



NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL

Tuesday, December 12, 2017, 3:00p.m.

Committee Room #2

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 (Arrived 3:13pm)
Craig West	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative

REGRETS:

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

GUESTS:

Joanna Bieska	- SUVA Architecture
Denitsa Dimitrova	- PMG Landscape Architects
Keith Koroluk	- Keith Koroluk Landscape Architect
Tim Orr	- Orr Developments
John Saliken	- SUVA Architecture
David Stoyko	- Connect Landscape Architecture
Denis Turco	- Denis Turco Architect Inc
Taizo Yamamoto	- Yamamoto Architecture Inc.

STAFF:

Rupinder Basi	- Senior Planner
Heather Corbett	- Committee Clerk

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

1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT items 4.4 (118 Royal Avenue) and 4.5 (215 Mowat Street) be removed from the agenda; and,

THAT the agenda be approved as amended.

CARRIED.

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

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of November 28, 2017

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the November 28, 2017 New Westminster 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

4.1 616/640 Sixth Street

**DPU00065
REZ00147**

Rupinder Basi, Development Planner, summarized the report dated December 12, 2017, regarding a Rezoning and Development Permit application to allow a 29 storey development consisting of 158 market strata units, 79 market rental housing units and 20,472 sq. metres of commercial retail space at 616/640 Sixth Street.

Mr. Basi reviewed the location of the site, the land use proposal for the project, and the considerations that the Design Panel was asked to evaluate.

Mr. Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architecture Inc. and Mr. David Stoyko, Connect Landscape Architecture, provided a presentation in which they reviewed the following:

- Site context, including the proposed tower and public plaza;
- Shadow studies and view analysis, including overlook and minimum distance from neighbouring towers;
- Design rationale, including massing and the tower/podium relationship to the street;
- Site circulation routes and retail frontage, including loading and parking access routes;
- Building design, showing precedent images of the desired simple, modern approach, with clean form;
- Tower materiality, including details of the balconies and glazing materials;
- Site plan, including parking levels, residential/retail levels, roof levels, and streetscape context;
- Elevation drawings and renderings from all directions, including frontages and lobby entrance; and,
- Landscape details, including a bird's eye view, landscape context, features, materials, streetscape and street activation proposal.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Yamamoto and Mr. Stoyko provided the following information:

- The glazing would have a frit pattern with a progression from 0 to 100% from the bottom to the top of the building, and the pattern is still to be confirmed;
- The tan concrete board form would be on the base of the building;
- A curtain wall would occur at the ground level with a window wall above;
- There would be concrete at the top of the elevator overrun;
- The metal mesh screens would be an extension of the balcony screen that extends beyond the top of the building, primarily on the two ends and at the top;
- No sample was available of the mesh material being used;
- The retail canopy would be white with glass;
- The material above the storefront canopy would be clear glass, with inserts for ventilation;
- The green screen would be composed of a cable system that would sit at a foot out from the glazing;
- The green screen plants are proposed to climb up the cables and provide a level of transparency;
- The green screen would be approximately 2.5 storeys tall, with a thick planting area at the top and vines to grow from the bottom;
- The green screen wall has some western exposure and will include a diversity of vines so there will be coverage in terms of temperature and growth rates;
- The developer plans to deal with the City in terms of assessing the neighbouring trees on all sides of the building;
- The trees on Seventh Avenue would be in tree grates in the sidewalk as they exist there presently;
- The covered walkway would wrap around the retail and extend to approximately 6 feet deep;
- The patios on the towers are private for the penthouses;
- The property line on the north west side will remain as it is presently, with the addition of a fence;
- CPTED concerns have been addressed in the rear loading area through the overlook by the proposed second and third floor units on the west edge of the building;
- The loading area would be covered by a metal trellis overtop, and would have a gate;
- The north side of the loading area is where an outdoor extension of the indoor amenity would be located;
- There would be two bedrooms that look out towards the Royal City Centre(RCC) ramp, and an additional four units that have been setback in order to minimize the ramp view;
- There was no data available at the time of the meeting for how often the RCC ramp is used;

- The tree rhythm on Sixth Street is intentional in order to work with the breaks at the retail units; and,
- The three level podium was designed as per the OCP direction.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments in relation to each of the questions asked in the December 12, 2017 staff report:

Question 1: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the design and materiality of the proposed tower and how it addresses the draft Iconic Principles and OCP DPA guidelines in order to provide for an elegant design that will contribute positively towards the New Westminster skyline.

- In general, the building meets the OCP intention – it is well thought out in terms of materiality and urban design; it addresses the iconic principles and design guidelines, and demonstrates architectural creativity;
- Appreciation was expressed for the proposed tower in terms of its massing, slenderness, and slip;
- Appreciation was expressed for the transition of the glass up the building, however further detailing on the execution of the glazing, guards and railings would be useful;
- The massing diagram provides a better illustration than the elevation drawing of the screening that wraps around the top of building, however it may be worthwhile reconciling the mix of glass and metal for an improved end result;
- The idea of ‘ghosting’ at the top could work well, however it may be worthwhile testing out what this would look like in terms of perforation;
- The white horizontal railings are very striking and could possibly be muted so that they do not stand out as much; and,
- Appreciation was expressed for the landscape design, materiality, and paving choices.

Question 2: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to how this proposal addresses Seventh Avenue and the Crosstown Greenway.

- On Seventh Avenue, ensure that the sidewalk width is adequate and usable;
- The relationship between the bike lane and the site works well; and,
- Consider investigating a change in grade level to distinguish the bike lane from the street parking areas.

Question 3: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the grade-level commercial units and how they address the streetscape along Sixth Street (Great Street), Princess Avenue, and Seventh Avenue (Crosstown Greenway).

- The project could benefit from additional lower planting to differentiate between the retail units and the sidewalk, in order to keep the area relatively open and inviting, but to keep a separation between the uses;
- Adding bike racks to the drawings would be beneficial, if the intention is to provide them;
- Consider adding more street trees to the planting plan on Sixth Street and additional seating along the Sixth Street edge;

- Consider softening the relationship between the vertical piers and the horizontal balconies above; and,
- The podium feels a little monotonous and could use more variation along the residential elevation.

Question 4: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the proposed privately-owned, publically accessible plaza that is proposed at the corner of Sixth Street and Seventh Avenue.

- The plaza area is a generous size and works well with the adjacent amenity area;
- If a regular activation of the public plaza (eg with market stalls) does not come to fruition, the area may remain very empty;
- Explore finding a balance between providing opportunity for events and providing permanent seating, planting and lighting;
- Activating the plaza space could be very seasonal, therefore adding elements such as seating and greenery may draw the public into the space at all times of year; and,
- The location of the amenity space near the entry provides a good opportunity for activation along the site edge.

Question 5: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the proposed ground-level indoor amenity area and the proposed green wall and how this interfaces with Seventh Avenue (Crosstown Greenway).

- The ground level indoor amenity area has the potential to be very nice if the proposed vines are successfully grown and area able to flourish;
- Ensure that the green screen glass will be easily cleaned; and,
- Variation in the green screen planting will likely help with filling out the wall, but it may take some time.

Further general comments were noted by the Design Panel:

- Overall, the proposed tower is well-conceived;
- Appreciation was expressed for the attention to details in the package and presentation;
- Consider resolving the residential lobby space as it appears to be a very tight space, which is recessed and not prominent enough;
- Look at adding additional seating in the lobby entrance so that it appears more inviting;
- The black cladding lands bluntly and it may be worthwhile terminating it at the retail level to demarcate the lobby location;
- Consider providing larger units on the west side of the building where there are large balconies, as these could be ideal for family-oriented uses;
- Consider working with the City in regards to ensuring that the existing trees to the West of the building will survive, and possibly provide more planting in order to screen the RCC ramp from the adjacent units, as the RCC ramp can be very loud and disruptive;

- In the loading area, consider adding some planting and paving to follow the lines of the building so there is some variation when looking down onto the area;
- At the podium level, the larger deck spaces could be filled with more planting;
- At level four, some of the areas adjacent to the community planters seem rather bare and could use more seating or planting;
- The seating area near the fire pit is located near to a third bedroom, so it would be worthwhile to consider screening or reorienting the seating in this area; and,
- Consider adding some privacy screening near the residential unit which is adjacent to the amenity space.

MOVED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel support the project, with consideration of the comments.

NOT SECONDED.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel support the project and have the applicant work with Staff to reconsider the residential lobby, the plaza at the corner and the podium.

CARRIED.

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

4.2 228 and 232 Sixth Street

**DPU00054
REZ00109**

Rupinder Basi, Senior Planner, summarized the report dated December 12, 2017, regarding a Rezoning and Development Permit application to allow a six storey mid-rise development, comprised of 53 residential units and a two-level underground parkade, at 228 and 232 Sixth Street. The application was reviewed as a pre-application at the June meeting and the proponents have since updated the design.

Mr. Basi reviewed the location of the site, the land use proposal for the project, and the considerations that the Design Panel was asked to evaluate.

Mr. Denis Turco, Denis Turco Architect Inc., and Mr. Keith Koroluk, Keith Koroluk Landscape Architect, provided a presentation in which they reviewed the development as a whole, and summarized the changes that had been made to development in response to the Design Panel's last review of the project, including:

- Elimination of the solariums and the addition of screening details on the balconies;
- Reduction of the podium and concrete wall;

- Reconsideration of the materials throughout;
- Changes to the roof structure;
- Changes to the amenity room and the accessibility of units; and,
- Changes and additions in regards to landscaping, walkways and public areas.

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

- Townhouses have been included in this development in lieu of commercial and to meet the City's requirements for family friendly housing;
- This project was started prior to the OCP being adopted, so it is in a unique situation in that the previous guidelines apply, however the proponents are applying the new guidelines to the fullest extent possible;
- The height of the building meets the C3A zoning in that it requires a step back above the third level; and,
- The concept of the stacked bicycle lockers is currently being reviewed with the City's transportation department

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

- The townhomes are distinguishable from the rest of building through the introduction of a continuous wood band and darker colours on the bottom which provide separations and emphasize the contrast between the two parts of the building;
- The material on the underside of the third floor balconies would be longboard;
- The plant material in the fiberglass planters is a Taxus yew hedge;
- The balcony glass is intended to be clear, although translucent glass could be considered;
- The entry feature material is intended to be Glulam;
- On Welsh Street, the concrete wall would be four feet at its highest point by the parkade;
- The fence on the roof would replicate the cedar fence on the lower level and be composed of a metal structure with wood slats;
- The balcony screens on Sixth Street are not continued on the Welsh Street side of the building, as privacy is not as big an issue, but they could be considered;
- The townhouse units on Sixth Street do not have access to the elevator;
- A 3D study of the site has not been included in the revised package, however the street view elevation shows the context;
- The green screen will be backed by a dark mesh-like material which would provide privacy in case the planting does not succeed; and,
- A variation of vines will be planted in the green screen area to ensure variety.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments in relation to each of the questions asked in the December 12, 2017 staff report:

Question 1: Staff would like to obtain further feedback from the NWDP in regards to 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.

- The proposed setback along Sixth Street will be suitable, provided that outside spaces and landscaping along the site edge will be sufficient enough to activate the space;
- Appreciation was expressed for the entrance structure, however this could be enhanced even further;
- The reorientation of the townhouse entrances in this design is more successful;
- The transition of the public/private space through the addition of screening on the patios is more successful;
- The added planting improves the site, however further consideration to the guidelines in regards to materials may be appropriate; and,
- Further consideration to the entry of Townhouse 2 may be appropriate as it appears to look directly in to the bedroom of the unit.

Question 2: Staff would like to obtain further feedback from the NWDP in regards to the overall scale, massing, and proposed materials of this proposal and how the development fits with the size of the property and the surrounding neighbourhood context.

- The stepping at the upper most level of the West corner of the building is appreciated, however there could be a clearer setback at the top of the building to reduce proximity issues of the overhang of the roof;
- Breaking up the line of the roof element may be beneficial to reflect the massing;
- An increase in articulation on the Welsh Street side near the corner would be beneficial;
- Two of the townhouses are 1 bedroom units and two are townhouses which face onto Sixth Street, and therefore may not be appropriately deemed family friendly;
- Comments on the proposed materials included:
 - The proposed material palette will provide warm elements through the use of the longboard for screens and soffits;
 - (The Panel had mixed opinions on whether the longboard was a successful material for the building cladding and soffits);
 - Consider turning the corner and extending the longboard cladding and balcony screening to Welsh Street to provide continuity and additional variation;
 - Once installed, the Hardie board panels may change the appearance of the building from how it is indicated in the drawings;
 - Consider revising the use of white windows against dark cladding;

- Consider revising the use of longboard as the distinguishing feature between the townhouses and the rest of the building massing, as per the guidelines;
- Appreciation was expressed for the added paving provided on the Welsh Street side; and,
- Consider adding a green screen between the adjacent tower and the dog relief area on the podium level and near the amenity area.

Question 3: Staff would like to obtain further feedback 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.

- The change of cladding colour and the wood strip that runs along the perimeter has provided definition.

Question 4: Staff seeks further 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.

- It appears that the setbacks provided at the upper levels of the North and West sides of the site will be sufficient in terms of proximity to the adjacent site;
- The finish of the inside face of the concrete block wall could be softened at the first two levels; and,
- Provide for maintenance and irrigation of planting if they are to be located in private patios.

Question 5: Staff seeks further 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).

- Consider revising the individual townhouse entries to be more visible and well identified, as per the guidelines;
- The canopy helps to distinguish the residential lobby entrance from the ground floor units, however the glazing is the same proportion as the units and detracts from the identification of the entryway; and,
- Consider breaking up the long length and improving the visual connection to the street and to the townhouse entries on the South (Welsh) edge of the site through the use of materials, such as a glazed guard rail or variation in planting.

Further general comments were noted by the Design Panel:

- Clearer planting plans would be helpful as the print is small and they are difficult to read;
- It may be worthwhile considering some variation of roof line;
- Consider pulling Unit J1 back in order to reduce proximity between the living spaces of Units J1 and J2;

- Consider the separation between the parking and the F townhouse unit as there is little mediation between the parking and bedroom in terms of lighting and exhaust;
- Reconsider the configuration of the B and C townhouse units as they look into an elbow which would provide very little light, air and privacy;
- The amenity area at the North of the building appears small and does not take advantage of the space on NW corner of the building;
- It appears that all of the visitor parking is for small cars – it would be important for this to be reviewed by the City;
- If townhouses are meant to be family oriented, it would be worthwhile adding a children’s amenity or playful element to make it more it more friendly and a destination for children;
- Consider adding a separation or alleyway between the vegetable garden boxes to increase access to all sides;
- Irrigation will help with the planting in the fiberglass planters but will be an ongoing maintenance issue;
- Consider removing Hedera Helix (English Ivy) as it is considered an invasive species in New Westminster and Boston or Baltic Ivy may be better choices; and,
- The inside north elevation will be visible from neighbouring tower and more articulation may need to be considered.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel support the project submission for acceptance, subject to the Panel’s comments in terms of the following considerations:

- *Further develop lobby entry and townhouse expression;*
- *Review expression of roof line to break up the building massing;*
- *Review detailing of window framing and Hardie joinery;*
- *Develop the Welsh Street elevations on the building, in terms of the connection to the street and articulation of planting;*
- *Consider family-friendly layouts for townhouse units, as well as related amenity space;*
- *Consider a change in Ivy planting; and,*
- *Consider interior elevations.*

DEFEATED.

All members of the Panel present voted in opposition to the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the project returns for review by the New Westminster Design Panel with above comments addressed.

CARRIED.

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

Procedural Note: Meredith Mitchell recused herself due to a conflict of interest.

Rupinder Basi, Senior Planner, summarized the report dated December 12, 2017, regarding a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow a six-storey, mixed use development project with 80 secured market rental housing units, retail space at grade and office space on the second storey, at 406 – 412 East Columbia Street, with total FSR of 4.52.

Mr. Basi informed the panel that since their last review of this project in September, the proponents had secured an additional site to the south, which allowed for an increase in the amount of rental units proposed. As well, Mr. Basi reviewed the questions that the Design Panel were asked to address, and highlighted the following:

- This development supports the City's IDEA Centre initiative; and,
- It is recognized that this applicant submitted their proposal before the implementation of the OCP, and its associated design guidelines, and they have been asked to address the design guidelines as much as possible.

John Saliken and Joanna Bieska, SUVA Architecture, provided a presentation summarizing details of the expanded building proposal, as outlined in Appendix A in the agenda package, covering the revised project context and details, elevation drawings, floor plans, cross-sections, landscaping details, shadow studies and parking plans. Mr. Saliken and Denitsa Dimitrova, PMG Landscape Architects, also reviewed the changes made in response to the Design Panel's comments at the September meeting, which include:

- Potential for expansion of canopies if the City agrees to an easement;
- Addition of parapets to break up roofline;
- Addition of a vertical element to break up horizontal line of building;
- Rear elevation changes, including:
 - Addition of an enhanced screen;
 - Lower wall to be painted in a lighter colour;
 - Exit stairwell has been incorporated into the building and enclosed;
 - Wood lattice has been incorporated to cover garbage area;
 - Electrical box has been removed;
- Addition of a second elevator and a second loading bay;
- Addition of a ground floor amenity space;
- Roof terrace amenity space and landscaping changes, including:
 - Integration of planting;
 - Dog relief area removed;
 - Addition of BBQ area with dining and lounge areas;
 - Addition of a community garden area;
 - Addition of two storage areas;
 - Addition of a small play area and bench seating;
 - Addition of a trellis structure for shaded area with bench; and,
 - Changes to the Streetscape, including the addition of planters and bike racks.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Saliken and Ms. Dimitrova provided the following information:

- All of the windows on the front elevations are planned to be white;
- The aluminum on the front storefront elevations are planned to be bronze;
- The wall behind the balcony is planned as stucco and the balcony is planned as glass;
- The bottom two feet of glass on the balconies would be translucent and the top would be transparent;
- Although depicted in the elevation drawing, the balcony glass is not planned to step in;
- The corners and edges showing as made from Hardie will be completed using best practice;
- The two elevators would be used by all users of the building, including residents, office residents and commercial users, with a fob system;
- The empty space present at the Southwest corner of the building, on East Columbia, is because the building has been pulled back by four feet to allow light to the windows of the adjacent Elizabeth Fry building;
- The “dead zone” that is created at the southwest corner could be fenced off;
- The strong arched entrance as referred to in the Great Street Overview is on the northwest corner, or far left, of the building;
- The windowless bedrooms have been designed for the units because the objective of the development is to maximize the amount of low cost rental units, and light will be brought in from the living room;
- The protective canopy is planned as steel, because glass gets very dirty, and because the canopy is currently planned as high up and not deep, and therefore would not block light;
- If the City agrees to an expanded canopy depth along East Columbia, this would be incorporated in the design;
- The current planned depth of the canopy is 3.2 feet;
- The building would be stepped back by four feet along the south elevation, where the adjacent building’s windows are present;
- The treatment of the parking surface is planned as asphalt;
- All references to wood are intended to represent Hardie board with painted effect;
- The area above the windows and doors of the retail space would be made of stucco, with the intention for tenants to add their own signage;
- The rear elevation does not have added parapets but this is an addition that could be considered;
- The sidewalk will be built as per the City standard and subject to Engineering review; and,
- The planting on the rooftop amenity appears formal because fiberglass planters are being used, although it would be possible to use curved planters.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments in relation to each of the questions asked in the December 12, 2017 Staff report:

Question 1: Staff would like to get feedback from the NWDP in regards to the proposed building separation between the expanded building and 402 E. Columbia Street (building to the south) given the presence of existing windows.

- It was noted that while a setback has been provided, a “dead zone” or void has been created which looks like a walkway and it may be an idea to provide planting or fencing in the space to avoid CPTED issues and collection of garbage in the space; and,
- Further demonstration is needed of how the relationship with the Elizabeth Fry building would be resolved, as well as how the proposed building will impact the existing Elizabeth Fry windows.

Question 2 (from September meeting): Staff would like to obtain preliminary feedback from the NWDP in regards improving the relationship of the proposed building to East Columbia Street while at the same time ensuring a suitable setback for the upper levels of the building (above the second floor office level)

- The massing on E. Columbia is generally agreeable as stepping in and out has been provided; and,
- An increase in planters or more depth along the retail frontages could be provided.

Question 3 (from September meeting): 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.

- The building will be very large for East Columbia in its existing state, however it may fit better down the road if the City’s OCP plans come to fruition;
- With respect to the livability of the residential units and no provision of windows, some units will be challenged to have access to light, fresh air and privacy
- Further consideration of how air circulation in the units will occur is suggested;
- Some consideration to widening the units is suggested in order to improve livability; and,
- With opaque glass being provided at the bottom of the balconies, and clear above, screening may be beneficial for providing privacy between adjacent units;
- Consider exploring different materials that would allow for sharp corners, such as aluminum, as it is not clear whether the Hardie product will be the best product for a wood appearance material at this scale.

Question 4 (from September meeting): Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to how the ground-level commercial and second level office are defined so that they stand out from the upper levels of the proposed building.

- Appreciation was expressed for the articulation of the roofline through the use of parapets; and,
- Give further consideration to two separate elevators – one for the office level and one for the residential tenants.

Question 5 (from September meeting): Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to proposed vertical and horizontal design elements and how these contribute to the overall design of the building. Staff also seeks input in regards to how the residential and office entry is defined from the rest of the building/commercial retail units at grade.

- The vertical near the entrance is somewhat heavy, however overall appreciation was expressed for the variation of horizontal versus vertical on the front elevation;
- The addition of the black verticals is positive in terms of articulation, however it was felt that the two wood grain vertical elements conflict with the horizontal elements;
- On the front elevation, some elements were more successful in the original iteration in terms of how the second floor was contained in a portal; and,
- In the new black vertical element, consider a review of the relationship and overhang of the top two-storey form over the bottom two-storey form.

Question 6 (from September meeting): Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to how this proposal addresses the streetscape along East Columbia Street (Great Street) in regards to providing a vibrant, animated, and pedestrian-oriented streetscape.

- Consideration of extending the canopy coverage and changing the material to glass is strongly advised;
- The entry is perhaps not as delineated as it could be – this could be solved through further breaking-up along the retail edge and a variation in material;
- Appreciation was expressed for the active retail entrances which will provide for a vibrant and animated streetscape;
- It was noted that without canopy plans, furniture design, and signage details, it is difficult to discern how the proposal addresses the Great Street design guidelines;
- The owner could consider providing a definition or strategy for the retail signage areas in order for tenants to understand and be consistent with the overall building design; and,
- Consider a more commercial material for the retail signage areas than stucco.

Question 7 (from September meeting): Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the design of the rear elevation of the building.

- No comments mentioned.

Question 8 (from September meeting): Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the proposed rear setback of the building (at lower and upper levels).

- No comments mentioned.

Question 9 (from September meeting): Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to how the design of the building addresses privacy concerns (given that the building will be facing rear yards), and potential sun and shape impacts of the six storey form.

- Greater articulation at the base versus the upper parts of the rear elevation could be worthwhile;
- Consider additional stepping of the building to give relief to the single family houses to the rear and in order to prevent overshadowing;
- While the design addresses the OCP setback requirements and allowance for six storeys, it does not demonstrate how the potential overshadowing of the neighbouring residential properties has been addressed; and,
- Appreciation was expressed for the variation in materials at the rear elevation; however it is still a very overbearing structure.

Further general comments were noted by the Design Panel as follows:

- Appreciation was given for the addition of the indoor amenity space;
- Ensure that the materials and colour scheme are indicated very clearly in the drawings and are reflected in the renderings;
- The ground floor retail floor plans are hard to read;
- The volume of the mechanical equipment does not appear to be represented in the 3D rendering – this would be important to include with respect to how it will be screened off from the rooftop amenity space; and,
- The treatment of the south elevation has not been shown in the drawings – this would be helpful in order to get an idea of the inset windows from the street.

MOVED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel support the design and for the proponents to resolve the following items with the Planning Department:

- *Further articulation on the lobby entrance;*
- *Canopy coverage to be 2 metres and to consider glass;*
- *Consider articulation of rear roofline and elevations and consider overshadowing of residential properties at rear with possible stepping;*
- *Elizabeth Fry proximity and elevations to be resolved;*
- *Great Street articulation to be further resolved, including stucco finish, street furniture and signage guidelines; and,*
- *Vertical to horizontal expression to be resolved.*

NOT SECONDED.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the project return for review by the New Westminster Design Panel with general comments resolved.

CARRIED.

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

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

The Design Panel members discussed the following points with Staff in relation to the presentations that are given by the project applicants:

- For new projects to be reviewed, ask applicants to focus their presentations on the staff questions and how these have been addressed;
- For the projects that return for review by the panel, ask applicants to focus on the changes that have been made;
- Enforcing a time limit on presentations may be useful, with consideration to the scale of the project being examined;
- Models are useful, whether in digital 3D or physical.

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, January 23, 2017, in Council Chambers.

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting was adjourned at 6:32 p.m.

Certified Correct,

Chris Block
Chair

Heather Corbett
Committee Clerk