

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2023

4:30 PM VIA ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

(Members of the public may hear, or watch and hear, the meeting by attending the Raven Room in the Municipal Hall, or via electronic communication facilities through the link provided on the Committee's webpage)

Note: Council Committee meetings are conducted in accordance with Council Committee Procedure Bylaw No. 5020, 2019 (as amended), subject to the discretion of the Chair.

CALL TO ORDER

1. Call to Order

Note: Chair will confirm that the meeting is being conducted via electronic communication facilities, pursuant to Council Committee Procedure Bylaw No. 5020, 2019 (as amended).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

2. Approval of Committee Meeting Agenda

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the March 9, 2023 Design Review Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

3. Adoption of Committee Meeting Minutes

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the February 16, 2023 Design Review Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

INTRODUCTION

4. Introduction

- a. Presentation by staff.
- b. Roundtable questions.
- c. Roundtable discussion and comments.

REFERRALS FOR CONSIDERATION

5. Referrals to the Design Review Committee for Consideration:

5.1 Project: Ambleside Local Area Plan

Project	Ambleside Local Area Plan
Description:	Planning and design input on draft, high-level Local Area Plan (LAP) options
Staff:	Courtney Miller, Senior Urban Planner Linda Gillan, Senior Community Planner, Economic Development Tom Kwok, Assistant Planner

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Design Review Committee receive the referral for the Ambleside Local Area Plan for information.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

6. Public Questions

NEXT MEETING

7. Next Meeting

The next Design Review Committee meeting is scheduled for April 20, 2023 at 4:30 p.m. via electronic communication facilities.

ADJOURNMENT

8. Adjournment of Committee Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the March 9, 2023 Design Review Committee meeting be adjourned.

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
VIA ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION FACILITIES
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2023**

Committee Members: E. Fiss (Chair), M. Avini, R. Ellaway, A. Hatch, S. Khosravi, J. Leger, D. Tyacke, N. Waissbluth; and Councillors N. Gambioli and S. Snider attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities. Absent: L. Xu.

Staff: L. Berg, Senior Community Planner (Staff Representative); E. Wilhelm, Senior Community Planner; and Naomi Allard, Administrative Assistant (Committee Clerk) attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:33 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the February 16, 2023 Design Review Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the January 19, 2023 Design Review Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

4. INTRODUCTION

- a. Introductory presentation by staff.
- b. Applicant presentation.
- c. Clarification questions to applicant by the DRC.
- d. Roundtable discussion and comments.
- e. Recommendations and vote.

5. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Applications referred to the Design Review Committee for Consideration:

5.1 Address: Lot C and D, Daffodil Drive

Background: L. Berg, Senior Community Planner, introduced the proposal and spoke relative to site context, including:

- Proposal includes 2 lots: presently approved for a 10-lot subdivision under existing zoning; in tandem with existing proposal, applicant is pursuing proposal for a rezoning and development permit for a 36-unit development with majority duplex units; and two single family dwellings.

Project Presentation: J. Harper, Eagle Harbour Ventures, introduced the project team and provided a presentation, including:

- Development name is Aquila, Latin for Eagle; name believed to be synonymous with the area of site.
- Located in Eagle Harbour; near transit corridor; previously approved for a 10-lot subdivision to accommodate large homes; felt that there was no need for more large homes in West Vancouver so proposing two single family dwellings and 17 duplexes.
- Present zoning proposal is for 10 homes with 10 suites; this proposal under new zoning would be for 36 homes with site coverage of 20% so will have less impact on area and neighbourhood.
- Environmental area on west encompasses houses; on south is dedicated park land.
- The proposed site layout buffers proposed units to the north along rail line and to the south along eagle creek; to the west have large buffer for riparian area.
- Access to site from Westport Road and Daffodil Drive;
- Conducted an analysis for people to see overall views of Cranley Drive; green line on plan denotes line of site of person looking down to Cranley; strategically planned so that people in upper homes will not see lower homes; Aquila is 30 ft lower than already approved development.
- 20.4% site coverage allows for buffer and proposing 0.378 FAR increase; basements are walk-out and part of basements are counted in FAR.
- Proposal complies with Step 5 of the BC Building Code with a Low Carbon Energy System, increase in park area with 6,200 square feet of parkland.
- Unnamed stream on western edge; currently stream is dry for five months per year; proposing overwintering and rearing to allow fish to spawn; north-south running creek.
- Split level homes with contemporary and modern homes provides a varied architectural mix.

Project Presentation: S. Gordon, Architect, provided a presentation, including:

- Broke up massing of buildings and fit proposal into the hillside and street scape; materials include hardy board, stone, and exposed woods.
- Attempt was made to keep retaining walls low and to follow natural grade; looked at examples of ski resorts where massing is broken up to maximize views particularly to the west of site.
- Roads follow north-south corridors and follow grades which are soft and gentle.
- Roof forms appear shallow to keep views and impact of massing low; hardy board with natural greens; standing seem roof good for durability and fire resistance; proposal design is that of a contemporary building that incorporates natural features of West Vancouver.
- Tried to respect neighbourhood by having wide side yards, green areas, and water features.
- Landscape is mix of native and adapted plants; modern West Coast approach to planting; steep side so lots of grading balanced with retaining walls that are concrete; trying to mitigate height of walls; thought put into planting at entries and along trail and amenity areas; thought about planting for fire hazard mitigation and the ecology of the area by adding species that will bring more wildlife such as birds; holistic design of landscaping that will improve sustainability of development.
- Plan to implement pathway that will connect Eagle Harbour to Westport Road, along creek.

Committee Questions:

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

- Can you provide layout of landscaping? *This has been provided in proposal.*
- What is the percentage of retention of trees that you propose? *The site coverage of this site is 6% less than approved proposal so in terms of mature trees being kept, this development allows for more trees to be retained.*
- There is a design rationale that cement siding has less impact on the environment. Can you provide rationale for this? *Wood is not as sustainable as fibrous cement – fibrous cement is non-combustible and looks like wood so that is why we chose it; this material was previously used in other projects and received well; lifespan double that of wood. Staff note: District's Wildfire Hazard Development Permit Area (WHDPA) and regulations limits the use of combustible materials.*
- Is there any natural wood being used or is everything cementitious? *Everything comes down WHDPA, cannot have anything that is combustible. Some of facade will be in wood.*
- Are elevators the only strategy for aging in place? *"G – Units" are larger units and would be more family-oriented; in these units there will be walk-out basement to accommodate a caregiver if needed.*
- Mention of cul-de-sac; is there enough room for car to turn around on this street? *Upper road there is a turn around for larger vehicles; proposal has been designed to accommodate a fire truck; fire truck must be within 45 metres of the last unit.*

- The Official Community Plan (OCP) asks for context studies to see how the buildings are situated in relation to their neighbours. Do you have a context study in terms of street scape and street views? *We have looked at this aspect in our proposal; "Unit C," for example, is a single family dwelling that we have chosen to add specifically so that the development integrates with neighbourhood character; to north is a buffer so as to integrate the site with CP Rail and to protect the creek; we looked at buffers to provide integration with the surrounding environment.*
- What's the reason for the extensive tree removal? Why not keep some of the trees that are being proposed for removal? *Reasons include: 1) the WHDPA regulations require the removal of a certain percentage of trees on site; 2) there is wind throw risk; and 3) we are proposing to cut less trees than in original proposal. Did you consider alternatives to removal of these trees? Yes, we chose to create a large setback to allow for more trees.*
- Is there any plan to improve Daffodil Drive to accommodate increase in use? *Currently Daffodil Drive accommodates parking on one side and is a standard two-way road; it does not have off-street parking; the blacktop is just over 19 feet but appears less due to a hedge encroaching onto road at 5670 Daffodil. In terms of Traffic, suggestion has been made to remove the corner of the encroaching hedge to improve visibility; suggestion of stock control at intersection; although 24 more homes, the volume of traffic is anticipated to be quite low as per traffic analysis that was done; analysis has projected there will be 32 two-way trips in the a.m. and 34 in the p.m.; overall this is a fairly low volume traffic that is anticipated.*
- Traffic report is from 2021; has there been any traffic change or update to plans? *No; formal application submitted in September 2021; received comments back in 2022.*
- What are you doing to handle site lines at the Westport Hill intersection? *Proposal to move the access, provide additional traffic signage, and a streetlight at the driveway entrance to improve the visibility for traffic.*
- The train is quite loud. Have you planned noise buffering for homes, especially those on the north side of site? *There will be no houses on the northerly slope due to the train noise; homes are proposed to be set down on the street so they open on Cranley Drive; no windows on side facing train.*
- To be clear this is a strata development and roads/landscaping will be maintained by strata? *Yes, this is a proposal for a strata.*
- In terms of the Right of Way (ROW) will this be maintained by strata or the District? *Proposal for strata to maintain the ROW.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Think this is a great project; would have liked to see a comprehensive planting plan; large open spaces between blocks – not sure what these are; architectural section shows a steep slope while grading shows a gentle slope; architectural sections would aid proposal; concerned of planting around existing trees as well as size of plants; planting should be done with assistance of arborist.

- Site planning has been done well and grade aligns with road access; strongly recommend an acoustical report; I find setbacks from house to house is quite minimal and may not support minimal retaining wall heights; perhaps if you were to build with mass timber you may be able to utilize wood in this proposal.
- Supportive of density and site strategy; sustainability aspects are strong for proposal; I wouldn't mind if another few units were added; architectural forms lack variation; color scheme and material colour pallet are uniform and could be varied throughout proposal; don't agree with lack of articulation – natural environments do have articulation; more distinguishing using wood could benefit proposal design.
- In terms of design is a nice project; agree with use of mass timber; main concern is retaining the trees; arborist report says 28 trees are high value therefore, can't support project with the removal of these trees with the setback on top of the tree removal; in terms of massing it is nicely done but I find some points bulky, especially in unit types E and G; suggest reviewing the massing in design.
 - Attractive project; realize the limitations for retaining trees are determined by WHDPA; park area on south side is nice with the trail; suggest implementing improvements to Daffodil Drive Lane.
 - Share perspectives on the trees; curious to know how trail will be maintained; the streetlight could be included in the traffic plan when it is updated.
 - Suggest doing an acoustic study in regards to the train; trees here are surrounded by tall trees and if you cut them down then site will not blend with surrounding area trees – newly planted trees will become cultivated in appearance; architecturally speaking, massing works; colour tones look repetitive in browns and grays; suggest mixing up colour tones; some of elements in rendering such as exposed beams: are these ornamental or structural and if so, can we celebrate them for what they are; consider what this proposal will look like in 20 years.
 - Support the density of this project; design reflects some aspects of the Upper Lands Development more than immediate neighbourhood context; roadway appears larger than many of roads in West Vancouver so I think it can work.

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 subject to the following considerations by staff:

- Further design development to the articulation and materiality of the buildings; consider alternative materials to distinguish between natural and artificial and design developments to the massing and facades to add articulation and variation in colour, material, and massing.
- Provide a comprehensive planting plan complete with sections to the retaining walls and to identify opportunities to tree retention.
- Ensure that the greatest number of high-value trees be retained as recommended in the arborist report and develop a less formal planting plan.
- Submit an acoustic report to address the railway right-of-way.

CARRIED

5.2 Address: 737 20th Street

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

- Triplex proposal is located due east of Hollyburn Mews; this is a new development of infill with coach houses and duplexes; to the south is a single family dwelling; to east is a church; plan shows walkability and services surrounding site including community centres and parks.

Project Presentation: A. Igel, Architect, provided a presentation, including:

- The proposal is for a triplex: 3 units all fronting laneway; access to the north; effort to make sure elevation on east is used as main entrance and building fronts to engage with street; each unit has a basement; end units with walk away suites.
- Entrance is from the laneway and one from east towards 20th Street.
- Basement level: rear bedroom for all three units; entrances on east and west equipped with bedroom, bathroom, living area, and sunken patio to minimize casting of shadows and neighbourhood; tried to soften sunken patios.
- Main level: single car garages off laneway; created buffer and courts where pedestrians can enter; main door off permeable area; powder room; living; dining and kitchen area; patio facing south; east side has secondary entrance.
- Upper floor: setbacks designed to minimize massing; ensuite and second washroom, bedroom and laundry; compact design to cut down massing.
- Roof plan: slopes down to decrease shadows being cast; heavily treed laneway to create privacy from neighbouring dwellings.
- Grade change from laneway to south.
- Buildings section show stepping down; tiered retaining wall near sunken patio allows for landscaping and pleasant experience for residents of suites and to buffer properties to south.
- Standard concrete fiber siding, asphalt shingles to fit with OCP guidelines and traditional form neighbourhood character.
- Natural exposed beams and columns provide a West Coast feel while conforming with bylaws and regulations.
- Landscaping with existing trees on site; use of permeable pavement by way of paver stones to allow water to flow to soil.
- Trying to soften connection to 20th Street and neighbouring property with retaining walls; minimal room to work therefore want to make most of planting in these areas.
- Different roof projections break up mass and make for a more appealing design.

Committee Questions:

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

- Did you do a shadow study? *No. This proposed building is at the same level as neighbouring homes.*
- Could landscaping be accommodated on the elevations shown to the west? *We have limited openings as we have sunken the entry way down; sheet A1 shows elevation with the retaining wall.*

- Is there anything else you are doing for sustainable measures? *Designing to BC Building Code Step 3; maximizing daylight through southern exposure and skylights; proposing rain barrels to collect rain from the roof; light roof colour to reflect the sun and make second floor more livable; vaulted ceiling adds livability. Low consumption water fixtures and low voltage lighting incorporated; heat pump system proposed.*
- Did you do any context study for this project and how does this build fit into context of neighbouring buildings? *No study was conducted; in terms of character, tried to design in same character as other dwellings; looked to Geller Designs for inspiration.*
- Did you consider how fire fighter access would be handled from the lane, specifically addressing, and what is the procedure being proposed for this access? *Consulted with Fire Department and addressing was discussed; previous coach houses have been addressed in a similar manner of laneway with no safety problems as of yet; could work towards having better signage; no issues in terms of safety from District.*
- Is there any consideration for sidewalk access from the laneway to the suites? *There are unofficial sidewalks that are 2.5 feet wide from Hollyburn Mews that we assume would carry on from the Mews to this project; no official sidewalk but we assumed this path would be continued.*
- How are the suites locked off? *We have designed units to allow for the suites to be walled off if residents want; offering some flexibility in the design of these units to meet residents needs.*
- Is there room for a bike plus a vehicle in the garages? *No, only allows for a vehicle 11.5 x 18 ft long. Could mount bikes vertically along wall. Is there other bike parking? Along west side you could store a bike as well as at entry ways but there is no secure bike storage included in design.*
- Is basement level counted toward Floor Area Ratio (FAR) or, is this area exempt? *It is exempt.*
- Is there indoor storage? *Storage is in closets and under stairwell.*
- Are there any outdoor spaces to store garbage and recycling? *Garbage and recycling storage will be at entry way near gate.*
- It looks like windows in showers are conflicting on upper floor, is this so? *They are raised higher and are to code.*
- Along the west property line is there a guardrail? Can't see anything on landscape plan. *There is a retaining wall with a fence on top of the wall at this location. That will be a cavernous appearance here unless some treatment is given to this.*
- Area at bottom of stairs seems large. Could you pull planters to the door? *Yes.*
- Could there be more resolution around the garbage and recycling area? *Yes.*
- Unit 2, is that a vent? *It is a window well. Is this not where the garbage is being stored? Give more consideration towards the garbage placement near the window.*
- What is the tree retention plan? *Existing trees were removed but we can replant them in the same areas as before. Four trees are not being relocated? No.*

- Have you spoken to the neighbour immediately to the south or west and if so, have you responded to concerns in terms of design? *Developer still putting out information to the neighbours; prior to this we were in discussion with neighbours to south; previous development had some water issues which we have accounted for in Storm Water Management Plan.*

Committee Comments:

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

- Going from a single family dwelling to potentially a 5-family, high-density development; unique set up; landscaping: two staircases on east and west appear odd in relation to the prominent corner; west side appears as a deep canyon; lock off unit appears dark, suggest getting more daylight to this area. Light well meets intent but may become a nuisance for those entering door; consider doing an inverted plan whereby living area is upstairs, to allow for more light.
- I didn't find the move from a single family dwelling to a 5-family development that appealing; not a lot of light; landscaping minimal; congested area especially for bike and garbage storage; overall seems a very busy space for residents and neighbours. Nice addition to neighbourhood fits into character; suggest addressing the lighting as overall seems dark.
- Suggest more setback to laneway so people can walk and for overall better access; support height of project at street but the relation between the project and the coach house to the west seems unresolved; would like to see a context study.
- I think this is a well-crafted development and I support infill and high-density housing; there is a lot of balcony massing; suggest reducing the upper floor balconies to make building appear less bulky; I think it is nicely articulated with wood touch, perhaps incorporate more colour variation; if there is any way to get larger dining rooms that would be a benefit to the family home concept;
- Overall good project; I would like to see better integration of the lane façade; guardrail on top of garage does not work with overall massing.
- I would recommend putting in larger tree species and ensure they survive; planter walls on lower units could be dropped to allow for a green front rather than a concrete one; top balcony could be cut back to allow for more light and lessening impact of walls; planting plan could be re-examined.
- This appears a sophisticated and creative project that could be a test case for West Vancouver; lack of outdoor open space except on 20th Street; south façade appears as a deep well however if the neighbours are ok with it then that's fine; if not perhaps landscaping could be brought up closer to property line; I am supportive of project as it aligns with affordability and missing middle.

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 subject to the following considerations by staff:

- Further design development to improve livability with particular attention to bicycles and garbage storage and to reduce the impact of the retaining walls.
- Provide mature trees on east side of site and replace those that were lost in the previous demolition.
- Improve access to daylight within the units.
- Provide proper access for pedestrians at laneway for the 5 units with improvements to the expression of the lane so that it appears as the main entrance.
- Provide a context study to show relationship to surrounding neighbours.

CARRIED

6. ANNUAL COMMITTEE EVALUATION

The report on the Annual Committee Evaluation for 2022 was received for information.

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

8. NEXT MEETING

Staff confirmed that the next Design Review Committee meeting is scheduled for March 9, 2023 at 4:30 p.m.

9. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the February 16, 2023 Design Review Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Chair

Staff Representative