

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER  
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
MUNICIPAL HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2019**

---

Committee Members: F. Ducote; D. Harrison; A. van Hoek; J. McDougall; L. McKenna; A. Matis; Councillor B. Soprovich; and Councillor S. Thompson. Absent: J. Levine; B. Phillips; and B. Nelson

Staff: L. Berg, Staff Liaison and M. Emery, Committee Clerk.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 4:35 p.m.

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the November 21, 2019, Design Review Committee Meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

**3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

F. Ducote noted that his name was misspelled in the minutes.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the September 19, 2019, Design Review Committee Meeting minutes be approved as amended.

CARRIED

The Committee asked a question of staff on whether the Duplex Guidelines would be coming for review. L. Berg (senior Community Planner) advised that the Duplex Guideline workshop would appear as agenda item in the near future.

**4. OTHER ITEMS**

**COMMITTEE PROCEDURE BYLAW**

L. Berg advised that the Council adopted a new Committee Procedures Bylaw, and that there are no significant changes to current meeting procedures. Under the new bylaw, the public question period is at the discretion of the chair and will continue to be included at the end of the agenda, limited to 2 minutes per speaker regarding process and disposition.

## 5. INTRODUCTION

L. Berg outlined the meeting procedures.

## 6. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

### 707 AND 723 MAIN STREET (GATEWAY RESIDENCES) 5 STOREY ADDITION

L. Berg introduced the proposal and spoke relative to the approved project and the proposed application. The approved project is for two buildings of 11 and 14 storeys each with a FAR of 2.25, 203 rental units, 251 parking spaces, 282 bicycle spaces and extensive public realm improvements. The project received approval in 2018 and is currently under construction. The proposal is to add 95 additional secured rental units by increasing the building heights from 16 and 19 storeys with a FAR of 3.07. No additional parking or changes to the public realm are proposed.

#### **Project Presentation:**

M. Ehman (Architect, DA Architects) provided a presentation, including:

- Proposal is to add 5 storeys to each tower with no design changes at the top or the base of the building.
- A review of the approved building forms, unit types and uses.
- No changes to the approved materials: cementitious panels, grey brick, curtain wall form, white aluminum cladding, charcoal mechanical penthouse, and wood-like material to frame major entrances.
- View studies showing before and after conditions.
- Increased adaptable and barrier free measures with 23 adaptable units: 7 in west tower and 16 in east tower. Converting four parking spaces into accessible parking spaces and increasing the amount of push button doors.
- Sustainable measures including Step 3 of the BC Energy Code and LEED Gold.
- Noted that it is an appropriate location for added density as is centrally located to shopping and transportation, and connections to nature.

#### **Committee Questions:**

The Committee went on to question the presenters, with the applicants' and staff responses in *italics*:

- How does the taller building relate to the adjacent building? *By extending up it will affect all the units to a certain degree.*
- Is there dedicated parking for the day care. *Yes.*
- Is there a limit to how many storeys you could add? *Buildings designed for five extra storeys.*
- Did you consider going horizontally instead of vertically? *Occupying a fair amount of site and did not want to impinge into the public realm.*
- Evelyn Drive potentially affected with the proposed height, have you met to discuss? *Had public information meetings and a number of residents from Evelyn Drive attended, but have not discussed formally. A 2016 study showed buildings along the south of the shopping centre with heights that would affect the neighbours to the north, thus likely some time in the future taller buildings than this will be built (on leased land).*

- Shadow study that shows the previous and current buildings? *Some of the parking lot will be in shadow at certain times of the year.*
- Car share allocation to both buildings? *Yes car share spaces in parkade. Have you expanded program to add more care share for increase in units? No.*
- What additional CAC contribution have you indicated you will provide? *Currently gong through process, but preliminary estimate \$4-6 million dollars.*
- Are you increasing the size of childcare as part of CAC? *No increase as part of discussion. Level two of west tower occupied by 11 units and daycare owned by the District. There is also a 110-space childcare facility (privately owned) at the north mall under construction.*
- Consideration of providing a children's play area outside of the childcare area? *Only dedicated outdoor play area on level two. Noted that children will have access to public plaza with waterjets and public washroom.*
- Approaches to the at-grade space to mirror and compliment the surrounding natural areas? *An active zone within the plaza and the water feature, but no additional space for more passive green space at this level.*
- Are benefits identified equal to design rationale in adding height? *The building is well articulated, but could have had a more generous vertical proportion. It is now a gateway to herald the corner of a major intersection and the vertical elongated proportion is architecturally attractive.*
- LEED Gold certified? *Intent not to certify, just following the checklist.*
- Noticed floor plate layout changed has footprint increased? *Not significantly. Internal unit layout changes.*

#### **Committee Comments:**

The Committee went on to provide comments on the presentation, including:

- From a design perspective, the taller building works with viewpoint shown. May affect adjacent building views. Net gain of increased rental is positive. Concerned shading will affect the daycare outdoor play space. Generally, in support of form shown, encourage applicant to increase car share opportunities and provide amenities for pedestrian circulation.
- The original proposal had the buildings cascading going down from east to west but now five additional storeys have lost that sloping effect at the entrance. Agree that buildings are less squat and a thinner profile makes them look airier and less heavy, but worry about view impact on Evelyn Drive.
- Additional height improves building proportion and scale. Appear lighter and slimmer when viewed on the narrow side, but on broad face additional height might not improve elegance and proportions as much. The modest increase in height helps architecturally. The podium level 4 and 5 green roof is an opportunity to utilize roof top space for some active uses and level 5-roof top podium could have access to roof deck as a common area. Materials are handsome and robust, concern with durability of wood surround at the entrance.
- Consider providing opportunities for children's play at the ground plane. Increasing the units makes a significant difference, encourage the District to maximizing community amenity contribution to make sure all units equally supported, as increase in density will require additional amenities and effort put into the ground level. Childcare will not be finite so encourage opportunities for good quality childcare facilities. Think likely the way of the future is for families to

start in rental buildings and ability to have children close to home is a benefit. Support the needs for additional car share and amenities needed to support the additional 95 units.

- Concerned with shadowing the daycare. Think seeing something more elegant in profile would be a better contribution to skyline. Would have liked to see view taken on downhill side rather than uphill side so can see impact on views to bridge and skyline of city. When reviewed previously (by the DRC), made mention would have liked to see a taller building but surmise it would be same amount of area on a smaller floor plate but in a different form. Consider shifting height around to improve profile and to reduce shadows on daycare. No question this will contribute to urbanism of Marine Drive.
- Support of the proportion of towers and applaud increase in barrier free measures. Following LEED score card without having any measured starts with good intention but may fall aside. Step 3 of the Energy Code will offset it.
- Consider possibility to improve the day light onto the outdoor children's play area without significantly change the massing.

Having reviewed the application and heard the presentation provided by the applicant:

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee SUPPORT the application for a 5-storey addition to the Gateway Residences at 707 and 723 Main Street; subject to further review by the applicant with staff of the following items:

- a review of potential expansion of the car sharing opportunities;
- a review of the potential for active uses of the level 4 and 5 rooftop areas;
- consideration of the robustness of the Prodema material around the high traffic entrance areas;
- a review by the District and the proponent to maximize community amenity contributions to use in a way that supports increased density;
- consideration of the child care spaces and potential opportunities for expansion;
- consideration of providing opportunities for children's' play on the ground floor public realm.

CARRIED

## 6.2 6421 ARGYLE AVENUE, DUPLEX

### Background:

L. Berg (Senior Community Planner) introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context. Development Permit proposal in existing duplex zoned area, this will be the last single-family house to be developed on the north side of Argyle Avenue. The District is currently undertaking the Horseshoe Bay Local Area Plan review and housing uses and allowable forms could be modified in this area.

### Project Presentation:

Z. Erickson (ZED Studio Design) provided a presentation, including:

- Reverse plan duplex with living on top floor to maximize light. No basement suites proposed. Terraced building to respond to the grade change from Argyle Avenue to the lane.
- Roof top patio accessed from living space patio. To address privacy and minimize overlook, have screened the upper floor roof top deck and setback from building edge. Building setback to minimize shadowing.
- Materials include metal panel, faux wood siding, acrylic stucco and stone split face.
- South facing front yard connects to the upper floor with common path from street to front entry. Private back yard accessed from bedrooms, yard follows grade. Landscape includes sod lawn, planting along perimeter edge with two trees and hedges.

### Committee Questions:

The Committee went on to question the presenters, with the applicants' and staff responses in *italics*:

- Front pathway and stairs, have you considered keeping level for universal access? *Mid-level entry, the 3 steps down keeps yard connected to street and not to have a large gap between yard and entry.*
- What are dimensions from edge of the building and the fence to neighbouring property? *5 ft. setback from house to property line, 2 ft. planting and 3 ft. buffer.*
- The hedge moving down slope is that going to cause difficulties with matching stairs and planting? *Trying to follow grade as it transitions down site, some retaining will be required as slopes down.*
- Do neighbours on either side have roof decks? *No but they have a series of terraced decks on upper and middle floor. Age of neighbouring properties? Possibly 80's and 90's designs.*
- Any chance that lower level could be rented legally? *Not intent to put in a suite and think it would be difficult to create a bedroom that would have a window.*
- Master bedroom seem quite recessed below the deck have you considered shortening deck or push bedrooms out? *It is a square footage issue, need terrace so have access on upper floor to reach roof top deck.*
- Any sustainable measures? *Duplex designed to Step 3 of the BC Energy Code.*

### Committee Comments:

The Committee went on to provide comments on the presentation, including:

- Review layout so deck above does not impact windows of master bedroom below.
- Like design as it is not a mirrored image, not sure how contemporary style will fit into street.
- Overall materials are of a high quality and expression of a high standard, have no issue with the exterior design. Consider staggering at back where one deck is slightly longer so not creating extra shadow for bedroom. Recommend looking at ways to increase amount of light to lounge area.
- Agree with idea of staggering the deck at back, will benefit exterior and interior from a light point of view. Think level grade entrance would increase usability of

space. Question need for a fence in front yard, if read as one yard would be a better situation.

- Attractive duplex and nice to see one that is thought out, well designed and mindfully fits into and works with the site. Nice materials will be very high quality dwellings and pleased to see a duplex that is not trying to put in two additional suites in the basement.

Having reviewed the application and heard the presentation provided by the applicant:

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee SUPPORT the application for a duplex at 6421 Argyle Avenue subject to further review of the following items with staff:

- consideration of the staggering of the balconies at back to allow for additional daylight into the bedroom and bathroom;
- consideration to bring light into the downstairs lounge area;
- consideration of a level grade entrance through site manipulation;
- reconsideration of the need of a fence in the middle of the front yard.

CARRIED

### PUBLIC QUESTIONS

7. A member of the public queried when drawings for Item 6.2 would be available for viewing and staff provided a response.

### NEXT MEETING

8. The next meeting is scheduled for December 5, 2019

### ADJOURNMENT

9. It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the November 21, 2019, Design Review Committee Meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Certified Correct:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Staff Liaison  
COMMITTEE CLERK.