

NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL

Tuesday, March 28th, 2017 3:00p.m.

Council Chamber

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chris Block	- Chair, Architectural Institute of BC Representative
Maranatha Coulas	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
Meredith Mitchell	- Vice Chair, BC Society of Landscape Architects
Craig West	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative

REGRETS:

Maria Fish	- BC Society of Landscape Architects
Rodney Maas	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
David Roppel	- Development Industry Representative

GUESTS:

Donald Luxton	- Donald Luxton and Associates
Margot Long	- PWL Partnership
Joelle Sept	- PWL Partnership
Derik Giner	- Amanant Architect
David Stoyko	- Connect Landscape Architecture
Stu Lyon	- GBL Architects
Garth Balint	- Stantec
Rebecca Waring	- Stantec
Steven Webb	- Bird Construction
Ken Rafflaub	- Bird Construction

STAFF:

Carolyn Armanini	- Planner
Rupinder Basi	- Senior Planner
Britney Quail	- Planning Analyst
Lynn Roxburgh	- Senior Planner
Mike Watson	- Senior Planning Analyst
Lauren Blake	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m.

1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

There were no additions.

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of February 28th, 2017

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the February 28, 2017 New Westminster Design Panel minutes be adopted.

CARRIED.

All members of the Panel present voted in favour of the motion.

3.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION

There were no items.

4.0 DESIGN REVIEWS

4.1 Queen's Park Neighbourhood Heritage Conservation Area: Residential Design Guidelines

DP00615

Britney Quail, Planning Analyst, summarized the report dated March 28, 2017, regarding a full draft of the Queen's Park neighbourhood's residential design guidelines. These new guidelines focus on compatibility with the existing streetscapes rather than a prescriptive architectural style. The guidelines are being updated as part of a proposal to implement a Heritage Conservation Area in the Queen's Park neighbourhood.

Donald Luxton, Donald Luxton and Associates, and Margot Long and Joelle Sept, PWL Partnership, provided an on-table PowerPoint presentation summarizing details of the project as outlined the report dated March 28, 2017.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Luxton, Ms. Long and Ms. Sept provided the following information:

- The guidelines suggest utilizing a mix of materials in order to provide visual interest;
- Implementing a numeric point system to rate new build proposals could be difficult due to the variety of architectural styles that exist in Queen's Park;
- Illustrations will be included in the guidelines following the finalization of the content;
- The landscaping guidelines would apply to new buildings or the major rehabilitation of an existing home; and,

- Lower hedges were suggested in the guidelines based on feedback received from the community.

In addition, Ms. Quail provided the following information:

- Landscaping guidelines were included based on feedback received from the community;
- Alterations to the rear of a building could would not be subject to the Design Guidelines; however, all additions would be subject to RS Zoning regulations, which include site coverage restrictions;
- A separate garage would be considered an auxiliary building; and,
- It is not yet been determined if new build single family homes will require landscape architectural plans.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel noted the following comments:

- The guidelines are clear, flexible and easy to understand;
- It was suggested that additional clarification could be provided for the materials used, as hardie board is shown in both the acceptable and non-acceptable columns;
- Rear additions could be included and subject to the design guidelines, as an additional to a heritage home may affect its context; and,
- It was suggested that Part A – Choice of Material may be too prescriptive.

4.2 660 Quayside Drive

DVP00615
SDP00208

Procedural note: Item 4.2 was considered first on the agenda.

Carolyn Armanini, Planner, summarized the report dated March 28, 2017, regarding an application that has been received for a Special Development Permit (SDP) and Development Variance Permit (DVP) application for the development of a mixed use development with two high rises and one three-storey commercial building at 600 to 720 Quayside Drive. The proposed development would provide approximately two acres of green space to be extended to Westminster Pier Park, complete the missing waterfront esplanade link between the Fraser River Discovery Centre and Westminster Pier Park, provide improved pedestrian and cyclist access to the waterfront via Begbie and Sixth Streets and provide a 40 space childcare facility along with at-grade commercial space near Begbie Street. The proposed SDP would be accompanied by a DVP, which is a response to a revised site plan. The DVP would allow an increase in building height, a larger

tower footprint above the second storey and revised building siting to reflect the proposed site layout.

Derik Giner, Amanant Architect, and David Stoyko, Connect Landscape Architecture, provided an on-table PowerPoint presentation summarizing details of the project as outlined in the report dated March 28, 2017.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Giner and Mr. Stoyko provided the following information:

- The project would include 80 underground public parking spots. In addition, there would be parking stalls provided for the commercial space. Daycare parking will be provided above grade, on-site, with signage to indicate it is for daycare use;
- Access to the quay from the underground parkade is provided via an elevator that opens into the commercial building lobby;
- A traffic consultant has completed a traffic analysis for emergency vehicle access;
- The north edge is treated with paving and planting. The railway tracks cannot be screened;
- Railway regulations require that there be a fence in between the project and existing railway tracks;
- It is not anticipated that many cars will be required to wait for passing trains due to the early warning system that will be implemented;
- The canopy above the restaurant space is 16 feet high;
- The park would be included in phase two of the project, which is expected to be completed in 2022;
- The road configuration had been inherited from a past proposal for the site, and road development is restricted due to the presence of the railway tracks; and,
- The plaza road could restrict vehicle access for special functions, and may be demarcated with colored concrete.

In addition, Ms. Armanini advised that there will be a covenant registered to exclude the lobby space from the Floor Space Ratio (FSR).

Discussion ensued, and the Panel noted the following comments:

- Concerns were expressed for the access road being implemented along the waterfront side of the site;
- Concerns were expressed for the potential vehicle closures to the plaza street;

- While the Panel noted that the towers would be taller than currently existing neighbouring towers, it was noted the current proposal is more attractive than previous proposals for the site;
- It was suggested that future developments could be included in the model to provide context;
- There is a lack of interaction and transition from the private to the semi-private areas of the project from the townhomes to the park space;
- Landscape screening would be important to maintain privacy for the townhome yard space;
- The siting of the townhomes is appropriate;
- A different material could be utilized to differentiate the townhomes from the lobby and commercial units;
- The architecture of townhouse podium could be moderated to help bring the scale down;
- Patterning on the tower podiums could be used to draw sightlines down to the street level behind the rear walls;
- There could be further articulation of the materials utilized on the north facing walls to enhance the gateway feeling of the project;
- The towers have been appropriately sited to reduce the impact on view corridors;
- A wrought iron fence separating the project from the railway would be preferable to a chain link style fence;
- It was suggested that a pedestrian short cut along the rear of the commercial building from Begbie Street could provide more direct access to existing activity areas to the west;
- Support was expressed for the accessibility of the project;
- The project could embrace the quirkiness of the quay and celebrate its history;
- The project has the potential to be iconic, if the height as well as the interface with the public park is resolved;
- The towers could create a clear identity and beacon for the waterfront and downtown;
- The raised semi-private space could be reconsidered as either public or private space;
- The public space has many interesting elements and adequate seating; however, the space could be programmed with more activities, such as a games table;
- Additional renderings for the proposal could be included as part of the submission to indicate how the project will be viewed from other areas of the city such as Queen's Park;
- The energy requirements for a full glass tower should be considered;
- The public park is a valuable amenity;

- Concerns were expressed for the expanse of architectural louvers on the north side of the rear wall;
- The podium requires additional work, and it could be differentiated from the tower;
- The site's entry at Begbie Street does not appear inviting or exciting, and could be given additional attention and structure;
- The plaza could benefit from softening;
- The rear walls could benefit from further articulation; and,
- The public realm aspect of the project is well done.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Panel support the project, with staff to work with the applicant to work on the following items:

- *The base of building with particular attention to the townhomes and the north side rear wall;*
- *The public realm and landscaping , particularly at the site entry at Begbie Street;*
- *Review of the public access from Begbie Street and the pedestrian circulation to allow for a pedestrian pathway from the northside of the commercial building to the quay; and,*
- *Potential access from the underground parking that faces the quay.*

CARRIED.

All members of the Panel present voted in favour of the motion.

4.3 330 East Columbia Street

PF007062

Rupinder Basi, Senior Planner, summarized the report dated March 28, 2017, The applicant (Bird Construction) has submitted design drawings for the first phase of the Royal Columbia Hospital (RCH) redevelopment, located at 330 East Columbia Street, which includes the proposed Mental Health and Substance Use (MHSU) building and Energy Centre (See Appendix 1 – Location Map). Given that the subject property is not located within a Development Permit Area and is institutional, no development permit is required for the site.

In order to facilitate the proposed development, a Development Variance Permit application has also been submitted to vary the front yard setback requirements for certain portions of the building. The proposed variances would only apply to two (2) minor structural encroachments into the required building setbacks along Allen Street and Brunette Avenue, with the majority of the building being sited in accordance with P-3 zoning requirements, and are considered reasonable.

Garth Balint, Stantec, provided an on-table PowerPoint presentation summarizing details of the project as outlined in the report dated March 28, 2017.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Balint, Steven Webb, Bird Construction, Ken Rafflaub, Bird Construction, and Rebecca Waring, Stantec, provided the following information:

- Berming along Brunette Avenue is being explored;
- The western portion of the pedestrian bridge may be altered due to the second phase of the project;
- The delivery lane located along Brunette Avenue would be for emergency deliveries only;
- A joint traffic study is currently being completed;
- The exposed edges of the patios would be landscaped;
- The parkade entrance cannot be provided from Keary Street; and,
- Cosmetic screening at the north end of the building is being explored.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel noted the following comments:

- The elevation along Brunette Avenue could benefit from softening and/or visual interest;
- The noise from Brunette Avenue should be negated as much as possible due to the presence of the mental health and rehabilitation centre in-patient units and patios;
- The project complements the hospital context, and is an institutional design;
- The proposed material appears to be durable;
- The pedestrian bridge could benefit from additional transparency; however, it was noted that too much transparency may affect the privacy of the neighbouring residential development;
- The project could benefit from a stronger pedestrian approach from the SkyTrain Station, including additional landscaping and way finding;
- Concerns were expressed for the projects impact on the neighbouring residential units;
- The entry point to the parkade could benefit from softening;
- Support was expressed for the overall interest the project provides, including the application of color, pattern and materials; and,
- Support was expressed for the plaza landscaping.

4.4 618 Carnarvon Street

**SDP00204
REZ00116**

Mike Watson, Senior Planning Analyst, summarized the report dated March 28, 2017, regarding applications that have been received for a Rezoning and Special Development Permit to allow a 33 storey mixed use, commercial multi-unit

residential development at 618 Carnarvon Street. The proposed building includes 252 residential units, 526.3 square metres (5,665 square feet) of at grade commercial floor space. The applicant has also proposed the provisions of a privately owned, publically accessible 87.14 square metre (938 sq.ft.) pocket park at the south east corner of the site and encapsulation of the Sky Train guideway which surface from underground at the south edge of the site.

Stu Lyon, GBL Architects, provided an on-table PowerPoint presentation summarizing details of the project as outlined in the report dated March 28, 2017.

Discussion ensued, and the New Westminster Design Panel noted the following comments:

- The project design may need to improve in order to contribute to making Sixth Street a “great street”; however, it is difficult to determine as there are not enough elevations and perspectives;
- The Sixth Street elevation appears flat and could benefit from additional refinement, articulation, differentiation between commercial and residential components and stepping of the massing;
- The corner of Sixth and Carnarvon Street is an important intersection and the renderings could be more indicative of how the window wall at the corner of Carnarvon and Sixth Street would appear;
- The material selection is limited and could benefit from a more variable colour palette and material selection;
- Materials could be used to differentiate between residential and commercial;
- Project could benefit from additional variety and articulation;
- A more effective transition between the townhomes on Carnarvon Street and the commercial units is required;
- Concerns were expressed for the achievability for an all-glass tower from an energy efficiency perspective and in terms of what that would mean from a privacy perspective. It was suggested that additional solid or vertical elements could be implemented;
- In regards to additional height there is very little difference in terms of view blockage or shadow impacts;
- Given the significance of this building in terms of skyline presence, the building may not appear iconic enough to justify the additional height;
- It was suggested that a 3D or physical model including existing and potential towers could be beneficial to provide context;
- The tower is appropriately sited to balance view and tower separation;

- The project is not sympathetic to the neighbouring heritage building. Additional information regarding the interface of the project and the heritage building was requested;
- Support was expressed for the outdoor amenity space, and utilizes the covered SkyTrain space well;
- Consideration might be given to the location of the children's play area as the shadow diagram it would be shadowed more than other areas;
- The pocket park design should be reviewed to ensure that it feels and appears openly accessible to the public and not as a private space associated with the commercial unit;
- The Clarkson Street wall appears blank, and could benefit from a mosaic, lighting display or a green wall feature;
- Concerns with respect to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) were expressed regarding Clarkson Street and the location of the townhomes on Carnarvon Street;
- Concerns were expressed for the parking entrance from Clarkson Street, as Clarkson Street only appears wide enough for 1.5 cars. Safety concerns were also expressed, as the entrance to the pocket park is located in close proximity to the parkade entrance; and,
- Additional lighting and sight lines along Clarkson Street could be beneficial.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the proposal for 618 Carnarvon Street return to the New Westminster Design Panel after consideration for the comments provided at the March 28, 2017 meeting.

CARRIED.

All members of the Panel present voted in favour of the motion.

4.5 OUR CITY 2041 – Draft Development Permit Areas and Design Guidelines for the Official Community Plan

Lynn Roxburgh, Senior Planner, summarized the report dated March 28, 2017, regarding the Draft Development Permit Areas and Design Guidelines for the Official Community Plan. The City of New Westminster is presenting the New Westminster Design Panel with an excerpt of the first draft of the Development Permit Areas and associated and design guidelines, for their review and comment. These Development Permit Areas will be included in the new Official Community Plan, which is now in draft form.

In response to questions from the Panel, Ms. Roxburgh provided the following information:

- There would not be a zero lot line setback for a multifamily development;
- Parking access is usually determined on a site by site basis, with priority provided for access from a lane; and,
- The Design Guidelines would replace the existing Art Deco Policy for Twelfth Street.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel noted the following comments:

- The Design Guidelines are well written, comprehensive and well organized;
- Appreciation was expressed for the inclusion of illustrations;
- It was suggested that maps could include street names;
- Some items in the Guidelines appear to be too prescriptive, including the maximum amount of glazing permitted and the integration of balconies into the building mass;
- The Guidelines could benefit from a system similar to the proposed Heritage Guidelines, including a recommended list of items, an acceptable list of items and an unacceptable list of items;
- Concerns were expressed for the underground parking requirements and access to parking, including the stipulation that parking must be provided from a lane, if there is an existing lane;
- Ventilation requirements may not be achievable ;
- It may be difficult for residential projects located along Twelfth Street to be oriented towards but set back from the street;
- The setback requirements may require additional articulation;
- The energy sustainability targets may not be achieved unless they are mandated;
- Section 1.4 regarding multifamily developments could use different terminology for landscaping and outdoor space provided on a roof rather than “green” roof. It was suggested that programmed landscaping could be used; and,
- Storm water management could be addressed as part of the environmental section, and encourage projects to address storm water onsite, such as on the roof level and ground plane level.

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

There were no items.

6.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There were no items.

7.0 CORRESPONDENCE

7.1 Petition against proposed development density and height of mixed use tower at 618 Carnarvon Street from July 20, 2016.

The Panel acknowledged the on-table correspondence dated July 20, 2017 regarding the proposed density and height for the tower located at 618 Carnarvon Street.

8.0 NEXT MEETING

8.1 Tuesday April 24th, 2017 (in Council Chambers)

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

Certified Correct,

Chris Block
Chair

Lauren Blake
Committee Clerk