



## **NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL**

**Tuesday, August 23, 2016 3:00 p.m.**  
**Committee Room No. 2**

### **MINUTES**

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Meredith Mitchell  
Donald Andrew  
Maranatha Coulas  
David Roppel

- Chair, BC Society of Landscape Architects
- AIBC Representative
- Architectural Institute of BC
- Vice Chair, Development Industry Representative (UDI)

#### **REGRETS:**

Robert Duke  
Maria Fish  
Rodney Maas

- AIBC Representative
- BC Society of Landscape Architects
- Architectural Institute of BC

#### **GUESTS:**

Laura Jones  
Gerald Blonki  
Arthur Buse  
Sylvain Boulanger  
Sandra Moore  
Patricia Campbell  
Eric Pattison

- Pacific Land Group
- Gerry Blonksi Architect
- Boldwing Continuum Architect
- Boldwing Continuum Architect
- Birmingham Wood Architects and Planners
- PMG Landscape Architects
- Pattison Architecture

#### **STAFF:**

Rupinder Basi  
Michael Watson  
Julie Schueck  
Debbie Johnstone

- Senior Development Planner
- Senior Planning Analyst
- Heritage Planner
- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 3:09 p.m.

### **1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**

There were no additions.

## **2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

### **2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of July 26, 2016**

#### **MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the minutes of the July 26, 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**

There were no items.

## **4.0 DESIGN REVIEWS**

### **4.1 716 Twelfth Street**

Mike Watson, Senior Planning Analyst, summarized the report dated August 23, 2016 and provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding a Development Permit Application that has been received for 716 Twelfth Street.

Laura Jones, Pacific Land Group and Gerald Blonski, Gerry Blonski Architect, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the proposed plans for the project.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel provided the following comments:

- It was suggested that the site be softened with additional landscaping as much as possible;
- Along with 'No Idle' signage, pavement painting could be considered;
- The canopy and  $\frac{3}{4}$  wall would both be positive additions to the property;
- The proposed 6-8 foot height for the cedar hedge located between the development and the adjacent residential property would be adequate;
- Implementing infill planting at north west end of the cedar hedge along the west property line could be considered;
- Concerns were expressed regarding the durability of implementing 15 cm pots along the corner of Hamilton Street and Twelfth Street. As this is a busy pedestrian and vehicle location, it was suggested that the pot size be increased to prevent trampling and that a curb be considered at edge of the planting bed; and,
- Further consideration regarding the existing cedar hedge on the Hamilton Street side of the development was suggested. Lower hedging could

provide better visibility for the site and could more adequately address potential issues regarding Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED).

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Panel support the Development Permit Application for 716 Twelfth Street with consideration of the landscape comments.*

**CARRIED.**

All Panel members voted in favour of this motion.

**4.2 300 Salter Street**

This item was deferred to the September meeting.

**4.3 612-618 Brantford Street**

Rupinder Basi, Senior Development Planner, summarized the report dated August 23, 2016 regarding an application that has been received for an Official Community Plan Amendment, a Heritage Revitalization Agreement and a Development Permit Application for 612- 618 Brantford Street.

Julie Schueck, Heritage Planner, provided a summary regarding the heritage context of the site and the potential plans for the heritage home.

**Procedural Note:** As the architects were not yet in attendance, the Panel addressed item 4.4, and then returned to discuss item 4.3.

Arthur Buse, Boldwing Continuum Architects, Sylvain Boulanger, Boldwing Continuum Architects, Sandra Moore, Birmingham Wood Architects and Planners, and Patricia Campbell, PMG Landscape Architects, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the architectural, heritage and landscape plans for the proposed development.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Buse, Mr. Boulanger, Ms. Moore and Ms. Campbell provided the following information:

- Parking for the entire strata development, including the heritage home, would be underground;
- The front porch of the heritage home would be restored and the enclosure would be removed;
- Any new materials implemented on the heritage home would be distinguishable from the original materials;

- The heritage home would be raised and moved onto its final site;
- The six storey building (principle building) would have an outdoor and indoor amenity area located beside the heritage home to provide minimal disruption between the two structures; and,
- Implementing minimal side windows, and pushed back balconies between the second floor of the principle building and the heritage home could address potential privacy issues.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel provided the following comments:

- Concerns were expressed regarding the lack of separation between the principle building and the heritage home;
- Noise and privacy issues could arise from the proposed location of the principle building's amenity space in relation to the heritage house;
- Separating the private outdoor space of the heritage home and the shared amenity space for the principle building with only a low wall may not be adequate to address privacy concerns;
- The street frontage wall between the principle building and the heritage home could be adapted to better express both the unity of the development and the uniqueness of the heritage home;
- The form and character of the principle building could be more effective in fitting in with the surrounding neighbourhood;
- The south elevation could benefit from additional variation, particularly to the single family context of the neighbourhood;
- The current design of the principle building may be too imposing for the context of the neighbourhood;
- Further acknowledgment of the street front units off the main level could be provided;
- Landscape lighting or other design elements could be utilized to attract attention to the lobby area;
- The vertical design elements including colour scheme and suggested materials for the principle building could be reconsidered. Instead, it was suggested that the colour and materials utilized acknowledge the heritage implications of the neighbourhood and that the lower level have a more horizontal feel
- Stepping back could be considered for the shoulders of the building;
- Further work could be considered on the roofline, as it currently feels unfinished, in particular the termination of the brick pillars needs to be better resolved
- It was suggested that the location of the garbage/recycling receptacle be reconsidered, or that similar materials from the heritage addition are utilized to clad the structure;

- The amenity spaces throughout the development could benefit from further connectivity;
- There could be better separation between the shared outdoor space of the principle building and the corner unit that is adjacent to it;
- Planting on the southern face of the development could be considered, as well as a planting strip along the eastern face of the development to soften the views of the underground parking ramp and the parking lot;
- The different landscape designs for the heritage house and the principle building works well as it supports the individuality of each building; and,
- Good distinguishable design exists between the heritage house and its proposed new addition.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Panel does not support the project at 612-618 Brantford Street as presented.*

**CARRIED.**

Maranatha Coulas voted in opposition of this motion.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the applicant returns to the Design Panel after consideration of the comments provided by the Panel.*

**CARRIED.**

All Panel members voted in support of this motion.

**4.4 1023 Third Avenue**

Julie Schueck, Heritage Planner, summarized the report dated August 23, 2016 regarding a Heritage Revitalization Agreement application that has been received for 1023 Third Avenue. Ms. Schueck explained that the City is exploring ways in which creative infill would allow for multifamily developments in the Brow of the Hill neighbourhood.

Eric Pattison, Pattison Architecture, summarized a PowerPoint presentation regarding the potential plans for the project and the historical significance of the heritage farmhouse. Patricia Campbell, PMG Landscape Architects, summarized the landscape plans for the project.

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

- The colour pallet for the heritage home would be heritage green in an effort to replicate the original colour of the home;

- The new location of the heritage home would not require a change in grade from its existing location;
- A four foot tall wood fence would be implemented off Oxford Street; and,
- All units in the proposed development would maintain addresses on Third Avenue.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel provided the following comments:

- The development could be a great solution for a multifamily lot;
- Overall the design for both the duplex development and the heritage home works in a cohesive manner;
- The length of the duplex yields a long side yard; however, it does not appear that it would disrupt the neighbourhood;
- Landscaping could assist in softening the lengthy vehicle courtyard;
- Ensuring that both the duplex development and the heritage home are visible from the street could provide an interesting perspective; and,
- A pedestrian entry for the heritage home separate from the vehicular entry off Oxford Street was suggested.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Panel supports the Heritage Revitalization Agreement for 1023 Third Avenue subject to the addition of the pedestrian entrance off Oxford Street for the heritage home.*

**CARRIED.**

All Panel members voted in favour of this 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**

**September 27, 2016 (in Committee Room No. 2)**

**9.0 ADJOURNMENT**

**ON MOTION**, the meeting was adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

Certified Correct,

---

**Meredith Mitchell**  
**Chair**

---

**Debbie Johnstone**  
**Committee Clerk**