MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON April 9th, 2026 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER

ATTENDING:	Sgt Kevin Bracewell, RCMP Crime Prevention Mr. Rasool Ghodoosi, Landscape Architect Mr. Robert Greene, Visual Art Specialist Mr. Koosha Kheradmandnia, Professional Engineer Ms. Vanessa Konn, Architect Mr. Tieg Martin, Building Industry
REGRETS:	Mr. Jay Boyce, Architect Mr. John Gilmour, Development Industry Representative Mr. David Parke, Accessibility Representative
STAFF:	Ms. Jon Maselli (Staff Liaison), Development Planner Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner Mr. Graeme Budge, Development Planner Ms. Afrooz Fallah, Planning Assistant

1. PANEL WELCOME AND DINNER

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Vice-Chair, Mr. Tieg Martin, who presided in the absence of Chair, Mr. John Gilmour. Attendance was taken and it was noted that Mr. John Gilmour and Mr. David Parke were unable to attend but had submitted their scores for item (b), the 2025 Design Excellence Awards.

2. ADMINISTRATION

The minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting held on February 12, 2026, were reviewed and amended. A motion to adopt the amended minutes was moved by Mr. Tieg Martin, seconded by Mr. Robert Greene, and carried unanimously.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) Development Application Process Review (DAPR) Presentation

Mr. Graeme Budge, Development Planner, presented an overview of the Development Application Process Review (DAPR) initiative, which focuses on improving development approval processes across the District of North Vancouver organization. He outlined three key objectives: enhancing the applicant (customer) experience, streamlining staff workflows, and building organizational capacity through continuous improvement.

Mr. Budge highlighted a recent procedural change where Council has delegated authority to staff to issue Development Permits for Form and Character of industrial and business park

developments. He clarified that while approval authority has shifted, the existing design guidelines and the Advisory Design Panel's (ADP) advisory role remain unchanged. The importance of clear communication and defined roles within the development approval process was emphasized, noting the Panel's continued role in providing targeted feedback on applications.

During discussion, a Panel member inquired about benchmarking and timeline improvements. Mr. Budge noted that while formal service standards are not yet established, the initiative aims to significantly reduce processing timelines. He referenced previous delegated authority changes that resulted in approximately a 30% reduction in processing time.

Mr. Budge invited Panel members to provide feedback and share insights to support ongoing process improvements via email at dapr@dnv.org

b.) 2025 Design Excellence Award

Mr. Jon Maselli (Staff Liaison) initiated the item by outlining the process for the 2025 ADP Design Awards. He confirmed that six shortlisted projects would be reviewed, with the Panel providing scores and high-level commentary for each.

Mr. Maselli noted that each project would be evaluated individually, with a brief discussion followed by scoring before proceeding to the next project. Panel members were encouraged to provide comments, while maintaining an efficient review process.

The six shortlisted projects are as follows:

1. Emery Village (Phases 2 & 3) – 1200–1259 Emery Place; 2320 Emery Court
2. Fulmer Family Centre for Childhood Studies – 2055 Purcell Way
3. City Suites Oxford – 220 Mountain Highway; 1529 Oxford Street
4. Rupert Street Townhomes – 342 Mountain Highway
5. Emerald Townhomes – 2028–2067 Glenaire Drive
6. Hollybrook – 600 West Queens Road

The evaluation criteria, totaling 10 points, include:

- Context and Site Planning (2 points)
- Architecture and Massing (2 points)
- Landscape (2 points)
- Relationship with the Public Realm (1 point)
- Details, Execution, and Materiality (2 points)
- Overall Impression (1 point)

Sgt. Kevin Bracewell, RCMP Crime Prevention, advised that Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) was not included as an evaluation criterion for the awards. Accordingly, he did not participate in the scoring process and recused himself from this portion of the meeting, departing at 6:07 PM.

Mr. Maselli clarified projects achieving an average score of 7.5 or higher 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) Emery Village (Phases 2 & 3) - 1200–1259 Emery Place; 2320 Emery Court

Project Overview

The Panel reviewed Phases 2 and 3 of Emery Village, a multi-phase residential development located in Lynn Valley Town Centre. The overall development (rezoned in 2018) permits up to 411 units across four phases. Phase 2 includes two 12-storey towers and one 8-storey building (220 strata units), while Phase 3 consists of 46 townhouse units across multiple buildings. The project features shared courtyard spaces and interfaces with Kirkstone Park.

Panel Discussion Summary:

- *Merits*:
    - The Panel generally acknowledged the project's strong integration with the surrounding context, particularly its relationship with Kirkstone Park and the provision of shared courtyard and open space areas.
    - The landscape design and courtyard spaces were noted as high-quality and well-integrated, contributing positively to the overall development.
    - The project was recognized for delivering a diverse mix of housing forms, including mid- and high-rise residential buildings alongside townhouse units.
    - Several Panel members noted that, given the density and site constraints, the project represents a competent and, in some aspects, skillful resolution, particularly in the arrangement of buildings and open spaces.
    - One Panel member expressed stronger support, emphasizing the quality of the landscape integration and overall execution on the ground.
- *Deficiencies and Concerns:*
    - The Panel expressed concern regarding the overall scale and massing, noting that portions of the buildings read as long and imposing, with limited articulation to break down perceived bulk.
    - There was consistent feedback that the development lacks sufficient modulation and stepping, particularly along street frontages, resulting in a less refined pedestrian experience.
    - Balconies and façade treatments were described as repetitive and overly linear, contributing to a sense of visual monotony.
    - Some members identified accessibility challenges, particularly in relation to courtyard access and usability.
    - Concerns were raised regarding the level of design refinement and execution, with several elements appearing unresolved or treated as secondary considerations.

- Overall, while the project performs adequately at a planning level, some Panel members felt that greater attention to architectural detailing and human-scale design was warranted.

Scoring and Decision:

The project achieved a final average score of 7.50. The Panel determined that the project meets the threshold for a Design Excellence Award, acknowledging its overall strengths, while noting areas for improvement in massing articulation and design refinement.

2) Fulmer Family Centre for Childhood Studies - 2055 Purcell Way

Project Overview

The Panel reviewed the Fulmer Family Centre for Childhood Studies, a two-storey institutional building at Capilano University. The project incorporates mass timber construction, LEED Gold certification, and integrated indoor–outdoor learning environments, including play areas connected to surrounding natural features.

Panel Discussion Summary:

- *Merits:*
  - The Panel expressed strong overall support for the project, particularly its architectural expression and use of mass timber as a defining structural and aesthetic element.
  - The building was recognized for its high-quality materiality and cohesive design, with well-executed detailing in key areas.
  - The project demonstrated a thoughtful integration of indoor and outdoor spaces, supporting childcare and academic programming, including play areas that incorporate natural elements and repurposed materials.
  - The building was seen as responding well to its campus context, with strong relationships to surrounding trees and open space.
  - Several Panel members noted that the project represents a well-resolved institutional building, with a level of design quality that contributes positively to the campus environment.
  - It was also acknowledged that the interior quality (while not formally evaluated) appears to further strengthen the overall project.
- *Deficiencies and Concerns:*
  - Some Panel members noted that public/institutional buildings are expected to demonstrate a higher level of design ambition and suggested they may warrant evaluation separately from private developments, which are often more budget constrained.
  - Concerns were raised regarding the visibility and legibility of the main entrance, which was not clearly identifiable from certain approaches, particularly from the vehicular drop-off area.

- The building was described in some views as presenting a more closed or inward-facing expression, with limited engagement along certain edges, reducing its presence as a public-facing facility.
- The breezeway element, while appreciated conceptually, was noted to have low ceiling heights and limited natural light, impacting user experience.
- Minor detailing issues were identified, including:
  - Visible fasteners on darker cladding materials,
  - Awkward or unresolved transitions at grade,
  - Elements of finishing that did not fully meet expectations for a project of this type.
- Some concerns were also raised regarding long-term durability and detailing resolution, though these were not considered critical.

Scoring and Decision:

The project achieved a final average score of 8.21. The Panel determined that the project warrants a Design Excellence Award, recognizing its strong architectural expression, material quality, and integration with its context, while noting opportunities for improvement in public interface and detailing refinement.

3) City Suites Oxford - 220 Mountain Highway; 1529 Oxford Street

Project Overview

The Panel reviewed City Suites Oxford, a six-storey, 140-unit purpose-built rental development located in Lynn Creek Town Centre, including a mix of market and non-market units.

Panel Discussion Summary:

- *Merits*:
  - The Panel acknowledged the project's contribution to the provision of rental housing within a designated growth area.
  - The development was recognized for achieving functional density and accommodating a range of unit types within a compact urban form.
  - Some members noted that the project reflects a typical and efficient building form for this type of development, particularly in the context of affordability constraints.
- *Deficiencies and Concerns*:
  - The Panel expressed significant concern regarding the overall lack of architectural distinction and design ambition, noting that the building is highly similar to many comparable developments, with limited evidence of thoughtful or intentional design decisions.
  - The massing and scale were described as imposing, with long, continuous façades lacking sufficient articulation, modulation, or meaningful recesses to improve the pedestrian experience.
  - Balconies and façade treatments were characterized as repetitive and overly linear, contributing to visual monotony.

- The relationship to the public realm was considered weak, with limited activation, poor integration at grade, and a lack of engagement with the surrounding streetscape.
- Several elements were described as appearing poorly resolved or treated as afterthoughts, including:
  - Mechanical units on balconies placed inconsistently, in some cases negatively impacting usability and resident comfort;
  - Bike storage located in a highly visible area near gas meters, lacking integration and already showing signs of deterioration;
  - Bench seating that was poorly located, not level, lacked backs, and was not effectively integrated with usable or sheltered areas;
  - Screening elements that could have been enhanced through design treatment or public art.
- Concerns were raised regarding the quality of detailing and construction, including visible inconsistencies and poor workmanship (e.g., gaps, uneven finishes, and inadequate transitions).
- The Panel emphasized that design quality is not solely dependent on budget, and that stronger design direction and attention to detail could have significantly improved the outcome.
- Overall, the project was described as maximized for site yield without sufficient consideration for livability, user experience, or public realm quality, raising concerns about long-term impacts given the permanence of such developments.

Scoring and Decision:

The project achieved a final average score of 4.96. The Panel determined that the project does not qualify for a Design Excellence Award, citing significant concerns related to design quality, execution, and overall contribution to the public realm.

4) Rupert Street Townhomes - 342 Mountain Highway

Project Overview

The Panel reviewed a five-storey, 26-unit stacked townhouse development located at the corner of Mountain Highway and Rupert Street in Lynn Creek Town Centre. Ground-oriented units are accessed directly from the street, while upper units are accessed via internal walkways. The project includes a central, resident-only courtyard.

Panel Discussion Summary:

- *Merits:*
  - The Panel recognized the project's efficient use of the site and the application of a stacked townhouse typology to achieve increased density within a compact urban form.
  - The internal organization, including the central courtyard, was viewed as functional and appropriate for residents.

- Several Panel members acknowledged that the project demonstrates a higher degree of creativity and design effort compared to many similar developments in the area.
- Positive elements noted included the use of window boxes and façade features, which contributed to a more engaging architectural expression than typically seen in comparable projects.
- Overall, the project was seen as making a meaningful effort to go beyond standard development approaches, warranting recognition.

- *Deficiencies and Concerns:*
  - The public realm interface was identified as a key weakness, with ground-level spaces described as dark, underutilized, and lacking activation.
  - Some design elements, while conceptually strong, were considered poorly executed or unresolved, including:
    - Window box features that lacked functional integration (e.g., non-operable elements or artificial planting);
    - Public seating that was improperly installed (e.g., not level), detracting from usability and overall quality.
  - Concerns were raised regarding the functionality and livability of certain at-grade spaces, which were perceived as less inviting or usable.
  - The project was generally characterized as competent and somewhat creative but not achieving the level of refinement or consistency required for design excellence.

Scoring and Decision:

The project achieved a final average score of 7.01. The Panel determined that the project warrants an Award of Merit, recognizing its creative approach and overall performance, while noting areas for improvement in public realm integration and execution quality.

5) Emerald Townhomes - 2028–2067 Glenaire Drive

Project Overview

The Panel reviewed Emerald Townhomes, a 41-unit townhouse development in Lions Gate Village, organized into multiple buildings with internal courtyards and pedestrian pathways connecting to the Capilano River Regional Park and trail system

Panel Discussion Summary:

- *Merits:*
  - The Panel strongly supported the project's site planning and integration with the natural environment, particularly its direct connection to the Capilano River Regional Park and surrounding trail network.
  - The development was recognized for its high-quality pedestrian connectivity, including publicly accessible pathways that enhance movement through the site and link to adjacent open spaces.

- The relationship between built form and landscape was viewed as well-resolved, with internal courtyards and edge conditions contributing positively to both the resident experience and the broader public realm.
- The project demonstrated coherent and consistent architectural language, with a unified material palette and thoughtful composition across multiple buildings.
- Several Panel members noted the project's strong livability, highlighting the quality of open spaces, integration of landscaping, and overall setting as desirable for residents.
- The interface between the development and adjacent natural areas was described as seamless and well-integrated, reinforcing the project's contextual responsiveness.

- *Deficiencies and Concerns:*
  - Minor concerns were raised regarding the limited variation in architectural expression, with some members noting that the uniformity of the buildings could benefit from additional differentiation.
  - A few comments suggested opportunities for enhanced detailing or refinement in certain elements; however, these were considered minor and did not significantly detract from the overall quality.
  - Some discussion noted the internalized nature of portions of the site, although this was generally understood as appropriate given the project's configuration and context.

Scoring and Decision:

The project achieved a final average score of 7.89. The Panel determined that the project warrants a Design Excellence Award, recognizing its strong site planning, integration with the natural environment, and overall design quality, while noting minor opportunities for increased variation and refinement.

6) Hollybrook - 600 West Queens Road

Project Overview

The Panel reviewed Hollybrook, a four-storey, 86-unit affordable rental housing located near Delbrook Community Centre. The project is situated on a sloped site adjacent to Delbrook Park and includes pedestrian connections to the park and surrounding neighbourhood.

Panel Discussion Summary:

- *Merits:*
  - The Panel acknowledged the project's contribution to affordable housing, recognizing the importance of delivering this type of housing within the community.
  - The site planning and connectivity were considered generally appropriate, including pedestrian links to Delbrook Park and nearby amenities.

- Some members noted that the project appears to provide a positive living environment for residents, with access to outdoor spaces and proximity to a well-designed park.
- The building was viewed as generally compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood context in terms of scale and sitting.

- *Deficiencies and Concerns:*
  - The Panel expressed significant concern regarding the project's limited architectural expression, noting a lack of refinement and distinction in form, materiality, and overall design resolution.
  - The relationship to the public realm was considered weak, with the building described as largely inward-facing and turning its back on the street.
  - Key frontage areas, particularly along West Queens Road, were seen as dominated by vehicle access and parking-related elements, detracting from the pedestrian experience.
  - The main entrance was not clearly legible or prominent, reducing the building's presence as a civic-facing development.
  - Portions of the building were described as presenting blank or inactive façades, further limiting engagement with the public realm.
  - While the internal and resident-oriented spaces may function well, the Panel emphasized that the project does not adequately contribute to the broader urban environment, which is a key consideration in the Panel's evaluation.
  - The Panel also noted that budget constraints do not preclude design quality, and that greater attention to public-facing elements could have improved the overall outcome.

Scoring and Decision:

The project achieved a final average score of 6.64. The Panel determined that the project does not qualify for an award, citing concerns related to architectural expression, public realm interface, and overall design quality.

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
Emery Village (Phases 2 & 3)	7.50	Design Excellence Award
Fulmer Family Centre for Childhood Studies	8.21	Design Excellence Award
City Suites Oxford	4.96	N/A
Rupert Street Townhomes	7.01	Award of Merit
Emerald Townhomes	7.89	Design Excellence Award
Hollybrook	6.64	N/A

The Panel confirmed the following award outcomes:

- *Design Excellence Award:*
  - Fulmer Family Centre for Childhood Studies
  - Emerald Townhomes
  - Emery Village (Phases 2 & 3)
- *Award of Merit*:
  - Rupert Street Townhomes

No awards were granted to the remaining projects.

A motion to endorse the above award determinations was put forward by Mr. Robert Greene and seconded by Mr. Rasool Ghodoosi carried unanimously.

CARRIED

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

5. NEXT MEETING

May 14, 2026

Chair

NOVEMBER 12, 2026

Date