



NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL

**Tuesday, November 28, 2017, 3:00p.m.
Council Chambers**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Meredith Mitchell	- Vice Chair, BC Society of Landscape Architects
Maranatha Coulas	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
Rodney Maas	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
David Roppel	- Development Industry Representative (Arrived 3:13pm)
Craig West	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative

REGRETS:

Chris Block	- Chair, Architectural Institute of BC Representative
Maria Fish	- BC Society of Landscape Architects

GUESTS:

Mary Chan-Yip	- PMG Landscape Architects
Paul Fenske	- Ekistics Architecture Inc.
Glenn Peters	- Chernoff Thompson Architects
Daryl Tyacke	- ETA Landscape Architecture,

STAFF:

Jim Hurst	- Development Planner
Heather Corbett	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. Meredith Mitchell assumed the Chair.

1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

The Panel added one item to the agenda:

5.1 Changes to developments that occur post Design Panel review

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of September 26, 2017

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the September 26, 2017 New Westminister Design Panel meeting be approved.

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 41 and 175 Duncan Street: Official Community Plan Amendment and Rezoning to allow a 170 Unit Townhouse Development

**OCP 00020
REZ00136
DPQ00140**

Procedural Note: David Roppel recused himself due to a conflict of interest.

Jim Hurst, Development Planner, summarized the report dated November 28, 2017, regarding an Official Community Plan Amendment and Rezoning to allow a 170 unit townhouse development at 41 and 175 Duncan Street, which was a resubmission from September.

Mr. Hurst reviewed the location of the site, the floodplain requirements for this project, and the considerations that the Design Panel was asked to evaluate.

Mr. Paul Fenske, Ekistics Architecture Inc. (on behalf of Anthem Properties), and Ms. Mary Chan-Yip, PMG Landscape Architects, provided a presentation in which they reviewed the site plan as a whole, and summarized the proponents' responses to each of the comments that the Design Panel had made in September, as outlined in Attachment 2 of the agenda package.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Fenske and Ms. Chan-Yip, provided the following information:

- The unit plans included in the package are indicative of what has been designed for the development;
- The patterning of the units provides an alternation which is intended to create reduce the overlook of units that face each other;
- The intention is to honour the history of Poplar Island with the provision of information boards where the seating is located within the Central Commons greenspace;
- The ground level units are planned at 4.2m FCL to address the floodplain, however some of the units on Duncan Street will sit below at 3.8m FCL, therefore only the garage and stairs are planned on the first floor;
- There is no public art proposal within the site plan, however decorative columns are planned within the Poplar Grove, and poplar leaves will be stamped into the paving;
- The industrial site on the neighbouring property is not subject to the City's noise or business hour regulations, as it is owned by the Port.
- The acoustic study was conducted based on the existing conditions at the site;

- The plan is for the entire site to be lifted above the elevation of the industrial area; and,
- The planned surface for the bench seating at the Central Commons is concrete, with a wooden topping in certain areas.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments in relation to each of the questions asked in the November 28, 2017 staff report:

Question 1: The project has 170 units. Is there enough variation in the architectural presentation to ensure that the project is not monotonous?

- The Panel expressed appreciation for the additional information and the unit plans that were provided, as they helped the discussion;
- The variation in colour of the units is sufficient;
- Increased variation in the materials, such as the addition of brick or stone, would have made a strong impact – the developers could consider a material change at the edges of the development to provide “bookends”; and,
- The Panel encouraged more thought into the proposed ridgeline, as while it appears variable when shown from the pedestrian perspective, it may not appear so when seen by neighbours from the South.

Question 2: In a number of instances the proposed buildings do not achieve the separations identified in the RT-3 zone. Are the separations proposed sufficient to satisfy the intent of the bylaw?

- The Panel expressed appreciation for the illustration of the staggering of the units; and,
- When including the balconies and porch columns, the separations still appear tight between buildings 14-17 (in the image on Page 8 of the attachment) and buildings 26-27; therefore it would be worthwhile to explore shifting buildings 14-17 slightly northward to achieve a 7.5m separation on the Mews;

Question 3: The west end of the site is adjacent to an active industrial area. Are the setback, materials, orientation of the buildings and landscaping of the site sufficient to provide a meaningful buffer to the units adjacent to the industrial site?

- The Panel expressed appreciation for the change in planting from deciduous to conifer trees along the industrial edge;
- A reconsideration of the height of the attenuation fence may be worthwhile, as its effectiveness may be reduced at the second floor level in the units that face the industrial edge;
- Consider the materials in regards to sound attenuation and light pollution into the site from the neighbouring industrial site;
- A concrete attenuation fence may be more effective for noise reduction than the board and batten fence proposed; and,
- It will be important to ensure that the evergreen trees acquired for the Western edge are as tall as possible at planting, and that they are given large volumes of soil and maintenance plans to encourage growth.

Question 4: Have the comments made by the Panel been addressed?

- The Panel appreciated the detailed nature in which their comments were redressed.

Question 5: Does the project conform to the Development Permit Area Guidelines?

- The project conforms to the Development Permit Area Guidelines apart from the provision of public art;
- The addition of a plaque and/or historical explanation within the Poplar tree space would be beneficial; and,
- An opportunity for public art within the park or along the walkway would help to address the guidelines further.

Further general comments were noted by the Design Panel:

- The seating area surfaces within the Central Commons could be reconsidered, as concrete surfaces are not the most pleasant to sit on in cold and wet weather; and,
- Increased variation in the planting along Duncan Street would be beneficial to break up the length of the edge.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel support the application, and recommend the Applicant work with Staff to increase the separation of the East/West Greenway units, and further explore the height and material of the fence at the Western edge of the site.

CARRIED.

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

4.2 420 Boyne Street – Development Permit Application for the Proposed Building for the City Animal Shelter and Offices for the City’s Towing Service

**REZ00138
DPQ00172**

Jim Hurst, Development Planner, summarized the report dated November 28, 2017, regarding a Development Permit Application for the proposed animal shelter and City towing office building.

Mr. Hurst reviewed the location of the site, the access routes, the tree management plan, the future location of the towing yard, the building uses, considerations for disabled access and the questions that the Design Panel was asked to evaluate.

In response to a question from the Panel, Mr. Hurst informed the Panel that the building would be open normal business hours, including weekends.

Glenn Peters, Chernoff Thompson Architects, and Daryl Tyacke, ETA Landscape Architecture, provided a presentation summarizing details of the development, as outlined in Attachment 2 in the agenda package, covering the design philosophy, project context, elevation drawings, floor plans, cross-sections, perspectives, landscaping details, and parking plans, noting the following:

- Vehicles would access the building from Boyne Street, and parking would be available on the South side of the building;
- The animal stalls are planned for the Northeast side of the building as there is cooler exposure on that side for dogs and dog runs;
- The building will provide public washrooms with access from Wood Street, which is used frequently by dog walkers;
- The building is has been designed as a steel framed structure, covered in metal cladding, which is known to be a durable, long lasting material; and,
- The building is intended to meet the BC Step Code Level 1, not LEED.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Peters and Mr. Tyacke provided the following information:

- The setback line is a riparian setback which cannot be altered;
- The primary site signage is planned off of Boyne Street, as that will be the primary access point for vehicles;
- There has been no signage off of Wood Street formally developed, although it does make sense that there would be some on that side of the building;
- The distribution of materials would be as follows:
 - Masonry: along the front of the building up to the entrance;
 - Wood screening: will help to declare the main entrance;
 - Screening on the roof for mechanical units;
 - Painted exposed steel: occurs over most of the building;
 - Glazing at Wood Street corner: will provide good visibility both in and out
 - Anodized aluminum: on the windows and doors;
- The existing trees in the riparian area are a mixture of conifers and deciduous, including Douglas Fir, Cottonwood, Cascara and a Black Cherry;
- The bio-swail would be fed by water taken from the parking lot and the roof of the building;
- The building would be meeting Level 1 of the BC Step Code, and in many cases would be exceeding Level 1 with energy efficient measures such as the radiant heat planned for the building; and,
- The numbers are doubled in the planting list, in error.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Wayne Werbovetski, Building Manager, provided the following information on behalf of the City:

- The architects have met with the City's building permit representatives and there are no perceived energy code issues; and,
- The City's goals for achieving the most energy efficiency building, taking into consideration measures required for animals (such as odour mitigation, air circulation and water usage), within the budget allowances, are being met.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments in relation to each of the questions asked in the November 28, 2017 staff report:

Question 1: Does the project provide appropriate eyes on the street toward the future Wood Street Greenway?

- The project does provide eyes on to Wood Street, however it also provides “eyes on the parking lot”; therefore, consideration for a continuation of the glazing around to the west façade could aid in putting more eyes on the Greenway;
- The existing trees may provide a barrier to the visibility through to Wood Street, however it will be difficult to mitigate this due to the riparian area;
- The Panel encourages working with the Parks Department in terms of limiting the growth of low branches in the Riparian area to allow for increased visibility; and,
- The addition of seating and/or picnic benches may add to the eyes on the street desired, as it will encourage use of the area.

Question 2: Does the project confirm to the requirements of the Development Permit Area designation?

- The Development Permit Area guidelines appear to be met;
- The choice of materials is appropriate in that they are industrial in nature, and the corrugated cladding is nicely offset with the wood;
- Varying the amount, colour and texture of the corrugated cladding could be an advantage to the overall look of the building;
- The wood could be used in greater capacity, particularly on the South elevation;
- The horizontal corrugation could have long-term maintenance issues;
- The addition of a pedestrian walkway from the Wood Street Greenway to the building could be helpful in terms of providing a pedestrian environment;
- The entrance to the building is well expressed and clear; and,
- It would be important to ensure that the energy modelling is accurate given the amount of glazing being used on the building.

Further general comments were noted by the Design Panel:

- In terms of floor layout, some internal offices have no access to external light;
- The use of solar tubes have been shown to be effective for animals when kennels have no external light source;
- The outdoor staff area may not receive very much sun as it faces Northwest;
- The addition of an informal dog park area in front of the building would make for a pleasant area for the public to connect with the shelter’s animals and/or bring their animals from the Greenway;
- The bio-swail will be an attractive element and a nice tribute to the adjacent waterway.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel support the project, subject to the Panel's comments and reduced use of corrugated cladding.

CARRIED.

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

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Changes to Developments Post Design Panel Review

The Panel discussed changes that often occur in construction, after the Design Panel has reviewed a project, and once a development permit is issued. Mr. Jim Hurst will bring this up with the Planning Department and will report back on how this is followed up.

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, December 12, 2017, in Council Chambers.

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Certified Correct,

Meredith Mitchell
Vice-Chair

Heather Corbett
Committee Clerk