

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 30, 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;
Jennifer Marshall; Karl Ray; Duane Siegrist.

Members Absent: Stuart Hood; Michael Richardson.

Non-Voting Members: Councillor Shannon Walker

Staff Present:

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the agenda the September 30, 2010 Meeting be confirmed as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF SEPTEMBER 9, 2010 MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the minutes of the Design Review Committee held September 9, 2010 be
adopted.

CARRIED

4. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION:

4.1 AMBLESIDE PARKS FIELD HOUSE RENOVATION, 1040 MARINE DRIVE

Project Presentation:

James Chandler, Project Manager for the Ambleside Artificial Turf Field and Field House Renovation Project provided an overview of the current status of the project noting that:

- funding has now been secured (as of September 30) in the amount of \$740,000 from all sports group and partners to go towards the renovation and completion of Phase 1
- the project must meet substantial completion by March 31, 2011
- the project must move to tender in the next few weeks
- the core functions of the sports groups are addressed in this phase of the project (Phase 1) and Phase 2 will address the community functions.

Using a materials board, elevation drawing and site plan the Architect, Bruce Carscadden, addressed the comments from the previous meeting, (see letter dated September 28, 2010) and summarized the sustainability features of the project.

Committee Questions:

The Committee questioned the presenters on donor wall details, mechanical system, landscape details, weather protection, lighting scheme, and building materials.

Committee Comments:

The following comments and recommendations were forthcoming from the Committee:

Overall

- General feeling that little of substance has happened since last presentation, feel all our comments were not considered and no confidence that anything will change.
- Unhappy with how this project is being handled. This and all Parks projects must provide more lead time, more details and include full landscape plans.
- This is not the architect's fault – feel put in extremely difficult position, too difficult to ram it through like this. We are not going to be able to discuss nature of which option works better or review at the design development stage.

- Lack of understanding of how people really use the building in the community; no effort to support use of the building by the larger community.
- There are problems with promises of a Phase 2; feel it is an out and doesn't address the substantial concerns.

Donor wall

- Donor recognition wall is a mystery. It is extremely inappropriate – that is not the point of donating money. The whole idea has not been well thought out.
- If there has to be a donor wall, look at placing it on the south wall where people congregate.
- If some treatment is necessary of this exterior wall, use words of inspiration.

Glass panel

- Panels dwarf the building and are not working with the character of the building.
- Love the glass but feel scale of the panels is problematical; they are bigger than they need to be.

Lighting

- Making a wilful gesture on front of building has limited function; by putting low level lighting behind panel will allow it to express itself. Would like to see soft glow coming from building at all hours.
- Don't want big surface mounted lights on the building, not sure if lights around top are enough; maybe include lights around back where people congregate.
- An up/down fixture that would wash the façade and ground plane to light up floor and grill. Glass panel should be lit.
- Don't want to over light the building, provide subtle lighting after hours, light that washes the glass.
- Like to see lighting plan that reflects exterior lighting along with preliminary landscape plan.
- There is no lighting plan, this project is not developed enough, if going out to tender now it will be either a poor design or if changed along the way Parks will have to pay for it. No score board, feel not planned out, rushing ahead of its time.

Landscape

- Landscape submission should have been included with this application. Can't expect the architect to do their job without dealing with landscape.
- A complete landscape plan should be presented for review before installation. This plan should include the context for this renovated building (i.e., the new artificial turf fields) and a schematic of Phase 2.

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 “TOBY HOUSE” HERITAGE REVITALIZATION AGREEMENT, 2055 QUEENS AVENUE

Background:

Stephen Mikicich, Senior Community Planner provided an overview of the heritage policy and initiatives in West Vancouver noting the Heritage Strategic Plan adopted by Council in 2006, the Community Heritage Register established in 2007 and the role of Heritage Revitalization Agreements (HRAs) in supporting heritage conservation. The Toby House is the first HRA in West Vancouver.

Project Presentation:

Using a scale model, rendering, elevation drawings and Power Point slides, Architect Neil Banich of Wensley Architecture started the presentation. He outlined the property owner's wishes to retain the existing 1962 West Coast Modern, Ray Toby designed, house and to subdivide the lot to allow for construction of a new three-level house built into the hill.

The proposed addition to Toby House includes a small two-storey extension incorporating a new family room on the main floor and new bedroom on 2nd floor. The addition will continue using the design vocabulary of the existing house. Whereas the Toby House represents a modern house of its era, the new Hill House is to be a modern design of this era.

The 4,000 sq.ft. Hill House and driveway would be located outside of the 15 m Top of Bank riparian area. The area between the house and the first approximately 5 m (width varies) of the riparian area would be designed to provide a transition from 'backyard' space to riparian habitat. The Hill House will have a 'green roof' that extends the visible landscape from the Toby House with uninterrupted site lines. Materials include exposed concrete, aluminium infill curtain wall system, stained cedar siding, anodized windows, and natural stone retaining walls, driveways and

patios. As active backyard space is limited, outdoor decks at the 2nd and 3rd floors are proposed.

The Landscape Architect went over the landscape treatment of the site and riparian area, including removal of invasive plant species. The landscape concept includes storm water management, tree retention, permeable paving and rock pit for drainage. Plant materials include native planting and non evasive exotic species. The presenter went over the lighting and views from site. A concrete roof 'lid' will accommodate a large soil profile for the green roof; and they will try to integrate the landscape from the Toby House into the roof top garden.

Committee Questions:

The Committee questioned the presenters on tree retention, number of storeys, legal organization of the 'subdivided' property, and design vocabulary of the two houses.

The Committee asked staff to clarify the approval process for an HRA, specifically wishing to know whether everything had to be finalized before initiating the bylaw or whether the bylaw would allow for refinements before building permit. The question was asked as some members felt that the project includes some excellent innovations but lacks detail in other areas. Staff advised that the HRA should include well-developed plans but would allow for refinements prior to building permit.

Committee Comments:

The Committee provided comments on the proposal including the following:

Toby House

- Toby House looks good but hard to comment on with the information available. Need more information on the proposed Toby House addition to fully critique the proposal.
- Trees and landscape are the character of old West Vancouver; encourage applicant to keep as many trees as possible to retain existing character of site.
- Chimney at front looks weak; can something be done to spruce it up?
- Existing house is celebrated as heritage; new addition needs to be more expressive as an expansion, but doesn't need to be a copy.
- Would like to see elevation of existing house showing the addition.

Hill House

- Good idea to cut into hill, modern approach is valid; however three storeys looks really big, seems out of scale - creating a "cliff house", feel it should step down and be more sympathetic to site. Key to integrating with existing house is to terrace it down.

- House could encroach into riparian setback to expand bottom floor. Feel face is very stark and institutional, needs some stepping back.
- Include some reference to Toby House such as outrigger rafters, some sort of subtle play to reinforce that house.
- Great concept to allow this kind of development, Hill House is a great infill project; key is showing some terracing.
- Like to see more details about lighting and overhangs; and feel that the (apparent) building scale could be reduced.
- Hill House interface to west needs design development as it hits the landscape.
- Not troubled by three-storey aspect of the Hill House, but think of ways to set back the upper level. Like design but look at ways to make more referential (to Toby House).
- Like the design; feels it is elegant and simple. Encourage applicant to keep it simple and keep the distinction between the two houses. Like massing and three storeys, but at far end think about wrapping grade around corner.
- Flying buttress seems too heavy.
- Stone-faced retaining walls should be concrete, keep it simple.
- Like distinction between the two buildings.
- No need to gussy up walls, nicely designed concrete with form ties, save high grade stone materials for ground plane.

General comments

- Sensitivity in building and landscape design; project well presented.
- Feel this is a great thing; scale of project is appropriate for West Vancouver, and awesome and interesting.
- Overgrown plants will need replacing sooner or later; landscape strategy must understand the maturity of the existing planting.

Resolution:

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee:

- (a) STRONGLY SUPPORTS the concept of the Hill House in conjunction with the Heritage Revitalization Agreement for the Toby House at 2055 Queens Avenue; and
- (b) Recommends that the application be advanced in the HRA process, with detailed development of the Hill House as per the DRC comments, and a further submission to the DRC on the Toby House addition and landscape treatment.

CARRIED

REPORTS/REFERRALS.

No reports received.

CARRIED

- 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, October 21, 2010.

- 8. ADJOURNMENT.**

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee meeting be adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

CARRIED



Erik Lees, CHAIR



Geri Boyle, STAFF LIAISON