

NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL

Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 3:00 p.m.
Committee Room No. 2

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Meredith Mitchell	- Chair, BC Society of Landscape Architects
David Roppel	- Vice Chair, Development Industry Representative (UDI)
Maranatha Coulas	- Architectural Institute of BC
Maria Fish	- BC Society of Landscape Architects
Rodney Maas	- Architectural Institute of BC

REGRETS:

Donald Andrew	- AIBC Representative
Robert Duke	- AIBC Representative

STAFF:

Mike Watson	- Senior Planning Analyst
Debbie Johnstone	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m.

1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

There were no additions.

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of March 22, 2016

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the March 22, 2016 New Westminster Design Panel be adopted.

CARRIED.

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

3.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION

3.1 Zoning Bylaw Update

Mike Watson, Senior Planning Analyst, provided a presentation and summarized the report dated April 26, 2016, regarding the draft version of the new Zoning Bylaw for the City of New Westminster.

Mr. Watson directed the Panel to provide feedback regarding the following sections:

Townhouse Setback Standards in Multiple Unit Residential Districts

- A small sketch or drawing could be utilized to better illustrate the guidelines regarding the minimum side setback. It was suggested that the current language surrounding this guideline be made clearer;
- Further clarification regarding the determination of front and side yards could be required. A reference back to the definitions section could be provided; and,
- The vision clearance regulation with a rear setback adjacent to a park could be reconsidered. Currently, New Westminster has a guideline of 6 feet; however, areas like Surrey have implemented 4 foot fence guidelines with townhouse units that are adjacent to a park.

RM-3 Multiple Unit Residential District (Six Storey Residential)

- Further clarification regarding bonus density was recommended. It was suggested that this section could be misinterpreted to suggest that bonus density was equal to the base amount plus the bonus density amount, which is not the intent of the regulation;
- Concerns were expressed regarding the maximum building height. Using a 45 foot base density for six storey buildings could confuse builders and developers, as it would be nearly impossible to implement. Instead, it was suggested that no base density be listed for six storey buildings, or the base density and bonus density both be indicated at 75 feet; and,
- Providing too strict of a height guideline could limit the type of roof that could be implemented. 75 feet would provide more flexibility.

High Technology and Business Park District (CHT)

- Providing a clearer definition regarding the High Technology and Business Park District was suggested;

- The charts at the beginning of the section are helpful; however, a reference or link back to this section could be provided for ease of reference;
- Issues with security could arise due to the large setbacks suggested in this district;
- Encouraging mixed use buildings could activate the space during evenings and weekends;
- It was suggested that the City look into high technology districts in places like Seattle for examples regarding how to properly utilize the district; and,
- Enquiries were made on whether this zone is actually required, and if so, additional work with regard to this section was suggested.

The Panel provided the following additional comments with regard to the new Zoning Bylaw:

- Overall, the Zoning Bylaw is easier to read, and the graphics act as clear reference points;
- Once the document is finalized, page numbers will need to be corrected and page breaks inserted to ensure that tables and diagrams are displayed properly. Providing wider or alternating margins was also suggested to accommodate hole punches;
- Inconsistencies were highlighted regarding the use of floor area ratio (FAR) and floor space ratio (FSR);
- Consistency for metric and imperial measurements need to be implemented throughout the document;
- Providing a digital copy of the Zoning Bylaw with the ability to hyperlink to different sections and definitions was suggested;
- Section 120.11 states that the height on a sloped roof would be indicated as the average or mid-point of the roof; however, the graphic design does not reflect this;
- The regulation at section 130.17 is worded in a way that could eliminate walk up units. It was suggested that the word “isolated” be removed from the guideline;
- The percentages indicated at section 130.19 could be reworded to provide additional clarity. The intent for the regulation would be for 30% of the units to be two or three-bedroom dwelling units, and at least 10% of the units have three or more bedroom units;
- Additional clarification could be required regarding gross floor area exemptions (Section 130.34 [f] and [g]);
- Under height and setback exemptions (Section 130.35) it was suggested that green roof and roof top access be exempt to encourage more greenspace for livability. It was further suggested that storage spaces and

cladding be reconsidered as an exclusion, as this clause was created due to issues with leaky condos;

- It was suggested that guidelines surrounding permeable materials in parking areas be considered; and,
- Additional consideration regarding parking (in areas such as parks, for example) and above ground bike parking was suggested.

4.0 DESIGN REVIEWS

There were no items.

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

May 24, 2016 (in Committee Room No. 2)

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Certified Correct,

Meredith Mitchell
Chair

Debbie Johnstone
Committee Clerk