

## **NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL**

**Tuesday, September 27, 2016 3:00 p.m.  
Committee Room No. 2**

### **MINUTES**

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

#### **REGRETS:**

Rodney Maas	- Architectural Institute of BC
Donald Andrew	- AIBC Representative

#### **GUESTS:**

Cindy Brenneis	- Ramsay Worden Architect
Peter Reese	- Ramsay Wodren Architect
Doug Ramsay	- Ramsay Worden Architect
Rod Maruyama	- Ramsay Worden Architect
Victor Sutton	- Porte Development Corp.
John Bingham	- Bingham Hill Architects
Arthur Buse	- Boldwing Continuum Architect
Caelan Griffiths	- PMG Landscape Architects
Paul Grant	- Grant Architecture Studio
Autumn Sweet	- Grant Architecture Studio
Julie Hicks	- Viewpoint Landscape Architects
Cheryle Beaumont	- Head of School, Urban Academy

#### **STAFF:**

Lynn Roxburgh	- Planner
Michael Watson	- Senior Planning Analyst
Jim Hurst	- Planner
Rupinder Basi	- Senior Development Planner
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 August 23, 2016**

#### **MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the minutes of the August 23, 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 Infill Housing Design Guidelines**

Lynn Roxburgh, Planner, and Mike Watson, Senior Planning Analyst, summarized the report dated September 27, 2016 regarding the first draft of the Infill Housing Design Guidelines for Laneway and Carriage Houses, and for Townhouse and Rowhouses.

Cindy Brenneis and Peter Reese, Ramsay Worden Architects, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding their collaboration with the City on the draft Infill Housing Design Guidelines.

In response to questions from the Panel, Ms. Roxburgh, Mr. Watson, Ms. Brenneis and Mr. Reese provided the following information:

- Through the development of the Official Community Plan (OCP) the City is noticing an increase in the need and interest for infill housing;
- Lots would be evaluated on a case by case basis to determine if a laneway/carriage house could be built;
- Lot size requirements for laneway/carriage houses have not been determined by the City;
- The focus would be on the liveability of the site as opposed to an exact size requirement;
- Parking could be a determining factor when evaluating property potential for a laneway/carriage house ; and,
- The garage would be included in the floor space ratio (FSR) to reduce the incentive to build a garage and then convert it to additional living space.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel provided the following comments:

- Overall, the document provides strong direction for the City to fulfill the need for infill housing;
- The draft design guidelines are well illustrated and concise;
- Additional clarification was suggested for the building envelope diagrams illustrated in the document;
- Allowing for three cars on a single family lot could create issues with crowding. Instead, it was suggested that two cars be recommended;
- Implementing parking pads for laneway and carriage housing could limit opportunities for greenspace;
- In an effort to encourage residents to consider implementing laneway/carriage houses it was suggested that the City consider allowing home owners a slight increase in their FSR;
- The provided plant list and suggestions in the document could be too prescriptive. Instead, it was suggested that guidelines regarding plant characteristics, sun shade tolerance and permeability be developed;
- In some cases, permeable paving and storm water management could be more beneficial than the implementation of greenspace;
- It was suggested that the guidelines indicate that the emergency access path for infill housing be permeable paved;
- Recommending that laneway/carriage houses be made adaptable is adequate; however, it could also be made a requirement;
- To address potential issues with privacy and overlook it was suggested that the separation of outdoor space for infill housing be made a requirement;
- Including the garage space in the allotted FSR could deter home owners from building garages in the future;
- Concerns were expressed regarding the limitation of implementing only two types of materials for cladding. Instead, it was suggested that cladding be designed with relation to the principle building on the site; and,
- Providing a pushback for the end units of townhouse developments was recommended to enhance the streetscape.

## 4.0 DESIGN REVIEWS

**Procedural note:** David Roppel declared a conflict and exited the meeting at 3:45 p.m.

### 4.1 300 Salter Street – Port Royal

Jim Hurst, Development Planner, summarized the report dated September 27, 2016 regarding an application that has been received for a Development Variance Permit and a Development Permit for the property at 300 Salter Street.

Doug Ramsay, Ramsay Worden Architects, and Rod Maruyama, Ramsay Worden Architects, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the prospective plans for the project.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Ramsay and Mr. Maruyama provided the following information:

- Materials for the building would include brick, black and white hardy board, wood accent panels and cedar finishing;
- Zinc and aluminum would be implemented as a feature element on the roof;
- Unit plans would address ventilation through the use of a heat recovery ventilator (HRV). High ceilings and the open design layout for units would also address this issue;
- The entrance to the walkway along the waterfront would be addressed by the Strata; however, it is anticipated that access would still be permitted to the public; and,
- Ground level patios would be raised above the public space in an effort to provide additional privacy.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel provided the following comments:

- Incorporating townhouse units off the ground floor could soften the south and north elevation and provide a more inviting feel for the building;
- Softer entryways could improve the street presence of the building for townhouses along the main level and north elevation;
- The suggested building materials provide a strong contemporary pallet;
- Implementing zinc as an accent colour for the roof could be interesting; however, concerns were expressed if the colour would be adequately distinctive;
- Zinc could also be implemented on the entryway as an accent for the building;

- The proposed building height works well with the existing buildings and fits in with the context of the area;
- Additional consideration was suggested for the north elevation, as it is currently long and could benefit from further articulation;
- Overall, the building design does not seem to present any Crime Prevention Through Environmental Designs (CPTED) concerns;
- The open floor plan and high ceiling height maximises useable living space for the units;
- Implementing pocket doors for units could create issues with noise;
- It was suggested that the patios for the corner units on the ground floor be extended to prevent issues with shade and lawn growth;
- The natural play area and topography for the development work nicely for the area; and,
- It was suggested that ground cover planting be implemented rather than coniferous trees/shrubs along the parkade entryway.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Panel supports the application subject to further articulation of north elevation, consideration of shade on lawn areas and consideration of townhouse entrances on the lower level if possible; and,*

*THAT the Panel supports the suggested increased height for the project.*

**CARRIED.**

All Panel members voted in support of this motion.

**Procedural note:** David Roppel re-entered the meeting at 4:26 p.m.

**Procedural note:** Meredith Mitchell declared conflict and exited meeting at 4:27 p.m.

**Procedural note:** David Roppel assumed the role of Chair

**4.2 1002, 1012, 1016 and 1020 Auckland Street**

Jim Hurst, Development Planner, summarized the report dated September 27, 2016 regarding an application that has been received to amend the Official Community Plan, Rezone and issue a Development Permit for the site at 1002, 1012, 1016 and 1020 Auckland Street.

Victor Sutton, Porte Development Corp., John Bingham, Bingham Hill Architects and Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture summarized the prospective plans for the project.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Sutton, Mr. Bingham and Ms. Mitchell provided the following information:

- A sidewalk would not be implemented along Quebec Street for the development. Instead, it would continue to be utilized as green space;
- Consultation with the Engineering department would take place and a traffic report would be provided when evaluating the possibility of implementing a driveway for the development off Auckland Street;
- The amenity space would be split between levels one and two, with indoor amenity space on the first level; and,
- The application meets the suggested design guidelines in that the development compliments the neighbourhood, addresses both Auckland Street and Quebec Street, and provides an “eyes on the street” feel.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel provided the following comments:

- It was suggested that the building could be imposing on the landscape, particularly on the west side of the building;
- Additional setbacks could be considered on Quebec Street;
- The developers could consider working with the City to provide adequate space for both the boulevard and a sidewalk on Quebec Street. It was further suggested that the City swale extend onto Auckland Street if possible;
- The entryways for townhomes compliment the streetscape, and offer a strong base for the building;
- Additional consideration was suggested regarding the vertical elements of the development, particularly along the long elevations;
- Utilizing a variety of different materials could be considered to properly address the massing of the building;
- While the glazing on the development captures the industrial feel of the area, it was suggested that the base and the top of the development could benefit from a more harmonious approach;
- It was suggested that stepping be considered along the western slope of the development and at the far end of the north elevation;
- The elevation of the development could be broken up to provide a better sense of order for the building;
- The amenity space for the building could be reconsidered to better accommodate children;
- Artificial turf could be implemented in the amenity space, and on the upper landscaped area;

- Concerns were expressed regarding the location of the proposed amenity areas as it could result in noise issues with the adjacent units;
- Community gardens in the amenity spaces on the east and west sides of the building work well for the development;
- Utilizing retaining walls and bioswales could be an adequate way to address potential issues with drainage; and,
- In order for the applicants to acquire the additional floor space ratio (FSR) requested, further consideration of the project could be required.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Panel does not support the application for 1002, 1012, 1016 and 1020 Auckland Street subject to the comments provided.*

**CARRIED.**

David Ropell voted in opposition of this motion.

**Procedural note:** Meredith Mitchell re-entered the meeting at 5:25 p.m. and assumed the role of Chair.

**4.3 612-618 Brantford Street**

Rupinder Basi, Senior Development Planner, summarized the report dated September 27, 2016 regarding a revised design plan for an Official Community Plan amendment, Heritage Revitalization Agreement, and Development Permit for 612-618 Brantford Street.

Arthur Buse, Boldwing Continuum Architects, and Caelan Griffiths, PMG Landscape Architects, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the revised design plan.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel provided the following comments:

- The relocation of the amenity space works well with the entry canopy;
- The design of the top floor and soffit is simple and clean;
- Concerns were expressed regarding the grey metal paneling on the principle building, as it could be visually overwhelming for the structure;
- Implementing brick on the upper levels of the principle building could provide a stronger datum line;
- The structure for the rooftop may not complement the architecture of the building and could be reconsidered;
- Further activation of the rooftop area was suggested;

- Potential privacy concerns were expressed regarding private and semi-private space for the units on the south side of the principle building, as current separators are only indicated to be knee height;
- Changing the colour of the window coverings, and reconsidering the appearance of the corner windows was suggested. For example, the termination point for the windows on the corner of the principle building could provide a stronger statement;
- The red brickwork on the principle building works well with the colouring of the heritage home, and could be further utilized;
- The spacing relationship between the principle building and the heritage home is an improvement over the previous design plan;
- Implementing separate yard space for the heritage home could provide additional privacy for the heritage home;
- Removing the street frontage wall between the principle building and the heritage home provides a more visually appealing streetscape;
- Providing a stronger relationship between the principle building and the heritage home could still be explored;
- It was suggested that rather than implementing taxis between the heritage home and the principle building, a deciduous tree or shrub be considered;
- The garbage/recycling receptacle could be moved into the parking garage of the principle building to provide better accessibility and additional outdoor space for the development;
- Additional consideration regarding the views from the ground level units of the principle building was suggested;
- Implementing a pergola in front of the parking garage could be visually appealing and may work as a sound barrier for parking noise;
- Concerns were expressed regarding the implementation of a Juliette balcony in the units above the parking garage, as it could result in noise issues; and,
- The current location of the parking exit stairway in the south east corner of the building could be reconsidered.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Panel supports the project with consideration of all comments provided, especially the relationship of the ground floor to the parking level, and parking exit stair in south east corner of building, relocation of garbage/ recycling receptacle in southwest corner of site, and allocation of brick and panel materials on the elevation in consideration of the heritage building.*

**CARRIED.**

All Panel members voted in support of this motion.

**Procedural note:** David Roppel exited the meeting.



#### 4.4 100 Braid Street- Urban Academy

Rupinder Basi, Senior Development Planner, summarized the report dated September 27, 2016 regarding a Development Permit application for Urban Academy School (100 Braid Street).

Cheryle Beaumont, Urban Academy, Paul Grant, Grant Architecture Studio, Autumn Sweet, Grant Architecture Studio, and Julie Hicks, Viewpoint Landscape Architects, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the prospective plans for the project.

In response to questions from the Panel, Ms. Beaumont, Mr. Grant, Ms. Sweet and Ms. Hicks provided the following information:

- Low emission materials would be utilized, with the goal for the project being a zero-energy (net-zero) building;
- Traffic safety for students could be addressed through the development of a traffic demand management plan, implementing crossing guards during peak hours, and encouraging middle school children to utilize transit when possible. The school would also be working with the City on potential upgrades to the intersection at Braid Street and Rousseau Street;
- Bench seating would be provided by the entrance of the school;
- Irrigated area planting pockets would be implemented along Braid Street, and a bioswale would be developed on Rousseau Street;
- The sidewalk in front of the school would be two meters wide, with widened areas for bike racks and meeting areas;
- Impact resistant tiles would be implemented in the outdoor areas;
- Fencing along the upper play areas would be composed of heavy gauge chain and small mesh with black vinyl coating, and would not be climbable;
- Medium sized trees would be implemented in planter boxes on the upper level play areas. These trees would not be climbable; and,
- The lower play area on the south east corner of the school would be utilized by Kindergarten, and pre-Kindergarten students.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel provided the following comments:

- The development meets the suggested guidelines and is adequate in incorporating Rousseau Street;
- The concrete and materiality for the school is visually appealing;
- The massing for the building is appropriate given the context of the area;

- The suggested separation for pedestrians and students from the street frontage is adequate;
- Ambient heat concerns were expressed regarding the impact resistant tiles for the play areas. It was suggested that the landscape architect consider working with the manufacturer to implement a colour that produces less heat;
- Additional rain and sun coverage could be considered for the outdoor spaces on the first and second levels, as they are designed for younger children; and,
- Traffic could be an ongoing issue in this area and continued assistance from the City could be required.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Panel supports the Development Permit application for Urban Academy School (100 Braid Street) subject to the implementation of additional shelter for the outdoor spaces on the first and second floor.*

CARRIED.

All Panel members voted in support of this motion.

**5.0 NEW BUSINESS**

There were no items.

**6.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**Procedural note:** This item was discussed prior to item 1.0

**6.1 Review of start time**

Members of the Panel provided their opinions regarding the 3:00 p.m. meeting start time.

**7.0 CORRESPONDENCE**

There were no items.

**8.0 NEXT MEETING**

**8.1 Tuesday, October 25, 2016 in Council Chamber**

**9.0 ADJOURNMENT**

**ON MOTION**, the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Certified Correct,

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Meredith Mitchell**  
**Chair**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Debbie Johnstone**  
**Committee Clerk**