



NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL

**Tuesday, February 27, 2018, 3:00 p.m.
Council Chamber**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Meredith Mitchell	- Chair, BC Society of Landscape Architects
Derek Newby	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
Sarah Siegel	- BC Society of Landscape Architects
Joey Stephens	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
Craig West	- Vice-Chair, Architectural Institute of BC Representative

REGRETS:

Chris Block	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
David Roppel	- Development Industry Representative

GUESTS:

Witmar Abele	- KMBR Architects Planners Inc.
Miren Amaya Del Castillo	- Architect
David Crowe	- School District 40
Nancy Dheilily	- Designer
Tara Gronlund	- Gronlund Dare Partnership
Rebecca Krebs	- PMG Landscape Architect
Craig Lawrence	- Owner, 306 Gilley Street
Rod Maruyama	- Maruyama & Associates Landscape Architects
Curt Newstead	- Graham Design-Builders LP

STAFF:

Hardev Gill	- Planning Technician
Bob Sokol	- Planning Consultant
Mike Watson	- Planner
Heather Corbett	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m.

1.0 HOUSEKEEPING

1.1 2018 Committee Orientation and Oaths of Office

Ms. Heather Corbett, Committee Clerk, provided a PowerPoint orientation presentation, and reviewed the following documents:

- Terms of Reference;

- Committee Rules of Conduct;
- Respectful Workplace Policy;
- Social Media Policy; and,
- Freedom of Information Permission Forms.

Ms. Corbett administered the Oath of Office to all members of the New Westminster Design Panel present and requested volunteers to serve as the Chair and Vice-chair for the 2018 term.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Meredith Mitchell be appointed as Chair of the New Westminster Design Panel for the 2018 term; and,

THAT Craig West be appointed as Vice-Chair of the New Westminster Design Panel for the 2018 term.

CARRIED.

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

Mr. Mike Watson, Planner, discussed the City’s general procedures concerning New Westminster Design Panel (NWDP) project reviews, indicating the following structure:

1. The City Planner will introduce the project;
2. The project Proponents will give a presentation;
3. Opportunity for questions from the Panel;
4. Opportunity for comment by the Panel;
5. Motion of support or non-support given to the project by the NWDP, which can include requests for additional items or to return at a future date.

2.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

There were no additions to the agenda.

3.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

3.1 Adoption of the Minutes of January 23, 2018

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the following amendments be made:

- *The location be changed to Council Chamber;*
- *Nancy Dheilily’s occupation be changed from Architect to Designer; and,*
- *The time of adjournment be changed to 6:00 p.m.*

THAT the minutes of the January 23, 2018 New Westminster Design Panel meeting be approved as amended.

CARRIED.

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

4.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION

There were no items.

5.0 DESIGN REVIEWS

5.1 306 Gilley Street

HER00647

Mike Watson, Planner, summarized the staff report dated February 27, 2018, regarding a Heritage Revitalization Agreement application to allow an infill duplex at 306 Gilley Street in exchange for long-term designation.

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

Ms. Tara Gronlund, Gronlund Dare Partnership, and Craig Lawrence, the owner, provided a presentation in which they reviewed the site context, past amendments to the property, proposed changes to the heritage house, site and parking plans for the property, front and rear elevations, proposed materials, design rationale, landscape plans, and shadow studies.

In response to questions from the Panel, Ms. Gronlund provided the following information:

- The area to be used for garbage staging has been left open in order to leave flex space for parking, and because it was not possible to enclose all six cans;
- The heritage house has existing foundation walls and would not need to be moved on the property as part of this application;
- The grass paver strip behind the garbage area has been planned as pavers in order to allow for better maneuverability of cars;
- The duplex has been designed so that it will be more subdued, and not mimic the heritage house;
- It is anticipated that the outdoor flex space would be used in various ways, including as guest parking, as a children's play area, and as green outdoor space outside the duplex unit;
- The maneuverability of cars around the site has been reviewed by the City's Engineering Department;
- The reason that more substantial trees would not be allowed on the site is due to the right of way for servicing;
- The trees proposed to be removed in the arborist's report correspond with City bylaw;
- The retaining walls proposed in front of the duplex would be formed of Allan Block and used as a planter;
- The existing retaining wall is inside the garage; and,
- There is an existing wood fence on the east side of the property.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments in relation to each of the Staff questions asked in the February 27, 2018 report:

Question 1: Comments from the panel regarding how the proposal presents to the street, including comments on the materials used (e.g. plant materials, grass pavers) would be appreciated.

- It was acknowledged that Gilley Street does not have a regular street frontage, however there was concern that the frontage as proposed may appear somewhat vacant and vehicle-dominated;
- Consider consolidating and screening the garbage staging further and creating more of a street edge with planting;
- The courtyard area may be more effective with the addition of pots to provide some sense of screening;
- Comments concerning the grass pavers included:
 - Grass pavers may not be a useful surface for an amenity area for the duplex;
 - Grass pavers tend to be difficult as the grass can often die;
 - Permeable pavers may be more useful and greenery could be added in another way;
- Consider the use of permeable paving in the parking areas and driveway, as it would provide more stormwater retention;
- Concern was expressed about the narrowness of the driveway for ease of driving and how the pedestrian circulation pattern would work;
- As there is no pedestrian pathway, consider adding an element to define the edge of the lane;
- While there are limits on planting trees on the property, the proposed building would benefit from some verticality, like an ornamental planter;
- The circles indicated on the landscape plan for the Winter Gem Boxwood may be too small; and,
- There may be an opportunity to give the duplex its own identity and more articulation through the use of heavier trimlines.

Question 2: Comments from the panel on the proposed massing and setbacks of the application considering its surrounding context would be appreciated.

- The massing and frontages are appropriate for the neighbourhood, and meet all criteria; and,
- The design of the duplex appears to fit well with the heritage house.

Question 3: Comments from the panel on the impacts of shadows from the proposed development would be appreciated.

- The duplex does not appear to impose shadowing on the surrounding houses, other than on the heritage house; and,
- It would be reasonable to suggest that shadow implications are minor.

Further general comments were noted by the Design Panel:

- The shrubs suggested under the balconies of the duplex may be difficult to maintain;

- The space provided for car maneuvering seems like it may be tight;
- Explore pedestrian access to the rear duplex unit further; and,
- The applicant was applauded for the complete package and drawing set.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel support the project as presented, with consideration to the comments provided.

CARRIED.

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

5.2 118 Royal Avenue

**DP000700
REZ00151**

Mr. Hardev Gill, Planning Technician, summarized the report dated February 27, 2018, regarding a Rezoning and Development Permit Application for a four unit rowhouse development at 118 Royal Avenue. The application had previously been reviewed at the January 23, 2018 meeting.

Mr. Gill reviewed the location and neighbourhood context of the site, the land use designation and proposed rezoning for the project, and the considerations that the Design Panel was asked to evaluate.

Ms. Miren Amaya Del Castillo, Architect, Ms. Nancy Dheilly, Designer, and Ms. Rebecca Krebs, Landscape Architect, gave a presentation on the proposed development, including the changes made since the last presentation to the NWDP (Appendix B), including the addition of some 3D pictures and the streetscape context, modifications to the carports, changes to the East and West elevations, and landscape plan changes.

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

- A grate and railing have been proposed for the light wells on the North side of the building; and,
- The “no man’s land” beside the school field will be accessed through the proposed short shrub hedge to be planted on the west side of the property.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments in relation to each of the questions asked in the February 27, 2018 Staff report:

Question 1: Staff would like to obtain feedback from the NWDP in regards to improving the relationship of the proposed building with the adjacent school site in terms of enhancing the west elevation by providing more building articulation and developments to the north, east, and south.

- The additional windows on the east and west elevations are suitable, and address the elevations positively.

Question 2: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to how this proposal addresses the streetscape along Royal Avenue and Cunningham Street in regards

to providing a safe and attractive development and connectivity between the public and private realm.

- The lawn areas in the backyard are successful;
- The adjustments made to the carports are positive;
- The treatment along the front on Royal Avenue will likely provide a moment of respite for pedestrians; and,
- Consideration of bigger trees (than *Styrax Japonicus*) on Cunningham Street, such as Maple or Oak, could be worthwhile, however there are no other trees to take example from in the area;
- It was acknowledged that the slope of the property is challenging, however it may be worthwhile to consider lowering the building to give a closer relationship to Cunningham Street and provide a reduction in overall height of the building.

Question 3: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the overall scale and massing of the building.

- The setbacks and massing are appropriate for infill at this location; and,
- The scale is suitable in terms of the adjacent properties and surrounding area.

Question 4: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the interface with the adjacent school to the west and existing residential developments to the north, east and south.

and

Question 5: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the transition between the adjacent school site and subject residential site.

- It was acknowledged that the wall and “no man’s land” pose a difficult obstacle, as there could be potential for it to become overgrown, or laden with garbage;
- It was recognized that an effort had been made to distinguish the edge with planting, and provide access to the “no man’s land” strip, but whether it will be maintained is questionable; and,
- It was suggested that the owners could try to attain an agreement to retain the strip of land and incorporate it into the project, or perhaps ask the School District to plant some trees in the area, which would benefit both the field and the property.

Question 6: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the selection of building materials and colour scheme for the proposed development and how the development corresponds with the Townhouse and Rowhouse Design Guidelines.

- The materials and colour scheme meet the intent of the historic nature of area;
- The glass proposed for the carports is an appropriate gesture for light, however long term maintenance could be difficult, and it may not be necessary given there would be a metal trellis;
- The *Styrax Japonicus* proposed near the carports tends to drop its seeds and blossoms, which may be a nuisance on the carport glass;

- The Chamaecyparis Obtusa ‘Gracilis’ proposed at Royal Avenue is only two metres wide, therefore something larger could be appropriate;
- All other plant choices are successful;
- The concrete pavers at the carport edge are an improvement from the previous design; and,
- The grates proposed for the front light wells would be worth pursuing.

Question 7: Staff seeks input from the NWDP regarding having the multi-use pathway along Royal Avenue.

No comments were noted for Question 7.

The panel noted appreciation for the additional detailed drawings and renderings provided, as they helped to demonstrate the context and scale of the proposal.

MOVED AND SECONDED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel support the project as presented, with consideration to the comments provided.

CARRIED.

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

5.3 835 Eighth Street – New Westminster Secondary School PAR01192

Bob Sokol, Planning Consultant, summarized the report dated February 27, 2018, regarding the project design submission for the New Westminster Secondary School and separate maintenance and IT building. Mr. Sokol discussed the zoning requirements of the project and indicated that the project had come before the Design Panel due to the importance of the school as a community enhancement. He also noted that the proposal would be addressed in two phases, where Phase 1 would include the build of the school and Phase 2 would be the construction of the park.

Witmar Abele, KMBR Architects Planner Inc. and Rod Maruyama, Maruyama & Associates Landscape Architects, gave a presentation on the proposed development, in which they reviewed the following details:

- Project details, including the program overview and capacity requirements;
- Siting of the new school and the site context;
- Program distribution and relationships to adjoining buildings such as the gymnasium and theatre;
- Vehicle access road system and pedestrian/bicycle access points;
- Massing diagram of the building, including setbacks;
- Site plans and drawings for all three floors of the school;
- Shadow drawings and analysis at various point of the year;
- Streetscape elevations emphasizing the horizontal aspects of the building;
- Building sections, including the height and details of each storey;
- Prospective views from various aspects;

- Materials, including concrete, wood elements, corrugated metal and glazing; and,
- Landscape site plans and details.

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

- The high school would continue to have interconnectivity with Mercer Stadium and Massey Theatre once built;
- The skating arena is not used by the high school; and,
- Phase 2 would move forward after the new school is opened and occupied, which is likely to be late 2020.

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

- The anticipated entry points for vehicles would be from both ends of the site;
- The location of the IT building is being driven by the current site constraints, including the existing school, but it also needs to be located close to the access road as external parties would be accessing the building as well;
- The main entry plaza is anticipated to be used throughout the school day, and the intention would be for it to be used equally and simultaneously with the student patio (at the North), due to the number of students in attendance;
- The vertical element within the design of the Sixth Street entrance attempts to emphasize the entry point, however as the canopy wraps around from the front, it also maintains the horizontality of the west coast modern style;
- It is estimated that the service lane would not be very heavily used;
- The planters in the student patio have been configured to allow for a turning radius and deliveries into the space;
- The road that currently runs North-to-South through the property would be upgraded during Phase 2 of the project, however the section between Massey Theatre and Moody Park Arena would be included in Phase 1;
- The stage in the new school theatre is planned to be the same size as Massey Theatre's, therefore theatre productions would be able to practise and do blocking in the school's theatre and then move it to Massey to take advantage of the large capacity;
- It is envisaged that student drop off would be slightly North on Sixth Street and two bus stops would be added, as vehicle traffic would be discouraged around the school;
- For programs in the theatre and gymnasium that would be accessed by the public, the main entrance would serve as the lobby. Access to the UBC Counselling Centre and the Wellness Centre would also be isolated from the rest of the building;
- The second round of public consultation on the design thus far is currently in process. The first round occurred approximately 12 months ago;

- The response from the seniors' residence has been positive – they are looking forward to the activity;
- Fencing and planting is planned along the South border between the parking and the fence adjacent to the seniors' residence; and,
- Parking requirements are still under consideration with the City, however the zoning requires 325 spaces for the theatre, arena and the new school.

Discussion ensued and the Panel noted the following comments in relation to each of the questions asked in the February 27, 2018 Staff report:

Question 1: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regard to the connections between the school and the adjacent uses in light of the school's mid-block location.

- The Panel members shared similar views in terms of the overall site planning and the idea of the high school being the “heart” of the overall site, including:
 - Appreciation was shown for the sentiment of creating a “heart”, however the urban design of the campus needs further consideration – essential to the success of the property and public realm will be in defining how the buildings relate to each other;
 - It is difficult to consider the public realm because the site adjacencies were not included in the package;
 - A massing model may help to illustrate the overall layout and idea of the central heart;
 - The “heart” appears to be a place where cars would move – more illustration of the experience of approaching as a pedestrian or cyclist is requested;
- Comments concerning the location of the IT building included:
 - The IT building appears to be the first building that you arrive at, whereas the “heart” should be the first thing you reach;
 - It was suggested that the site design around the IT building needs more attention – currently it feels like an “island” as the cycling route has to flow around it;
 - In terms of sight lines, the IT building appears to be an end point to the drive aisle, exemplified by the cycle route flowing around it;
 - Consider shifting the IT building north so that it's not blocking the bike path or so that the new park would be visible rather than the end of a building;
- Seeing as the high school is a long-term building with significant investment, making sure that the building's interactions with the City and adjacent facilities are effective should be of utmost priority;
- The current design of the front entrance does not address the design guidelines which indicate a desire for it to interact with the City and the streetscape;
- Consider the relationship of the front door of the school to the surrounding area – the front entrance of the school would face the Zamboni end of the skating arena.

Question 2: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regard to the design and function of the outdoor spaces, principally the Main Entry Plaza, the Student Patio (and its connection to Mercer Field) and the Art Patio.

- As it is likely that the main entry plaza and the student patio would be heavily utilized, consider the opportunity to strengthen the visual connection between the two spaces and tie them together;
- Consider having the pattern of benches on the student patio face each other for more interactions;
- Comments concerning the plant material on the site included:
 - Japanese maples may not be durable enough for the requirements of the site, therefore it would be best to choose larger varieties, and ensure their maturity at planting time;
 - The suggested wildflower mix on the student patio may not be durable enough for the space – they can be hard to retain unless maintained; and,
- In order to incorporate the IT building into the overall site plan, an appropriate landscape plan is suggested, as there does not appear to be any landscape treatment currently planned.

Question 3: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regard to the expanses of the walls, primarily those of the theater and the gymnasium, and particularly those facing to the west, which will ultimately face towards the park/memorial.

- The interior site roads will likely feel like streets and be heavily used – therefore consider providing a stronger street presence by adding large trees, safe places for pedestrians to walk and gather, and activating the blank walls of the theatre and gymnasium; and,
- When approaching from Tenth Avenue, the north gym façade is blank and lacks identity – this may be an opportunity for another arrival point.

Question 4: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regard to the Sixth Street entrance and its significance as the only part of the building fronting on a public roadway.

- The Sixth Street entrance will be an important part of the building as it will be the only point where the new building would meet a public street, therefore it may require more articulation and clarity to convey a stronger sense of entrance for the public;
- There may be an opportunity to introduce more horizontality and west coast style to the Sixth Street entrance;
- More activity could be planned at the Sixth Street end of the building in order to drive traffic to it; and,
- Consider making the walls that frame the plaza at the Sixth Street entrance seat height as kids will be inclined to sit on the walls.

Question 5: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the interaction between the service lane at the back of the school and the adjacent outdoor spaces.

- It works well to include a plaza on this side of the school, however there may be a benefit to expanding the plaza even more and minimizing the service lane if it may not be used frequently;

- On the student patio, ensure careful consideration is given to the “delivery zone” as there is potential for vehicles to run in to the bench seating areas;
- Consider continuing the cut concrete pattern for the whole of the service lane, rather than asphalt;
- As there is a grade change down to the track , there will likely be a need for accessibility via a ramp;
- Skateboard deterrence may be necessary on the concrete walls of the plazas; and,
- Consider further separation between the service lane and the pedestrian entry at the Sixth Street entrance.

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

- The Panel commended the design efforts thus far and acknowledged the awkward site shape;
- It would be useful to include phasing diagrams in the drawing package to see how the school would be built over time;
- Ensure sufficient accessibility around the building perimeter and site at large, as it will need to feel like a safe place for universal movement;
- The building’s roof design does not currently reflect the design guidelines, which recommends an activation of the roof, i.e. a green roof or heat island;
- General comments concerning the planning and layout of the school included:
 - There may be a CPTED issue in the stairway between the PHE classroom and the weight room;
 - The way that the building is put together makes sense in terms of classroom layouts;
 - The orientation of the gym could be successful if it is swapped with the changing rooms, so that the gym faces the field and some high glazing is included;
 - Washrooms which address the playing field would be valuable assets; and,
 - Consider exploring the view when entering into the grand commons further – rather than a view of the stairs and culinary centre, a glimpse through to Mercer stadium could be more inviting and welcoming.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the project return for review by the New Westminster Design Panel taking into consideration requests for further detail, and the comments provided.

CARRIED.

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

6.0 NEW BUSINESS

There were no items.

7.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There were no items.

8.0 CORRESPONDENCE

There were no items.

9.0 NEXT MEETING

9.1 The next meeting of the New Westminster Design Panel will take place on Tuesday, March 27, 2018, in Council Chambers.

10.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Certified Correct,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Meredith Mitchell
Chair

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Heather Corbett
Committee Clerk