



## **NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL**

**Tuesday, June 27, 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
David Roppel	- Development Industry Representative
Craig West	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative

#### **REGRETS:**

Maria Fish	- BC Society of Landscape Architects
Rodney Maas	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative

#### **GUESTS:**

Ross Chilton	- Community Living Society
Keith Koroluk	- Keith Koroluk Landscape Architect
Peter Kreuk	- Durante Kreuk Landscape Architecture
Jason Letkeman	- Iredale Architecture
Denis Turco	- Denis Turco Architect Inc.

#### **STAFF:**

Rupinder Basi	- Senior Development Planner
Hardev Gill	- Planning Technician
Heather Corbett	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

### **1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**

There were no additions.

### **2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

#### **2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2017**

##### **MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the minutes of the May 23, 2017 New Westminster Design Panel meeting be amended as follows:*

- *Change adjournment from 8:04 p.m. to 5:04 p.m.; and, THAT the minutes of May 23, 2017, be adopted as amended*

**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**

#### **4.1 228 and 232 Sixth Street**

**REZ00109  
DPU00054**

Rupinder Basi, Senior Development Planner, summarized the report dated June 27, 2017, regarding a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow a six storey mid-rise development at 228 and 232 Sixth Street including 53 residential units and a two-level underground parkade.

Mr. Basi also reviewed the timeline of the application thus far, including details on a change of ownership and design team for the proposed building.

Dennis Turco, Architect, and Keith Koroluk, Landscape Architect, provided a presentation summarizing details of the site plans, elevations, shadow studies, materials, amenity areas, and landscaping and outdoor furnishings plans, as outlined in Appendix B in the agenda package.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Turco and Mr. Koroluk provided the following information:

- The top of the beams of the trellis entry feature is 12 feet at the highest point and 9 feet at the lowest point;
- The podium of the adjacent building is a wide open space with pre-cast pavers and basic shrubbery around the perimeter, likely used as an amenity space;
- The Hardie board product (presented as a sample at the meeting) was intended to show the colours to be used on the project, not the type of material;
- There are no trees to preserve on the site, however the intention is to preserve and protect the trees to the West of the property;
- The fiberglass planters with green screen lattices will be used on the rooftop garden and in the lower courtyard area, but in areas where there are views to the river, the planters will be left open;
- The outdoor solariums are included in the total floor space ratio;
- The solariums will not be heated, but do count in the FSR;
- The solariums will be clad in aluminum;

- The solarium doors are sliding walls that can slide in to each other and stack on each other;
- The intention of the solariums is to minimize the building's carbon footprint by being closed in winter and thus keeping warmth inside the building;
- The underside of the soffits in the solariums will likely be cedar or longboard;
- The finishes of the solarium walls will be a continuation of the rest of the building, however the balcony finishes have not been determined yet;
- The jointing pattern for the Hardie panelling has only been considered on a conceptual basis, but it will likely be a vertical Hardie Reveal Panel system;
- The green screens on the top floor will be 6-7 ft. tall giving some privacy from the adjacent tower; and,
- The communal garden patio area will be accessible via the front entrance.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Basi provided the following information:

- There are no plans to widen 6<sup>th</sup> Street, however like the property to the North, there may be an opportunity to widen the sidewalk for pedestrians.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments in relation to the questions asked in the June 27, 2017 staff report:

*Question 1: Staff would like to obtain preliminary feedback from the NWDP in regards improving the relationship of the proposed building to Sixth Street while at the same time ensuring a suitable setback for the proposed patio spaces for the ground-oriented units.*

- For townhouses 2 and 4, the entry door may be more successful if turned by 90 degrees, and this may also provide an opportunity to turn the steps and allow a softer entry onto the patio;
- The proposed solariums present a number of concerns, including:
  - Solariums often get used as a location for dry storage by residents, rather than in the intended way, which may pose a visual concern along Sixth Street;
  - From a CPTED perspective the solarium space may deactivate the street if not used;
  - It would be interesting to see the application of the enclosed solariums in North Vancouver (as discussed by the architect), and how successful they have been in activating the street; and,
  - The amount of sunlight that the north facing solariums will receive will be minimal;
- The patio sizes seem to be usable, however the patio wall is quite tall in the unit on the lower south side of the proposed building;
- The patios on Sixth Street next to the entry doors could be rather dark and overhung, as well as noisy;

- The entryway on Sixth Street appears compressed, and it would be worthwhile ensuring there will be sufficient lighting; and,
- Appreciation was expressed for the stepped planting on Welsh Street, as it would help the pedestrian experience.

*Question 2: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the overall scale, massing, and proposed materials of this proposal and how the development can best fit with the size of the property and the surrounding neighbourhood context.*

- As the proposed building is adjacent to another residential tower , the scale and size are reasonable for Sixth Street;
- The proposed materiality of the building is somewhat simple in terms of colour, appearing dark and heavy;
- Further information about the fiberglass planters would be useful, in regards to soil depth, size and irrigation needs;
- Watering and maintenance of the green screens could be an issue;
- English Ivy (*Hedera helix*) is considered an invasive plant in New Westminster, therefore its use should be reviewed; and,
- Comments on the unit plans included:
  - J Unit is meant to be the adaptable unit, however it does not appear possible to access the closet or washer/dryer;
  - Some reconsideration of the size of the bedrooms in F Unit may be required; and,
  - Some unit plans appear to have a lack of storage space and adequate kitchen floor space.

*Question 3: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to how the ground-oriented townhouse units and garden suites are defined so that they stand out from the upper levels of the proposed building.*

- Colour and materiality could be reconsidered in terms of further setting the townhouse podium apart from the upper levels of the building.

*Question 4: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to how this proposal addresses the building proximity issues to the existing apartment units to the north and west of the site.*

- Further information and context would be useful to clarify how the proposed tower would overlook the adjacent tower;
- Further consideration would be worthwhile on how effective the green screens on the level three private patios on the north side of the proposed building will be in providing separation from the amenity space on the adjacent tower;
- Possible reconsideration would be worthwhile of Units B and C, where the bedrooms would look into a light well, and have views of a wall; and,

- Concern was expressed about the height of the concrete wall on the north side of the building and a suggestion was proposed to add planting that may fall over it or climb up it.

*Question 5: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to how this proposal addresses the streetscape along Sixth Street (Great Street) and Welsh Street in regards to providing a safe and attractive pedestrian-scale streetscape that provides for a good transition between public, semi-private, and private space of residents (patios for ground-oriented units).*

- It was suggested that the developer may want to look at the City's standards and install more open paving or seating.

Further general comments were noted by the Design Panel:

- In a future presentation to NWDP, it would be useful for the Panel to receive further information and drawings on the following:
  - Context elevations of Welsh Street;
  - Further context to the existing building next door and relationships at each level;
  - Proximities to other buildings in 3D format; and,
  - A more legible landscape plan;
- Visibility when driving out of the parkade could be improved by installing a pedestrian warning system or setting the walls back further;
- There may be a possible code issue with the ground level amenity space, as there is no second exit indicated;
- The community garden planters may be better situated on the roof, as it appears to receive a large amount of shadow in its proposed location;
- Further consideration of the proposed use of the turf in the centre of the rooftop would be useful, including a possible children's play area;
- The sloped roof of the rooftop stairwell could be further integrated into the architecture, as a sloped roof does not appear anywhere else in the plans;
- The internal amenity space adjacent to the lobby is quite small and the location could be reconsidered, possibly to the rooftop;
- The dog area appears somewhat small and should be enclosed and gated;
- It is important to ensure that the railings above planters in both the garden courtyard area and the rooftop garden will be at 42", and that this is reflected in future plans; and,
- Bedrooms facing the outdoor corridor on the west side of the proposed building would benefit from planting and privacy.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Design Panel receive the report for information*

**CARRIED.**

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

## 4.2 43 Hastings Street

**REZ00139**  
**DPD00146**

Hardev Gill, Planning Technician, summarized the report dated June 27, 2017, regarding a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to build a six-unit, affordable rental housing project at the City-owned site of 43 Hastings Street.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Gill provided the following information:

- Five people attended the public consultation and all comments were generally positive.

Ross Chilton, CEO of the Community Living Society, provided information about the Community Living Society (CLS), reviewed the background and timeline of the proposed development, and discussed how the development will provide secure and accessible housing for people with developmental disabilities and low-income families.

Jason Letkeman, Iredale Architecture and Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architecture provided a presentation summarizing details of the site plans, streetscape, elevations, sections, context perspectives, materials, and landscaping details, as outlined in Appendix B in the agenda package.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Chilton, Mr. Letkeman and Mr. Kreuk provided the following information:

- The lane to the east of the property is an asphalt driveway on the adjacent property;
- The walkway at the north of the property is intended to be level and used for maintenance and site access at the back;
- The stairs at the front of the townhouse will likely be cast in place;
- There is no room to put planting in between the driveway and the sidewalk at the south of the property, and it would be difficult hard to back cars out of the garage;
- The property does not fall in the Queen's Park Heritage Conservation Area;
- The perimeter walls between the parking and the unit above will be concrete with wood frame above;
- The intended occupants of the ground floor accessible unites will be supported by the CLS as needed, and will be somewhat independent; and,
- The slope of the pedestrian walkway up to the ramp beside the loading bay at the southeast end of the driveway will be 12-14%.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel noted the following comments:

- Appreciation was given of the project, in particular for the:
  - Overall composition and proportion;
  - Asymmetrical design;
  - Vertical yellow details and colour accents;
  - Eyebrow composition;
  - Central stair with porch;
  - Separation of units;
  - Material selections;
  - Different approaches of the outdoor spaces; and,
  - Tinge of historical context, mixed with modern style;
- Some reconsideration of the size of the third bedrooms may be required;
- The paving pattern defines the sidewalk well;
- A perimeter fence may be an additional enhancement;
- A trellis and vines screening off the garbage and recycling area would be an opportunity to ensure that it is not overlooked by neighbours;
- There may be an opportunity to add a storage box under the patio closest to the bike storage;
- The inclusion of vines on the PMT could help to conceal the concrete face adjacent to the parking stalls;
- CPTED issues in the parking area could be addressed through lighting considerations;
- While there are structural restrictions, it may be beneficial to include a privacy separation using concrete at the southwest of the site; and,
- Although it is not able to be resolved by design, the street appears to be a difficult location and slope to provide for individuals needing accessibility or assisted living to integrate with the community.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Design Panel support the rezoning and development permit application for 43 Hastings Street, with consideration of comments from the panel*

**CARRIED.**

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

**5.0 NEW BUSINESS**

There were no items.

**6.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There were no items.

**7.0 CORRESPONDENCE**

There were no items.

**8.0 NEXT MEETING**

8.1 The next meeting of the New Westminster Design Panel will take place on Tuesday July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017, in Council Chambers.

**9.0 ADJOURNMENT**

**ON MOTION**, the meeting was adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Certified Correct,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

**Chris Block**  
**Chair**

ORIGINAL SIGNED

**Heather Corbett**  
**Committee Clerk**