

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER**

**DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the West Vancouver Design Review Committee meeting held at  
4:30 p.m. on September 9, 2010 in the Municipal Hall Council Chamber,  
West Vancouver, B.C.**

**Members Present:**

Voting Members: Erik Lees (Chair); Donal O'Callaghan (Vice-Chair); Tom Bunting;  
Stuart Hood; Jennifer Marshall; Karl Ray (until 6:30 p.m.)

Non-Voting Members: Councillor Shannon Walker.

**Members Absent:** Michael Richardson; Duane Siegrist.

**Staff Present:**

Staff Liaison, Geri Boyle, Manager of Planning and Lands; Recording Secretary, Mandy Emery, Permits and Inspections.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 4:36 p.m.

The Chair advised that Alexandra Bennett has left the Committee as she has moved to Toronto.

**2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the agenda for the September 9, 2010 Meeting be confirmed as circulated.

**CARRIED**

The Chair noted that both items are coming to the Committee in the design development stage and that the meeting will take on a more open workshop format.

**3. ADOPTION OF JULY 22, 2010 MINUTES**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the minutes of the Design Review Committee held July 22, 2010 be adopted.

**CARRIED**

#### 4. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION:

##### 4.1 AMBLESIDE PARKS FIELD HOUSE RENOVATION – CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR EARLY REVIEW BY DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

###### **Background:**

Geri Boyle introduced Andrew Banks, Senior Manager of Parks. He gave an overview of the Ambleside artificial field project and advised that a \$3 million grant was received from the Federal Government for the project, with additional funding from the District and West Vancouver field hockey and soccer clubs. The scope of the project is: artificial field for field hockey and soccer, field house renewal, practice areas and parking improvements. Under the grant all work must be completed by March 31, 2011. West Vancouver is hoping to tender the field house renovation at the end of September.

###### **Project Presentation:**

Architect Bruce Carscadden advised that this is Phase 1 of revitalization project. Intent of renovation is to make more joyous and serviceable public change rooms, washrooms, office and storage facility by keeping open and bright. Renovations include:

- complete upgrade of mechanical system
- insulating and re-cladding exterior walls
- new roof
- thermal glazing.

The architect advised that the washrooms are to be fully accessible hands free with co-ed zones. He went over the 3 design options which will screen the mechanical equipment with a designed wall visible from Marine Drive:

1. A live green wall – this could be planted to act as a sign
2. Artificial turf wall with game line stitched into turf
3. Glass channel wall providing see through transition from inside to outside.

###### **Committee Questions:**

The Committee questioned the presenters on vandalism and durability of materials; solar water heating; sound carried through change rooms; treatment of south side of building; and concept for phase 2.

## **Committee Comments:**

The following comments and recommendations were forthcoming from the Committee:

### *Building Renovation Approach*

- Important to consider community function and how the building will work in the future and with community events. The building should have the capacity to provide more weather protection and some seating. Support clearly evident for the design concept to include a second phase.
- The south face is just as much of a visible elevation as the north face and should be addressed.
- Is money being well spent? No additional overhang or weather projection area provided out front. Put mechanical equipment at back and do something more significant on entire front.
- Need some form of shelter for parents.
- Grass field has traditionally been a mud zone. Give consideration to the mud trap and leaving it outside the building rather than bringing it into the change rooms.
- No logic in putting mechanical system out front when everything is at the back anyway. Also, by placing the mechanical systems at the back you have the opportunity to make the whole south wall a solar collector.
- Move equipment to back.
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> phase is really important from a community use aspect.
- Prefer glass, tired of turf; don't like idea of Ambleside written in turf.
- Didn't see any options that looked at horizontal plane. No covered entry, seems like missing opportunity to make more horizontal rather than vertical. Love idea to make feature of entry.
- Not worried about back, it will take care of itself.
- Don't like billboard out front whether grass or glass, view from Marine Drive overbearing to what is going on in field - putting all up front while neglecting back.
- Change room exit needs to be defined, need to do something architecturally here rather than trying to hide the building.
- Like comments and approach around whimsy, like idea of mechanical equipment put out front and have fun with it, adds variation to façade, prefer glass option. Concern about plants and vandalism, caution about high tech grass wall.
- Need to provide cohesive landscape plan around building. Needs to be something for parents and families outside.

### *Heritage*

- Encourage heritage restoration of building
- Encourage respect for 50s building.

### *Interior*

- Like change rooms and washroom plan, make sure lasts a long time, good place to spend money.

### *Stone vs. Faux Stone Cladding*

- Like to see money spent on stone rather than relocating mechanical equipment
- Like stone cladding. Would rather see only 1/3 in real stone rather than all in faux stone.
- Advocate real stone or real material treatment. If not real stone then brick.
- Like throw back to Stanley Park and the traditional granite materials of park structures and use of real stone.

### *Sustainability Aspects of the Proposal*

- Encourage solar hot water and heating. Put equipment on back wall then whole wall can become solar collector.
- Solar hot water would be nice addition in roof and if can't be provided at this time you should at least rough it in/ make provision for it as a future retrofit.
- A summary of the mechanical systems and specifics on efficiencies and sustainable strategies, including lighting systems, would be desirable.

### **Resolution:**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee recommends that the application go back to staff to consider all the information that has been raised during the meeting.

**CARRIED**

#### 4.2 **PACIFIC ARBOUR SENIORS RESIDENCE, 2203 MARINE DRIVE – PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR EARLY REVIEW AND INPUT BY DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Geri Boyle provided background to the proposed development:

- The District issued an RFP for the use of the site as seniors housing and several DRC members joined Council in the review of the submissions;
- Council selected Pacific Arbour as the preferred proponent in June 2009;
- In July 2010 Pacific Arbour submitted an application for an Official Community Plan Amendment, rezoning and design/development approval (equivalent to a development permit);
- On July 26, 2010 Council directed staff to consult with the community on the development plans;
- Staff provided Pacific Arbour with comments on the material considered by Council on July 26<sup>th</sup> and as a result Pacific Arbour has modified the plans in response to these comments – it is these modified plans that are before the DRC;
- DRC consideration at this preliminary stage is part of the community consultation and provides an opportunity for DRC input at an early stage in the process; and
- It is anticipated that complete development permit plans will come back to DRC in late November.

##### **Project Presentation:**

Architect Walter Francl advised that the developer has had several public information meetings and strong opinions have been voiced from the public – some positive and some with concerns. The key element raised is that the building should be scaled down as much as possible. The Architect noted the following about the building:

- Sited the building to respond to the contour of land so that massing is as unobtrusive as possible and pulled building away from Tudor Gardens to prevent overshadowing.
- Commercial/institutional uses, totalling 8,000 sq. ft., are to be located on the Marine Drive at-grade frontage; a café and Capilano elder college are proposed for the majority of this space
- Curved building design to maximize views and sun exposure.
- Façade materials on the north side are mountain inspired with masonry materials and on the south side are marine inspired with more metal and glass. Large overhang and vertical screening elements provide shading on window faces, Introduce screening elements as privacy screen and indicate an inhabitable quality to façade.
- A LEED Gold building is the target. Strategies include a green roof, minimizing storm water run off, heat recovery strategies and a high performance building envelope.

Landscape Architect Bruce Hemstock went over the landscape plan:

- The landscape plan for the project draws inspiration from the landscape expression along Marine Drive from Memorial Park to John Richardson Park and the neighbourhood garden character – each garden is different but together reflects a residential character and create a less urban and softer streetscape. The project seeks to reinforce that character.
- Continuous landscape connection between the park and civic centre along the north edge. The landscape in centre of turnaround connects to the north edge. No fencing to define property lines, landscape melds.
- Raised rear patios to provide view to the park and provide sense of security.
- Green roof helps with storm water management, and take advantage of grade for storm water management.

#### **Committee Questions:**

The Committee questioned the presenters on site context, concept for retail front, treatment of building skin, sidewalk grade at commercial level, access to roof, treatment of top 2 floors and setbacks, drop off area at entrance and traffic calming measures, retention of trees, and railing details.

#### **Committee Comments:**

##### *General*

- Nicely presented project; package is excellent.
- Like the landscape architect's description of how the building and landscape were inspired by the Marine Drive garden character

##### *The Building and Landscaping*

- Four committee members commented on the massing of the building, three were in favour and one against. The specific comments were:
  - The proponent has done a great job, but the building dwarfs everything around it – essentially it feels too large for Marine Drive.
  - Really good concept and the siting is perfect. The building is big, but the team has done quite a lot to massing to lessen the impact on neighbours.
  - The building is a good addition for 22<sup>nd</sup> Street and does a good job at addressing Marine Drive at the ground plane.
  - Massing is good, great effort as long as upper floors dealt with to diminish impact. Feel that Marine Drive can take 6 storeys. North side of building should be stepped back at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor.
- Additional stepping of the north edge on the north wing would be a benefit in stepping away from Tudor Gardens and doing park swap a

- good thing. Good job carrying garden nature from Marine Drive, demonstrate great things for neighbour and substantial park area left.
- Appreciate siting and massing, notion of front and back differentiation extremely positive.
  - Encourage the development team to look at retail façade to allow building to float, as there is the capacity of that façade to become less dynamic and more stolid. Think about soffits being wood, and could provide warm feeling on Marine Drive, consider glazing being mirrored. Retail floor and sidewalk need to be one plane.
  - Corner greenhouse looks tacked on, not really part of building. Provide area for planting of things grown in green house.
  - Like the greenhouse, as it is an ingenious way of making the public private transition and making it an interesting one. Like the way the sidewalk swings up into forecourt zone - it works well. Sequence of green space from park, and “garden zones” to the east is important. Make sure the project has a distinct landscape not mundane planting; forecourt area can be enriched.
  - More detail on commercial/public space, changing paving pattern, differentiate between active space and sufficient space for seating.
  - The greenhouse is a great idea.
  - The opening for scooters needs attention as to how it is lit in the detailed landscape.
  - Like having a walkway connecting the park to the Civic Centre,
  - Concerned that if park space is being traded for the park connection on the north side of the site, that the connection is not simply a walkthrough linking up to street. There should be lots of planting and it should be opaque. When the project returns in November, the development team should demonstrate how the edge design is worked out.
  - Applaud applicant spending money on improvement of park. What is the program from District staff and Landscape Architect’s perspective?
  - Include whole park in landscape plan submission in November.

#### *Sustainability Features*

- The green roof is good. An accessible useable garden roof would be better.
- Design looks great, commend on going for LEED Gold.
- Air source heat pumps produce continuous noise and this will impact the neighbours unless equipment is selected that minimises the noise and that appropriate design measures are taken to further mitigate this situation. Recommend that the development team be aware of the level of acoustical output when selecting the equipment, and retain an acoustic consultant to assist in dealing with this aspect of the development

### *Materials*

- What is presented is good. Will the building appear like the rendering? It all comes down to detailing and how you execute it from here.
- Concern about materiality of building, as this is where it will succeed or fail.
- Concerned about the wooden louvers on Marine Drive and whether they help.
- Next presentation should deal with the wood screen as this will either be great or awful in 5 years.
- Provide more explanation on what the materials are.

### **Resolution:**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee recommends that the application go back to staff to consider all the information that has been raised during the meeting.

**CARRIED**

## **5. REPORTS/REFERRALS.**

No reports received.

Geri Boyle provided an update on previous projects:

- Duplex on Argyle Avenue in Horseshoe Bay (1010-20-10-031) – the applicant is considering subdivision of the property into 2 single family lots.
- Proposal for 3 units on each of 3 adjacent lots in the 2000 block of Esquimalt (Development Application 1010-20-08-041 – staff are currently dealing with broader block/neighbourhood character issues

Geri also went over some projects that may be sufficiently advanced to come to the Committee in the next several months.

## **6. PUBLIC QUESTION PERIOD**

(Regarding process and/or Disposition only)

No Questions Presented.

## **7. NEXT MEETING**

The next regular meeting of the Design Review Committee is scheduled for Thursday, September 30, 2010.

8. **ADJOURNMENT.**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee meeting be adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

**CARRIED**



---

Erik Lees, CHAIR



---

Geri Boyle, STAFF LIAISON