

## **MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2025 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER**

**ATTENDING:** Sgt. Kevin Bracewell  
Mr. John Gilmour  
Mr. Robert Greene  
Mr. Tieg Martin  
Mr. Stuart Rothnie  
Mr. Joshua Bernsen  
Ms. Emily Blair

**REGRETS:** Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia  
Ms. Farnaz Sharifi  
Mr. David Parke  
Ms. Mahnaz Mohamadloo,

**STAFF:** Ms. Tash Cheong (Staff Liaison), Development Planner  
Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner  
Ms. Yan Zeng, Development Planning Department Manager  
Ms. Mackenzie Stonehocker, Development Planner  
Ms. Dorin Vaez Mahdavi, Planning Assistant

**APPLICANT:** Ms. Dayna Gilbert (Forum Asset Management)  
Mr. Jason Santeford (Gensler)  
Mr. Daryl Tyacke (ETA Landscape Architect)  
Mr. Devon Smart (Polygon Development 395 Ltd.)  
Mr. Peter Fodor (NSDA Architects)  
Mr. Ken Larsson (Connect Landscape Architecture)

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

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM by Mr. Stuart Rothnie and attendance was taken.

### **2. ADMINISTRATION**

The minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting held on July 10, 2025, were reviewed and amended. A motion to adopt the amended minutes was moved by Mr. Robert Greene, seconded by Mr. John Gilmour, and carried unanimously.

### 3. NEW BUSINESS

- a.) **1578 – 1590 Hunter Street – Rezoning and OCP Amendment Development**  
**Application** for a 485-unit Purpose-Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) within a 24-storey building

#### **Staff Introduction:**

Ms. Cheong provided an overview of the application for a Purpose-built Student accommodation at 1578 – 1590 Hunter Street. She described the subject lots as well as the surrounding properties. She also noted that the site sits next to the future green spine which is envisioned as more of a pedestrian oriented corridor in the town center. The Official Community Plan designates the site as residential level 6, which allows for medium density apartments at a density of approximately 2.5 FSR. The existing zone is Single Family Residential (RS4) and the proposed zoning and OCP designation are still to be determined but an amendment to the OCP along with the rezoning will be required. The site is subject to several Development Permit Areas including the Form and Character, Energy and Water Conservation and GHG Emission Reduction, and Creek Hazard DPAs. The site falls under the Lynn Creek implementation plan and the Lynn Creek public realm guidelines. While the implementation plan originally envisioned mid-rise apartments, Lynn Creek has been evolving into a more urban, transit-oriented neighbourhood. The current proposal is for a 24-storey purpose-built student accommodation. It provides 485 units in different sizes as well as 20 vehicle stalls and 385 bicycle stalls. The application proposed density is 6.28 FSR which is higher than the OCP and requires an OCP amendment. Ms. Cheong elaborated on the building design and demonstrated some of the key features on the site plan.

Ms. Cheong posed some questions for the Panel's input:

- Question 1 – How does the proposed tower massing respond to the site context and surrounding scale, and could a more compact floor plate enhance its architectural expression?
- Question 2 – How does the proposed building form and character fit with the adjacent residential development context?
- Question 3 – How can the ground plane better engage the street and pedestrian environment, with particular attention to the mechanical room and amenity areas?
- Question 4 – Does the proposed floorplate layout, particularly with the high concentration of nano and micro units, adequately support unit livability and functionality, and is there an opportunity to introduce greater diversity in the unit mix?

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

The Chair asked Ms. Cheong to clarify whether this application is for OCP amendment and a rezoning or whether they are applying for a full Form and Character Development Permit approval. Ms. Cheong confirmed that they are all being processed concurrently.

### **Applicant Presentation:**

Ms. Dayna Gilbert provided a background on the application team and some examples of the previous projects PBSA Forum has worked on across Canada. They mentioned that all their projects are rentals, include utilities and are fully furnished. Residents have access to amenities such as gyms. All units are self-contained with a kitchen and a bathroom, and all units have a window. She further notes that they are designing the building so that all units have a double-loaded corridor so that every unit has access to the daylight. She pointed out that they have built a junior suit (200 sq. ft.) and a micro junior suite (160 sq. ft.) on the main cafeteria on campus for demonstration and she played a video showing those units. She emphasized on the importance of the sense of community, connectedness, and social interactions among students and explained that they want the amenities to draw the students out of their units. Therefore, they have 17,000 sq. ft. of amenities in this building – 3 levels in the podium, one on the 6<sup>th</sup> floor, and one on the top floor. She also mentioned that they have programming and events, as well as 24 security surveillance in the building. All of their leases are 12-month leases.

Ms. Gilbert shared some examples of the amenities including gyms, game rooms, storage lockers, community kitchens, etc. Next, she spoke about the student housing deficit in Canada and especially in the case of Capilano University. Regarding the parking utilization in PBSA, she mentioned that the parking utilization rate across all of their properties is 0.03 spaces per bed.

Mr. Jason Santeford from Gensler Architecture and Design then provided an overview of the site, speaking about the convenient location as it is within walking distance from the Capilano University, shopping amenities, etc. He spoke about the connectivity and integration of the green spine into their landscape strategies. He also explained that the L-shaped tower is suitable for PBSA due to the size of the units and that the incorporated atrium allows them to activate four sides of the podium into student housing. Mr. Santeford further pointed out how their design guidelines are aligned with the OCP in terms of sculpting the top of the tower, balconies, and high-rise corner treatment. The relationship between the subject tower and the adjacent 30- and 34-storey towers was also mentioned. Some of the other information that was discussed include the shadow studies, the amenities on Hunter St., the water entry room, the location of the garbage area and the parking ramp. He also provided some information about the chosen materials including the MTL panels and the alternative polymer stone material while showing some renderings of the façade of the building. He points out that units have a significant amount of glass but for energy- and safety-purposes, there are no balconies. He then shared some summary statistics and the site plan of multiple floors. They note that the gym and the laundry room are likely to be located on the ground floor as they are both sound-based amenities.

The application presentation concluded with the landscape architect, from ETA Landscape Architect providing an overview of the project and the connection of the design with the environment of the North Shore and the nature.

The Chair thanked all presenters and asked the Panel whether they have any questions.

- **Q:** Is this 100% student housing?
  - **Applicant Answer:** The building will always be for students and right now it is exclusively for Capilano University students.
- **Q:** What storage spaces are available to residents? If the storage space in the basement is not sufficient, what options do they have?
  - **Applicant Answer:** There is storage within the units for storing personal items. They can also have additional space in the underground. We find that students do not use a lot of storage space in our buildings.
- **Q:** Are there any considerations for parkade ventilation?
  - **Applicant Answer:** It will be considered.
- **Q:** Will the tower elevators be overhead traction?
  - **Applicant Answer:** At this time, yes, probably.
- **Q:** Will the bicycle elevator be EMR?
  - **Applicant Answer:** It will probably be hydraulic.
- **Q:** In the environmental sustainability report, is there no rainwater detention required on site?
  - **Applicant Answer:** Most likely there will be. There is a room for a tank, but our civil engineers know the details.
- **Q:** Is the HVAC system heating only?
  - **Applicant Answer:** Yes.
- **Q:** Are the students taking any classes during the summer or have summer jobs?
  - **Applicant Answer:** It depends on their program and the number of credits they have. The 21-month leases are important for the students to be in their community. If they need a sublet and will not be there for a semester, the professional property management team will deal with this situation, and a student must be residing in the unit as a subletter.
- **Q:** Looking at the ground floor plan, could you clarify that the northeast corner of the tower sits partway over the ramp and the building overhangs that access to the midpoint to the ramp?
  - **Applicant Answer:** No, the ramp is entirely outside of the footprint of the tower at the base, just on the other side of the garbage room. The tower does overhang that, so it's covered and so it is weather protected. (It was further clarified that it extends the property line, and it is in fact over half of the ramp.)
- **Q:** Is there a reason why the elevator is open on two sides?
  - **Applicant Answer:** Yes, it is to activate the lobby as well as the parcel and mail room, and have the elevators being accessed from the overall community space.
- **Q:** The unit counts, the floor plans and the architectural elevations all suggest that the double height outdoor amenity space on the South elevation as shown in the rendering does not in fact exist. Why is that?
  - **Applicant Answer:** Yes, that is a brand-new addition. What will be provided is what is shown in the rendering with the opening. (It was clarified that the form and character must be judged based on the rendering, not the site plans).
- **Q:** What is the rationale to increase the density from 2.5 FSR as stated in the OCP to over 6 FSR?

- **Applicant Answer:** The OCP is being redone and for this site within the town center and with the 30-storey tower next to it, we thought that this is what was needed and that it was a good use for this site.
- **Q:** Does Capilano University support this project?
  - **Applicant Answer:** Yes, a letter of support from Capilano University was submitted with our application.
- **Q:** From a developer point of view, how much rent will be charged or how much did you need to make it worthwhile on a per square foot basis?
  - **Applicant Answer:** We don't do per square foot and from a rental perspective it is based on the market – 20%-30% more affordable than an unfurnished unit in the District with no utilities included.
- **Q:** Will there be any staff on site and will there be a security component to that staff?
  - **Applicant Answer:** Yes, there will be full-time 24-hours security and someone who lives on site. There will also be a student health office and staff will be on site.
- **Q:** Parking spaces are limited – who do you see using those parking spots?
  - **Applicant Answer:** Visitors and or accessible needs – it could be staff, parents visiting, etc.

### Urban Design Presentation:

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, provided a detailed design review, offering observations and comments for further consideration. He began by expressing gratitude to the team for their presentation and materials. He emphasized the uniqueness of the building's typology and its proposed uses and noted that the project features a distinct configuration compared to traditional forms such as Flatiron buildings and the UBC student housing. He provided other examples of tall, narrow, and L-shaped buildings. His emphasis was on the scale of the buildings as this project is located in proximity to a potential new project – the Seylynn Gardens. He demonstrated through a rendering, how this configuration and typology for the student housing building in L-shape compares to a footprint of a building that is 28 meters by 33 meters (Seylynn Gardens) and added that the height difference is not visually significant. He mentioned a 5-meter setback requirement from the Greenway, with the current proposal falling short by 1 meter—suggested this be addressed in future refinements.

He discussed two proposed materials:

- **Aluminum:** Lightweight, textured, and more suitable for the building's character.
- **Polymer:** Heavier, less textured

He concluded his presentation by posing two questions:

- Question 1 - Does the proportional residential typology fit with the residential surrounding context which is changing?
- Question 2 - Is this building providing a functional and livable environment for the intended uses?

The Chair thanked the applicant for their presentation and asked the Panel members to share their comments.

- **Q:** Will there be any considerations for public art?
  - **Applicant Answer:** Yes, we would like to incorporate Indigenous art in recognizing the lands that we're building on. We have reached out to the Squamish Nation and the Tsleil-Watuth Nation. Additionally, there will be a public art component in the amenity spaces provided by local artists. Currently nothing is planned for the exterior.

### **Summary of Panel Commentary and Consensus Items:**

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

### **General Design, Massing and Location:**

- Majority of the Panel members supported the L-shaped design, size, height and massing of the building within this context. A panelist pointed out that the height of the building does not appear to be an issue given the nearby towers that are proposed.
- One Panel member suggested that a 3-storey podium might be more desirable than a 5-storey one; especially since it will be difficult to have daylight into the courtyard area.
- There was support for the location of the building and the integration with the green spine.
- It was noted that a shuttle bus to assist students going up the hill would be helpful.
- A member emphasized that the proposed building fits well with the character of Orwell St. West, but the Seymour Creek #2 will only feel cohesive if it's also allowed to develop similarly. Without that, the transition across the street, it will feel abrupt and disconnected.
- The design of the units and the use of Murphy beds was appreciated.
- The stairs may pose an issue as there will be no windows.
- A member suggested adding a rooftop vestibule for outdoor access, noting that openable windows may affect amenity space.
- There was support for the lobby's location on the corner of Hunter-Orwell St.
- A member supported integrating students into the broader community, noting the area's diversity and potential for strong engagement.
- A member encouraged the architect to refine the tower's top-floor massing to better express the contrast between the solid mechanical portion and the lighter, more open amenity space.
- A member expressed concern about the tower's base sitting half-way over the ramp, suggesting it should meet the ground more directly to reflect the building's solidity and improve the corner's expression.
- It was noted that for the Form and Character DP approval more consistency in the drawings and the quality of the drawings would be required.

### **Materiality and Building Façade:**

- There was general support for the texture and material that is proposed and the variations in the façade of the building.
- A comment was made about the exterior of the building looking busy.
- Another suggestion was reconsidering wood-look pavers, noting they may pose tripping risks and could quickly look dated.

### **Accessibility and Safety:**

- Concerns were raised regarding the security of the underground parking area where there are bike storage areas, and it was noted that a 24-hr surveillance as well as appropriate locking system at the construction phase is needed.
- A member recommended that an identifiable entrance door is chosen to ensure that residents can locate it at night-time or in different weather conditions.

### **Technical Concerns:**

- It was mentioned that the overhead traction elevators would result in an overrun and would impact the form and character in terms of the height of the building.
- It was noted that more space should be allowed for the control room.
- Another concern was that given the mechanical systems as described in the sustainability report, the mechanical penthouse does not seem to be laid out to accommodate equipment in a functional manner. In terms of form of character, there's no indication of the louvers and the screens needed for any of this air source equipment to function properly.

### **Amenity Areas:**

- Regarding the electrical room and the water entry room at the southeast corner, a recommendation was relocating the laundry room to face the street for a more attractive layout, while placing mechanical equipment (like hot water tanks and metering) near the MEP shaft to optimize space and function.
- The upper-level amenity program was supported, and the green roof's stormwater benefits were appreciated.
- A member discussed that the upper-level amenity design isn't reflected at street level and suggested animating the Hunter St. edge by extending the angular form and improving sidewalk access.

### **Landscaping:**

- It was suggested to add more covered outdoor seating areas, considering limited seating and the region's rainy climate.
- A member suggested moving the bench into the green spine for better animation and recommended improving circulation and engagement at the Hunter St. interface -

possibly by rethinking the landscape buffer and considering a more active amenity than a convenience store.

- A concern was raised about limited sunlight in the courtyard, suggesting a review of programming and shadow studies to improve usability and light access.
- It was suggested that having the plaza closer to the green spine could be beneficial.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion.

Moved by Mr. Tieg Martin, and seconded by Mr. Robert Greene with all members voting in favour, the following motion was passed:

*THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and **recommends APPROVAL for 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.

**b.) Lynn Valley Mall (1246-1268 Lynn Valley Road) and Draycott Gardens (3050-3174 Baird Road) - OCP Amendment, Rezoning and DP for a mixed-use development including 2525 m2 of commercial and 408 residential units in four 6-storey buildings**

**Staff Introduction:**

Ms. Mackenzie Stonehocker, Development Planner, introduced the project and explained the context. The site is located in the heart of Lynn Valley, fronting onto both Lynn Valley Road and Baird Road to the west. Hastings Creek runs behind the site, the existing Petro Canada station is to the east and Lynn Valley Village is to the south. The Ross Plaza is located immediately beside the site. She explained that the Lynn Valley flexible planning framework marks these sites as up to five stories and this proposal is for the redevelopment of two existing uses: Draycott Gardens – a townhouse complex built in 1972, and Lynn Valley Mall – consisting of one and two-story commercial buildings with surface parking.

The proposal also includes the purchase of the District lane to the south of the site. This proposal falls under the Lynn Valley Town Centre Public Realm and Design Guidelines for Form and Character DPA, Streamside Protection DPA and Energy and Water Conservation and GHG Emission Reduction DPA. The proposal is for four six-storey buildings developed in two phases. Building one includes rental units, and two levels of commercial space and tenants of Draycott Gardens can live in their existing homes until new rental replacement units are ready for occupancy in building one. Buildings two, three and four would all be six-storey strata buildings. Ms. Stonehocker further spoke about the access off the lane, the break in the ground

floor retail space for a breezeway, and the numerous pedestrian paths and outdoor spaces on the ground plane.

She then posed the following questions for the Panel's input:

- Question 1 – Is the scale/separation of the buildings related to a functional human scale?
- Question 2 - Do the west sides of Buildings 3 and 4 create a good fit with the scale and height of existing (or potential future) development along Baird Road?
- Question 3 - Is the south side of Building 1 (facing Lynn Valley Road) integrated with the surrounding context, and potential future redevelopment to the east (Petro Canada) and west (Ross Plaza)?
- Question 4 – Are the materiality and scale proposed for these buildings contributing to, or detracting from the urban character of Lynn Valley Road and Baird Road?

The Chair thanked Ms. Mackenzie Stonehocker for the presentation and asked a clarifying question:

- **Q:** Could you clarify what you meant by mentioning that the applicant will be purchasing the lane?
  - **Staff Answer:** The applicant has gone through a process with our real estate department to negotiate purchasing that lane. The lane would have to remain open for access to the rear of Ross Plaza and it will be upgraded as part of the development proposal.
  - **Staff Answer:** Ms. Yan Zang, Manager of Development Planning, explained further that this is a usual practice in the District as this lane will be serving the private development in the future.
- **Q:** That provides the applicant the control on the design, feel and look of that laneway. Is that correct?
  - **Staff Answer:** Yes, and the District would not be responsible for the maintenance of the road and it would be a private road serving the development.
- **Q:** Would the lane still provide the right of access to the mall to the south (during and after the development)?
  - **Staff Answer:** As long as Ross Plaza is in operation, there is guaranteed access.
- **Q:** Regarding the bike lane on Lynn Valley Road, is it the District's intention for the future of bikes on Lynn Valley Rd.?
  - **Staff Answer:** The proposal has not fully gone through its engineering review yet, so the final street design is not confirmed yet.
- **Q:** Was there a rule against putting access to the commercial parkade from Lynn Valley Road?
  - **Staff Answer:** As per staff direction, parking access off in Valley Road at that location is not permitted.

No further questions were raised, and the Chair asked the applicant to begin their presentation.

### **Applicant Presentation:**

Mr. Peter Fodor, the Principal of NSDA Architects, started the presentation by providing a background on the Lynn Valley Mall Development with 2.5 FSR and 408 homes (32 dedicate 3-bedroom rental replacement homes, 36 market rental homes, and 340 market strata homes). This development includes 2525 square meters of commercial and office space as well as outdoor amenities and landscape courtyard. He noted that the project will be compliant with the new 2025 OCP intents and Town Centre policies and it follows District guidelines for commercial and mixed-use buildings, multifamily housing and town village centers and advances the current OCP 2030 targets for housing, growth management and environment management. He further described the location of the site as well as the social and cultural amenities in the neighbourhood.

Phase one of the project will be targeting the Lynn Valley Mall and Draycott Gardens will be the the second phase. It was also noted that the access point to the Draycott Gardens is the laneway at Baird Rd. Phase one prioritizes market rental replacement housing, and it commences with the demolition of the existing Lynn Valley Mall and the construction of building one and two and phase two of the development will begin with the demolition of the Draycott Gardens and construction of building three and four. Mr. Fodor demonstrated the access points for vehicles and fire trucks, as well as the waste and recycling staging area at the back of the building one. In terms of the open spaces, the site responds to the Parks and Open Space requirements and guidelines by maintaining the SPEA setback on Hastings Creek and buildings are separated by 9 meters. There will be a large semi-public courtyard expanding on-site green space compared to the existing conditions. He mentioned the economic impact of this project as this mixed-use development reduces regional commuting, replacing around 2,300 sq. m. of existing commercial areas with 2,525 sq. m. of combined retail and office spaces. Moreover, he noted positive impacts of the public art component, the allocated breezeway, and the streetscape design. In terms of the infrastructure, he pointed out that the project relies on existing infrastructure and servicing is performed below grade on site. Other strengths of the project mentioned include supporting OCP 2030 by developing complete, walkable centres, enhancing densification of the Lynn Valley Town Centre commercial and community hubs, and prioritizing sustainable transportation modes. He elaborated by providing additional data-driven evidence.

Mr. Fodor described the visual design and used material (stone, wood, and metal) in this project as inspired by an interpretation of a mountain village. He also noted that all homes have basic accessible design features for the district's requirements, 5% of homes in each phase will have enhanced accessible design features, and the project is designed BCBC 2024 part 3 Section 8. Some climate action aspects of the project such as using LED light fixtures, controlled lighting, EV infrastructure and car and bicycle charging were pointed out. Mr. Fodor also spoke to the CPTED features of the project and emphasized safety through clear sight lines, lighting, controlled access, and defined public-private spaces.

Mr. Ken Larsson, from Connect Landscape Architecture, continued the presentation by providing some background on the inspirations behind the landscape design of this project with a focus on nature. He described a site design inspired by natural trails and creeks, with nearly

half the area dedicated to outdoor spaces that balance public and private zones. The layout centers around four key areas, including a vibrant street frontage, a social hub transitioning to a semi-private courtyard, and a breezeway linking civic and residential spaces. Features include a proposed bike lane, enhanced sidewalks, lush landscaping, and informal gathering spots. The courtyard is divided into active zones, including a nature-based play area that encourages mingling and community interaction, and it acts as a shaded, forest-like connector across the site. He noted that climate resilience is addressed through native plantings, efficient irrigation, and improved water absorption.

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:** Would you consider also integrating of the public art into the breezeway, the ceiling, and the ground level?
  - **Applicant Answer:** We will go through the usual process of engaging with the District to discuss our public art proposal. We have not considered the breezeway ceiling as a form of public art, but we want to obscure the parkade entry ramp and we think that it would be a great opportunity to place our public art there.
- **Q:** What are your plans for the lighting in the public realm?
  - **Applicant Answer:** That is an important node for our development and we have a particular focus on it for security reasons as well as public experience. It will not be a dark and heavy greenway.
- **Q:** What is the dimension (the width) of the lane?
  - **Applicant Answer:** 6 meters.
- **Q:** What is the dimension (the width) of the breezeway?
  - **Applicant Answer:** Breezeway is about 40 feet.
- **Q:** What is the reason behind a need or desire a northern connection to Hastings Creek? Was there a demand from the district that you provide a potential future connection into that site?
  - **Applicant Answer:** Early plans envisioned visual permeability through the site, allowing residents to walk freely toward Lynn Valley Rd from their homes. There are going to be private occupants in this area so ideally we do not want to allow people in the north on the site free egress into the site and to the Lynn Valley Centre,
- **Q:** Could you describe how you can get to the commercial parking for retail and office spaces? Should you go through Baird Rd, go down the ramp to the commercial parking at level one, then enter the elevator to go to the retail space?
  - **Applicant Answer:** Yes, there is a retail elevator at the elbow of building one.
- **Q:** Could you clarify what is at the intersection at the dead-end lane in the north?
  - **Applicant Answer:** That is the neighbour's property. There is a little gravel in that area. Ideally the public would walk down the boulevard along the Baird Rd and connect to the Lynn Valley Rd. I do not see many people walking down the northern lane. But it is a private property and there is no fence there.
- **Q:** How is the waste and recycling staging is envisioned to work considering the emergency access to the building through the lane?

- **Applicant Answer:** The staging is immediately behind building one. If you are driving, you have obstructed access up to building two. On your left you can find access to the parkade and the staging area and the commercial loading. The design accommodates large vehicles at the Class D loading dock, with turning analysis and traffic impact assessment completed.
- **Q:** Could you clarify what are the slab openings demonstrated on page 30?
  - **Applicant Answer:** They are mechanical.
- **Q:** Are building 3 and 4 going to have separate parkade gates?
  - **Applicant Answer:** There will be a gate for the parkade, and we will separate the commercial and rental from the strata development.
- **Q:** Could I as a member of the public, walk from there to the Lynn Valley Rd?
  - **Applicant Answer:** There will be a lane with public access and a walkway between building 3 and 4. The walkway is for the occupants.
- **Q:** How will you define your territory so that members of public do not use that as a shortcut to Lynn Valley Rd?
  - **Applicant Answer:** It is tricky to do that and there are limitations regarding the gates. Our intention is to discourage this by landscaping and planting in different ways.
- **Q:** Are people able to park or be in the vicinity of the bike storage lockers?
  - **Applicant Answer:** You will need fob access to the private bike lockers, but there are also at-grade bike racks.
- **Q:** What is the treatment at the eastern edge – the interface between the gas station?
  - **Applicant Answer:** We are proposing adding extra commercial frontage with paving and short connections to the adjacent Petro Canada site. While the owners aren't planning development soon, the design allows future integration, potentially creating a shared commercial corridor between the sites.
- **Q:** Can the pathway along the Hastings Creek be enhanced instead of planting shrubs and hiding the creek?
  - **Applicant Answer:** The creek has a setback attached to it and we were informed by the District that we are not allowed to develop there. The land must be untouched, and indigenous plants will be placed there.

### Urban Design Presentation:

Mr. Tejada started his presentation by noting that this proposal is still in early stages, with unresolved built form issues and unclear parking organization across site sections. He raised concerns about the service court's functionality for loading and garbage staging, noting it's a site plan issue that also impacts the building form and its integration with the surrounding context. He continued by pointing out that a six-storey building is being proposed while the flexible planning framework suggests five-storey buildings in this zone. The design still considers the scale and context of the existing surrounding neighborhood, which is expected to remain unchanged for some time. Mr. Tejada noted that the design reflects an urban or mountain village character but raised concerns about convoluted parking and loading access for commercial and office spaces. He questioned the ramp's layout between phases and suggested the plan needs further analysis and attention. He also identified the lane access point as a major

site plan issue, citing conflicts between garbage staging, loading, ramp access, and incoming traffic in that area.

Mr. Tejada highlighted concerns about pedestrian mobility, privacy, and security - especially around the breezeway's open access to the garden. He also flagged potential future impacts from transportation changes on Lynn Valley Rd, including setbacks, commercial frontage, and bus stop relocation, urging careful attention to these for long-term project success. Additionally, he mentioned that the building form appears dominant relative to the eastern and northern neighborhoods. He raised concerns about tight spacing between buildings - narrowing from 9 to 7 meters internally - especially given the six-storey height and nearby vegetation, suggesting the proportions may feel constrained. He emphasized that the continuous six-storey form should ideally be stepped back to fourstoreys to better align with guidelines and the Baird Rd neighborhood. While the village-style character and materials seem appropriate, he flagged concerns about specific areas - particularly where the building bends on Mountain Hwy and Lynn Valley Rd - that may need closer architectural attention. There is a potential to have more defined character in this corner on the ground floor. Mr. Tejada concluded the proposal needs further resolution on site planning and building form to better fit the surrounding context.

### **Summary of Panel Commentary and Consensus Items:**

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

### **General Design, Massing and Location:**

- The mix of homes and commercial spaces was supported.
- Concern was raised regarding the need for more rental units due to strata affordability issues.
- There was an appreciation for the articulation of the building with recessed balconies rather than a flat building.
- It was noted that the distribution of the buildings on the site follows a clear logic.
- Mostly, the scale and separation of buildings were considered acceptable. A member agreed that regarding the scale of the units along the Baird Rd, a transition from 4- to 6-storeys would be a nice articulation.
- It was mentioned that the scale and height of the buildings mix well with the local context, and it reflects the materiality and shape of the library.
- One member was concerned about the scale of the project and believed that 6-storeys in this neighbourhood might be too high. It was suggested that building 1 should be lower (like 4 storeys).
- A member noted that the south side of the building complements the Lynn Valley Village development and once both developments are complete, that part of the street will be more vibrant.
- A concern was raised regarding the addressing, though it has yet to be determined.

- A member expressed interest in the social aspect of the project and believed that it will be a nice place for children to spend time.
- It was noted that there are not many details in the site plans and renderings which limited the feedback.
- A concern was raised regarding the subset of building one and the viability of the northern CRU was questioned especially when the gas station was developed. It was proposed that if the mixed-use development was done in conjunction with redeveloping the other parcel, it would be more successful and there would be a sensible entrance for the commercial area. Another member agreed that the viability of the northern CRU is in question and there may be a better use for that space.
- More information about the mechanical penetrations would be helpful.
- It was mentioned that a detailed cross-section through Lynn Valley Rd and Baird Rd was missing which causes a challenge for judging the relative scale.

#### **Materiality and Building Façade:**

- A member supported the elevations and the mix of siding and the cladding as well as the wood beams and posts.
- There was support for the chosen materials, which add to the urban character, aligned with the guidelines, and fit within the neighbourhood.
- In terms of the material, considering the Lynn Valley Town Centre Public Realm and Design Guidelines, the use of the heavy timber is muted, and it could be celebrated more.
- It was suggested to consider using natural materials like natural stone and natural granite.
- It was suggested to distinguish the buildings from each other in terms of materiality.
- The importance of pavement markings on the main vehicle route was highlighted to help the entrances.
- Regarding the Design Guidelines, a comment was made about the A3.11 balcony. There were concerns about the balconies projecting out past the plane of the face of the building. Additionally, the all-glass material was not considered a good idea for the projecting balconies.

#### **Accessibility and Safety:**

- There was a concern regarding the access to the parkade - the viability of the commercial space having to drive around to Baird Rd and down the narrow alley and finding the commercial parking inside the parkade.
- One member discussed that although there are comments about the commercial parking, if the commercial units are desirable, people will migrate across the street from the library or the mall and go there.
- There was support for the small CRUs and it is visually appealing from the street but there needs to be enough pedestrian traffic to support it.
- There was a concern regarding the District's restriction on car access in and out of the parkade from Lynn Valley Rd.

- Concerns were brought up about wayfinding in the area, and it was noted that the entrances need to pop where buildings 3 and 4 are located.
- It was recommended to have wider access points. Similarly on the north side, it is unclear how the access point will be used but it could benefit from a wider corridor.
- It was noted that the hierarchy of the pathways is clear.
- Questions were raised about the entrances of buildings 3 and 4: Where will the pick-up and drop-offs or deliveries take place? (Applicant responded that they are working with the District to use their off-street guidelines with regards to parallel parking and it will be incorporated with discussions with the engineering and transportation.)
- A concern was raised about the width of the lane and it was pointed out that 6 meters is not adequate for the level of traffic.
- Another concern was with the access point of Baird Rd, which may need to be widened.
- A concern was raised regarding the security of bike storage – there needs to be substantial and robust locking system in place.

### **Common Spaces and Landscaping:**

- It was mentioned that there is sufficient green space in the project.
- A question was raised about whether the covered plaza will be a spot for children to hang out.
- It was recommended to consider a pub in the area.
- A member supported the balance between the public and private realm.
- It was discussed that the connection under the breezeway continuing on a public path could benefit from more material distinction or having wider space between the buildings to highlight the public access versus the private access for the internal pathway.
- It was recommended to have a double row of trees along the Lynn Valley Rd.
- There was support for the breezeway, but it was suggested that the horizontal stone cladding might be heavy and it is slightly low and long. It could be replaced with a large piece of timber, and it could be raised.
- A concern was raised about the connection point to Lynn Valley Rd especially if adolescents will be using that route. It may encourage jaywalking and the concern for jaywalking was highlighted by another member as well.
- There was a concern about the lighting, and it was brought up that the site lighting along the lane is not sufficient.
- A concern was raised about the northern side of the site – that is a hangout area and people will be drawn to that location with the bollard light.
- Another concern was about the trellis being a work of public art and it was noted that it will attract people to a semi-private area.
- A member said that Argyle students will be heading towards the Lynn Valley Centre and they will be drawn into the lane and the site. You can either deter them or invite them.
- Regarding the public art piece, it was suggested that if it will be placed around the entrance, it might benefit from an area to pause – a seating area or a covered area. Additionally, if the children and young people are drawn to the space, how will the noise and other possible disturbances be handled?

- It was also recommended to keep the conversation on public art open-ended.
- There was a concern about the designation of the areas being public, semi-public, and private (especially regarding the breezeway) and it is not clear in the landscaping plan how the transition occurs in the social hub area.

The applicant made a few comments in response to the panel's feedback:

- This site is at the center of the Lynn Valley Village, and it is an appropriate location for placing the highest density and the new OCP encourages this level of density in this area.
- They understand the surrounding context, and they have tried to articulate the elevations with material and colours.
- They're aiming to allocate at least the same amount of commercial space that currently exists on-site, though they also need to allocate rental replacement homes.

Ms. Zeng also made a comment and clarified that no decision has been made by Council regarding the OCP and while this project is not too ambitious in terms of the density, the general guidelines suggest 5-storey buildings and that is the policy baseline staff are required to follow at this time. She also acknowledged that the applicant has considered many factors especially for the existing tenants. While this application is at the early stages of revisions, changes can be reviewed at a later time.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion:

**MOVED** by Mr. Tieg Martin, and **SECONDED** by Mr. John Gilmour:

*THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and SUPPORTS the general concept but recommends revisions to the proposal and a further presentation to address the items noted by the Panel in its review of the project.*

**CARRIED**

The motion was approved, with a single vote in opposition.

#### 4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:21 p.m.

#### 5. NEXT MEETING

TBD

signed on behalf of  
chair John Gilmour

Chair

*(Tash Chong)*  
*John Gilmour*

*Jan 19 2026*

Date