

## **NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL**

**Tuesday, January 27, 2015 3:00p.m.  
Committee Room No. 2**

### **MINUTES**

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Ken Falk	- AIBC Representative
Jay Hiscox	- Acting Chair, AIBC Representative (arrived at 3:24 p.m.)
Keith Ross	- BC Society of Landscape Architects
Steve Wong	- BC Society of Landscape Architects

#### **REGRETS:**

Cheryl Fu	- AIBC Representative
Doug Hamming	- AIBC Representative
Tom Morton	- Development Industry Representative (UDI)

#### **GUESTS:**

Scott Gordon	- Architect
Rebecca Coulter	- Landscape Architect
Jordan Kutev	- Architect
Vikrum Tiku	- Architect
Mary Chen Yip	- Landscape Architect
Beth Peterson	- Architect
Graham	- Architect
Bruce Hemstock	- Landscape Architect

#### **STAFF:**

Jim Hurst	- Development Planner
Barry Waitt	- Senior Planner
Michael Watson	- Planning Technician
Lauren Blake	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 3:13 p.m.

#### **1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**

##### **MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT Jay Hiscox be selected as Acting Chair for the January 27, 2015 New Westminister Design Panel meeting.*

**CARRIED.**

All members present voted in favour of the motion.

## **2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

### **2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of December 9, 2014**

#### **MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the minutes of the December 9, 2014 meeting of the 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**

### **4.1 404 Ash Street**

**DPB00022**

Michael Watson, Planning Technician, summarized the report dated January 27, 2015, regarding a Development Permit application that has been received for 404 Ash Street in order to construct a four storey building with 38 residential units over one level of below grade parking. Mr. Watson noted that the Brow of the Hill Residents' Association made comments regarding the orientation of the proposed development to the street. In response the applicant has added entry doors and access walkways for units at grade.

Scott Gordon, Architect, provided a presentation regarding the architectural development of the proposed building as summarized in the report dated January 27, 2015.

Rebecca Colter, Landscape Architect, spoke to the proposed project landscaping as outlined in the report dated January 27, 2015.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments:

- The project would be a positive addition to the Brow of the Hill neighbourhood;
- The street-level front doors provide a connection to the streetscape and create an inviting project;
- It was suggested that a more honest material, such as an authentic stone veneer be utilized for the front entrance;
- It was suggested that the concrete patios located on the north lawn be extended for additional durability;
- It was suggested that attention be paid to the distances between roofing systems and their interface;

- The roof appears complicated for a small building, and it was suggested that the higher roof be simplified; and,
- It was suggested that the material and colour scheme be simplified.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Panel support the project as presented.*

**CARRIED.**

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

**4.2 129 Tenth Street**

**REZ00085**

**DPB00019**

Jim Hurst, Development Planner, summarized the report dated January 27, 2015, regarding a Rezoning and Development Permit application that has been received for 129 Tenth Street in order to develop an eight unit townhouse. Mr. Hurst advised that the Engineering department has reviewed the vehicular access to the project, and it will remain from McInnes Street.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Hurst advised that there is no specific zoning for urban townhome projects.

Jordan Kutev, Architect, and Vikrum Tiku, Architect, summarized the report dated January 27, 2015.

Mary Chen Yip, Landscape Architect, spoke to the landscaping of the project as outlined in the report dated January 27, 2015.

In response to questions from the Panel, the Mr. Kutev advised that the requested setbacks are required to accommodate the parking ramp.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments:

- The setback on Tenth Street is well handled with the landscaping, but requires additional space;
- The parking ramp could be better integrated into the architecture;
- It was suggested that a gate be implemented on Tenth Street instead of a door to provide improved transparency and air flow, and could be appear more decorative;
- It was suggested that a vine treatment be implemented along Tenth Street;
- It was suggested that a low gate be implemented at the parking entrance as an additional safety precaution, as well as provide definition to the edge of the project; and,
- The design of the courtyard could include window and balcony placement to address the lack of space in the courtyard.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the project be presented again for further review; and,*

*THAT the applicant address the design and the width of the courtyard and the 10<sup>th</sup> Street setback to improve the liveability of the units.*

**CARRIED.**

Ken Falk voted in opposition.

**4.3 811 Columbia Street – New Westminster SkyTrain Station upgradesSDP00201**

**Procedural note:** Item 4.3 was discussed first.

Barry Waitt, Senior Planner, summarized the report dated January 27, 2015, regarding a Special Development Permit application that has been received for the upgrading of the New Westminster SkyTrain Station.

Beth Peterson, Architect, summarized the memo dated January 13, 2015, and spoke to the project as outlined in the report dated January 27, 2015.

Ms. Peterson advised that the funds for the project have been contributed by the Provincial and Federal governments, as well as TransLink's operating budget, noting that the funds must be utilized by a deadline. The funds must be allocated towards upgrading the following categories:

- Acoustics;
- Lighting;
- Visibility;
- Vertical conveyance; and,
- Public Art.

The Panel noted that while TransLink has achieved its stated requirements for the project, the Panel's mandate is to represent the community, and provide comments regarding the public domain of the project.

With respect to the stated scope of the work, the Panel appreciated the proposed upgrades and improved aesthetics; however, the Panel expressed disappointment that the scope does not include addressing the sound impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood or the Eighth Street entrance, as these elements would assist with the integration of the station's public interface.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted that small measures could be implemented to address the concerns outlined at the November 25, 2014 meeting, and that the long-term public role of the station, including the public interface, must be considered.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Panel does not support the project as per the comments noted at the November 25, 2014 meeting.*

**DEFEATED.**

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Panel support the project as presented with regret that the applicant is unable to address the design issues such as the plaza and integrating the project into the streetscape.*

**DEFEATED.**

**4.4 900 Carnarvon Street**

**REZ00080  
SDP00190**

Barry Waitt, Senior Planner, summarized the report dated January 27, 2015, regarding a Rezoning and Special Development Permit application that has been received for 900 Carnarvon Street in order to develop a 398 residential rental units and 4,531 square feet commercial 38 storey tower. Mr. Waitt clarified that the building is 38 storeys, and not 37 storeys as stated in the report, and that the sustainability report card included in the report is outdated.

Graham McGarva, Architect, spoke to the report dated January 27, 2015.

Bruce Hemstock, Landscape Architect, spoke to the landscaping of the project as outlined in the report dated January 27, 2015 and provided the following additional details:

- In addition to a planted buffer along Columbia Street and Stewardson Way, glass panels with historic photos of New Westminster would provide further buffering;
- The plaza located at Tenth Street and Columbia Street would provide an active seating space, and as well provide additional separation between the project and street traffic; and,
- The water element would provide direction and anchor the corner of the plaza, as well as provide animation to the space.

In response to questions from the Panel, the following information was provided:

- The setbacks on Carnarvon Street provide connections to the retail space;
- There would not be a connection from the project to the McInnes street overpass;
- Studio units are provided with built-in furniture to maximize the space;
- There is a glazing ratio of 47%, and the project is exploring air to water hydronic heating methods to minimize heat gains, as well as providing corner windows, where possible;

- The historical photograph on the retail frontage would be a permanent installation and the applicant would be responsible for its maintenance; and,
- The building has a unique expression due to the geometry of the site, and it was a conscious decision to embrace the strong, slab-like form to create a brave, bold and iconic building.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments:

- The ordering of the levels of the buildings does not relate to the surrounding buildings;
- It was suggested that the tower relate better to the existing Plaza 88 towers;
- It was suggested that the tower be designed taller and more slender;
- The scale and bulk of the project requires additional attention;
- It was suggested that parts of the parkade be open to reveal its function;
- The landscaping surrounding the podium requires the same emphasis as the nose of the project;
- The plaza is integrated well into the streetscape, especially along Carnarvon Street;
- It was noted that the water feature in the plaza must be well maintained;
- The treatment of the podium above the plaza requires additional work;
- The view from the McInnes Street overpass to the project requires additional review;
- The massing and shape of the project from Columbia Street requires a better expression as seen from the ground plane;
- The residential entrance is not well-defined;
- Concerns were expressed for the effect of the glass panels as viewed from Columbia Street;
- Concerns were expressed for the relationship of the podium with respect to the pedestrian experience;
- The appearance of the podium from Tenth Street requires additional work; and,
- It was suggested that the podium could be broken down into smaller modules or with different finishes.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Panel request to see the project again with particular attention paid to:*

- *The public space and plaza interface and how they relate to each other;*
- *The podium and its relationship to the tower massing; and,*
- *The expression of form and the massing in the tower element.*

**CARRIED.**

All members of the Panel present voted in favour of the 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**

**February 24, 2015 (in Committee Room No. 2)**

**9.0 ADJOURNMENT**

**ON MOTION**, the meeting was adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

Certified Correct,

---

**Jay Hiscox**  
**Acting Chair**

---

**Lauren Blake**  
**Committee Clerk**