



NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL

Tuesday, April 24, 2018, 3:00 p.m.
Council Chamber, City Hall

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chris Block	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
Sarah Siegel	- BC Society of Landscape Architects
Joey Stevens	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
Craig West	- Vice-Chair, Architectural Institute of BC Representative

REGRETS:

Meredith Mitchell	- Chair, BC Society of Landscape Architects
Derek Newby	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
David Roppel	- Development Industry Representative

GUESTS:

Alex Chang	- Morrison Hershfield Ltd.
Shanelle Currie	- Morrison Hershfield Ltd.
Ron Hart	- Ron Hart Architect Ltd.
Kristina Zalite	- Jonathan Losee Landscape Architecture

STAFF:

Cameron Barker	- Planning Assistant
Claudia Freire	- Social Planner
Bob Sokol	- Planning Consultant
Mike Watson	- Planner
Heather Corbett	- Committee Clerk

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

Craig West assumed the Chair.

1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

There were no additions to the agenda.

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of March 27, 2018

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the March 27, 2018 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

4.1 265 Tenth Street

DP000716

Mike Watson, Planner, and Cameron Barker, Planning Assistant, summarized the staff report dated April 24, 2018, regarding a Development Permit application to allow for site improvements on the exterior of four existing residential housing co-operative buildings at 265 Tenth Street, noting the neighbourhood context of the site, the land use designation, and the considerations that the Design Panel was asked to evaluate. Staff also noted the following:

- The proposal is to address the deterioration of the building's envelope along with water ingress issues and thermal loss;
- Repairs will include a new building envelope, new rainscreen wall, new balcony membranes and railings and new window installations with some increased in size for improved "eyes-on-the-street"; and,
- The availability of financial resources above the work proposed is limited.

Shanelle Currie and Alex Chang, Morrison Hershfield Ltd. provided a presentation on the project, covering the following:

- The location and status of the building at present – given that the building was built in 1975, the envelope has reached the end of its service life;
- The proposal is to rehabilitate the building envelope and improve the aesthetic of the building;
- Context photos, streetscape photos, goals and scope of work, including:
 - New roof lines and overhead protection;
 - Larger windows;
 - More windows and site security;
- Precedence images with similar colour blocking and example of panels;
- Renderings and proposed colours and materials; and,
- Site plan drawings.

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

- The material that appears as stone will be a product with stone-like appearance;
- The panelling that is being proposed for Building C is due to its use in the neighbourhood and it is preferred by the Co-op for its modern appearance;
- The panels will be attached with flush fasteners and coated afterwards;
- The use of grey panels on Building B was chosen to break up the façade, as there is no option to add windows because of the concrete core;
- There are no landscape drawings provided for the Northwest corner, as the Co-op wishes to tackle landscaping as a different scope once the building envelope is completed, and if funds are available; and,
- There is a 90 degree corner at the wing wall of Building B where it changes from grey to red panelling.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments in relation to each of the Staff questions asked in the April 24, 2018 report:

Question 1: Panel's feedback in regards to how the proposal addresses the blank wall at the west street fronting façade, as well as the design guidelines in respect to façades and windows.

- Explore variations in how materials could break up the façade in order to better resolve the geometry;
- Given the core of the existing building would not support additional glazing, the proposal of grey panels on Building B is appropriate;
- Consider using a moderate amount of stone at building base, especially around the parkade entry; and,
- Consider a continuation of the colour around the corner for consistency.

Question 2: Panel's feedback on modest cost improvements at the corner of Tenth Street and Third Avenue, which would activate the space and provide increased interaction with the public realm.

- Explore opportunities for low-cost planting to make the area more attractive;
- The addition of a second, larger tree could create a buffer to the blank wall and interest at the corner; and,
- Garden plots for residents in this area may not be appropriate given limited solar access.

Question 3: Panel's feedback on the proposed materials and how they address the design guidelines.

- The materials and colour selection seem appropriate in terms of addressing the design guidelines and achieving a craftsman style;

- The roof overhang will bring consistency with the surrounding neighbourhood;
- Consider some treatment over the windows; and,
- Consider a different material from hardie panel, as it is usually only used as a feature in craftsman style.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel support the project as presented, with consideration of comments from the panel.

CARRIED.

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

4.2 838 Ewen Avenue

**DPQ00083
REZ00153**

Bob Sokol, Planning Consultant, summarized the report dated April 24, 2018, regarding an OCP Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit Application for a 44 unit modular residential building at 838 Ewen Avenue, noting the following unique points of the project:

- The units would be targeted for women with housing insecurity issues and would ease some of the pressure on existing shelter spaces for women, including senior women (age 55+);
- The site would be landscaped to provide a transition to the park and to the street, and include a welcoming plaza area on the north-west corner of the site with additional landscaping to achieve a soft edge where the development meets the adjacent green spaces;
- The proposed modular housing project would be temporary for a minimum of ten years.

Claudia Freire, Social Planner, discussed the background of the project and BC Housing's modular housing program, noting the following:

- The project would be part of the BC Government's initiative to invest \$291 million to support construction of modular housing units for people who are homeless across the province and \$170 million for operating costs;
- The City recently acquired 838 Ewen and would attain ownership and lease the property to BC Housing for a period of 10 years; and,
- The project is supportive of numerous City policies.

Mr. Sokol further described the project noting the following:

- Site area and location in context of community amenities
- The OCP amendment would change the property from Parks/Community Facilities to Residential – Medium Density;

- The project is designated as Natural Hazards Development Permit Area # 1 – Flood Hazard, which could affect the height of the building, grade access, or the number of units, however this may be exempted;
- Two building designs are being explored and the NWDP is asked to comment on the two designs and to recommend a preferred alternative.

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

- Currently, there is no long-term Master Plan for Ryall Park which would identify future plans for the park; and,
- The proposed project is temporary in that it will initially be a 10 year lease with BC Housing.

Ron Hart, Architect, and Kristina Zalite, Jonathan Losee Landscape Architecture, provided a presentation on the proposed development, including the following:

- Details of the site location, history of the site and context images of the surrounding neighbourhood, noting the newly installed bus stop, and the multi-use pathway nearby;
- Site plans, interior floor plans, elevation drawings and renderings for Design Scheme #1, which incorporates a simple palette and angled window bays;
- Elevation drawings and renderings for Design Scheme #2, which includes more prominent overhangs on both the primary roof and on the canopy/roof over the pedestrian entrance and plaza; and,
- Landscape plans, which demonstrate the desired objectives of maintaining the presence of a home and having a backyard or gathering place for the residents to use.

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

- The ‘second skin’ of the façade is still to be determined;
- On Scheme #1, the proposed roof would be composed of a low-slope roof package, which is a typical way of roofing modular buildings to provide the addition of a stronger roof;
- Two doors are proposed within the garbage and storage area – one for garbage, and one for storage;
- A previous iteration of the plans proposed a square shaped area for the garbage and storage area, however the shape changed as the City requested that it be moved farther away from the existing tree;
- The City is awaiting the arborist report for the site;
- A different location for garbage and storage may be possible in order to extend the patio and to provide space for buggies – these requirements will come clearer once the residents and operator are consulted;

- The type of tree that is being retained is deciduous, possibly beech, however the exact size and location will be identified in the arborist report;
- The off-site trees in Drawing L2B are proposed to provide transition between the project and the park;
- The proposed species of trees in Drawing L2B include Cherry, and Black Hawthorn, however the exact species are to be determined by the City;
- The 500 mm gravel strip where the building meets landscaping was requested by the geotechnical engineers;
- It is not yet confirmed how many staff would work at the centre;
- Street parking is available nearby and there is a transit stop directly in front of the proposed project site;
- Despite its modular construction, the building could be a permanent, long-term use structure, however, at this time, the land will only be leased to BC Housing for a 10 year term;
- BC Housing would be responsible for decommissioning the site if the Provincial Government program is discontinued, or at the termination of the lease;
- The entryway path off Ewen Avenue is proposed as offset from the entrance in order to provide privacy for the residence, rather than it enter directly into the plaza from the street; and,
- It would be possible to park on the newly proposed Carter Road.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments in relation to each of the questions asked in the April 24, 2018 Staff report:

Question 1: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regard to consistency of each option with the Ewen Avenue Multi-Family Design Guidelines.

The Panel did not make any specific comments in relation to the Ewen Avenue Multi-Family Guidelines.

Question 2: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regard to how each option relates to surrounding development.

- a. Does the more prominent roof of option 2 better reflect nearby development? Should the roof be more or less prominent?*
- b. Should the façades be more or less articulated?*
- c. Are the colours and the materials appropriate?*

In regards to Option 1, the Panel made the following comments:

- The red colouring on Option 1 shows the entrance well and provides balance to the design;
- The articulated façade of Option 1 works well, but could benefit from a stronger roof expression which picks up on the surrounding homes in the neighbourhood;
- The proportions are strong in Option 1;
- The shadows and variance of Option 1 work well; and,

- At the ground level in Option 1, one unit is indicated in the area with red materiality – it would be recommended to have all units within the white articulated piece.

In regards to Option 2, the Panel made the following comments:

- In Option 2, there appears to be a leftover bay – it would be recommended to shift all bays towards the stairs and perhaps give the stair some expression on the corner;
- Option 2, the roof may detract from the subtlety of the saw tooth – consider altering the variation of the roof for similarity to other buildings in the area;
- The introduction of materiality in the windows on the West elevation is successful and could be mimicked at the East elevation;
- In terms of privacy between the ground level units and the street, consider some stronger visual cues i.e. a low wall or posts introduced between the building and the multi-use path to create a hard divide between public and private spaces; and,
- Consider making the windows bigger, as currently there is too much solid to transparency ratio.

Question 3. Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regard to a recommendation of a preferred option by the NWDP. Are there characteristics of the two designs that should be “blended” into a preferred option?

- Both options present handsome designs; and,
- The Panel showed a preference for an “Option 3”, which could blend the stronger articulated façade of Option 1 with the enhanced roofline of Option 2.

Further general comments regarding site planning were noted by the Design Panel:

- Appreciating that space is needed for vehicle turning space, staff parking, and commercial kitchen loading, it would be important to resolve the space available for the storage and garbage area, including the following:
 - Consider opening up the dining room with the inclusion of double doors or a sliding door in order to promote a connection to outside eating space;
 - Consider the placement of the storage and recycling area away from the outlook of the dining room;
 - If on-site staff parking is required, consider swapping the garbage and storage area with the parking area, as overlooking cars would affect the view from the dining room less than a view of garbage and storage;
 - If street parking will be available nearby, consider removing on-site parking entirely in order to provide more room for outdoor space;
 - Examine the waste requirements for 44 units, as the proposed space may be excessive for the waste bins provision required;

- If the building is going to be a temporary structure in any way (e.g., may come down after 10 year lease), the hardie board panels may not be the best choice for sustainability of materials;
- The landscaping will be very important as the outdoor space is often used for socializing in this type of project;
- If the proposed Carter Road will have no sidewalk, consider locating the smokers' area on this side of the building, and focus the park side of the building on being an outdoor space for residents;
- Consider the inclusion of a covered smoking area, with seating;
- Consider shading of the proposed medicine garden by trees at the south;
- Consider the re-alignment of the entry pathway to align with the building entry, as direct visual connection may make sense for this type of building and providing "eyes on the street" and to mitigate CPTED issues; and,
- For future consideration of the City's Master Plan for the park, the creation of a walkway into the park would enhance the connection of the building to the park.

MOVED AND SECONDED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel's comments be considered and integrated into the building design as appropriate.

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

- 8.1 The next meeting of the New Westminster Design Panel will take place on Tuesday, May 22, 2018, in Council Chambers.

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Certified Correct,

ORIGINAL SIGNED
Craig West
Chair

ORIGINAL SIGNED
Heather Corbett
Committee Clerk