

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
MUNICIPAL HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2019**

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

Absent: A. Matis; J. Levine and D. Harrison

Staff: L. Berg, Staff Liaison; E. Wilhelm, Senior Community Planner 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 December 5, Design Review Committee Meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the November 21, 2019, Design Review Committee Meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

4. INTRODUCTION

The Chair read the statement of public participation.

L. Berg (Senior Community Planner) stated the purpose of the Committee, gave a brief introduction regarding review process of by the Committee, and outlined meeting procedures.

5. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

5.1 EVERGREEN SQUASH CLUB EXPANSION, 315 KLAHANIE COURT

Background:

E. Wilhelm (Senior Community Planner) introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context, including:

- The Squash Club is located within Klahanie Park.
- The amenities of the park include a small asphalt play area, two rugby fields, one soccer field, Capilano Rugby Club and the Evergreen Squash Club.

- Imminent changes to land uses surround the site, with the new town centre plan by the District of North Vancouver to the east.
- The development permit proposal includes some tree removal and adjustments to asphalt sports court and rugby field to accommodate the expansion of the squash club.

Project Presentation:

E. Berwick (Architect) provided a presentation, including:

- The Club has been operating in Klahanie Park for over 50 years on land leased from the District.
- To continue the success of the club, build membership and host larger tournaments, proposing to expand to 4,700 sq.ft. by adding a doubles court, singles court, a small office on main floor, a training area on upper floor and viewing areas.
- Existing entrance to club from Curling Road is under review due to the development in the immediate area. Districts of West Vancouver and North Vancouver are designing access to the park.
- Materials include the continuation of board and batten, stucco to match what exists there now. Design driven by blending old and new, need for economy, and keep club affordable. Intent for building to blend into landscape.

Committee Questions:

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

- Sport court is it used for practice. *The outdoor court is a parks amenity and will have to be shortened by 10 ft. to allow the addition.*
- Parking layout find westerly section has an awkward area where are avoiding a stump? *As part of a previous addition, it was stipulated that the stump remain.*
- The drawings show a possible pickle ball court, is that in first phase? *If the current access were closed, it would be a good possibility that it is included.*
- How do you get there by bike? *Entry would be through future pickle ball area along a new pathway, a matter of developing that pathway once the entrance is clarified.*
- Is there any impact to rugby field? *Yes, it has to be moved over 30 ft.*
- Upper lounge area shows two doors where do they go? *Area full of mechanical equipment in the roof area.*
- Is there a reason for the 9 ft. ceiling for exercise area, as this seems low? *Wanted to keep building as low profile as possible, it could be built higher.*

B. Nelson entered the meeting.

Committee Comments:

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

- Consider a more efficient parking lot layout to maximize efficiency for the park and club.
- Consider additional landscaping along whole west side of the building, and continue a series of trees along that boundary.

- The future pickle ball court may add too much on the east and west. Explore opportunity for creating a welcoming entrance for wayfinding. Architecture is basic, consider a simpler expression of the roofline and add more interest with materials and colours to contrast and enhance.
- Consider increasing landscaping along the west elevation. Review circulation.
- Appreciate blending the existing building and new architecture and how the building is blended in with the trees. Consider adding more trees.
- The road curve on north side leaves very little room for pedestrians and bikes. Explore designing a couple feet around the outline of the building so people can safely move around the building and show path on the plans.

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 the Evergreen Squash Club expansion at 315 Klahanie Court subject to further review by staff of the following items:

- consideration of the setback for landscape along the west and north west corner of the building;
- a review of the pedestrian and bicycle circulation around the building and how pedestrians and cyclists would arrive at the front entrance of the building in a safe way;
- work with staff to come up with a more efficient and useful layout of the parking;
- consideration of a simpler expression of the roof line;
- consideration of the use of some more contrasting colours for the addition;
- consideration of raising the roof of the building slightly to get more height in the exercise room above; and
- consideration to improve wayfinding around the site and to enhance the expression of the main entrance of the building.

CARRIED

5.2 GENTLES COTTAGE HRA, 4441 PICCADILLY NORTH

Background:

E. Wilhelm (Senior Community Planner) introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context, including:

- Outline of the HRA and where this application is in the review process.
- Site is not within the Lower Caulfeild Heritage Conservation Area. There are currently three primary structures on the site: Gentles cottage, gazebo and coach house with storage area.
- Cottage built in 1934 and considered an excellent example of English arts and crafts architecture; the cottage is not placed on the heritage register as the interior and exterior have had a number of renovations throughout the years; however, the 1934 living room and chimney are in excellent condition.

- Proposal is to protect and renovate the Gentles cottage with five rental units within the Gentles cottage, and add four duplexes and four townhouses on the west portion of the site accessed with a new driveway.
- Two parking stalls for each duplex and townhouse and one parking stall for each of the units in the cottage is proposed.

Project Presentation:

T. Ankenman (Ankenman Marchand Architects) provided a presentation, including:

- Site is one acre with exposed bedrock as a prominent characteristic of the site, which moves a lot of surface water through the site.
- Proposing infill housing as defined in the OCP along the Marine Drive corridor, where the objective is to add 200 infill units over next few years.
- The Heritage Advisory Committee suggested adding a trail to provide public access through site, down a right of way to Marine Drive, and connect to Caulfeild Park. Exploring improvements for pedestrian access to bus stops.
- The infill housing will be setback and unseen from the street.
- Proposal to restore house back to the 1951 era by removing additions and following the original archive drawings.
- The historic gazebo will be protected through the HRA. It is located in the heart of the site and will serve as a resident gathering spot.
- Promoting tourism by proposing short-term rentals and scheduled community events within the cottage.
- Green roofs proposed for townhouses and duplexes without obstructing views from the north.
- Townhomes to cater to younger families and three storey duplexes to allow ageing in place with master on main and elevator leading to two storeys below.
- Attempting to create a chronological time line as move through site with a clear distinction between historical aspect and new infill.

E. Gauthier (Landscape Architect) provided a landscape presentation, including:

- Retaining the existing rhododendron and mature trees around perimeter, in particular at south and north edge as well as entry. Proposing to remove 36 trees. Many of the trees have been topped to comply with a covenant serving to retain views for homes to the north. Proposing to plant 55 large ornamental deciduous trees.
- Promoting village character and scale by using naturalized materials in contemporary application.
- Proposing semi-private to private outdoor lounge patio at cottage. The existing patio will be retained as a common area that is adjacent to village green area.
- Drive court to be heavily vegetated with buffer planting. Common pathways to connect heritage area through the site and terminate in a secret garden.
- Each infill unit has a roof top patio and promotes rainwater collection from the green roofs. Propose to formalize streams and ponds on site.

Committee Questions:

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

- Duplex unit bedrooms and bathrooms seem very quiet close to each other? *Have off set windows but could increase the off set.*
- Existing coach house does it have heritage value? *No, but exploring recycling the timber.*
- How wide is the drive aisle and could two cars pass each other? *Yes, it is 6 m with have aprons on side for pedestrian access.*
- Does water feature have storm water capture? *It is a combination from roof leaders and channelling gravity through the site.*
- Does gazebo have heritage quality and is it being rebuilt? *Yes, it is being restored same as the house, it has a fireplace, built in barbeque and, great views to the water. It will be the social heart of the site.*
- Does outdoor amenity area carry up along the west side of heritage house? *Seems like lack of separation for private spaces. Intended as outdoor area for rental space.*
- What are character of defining elements of site? *Coach house has large footprint and remainder of site rock with topped trees. Propose to retain perimeter vegetation, as those trees have not been topped.*
- Is there enough room for trees and roots at perimeter on west side? *Many of the existing trees are on the property line and there is an existing wall so any work will be manually done with arborist reviewing and supervising.*
- Why not all townhouses on infill? *Trying to be inclusive and retain a variety of housing. The townhouses seem more for families and duplex more for empty nesters.*
- Is the 15 ft. right of way on the west side of the property District owned? *Yes. Will the District be providing access from private property on to this right of way? Recommendation from the Heritage Advisory Committee, to be reviewed by the District.*
- If the right of way was not in existence what would be the setback from the west boundary of property line to the building wall? *A conventional setback would be 2 to 3 m. Setbacks are negotiated under HRA.*
- Proposal includes a pipe system and exposed water for storm water, is it anticipated to have it all open? *It is all open from road down, at top, it is a series of pools, can consider continuous.*
- Why has the proposal taken four years? *Original owner passed away, since then a lot of design development, new OCP in place, and it has been an evolution with a lot of work on the heritage aspect.*
- Are there any existing utilities in right of way? *There is sanitary line for existing house, which will need upgrading, and given excavation, needed there will likely be tree removal. Would like to take storm water through this area.*
- Have you had any public meetings? *Had a meeting in 2016 with a conceptual idea where 30 people for and one against. Recent meeting in June 2019 with 60 in favor 40 against. The main comment against was changes in land use pattern by introducing multifamily in single family neighbourhood, also a lot of comments that the house was not worth saving as not on heritage register. People in favour were in support of this type of housing in West Vancouver.*
- Was there any discussion about tying in the architecture with the existing heritage character? *Not too many comments on architecture on infill.*

- Where would visitors park? *There are aprons between the drive aisle and garage doors for parking.*
- Why do the duplexes have such a large area given that they will have the least amount of people? *Site configuration best to have upper bench for families and lower bench for empty nester as one storey entry. Can the duplexes be smaller to increase setbacks? Duplexes long to accommodate bedroom on main floor and ageing in place.*
- What is the hardscape coverage? *Unknown, but intent to make the drive aisle as permeable as can with pavers.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Concerned with amount of maintenance required for all the ponds, important they are constructed in a simple enough way to be easily maintained.
- The glass doors on the duplex units too much. Consider further design development to introduce some craftsmanship to soften the expression of the entrances. In early images, the staircase on existing building has a wood feature and that as a design element make its way as a modern expression on balconies to bring a degree of similarity. Like slim line created at roofline but concerned with depth of construction materials try to make sure structure allowed for and amount of glazing reduced.
- Like overall approach to storm water and how it integrates through project. Seem like there are two distinct developments and the landscape pushes together to marry them but do not see an architectural bridge in any way.
- The buildings are tight to property line and trying to pack in a lot of landscape a, concerned with success of trees and buffer. New buildings have a thoughtful form, however duplexes are long. Consider reducing to create buffer at lower level. More design development needed for hardscape area as paved area leading up to bedrooms does not work. Stair crosses in front of unit 101 and 102 takes up lot of window space needs reconfiguration.
- Townhouses with smaller footprint allows more perimeter space for landscape and tree replacement. Reduce footprint of southern infill, as there is a lot of development on this site. Needs increased setbacks for neighbours and perimeter. The contrast between existing and heritage is good, architectural expression is good, materiality seems well thought out. Question why the big duplex units need roof top access, elevators look like apartment element rather than duplexes. Supportive of the general thrust, reducing coverage with an eye to softening and creating landscaping.
- The landscape plan would be much clearer if knew which trees were to be removed and which are topped as part of that list. Amount of site to be covered by the infill units as concerned with limited amount of buffering around the buildings and limited opportunity to soften with landscape. Encourage less hardscape and more naturalization. Storm water management by being visible and useable important. Concern with roof top spaces and overhangs on duplexes. They will be visible from townhouse units above. Further design development about public access as will run into difficulty with the railway line to north and blockage at south end to Marine Drive, it will be an awkward way to get down to Marine Drive and going to run into dead end for years to come. Like the

options of having five units and having one available for use by the community in the heritage building and support the gazebo area as a gathering space. If there was some natural ability to get pathway on that side that is not as hard surface will blend whole development into neighbourhood more.

- Appreciate addressing the missing middle however hesitant when a development could create conflict with unanticipated changes in the neighbourhood. Consider a sizeable site buffer, neighbourhood character and privacy. Concept, community elements, green roof and connections all good. Consider reduced massing and size. Concern how number of vehicles interacts with neighbourhood. Consider investigating underground parking to allow for pedestrian and trees above. Appreciate heritage try not to replicate to the project, quite a few modern architecture in area.
- Important to include dedicated visitor parking.
- Great need for this type of housing and commend that the project tries to fill the need but may be trying to do too much. It is commendable to have age in place units, but the proposed landscaping and permeability inhibits mobility. Explore opportunities to reduce massing to increase buffering. Support the modern aesthetic it is an appropriate response. Encourage framing the view from the townhouses and not having wall-to-wall, floor-to-ceiling glazing. Struggle with the footprint and size of duplexes on south in particular, that is the part of site that faces neighbour, north part of site setback tight but bordering railway right of way. Feel that it is too crowded on south portion with duplexes. Overall scale of the northern part appropriate and number of units appropriate but south duplex too high and tight on the sites.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee commends the applicant on an excellent design and presentation. The Committee recommends RESUBMISSION of the application for the Gentles Cottage at 4441 Piccadilly North to address the following concerns:

- a review of the buffering and setbacks of the infill portion of the project especially with regards to neighbouring properties including the trail to the west side;
- provide a clear landscape plan showing current state of the site and trees to be retained and removed and their respective condition;
- a review of the massing and height, in particular of the duplexes on the south side of the site;
- a review of the roof top access that creates the vertical shaft element and the overlook aspect that the accessible roof tops create for neighbouring properties;
- consideration of the amount of hardscaping on the site and provide data identifying the percentage of permeable surfaces versus non permeable surfaces on the site;
- consideration of the proximity and overlook between the duplexes;
- consideration of designating one or two visitor parking stalls;
- reconsider the pedestrian circulation as it pertains to public and private space along the north and west side of the Gentles cottage; and
- a review of the south façade for the infill units and reviewing glass to wall ratio on the façade.

CARRIED

OTHER ITEMS

6. There were no reports/items.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

7. Members of the public in attendance asked the following questions or made the following statements:
- If possible for the public to give opinion before the Committee's decision-making.
 - If the Heritage Advisory Committee minutes are provided to this Committee for information and how minutes are dealt with through the process.
 - Expressed that the information presented was misleading and offered a tour of the neighbourhood.
 - Questions regarding an applicant providing a trail on District land, potential blasting, and tree removal by BC Rail.
 - Clarification on storm water to Marine Drive.

NEXT MEETING

8. The next meeting is scheduled for January 16, 2020

ADJOURNMENT

9. It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the December 5, 2019, Design Review Committee Meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Certified Correct:



Chair



Staff Liaison