
 - General impression that elements were over-designed but under-executed.
 - Concerns were raised about poor detailing and lack of maintenance detracting from the overall presentation (e.g., dirty soffits under the awning).
 - Utility infrastructure was clumsily handled—e.g., exposed generator exhaust staining nearby surfaces, and non-functional bike racks placed too close to the building wall.
 - Panelists discussed a disconnect between design vision and final build quality. Attributed in part to common industry challenges—handoffs between design teams and constraints imposed during construction.
 - The inconsistency between concept and detailing was cited as a reason for scoring deductions.

Scoring and Decision:

Panelist scores averaged 7.7. Despite several concerns related to execution, the Panel felt that the Apex Towers project demonstrated architectural ambition, strong contextual fit, and a meaningful contribution to the built environment of Lynn Creek Town Centre.

3) Project Review: 2410 Dollarton Highway – Maplewood Fire and Rescue Centre (Fire Station No. 1)

Project Overview:

The Maplewood Fire and Rescue Centre is a new, purpose-built facility developed by the District of North Vancouver. Located at 2410 Dollarton Highway, the project is designed to serve as Fire Station No. 1 and includes essential operational spaces and community-facing components.

Panel Discussion Summary:

- The panel supported the architectural clarity and civic presence of the project.
- The building was seen as successfully integrating form, function, and public visibility.
- High marks were given for the clarity of purpose, material quality, and careful integration with the surrounding environment.
- It was noted that the project exceeded expectations for a utilitarian facility of this nature.

Scoring and Decision:

The project received a final score of 8.1. The Maplewood Fire and Rescue Centre was recognized by the Panel for its achievement in delivering a public facility that balances function, design integrity, and civic pride.

Final Results

The Chair thanked panel members for their time, insight, and dedication. The final scores for each project are as follows:

Project	Score	Panel Recognition / Remarks
Salal Apartments	6.7	Award of Merit
Apex Towers	7.7	Design Excellence Award
Maplewood Fire and Rescue Centre	8.1	Design Excellence Award

The panel confirmed the following award outcomes: the Maplewood Fire and Rescue Centre received the highest average score of 8.1 and was granted a Design Excellence Award. Apex Towers followed with an average score of 7.7, also receiving a Design Excellence Award. Salal Apartments, with an average score of 6.7, was awarded an Award of Merit in recognition of its creative and community-focused design approach.

There was also broad support among panelists for creating a distinct award category for non-market or social housing projects in future ADP Design Excellence Awards, to better recognize work produced under significantly different financial parameters.

b.) 1634 -1748 Capilano Road - OCP Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit for 475 Residential Rental Units, 180 Hotel Units and 4 Commercial Retail Units

Ms. Tamsin Guppy, Senior Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context. The site is located within a designated town centre and falls outside existing zoning bylaws and the current OCP. As such, it requires a rezoning. The project was previously presented to the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) in 2023 for its rezoning package. This updated submission reflects revisions in response to that earlier feedback.

Ms. Guppy explained the importance of the Curling Road extension, which is designed to improve east–west connectivity through the neighborhood. Approximately one-third of the site is dedicated to road improvements, including new public connections.

Key urban design strategies introduced in this iteration include:

- A coach layby lane added in front of the hotel to prevent traffic interference on Capilano Road. This required shifting the building back, affecting the public realm design.
- A pocket park proposed at the corner of McGuire and Curling Road, aimed at enhancing pedestrian experience and reducing the visual and spatial impact of rear vehicular access.

The ADP was asked to evaluate whether key elements, specifically the Capilano frontage and the pocket park, create a comfortable, functional public space for pedestrians, hotel guests, and residents. Ms. Tamsin Guppy posed two questions for the Panel's input:

- Question 1 – In order to accommodate coach service at the hotel without blocking transit or regular travel lanes on Capilano Road, a coach layby lane has been added in front of the hotel. The hotel design has been modified to accommodate this road widening. Is the resulting public realm along Capilano Road a comfortable space that will serve local pedestrians and hotel guests well?
- Question 2 – The pocket park at McGuire and Curling Road introduces a lushness to this corner and greatly reduces the impact of the rear car-oriented access to the hotel. This pocket park is currently proposed to be bisected by a path that divides the pocket park into two spaces, does this work well?

The Chair thanked Ms. Guppy for the presentation and invited the Panel to ask the development planner any clarification questions.

- **Q1:** What is the purpose of the road connection on Curling Road — why is it being brought through?
 - **A:** The intent is to improve east–west connectivity. Historically, residents living on the east side of Capilano Road felt isolated due to traffic congestion, particularly at the Capilano–Marine intersection. This made short trips (e.g., to get groceries) difficult. The Curling Road extension was envisioned during the 2010–2011 OCP and local plan process as a way to provide an alternative route for residents to access nearby destinations without relying on congested arterial routes. The district is working with transportation engineers to eventually extend Curling further, although this may take 10–20 years.
- **Q2:** Will the intersection at Capilano and Curling Road be signalized?
 - **A:** Yes, it already has a signal. Similarly, a new signal will be added at McGuire and Marine in the future. However, all signal timing will be coordinated with the Capilano–Marine intersection to avoid backups. These improvements aim to balance traffic flow while enhancing local connectivity.
- **Q3:** Will McGuire Street be one-way or two-way?
 - **A:** McGuire will be a two-way street. It will also be substantially widened as part of this application.

- **Q4:** How much of the site's land is being given up for road dedication and how does this compare to other developments?
 - **A:** Approximately 32% of the site is dedicated to public road improvements, which is higher than typical. For comparison, the nearby LARCO project dedicated around 25–30%. This dedication includes multiple sides of the site to support new connections.
- **Q5:** What portion of the site is allocated to the hotel, and how does that affect the rest of the development?
 - **A:** About one-third of the site is dedicated to the hotel, in line with the local plan's recommendations. Because of this allocation, the residential density is concentrated into one tower, rather than being distributed across a larger site with multiple buildings.

The Chair welcomed the applicant team; Mr. Byron Chard of *Chard Developments*, Mr. Mark Whitehead of *Musson Cattell MacKey Partnership*, and Mr. Grant Brumpton of *PWL Partnership Landscape Architects* introduced the project.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for their presentation and asked if there were any questions of clarification from the Panel to the applicant.

- **Q:** Are the wood grain and metal elements shown in the renderings used throughout the project?
 - **A:** Yes. The residential tower will use standard brick, while the hotel will use flashed brick, which shifts in tone depending on lighting—from charcoal to burgundy. Metal framing is black, with a matte, subtly reflective finish.
- **Q:** Is the metal trim gray or green?
 - **A:** The trim is charcoal, though it may appear different due to the reflective nature of the flashed finish.
- **Q:** Will the stormwater retention tanks serve uses beyond flow control, such as irrigation or fire protection?
 - **A:** No. The tanks are for detention only. Using them for irrigation would require additional infrastructure and a second tank.
- **Q:** Will the bus stop shown in renderings include a shelter, and who is responsible for it?
 - **A:** Yes, a shelter will be provided by the developer but designed to TransLink standards. It is intended to prevent spillover into the adjacent bike lane.
- **Q:** Has there been coordination with TransLink, particularly regarding the 246-bus route?
 - **A:** Yes. Long-term plans include maintaining bus service on both sides of Capilano Road, with Capilano & Marine functioning as a key interchange. Efforts are focused on keeping transit close to the site core.
- **Q:** Is the coach pull-out intended for buses or private coaches?
 - **A:** Both. TransLink buses will stop in-lane, while the hotel-side pull-out is designed to accommodate private coaches, including those serving nearby attractions such as the suspension bridge.
- **Q:** Will the coach pull-out include a shelter with cover?

- **A:** Yes. The rendering includes a shelter, as well as building overhangs providing weather protection for pedestrians.
- **Q:** Is there direct access between the coach drop-off and the hotel?
 - **A:** Yes. Guests can directly enter the hotel lobby from the coach drop-off area.
- **Q:** Is there a grade change between the road and the hotel lobby?
 - **A:** Yes. The hotel lobby is elevated relative to the adjacent street. The restaurant serving hotel guests is located near the public sidewalk, offers both internal access from the hotel and a separate public entrance. Privacy is supported through minor grade changes and a thoughtful layout. The internal connection is also used for service and deliveries.
- **Q:** Is the restaurant on the south end operated by the hotel or independently?
 - **A:** It is intended to be independently operated and not managed by the hotel.
- **Q:** How are loading and service access handled, especially without a rear lane?
 - **A:** Service and loading functions are centralized mid-building, using a dedicated back-of-house elevator and core. The internal design addresses the absence of a rear lane.
- **Q:** Will there be secure entry to the residential and hotel parking areas?
 - **A:** Yes. All parking—including residential, hotel, and visitor—will be secure and accessed through designated entries.
- **Q:** Will the new hotel match the scale and area of the existing ones?
 - **A:** The new hotel maintains a similar footprint to the existing North Hotel but is slightly more compact. The number of rooms will increase slightly—from 170 to 180—meeting Council’s requirement for maintaining room count.
- **Q:** Will Capilano Road lanes be affected during construction?
 - **A:** No. The site is large enough to manage excavation and construction entirely within its footprint. A similar approach was successfully used across the street at the Braxton project.
- **Q:** Has a location and budget been confirmed for public art?
 - **A:** Yes. A \$400,000 public art installation is planned for the corner of Curling Road and Capilano. Coordination with the Public Art Committee is scheduled for early July, with integration to be managed alongside the selected artist.
- **Q:** Who established the 5% accessible suite requirement?
 - **A:** This is based on municipal design guidelines, which predate and in some cases exceed BC Building Code (BCBC) requirements, particularly in interior features like cabinetry and finishes.
- **Q:** Will the project update to align with evolving BCBC standards?
 - **A:** The project must meet current municipal guidelines as part of the rezoning process. A comparison with BCBC is underway to ensure alignment where appropriate.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, provided a detailed design review, offering observations and comments for further consideration. He began by commending the applicant for their responsiveness to previous panel feedback and staff recommendations, particularly highlighting significant improvements on the north side of the site, especially the hotel component.

Mr. Tejada noted that the hotel design been improved and was largely successful in addressing earlier concerns. However, he expressed that the northeast corner at Curling Road and McGuire Avenue still felt unresolved. He emphasized the need to create a stronger sense of connectivity and contextual integration at this corner, potentially through enhanced public realm treatment to better link the site with the surrounding Town Centre area. He also acknowledged that design changes on McGuire Street, including the bicycle path and boulevard improvements, had successfully addressed earlier concerns about the mechanical ramp and its impact on public space. He praised the reconfigured park space for being more compact and cohesive, describing it as a successful turnaround from the previous design.

On architectural articulation, Mr. Tejada observed that the long street wall along McGuire (previously exceeding the recommended 45 meters) had been effectively addressed through segmentation and articulation, aligning with design guidelines. However, he expressed some concern about the metallic band used in the building, describing it as visually heavy in renderings, although possibly more balanced in the actual 3D model.

Mr. Tejada also appreciated the reintroduction of the black colour accent and the vertical painted metal cladding, both of which helped to enrich the building's expression. He noted the overall improvement in material composition and tower articulation.

In reviewing the southern residential tower, Mr. Tejada raised concerns about its relationship to future lower-scale development across McGuire Street, suggesting that the transition from a 12-storey massing to a potential 4-storey context could be more sensitively handled.

Mr. Tejada mentioned a new design element has been introduced around the 12th to 15th floors of the tower: a projecting balcony or horizontal band that was not present in earlier versions.

This feature appears visually distinct due to its thickness and contrasting material or colour, possibly using a different glazing or cladding treatment. While the intent seems to be to introduce visual interest and a sense of lightness in the mid-section of the tower, its integration feels somewhat unresolved. The element appears to float and lacks a clear structural or visual connection to the rest of the façade, which disrupts the continuity of the tower's design language.

In previous versions, the transition between the tower and mid-rise components was articulated more cohesively through consistent framing and material changes. This new feature may need refinement to ensure it complements the overall architectural expression.

Further input from the panel would be helpful to assess whether this new articulation enhances or detracts from the tower's design.

Finally, he commented on the tower's mechanical penthouse, acknowledging its necessity but suggesting its scale and treatment could be more refined, to reduce its visual prominence atop a 37-storey tower. He encouraged a softer, more integrated approach to its design, aligning with the intent of the broader urban design framework.

The chair invited comments from the Panel members and the following comments and items for consideration were provided:

1. General Design & Concept

- The overall design was generally well-received, with no major objections.
- The triangular site shape poses design challenges.

2. Public Realm & Pocket Parks

- The Panel supported the pocket parks, suggesting varied uses such as family-oriented or art-focused spaces, with some panelists preferring art or water features over a playground.
- The inclusion of benches was supported, with a recommendation to design them in a way that discourages prolonged occupancy.
- The necessity of a crosswalk through the pocket park was questioned due to misalignment with typical pedestrian routes and expected ride-hailing traffic on nearby streets.

3. Circulation, Access & Transportation

- Concern was raised regarding the size of the coach drop-off area. It appears too small to accommodate multiple buses simultaneously.
- The stairs between the coach drop-off area and the hotel lobby present challenges.
- Concerns about conflict zones between cyclists and pedestrians and clear signage recommended to mitigate cyclist and pedestrian conflicts.
- There was discussion about the removal of the southbound bike lane from Capilano Road and the suggestion to do the same for northbound bike traffic by redirecting it to McGuire Avenue.
- Concern was expressed that the current design, particularly along Capilano, restricts space for a lush boulevard and results in a more constrained public realm.
- Design should encourage pedestrian movement, especially along McGuire as Capilano may not be highly used by pedestrians.
- Positive comments were made about placing active, visible uses at the ground level to animate the street. There was, however, skepticism about the level of pedestrian activity along Capilano Road, especially north-south, given current conditions.
- The panel emphasized the importance of designing an engaging and welcoming public realm, particularly along internal site edges, as more critical for success than street-facing components.
- Storefront glazing is missing from elevation drawings at the bike lounge.

4. Building Design & Architecture

- The architectural massing was well-considered, particularly the juxtaposition of the serpentine ground floor and bar elements. However, there were requests to further integrate the design (e.g., wrap the brick element to McGuire).
- The tower's articulation, especially around the mid-point where a horizontal band appears, raised concerns. It interrupts the tower's vertical expression and creates

ambiguity in defining the base and upper massing. These tower floors also show the least coordination between structural columns and fenestration.

- One panelist suggested maintaining a strong vertical continuity for the tower, clearly separating the podium and tower with a distinct break or articulation and extending tower design language down to the ground plane.
- The stepped massing and integration with adjacent mid-rise and park elements were acknowledged as thoughtful.
- The top of the tower, including the architectural overrun, was supported and seen as contributing positively to the skyline when viewed from across the bridge.
- South wall of south tower is a blank 3-storey expanse; recommend design refinement if this will be a public pathway in the future.
- Clarify fenestration in DP; conflicts exist between glazing and structural columns.
- "White with a slot divider" recommended for hotel facades.
- Parkade vent in the roadway could introduce noise; assess and mitigate.
- Three balconies on Level 3 of south hotel building appear to lack direct unit access.
- Generator and mechanical exhaust locations (Level 3 YWCA amenity) raise concerns.
- Ventilation and detention tank access were noted as important and are being addressed.
- At AS402, the L4 transfer slab is too thin unless there are transfer beams underneath it (the L3 transfer slab appears very thick and the headroom beneath looks insufficient at L2 to accommodate much in the way of above-ceiling services).

5. Accessibility & Safety

- Accessible parking should be clustered for ease of use.
- Key service areas (bike room, garbage room) should include automated doors.
- Winter sidewalk maintenance and durable materials should be prioritized to ensure long-term safety and usability.
- Concern about the long-term quality of the hotel's side elevation.
- Ensure secure, theft-resistant bike storage (noting recent incidents nearby).

6. Recommendations & Next Steps

- While the project is on the right track, the following refinements were recommended:
 - Final adjustments to the hotel's architectural language for greater cohesion.
 - Further articulation and simplification of the tower's mid-section to enhance its vertical identity.
 - Review public realm treatments, especially at pinch points affected by road dedication or infrastructure (e.g., bike lanes).

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

MOVED by Mr. Stuart Rothnie, 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 8:55 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

The next ADP will be on July 10, 2025.

*Signed on behalf of
Chair, Stuart Rotnie
as amended*

July 21 2025

Chair

*Tash Cheong
(stuart liaison)
Ch.*

Date

