

## **NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL**

**Tuesday, June 23, 2015 3:00 p.m.**  
**Committee Room No. 2**

### **MINUTES**

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Doug Hamming	- Chair, AIBC Representative
Robert Duke	- AIBC Representative
Meredith Mitchell	- BC Society of Landscape Architects
David Roppel	- Development Industry Representative (UDI)

#### **REGRETS:**

Jay Hiscox	- AIBC Representative
Donald Andrew	- AIBC Representative
Maria Fish	- BC Society of Landscape Architects

#### **GUESTS:**

Jordan Kutev	- Jordan Kutev Architect, Inc.
Vikram Tiku	- Jordan Kutev Architect, Inc.
Doru Cornescu	- CCI Group
Taizo Yamamoto	- Yamamoto Architecture Inc.
Florian Fisch	- DK Landscape Architecture
Jason Newton	- Onni Group

#### **STAFF:**

Jim Hurst	- Development Planner
Barry Waitt	- Senior Planner
Lauren Blake	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m.

### **1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**

There were no additions.

## **2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

### **2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of April 28, 2015**

#### **MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the April 28, 2015 New Westminster Design Panel minutes be adopted.*

**CARRIED.**

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

## **3.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION**

There were no items.

## **4.0 DESIGN REVIEWS**

### **4.1 129 Tenth Street**

**REZ00085  
DPB00019**

Jim Hurst, Development Planner, summarized the report dated June 23, 2015, regarding rezoning and development permit applications that have been received to rezone the property at 129 Tenth Street in order to allow an eight unit townhouse development.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Hurst advised that the City would consider allowing the applicant to plant a trellis or vine along the boulevard to soften the appearance of the concrete wall. Mr. Hurst noted that the City has requested that the applicant retain as much of the heritage stone wall as possible.

Jordan Kutev and Vikram Tiku, Jordan Kutev Architect Inc., provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the project as outlined in the report dated June 23, 2015.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Kutev and Mr. Tiku provided the following information:

- The vehicle access gate would be a swing gate;
- Visitors must be provided access to the underground parking via interphone;
- The stair access to the parkade would be an exit-only stair;
- Visitors would be required to be buzzed in to be able to utilize the stair access to the parkade.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel expressed support for the proposed setbacks, variances and the situation of the building on the site. The Panel commended the applicant for the reorganization of the units to provide additional private space. The Panel noted the following additional suggestions:

- That the picnic table in the courtyard be removed and utilized as a patio space;

- That the units be provided more of a townhouse feel with individual entrances and private space;
- That the stair access along Tenth Street does not appear inviting and does not provide eyes on the street;
- That a different material be utilized for the walkway to Unit 8;
- That the concrete of the entrance be reduced, and a mesh material be utilized; and,
- That the second retaining wall be eliminated to allow for additional landscaping.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Panel support the project subject to:*

- *Additional confirmation regarding the landscaping, including materials to be used, the height of the retaining wall and adequate soil depth;*
- *Additional attention for guest way-finding; and,*
- *Consideration for modification of the 10<sup>th</sup> Street Entrance.*

**CARRIED.**

David Roppel voted in opposition to the motion.

**4.2 31 Elliot Street**

**DPD00143**

Barry Waitt, Senior Planner, summarized the report dated June 23, 2015, regarding a Development Permit application that has been received to allow for the replacement of windows and sliding doors and balcony enclosures.

Doru Cornescu, Building Envelope Consultant, CCI Group, summarized the project as outlined in the report dated June 23, 2015.

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

- The proposal would address building and fire code issues;
- The pattern of the open and closed balconies was determined in order to maximize the view from each unit;
- The proposal would address exterior painting, the waterproof membrane of balconies, drainage system, as well as the implementation of new sliding doors and windows;
- The building would upgrade the landscaping; and,
- There would be a different configuration at the penthouse level as there are only three units per floor.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT Panel approve the project as presented.*

**CARRIED.**

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

### 4.3 26 East Royal Avenue

DPW00012

Barry Waitt, Senior Planner, summarized the report dated June 23, 2015, regarding a Development Permit application that has been received for 26 East Royal Avenue in order to develop a 4 storey mixed use commercial and multi-unit residential building.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Waitt advised that the project has been designed at four storeys due to feedback from Victoria Hill residents.

Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architecture Inc., provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining the details of the project as outlined in the report dated June 23, 2015.

Florian Fisch, DK Landscape Architecture, spoke to the landscaping of the project as outlined in the report dated June 23, 2015.

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

- The canopy detail would be steel and glass;
- The decorative water feature called the “runnel” would be expressed with a different paving surface that would wind through the plaza; and,
- The round planters in the central plaza would be concrete with wooden seating.

Discussion ensued, and the Panel noted the following comments:

- The commercial space is in a good location and would be visible from Royal Avenue;
- The exit stair from the Plaza appears to be large and interrupting;
- It was suggested that additional flat surfaces be utilized to allow the plaza to be more flexible in its use;
- It was suggested that the “runnel” could collect water and funnel it into a garden;
- It was suggested that there could be a better connection between the project and Parcel C;
- The landscaping fits with the character of the neighbourhood;
- It was suggested that the planters be tall enough to ensure adequate soil depth;
- It was suggested that additional commercial space be implemented along the mews to provide activation for the space;
- It was suggested that the amenity space could be extended to provide additional “eyes on the street”;
- Concerns were expressed with respect to mobility issues in the plaza, including the presence of the runnel;
- The circular planters do not seem to fit with the character of the project, and could act as a barrier to the plaza;
- It was suggested that the landing for the plaza stairs be increased and provided with seating;

- It was suggested that there be a stronger separation between the private and public space;
- It was suggested that commercial space be implemented on both sides of the project to attract pedestrians to the plaza;
- It was suggested that there be some community focus in the landscaping; and,
- It was suggested that the plaza requires additional design development.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the project return to the Panel with consideration made for the design of the plaza and the East and West entries.*

**CARRIED.**

Robert Duke voted in opposition 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**

**July 28, 2015 (in Committee Room No. 2)**

**9.0 ADJOURNMENT**

**ON MOTION**, the meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Certified Correct,

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Doug Hamming**  
 Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Lauren Blake**  
 Committee Clerk