



NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL

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

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Meredith Mitchell	- Chair, BC Society of Landscape Architects
Chris Block	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
Derek Newby	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
David Roppel	- Development Industry Representative
Sarah Siegel	- BC Society of Landscape Architects (Arrived at 3:08)
Joey Stevens	- Architectural Institute of BC Representative
Craig West	- Vice-Chair, Architectural Institute of BC Representative

GUESTS:

Karla Castellanos	- KCC Architecture and Design Ltd.
Alex Chang	- Morrison Hershfield
Lambert Chow	- Birmingham & Wood
Jeff Mok	- IBI Group
Dan Roberts	- Kane Consulting

STAFF:

Cameron Barker	- Planning Assistant
Hardev Gill	- Planning Technician
Mike Watson	- Planner
Heather Corbett	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

There were no additions to the agenda.

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of May 22, 2018

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT page 12 of the May 22, 2018 New Westminster Design Panel minutes be amended to note that the meeting was Chaired by Meredith Mitchell, not Craig West; and,

THAT the May 22, 2018 minutes be adopted, as amended.

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

4.1 651 Carnarvon Street

SDP00218

Cameron Barker, Planning Assistant, and Mike Watson, Planner, summarized the staff report dated July 24, 2018, regarding the proposal to rehabilitate the building envelope and architectural elements of the exterior facades at 651 Carnarvon Street (the Provincial Courthouse) in order to improve the overall thermal performance and reduce water penetration. The work would include the over-cladding of the existing building and the replacement of all current glazing, green roofs, and podiums, as well as some minor landscaping changes.

Mr. Barker reviewed the details of the proposal, including the location and context of the Downtown zoning and applicable design guidelines, and noted the questions that the Design Panel was asked to consider.

Alex Chang, Morrison Hershfield, provided a PowerPoint presentation covering the following information:

- Current building envelope, including photographs of the elevations to be rehabilitated;
- The building design is required to abide by Law Court guidelines from the BC Government;
- Proposed work to be completed, including:
 - Skylight and curtain wall replacement;
 - Changes to the windows;
 - Replacement of podium waterproofing;
 - Full building re-clad with the original architectural intent being kept through the proposed colour;
- Scope of work, design rationale and neighbouring context;

- Cladding precedents, noting that it was chosen to comply with the Law Court guidelines and for durability;
- Material selection, including the use of Swiss Pearl Panels for exterior walls and Alucobond Panels for areas around windows, all in a earth-toned scheme;
- Landscaping changes, including:
 - Waterproofing above the parkade; and,
 - Removal of some existing landscaping in order to resolve some accessibility issues.

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

- The soffit material proposed for the plaza is Alucobond;
- The building was not designed by Arthur Erickson;
- The joints would be treated via hidden flashing and existing joints would be aligned and refined as much as possible with very small gaps;
- Swiss Pearl has been identified by the Provincial Government as their choice for the cladding;
- The sunshades are proposed for the fourth floor of the longer elevations for privacy reasons;
- The sunshades would be vertical and run from sill to head;
- The windows receiving the sunshades are being replaced;
- Exposed fasteners would be used for the Swiss Pearl panels, colour-matched for cost reasons;
- The colour of the existing glazing is dark brown and it is proposed to use a similar colour, as a perfect match has not yet been found;
- Alucobond panels are proposed to “picture frame” the windows due to issues that can arise with Swiss Pearl terminating at windows;
- The Swiss Pearl joint with the Alucobond panels appears subtle and clean, and will be long-lasting;
- The material of the fins for the fourth floor shades is intended to match the window frames;
- The accessibility issues being addressed include adding a required railing and ramp, so that the general exit will be usable;
- Six trees will be removed and replaced with 12 Japanese Maple trees; and,
- A Landscape Architect and Arborist have both been involved in the project.

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

Question 1: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the Built Form and Massing regarding rooftop fenestration and material treatments.

- Recommend the use of concealed fasteners rather than exposed fasteners on the Swiss Pearl panels, as exposed fasteners would change the intent of the building; and,
- Consider the corner joint of the panel, as the return on the Swiss Pearl panels, and how they meet, is a critical detail.

Question 2: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the Building Materials as described in the July 24, 2018 staff report.

- The soffits on the East elevation warrant a material such as wood, rather than Alucobond;
- While it will be disappointing to lose the look of the rough concrete, the Swiss Pearl and Alucobond are good quality material choices for maintaining the longevity of the building;
- The approach of using two tones for the panelling is questionable, as it would change the aesthetic of the monolithic building, however the lighter colour may create more of a distinction;
- The Alucobond will likely play with the light and shine when the sun hits the building more than the Swiss Pearl;
- In terms of the solar shades, the bronze would tie in with the cladding, while the black will tie in with the glazing, therefore either would work; and,
- Recommend that the solar shades not be gray.

Question 3: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the Landscaping changes proposed.

- Consider maintaining the current landscaping to some degree in order to encourage the historic value of the modernist landscape and how it interacts with the building;
- The new stairwell may have an impact on the view from the inside of the building and change the intended relationship between architecture and landscape;
- Consider a reduction in the number of plant species in order to respect the minimalist style of the existing landscape;
- It would have been useful to indicate the species of the trees being removed from the plaza on the plans and for the Landscape Architect to be present;
- Accessibility is important to achieve, however the need to remove the mature trees is questionable;
- Given that the three trees proposed for removal are for aesthetic purposes, it would be highly recommend to retain those trees, as they are quite large and their removal may impact the trees just to the east; and,
- Consider alternate trees to the Service Berry trees that are proposed for planting, as they can be messy from a maintenance point-of-view.

The Design Panel made other general comments about the project, as follows:

- Appreciation was shown for extending the life of the building and making it more sustainable;
- It is clear that the courthouse architecture has been influenced by other iconic buildings in the region and it is a meaningful building to the City;
- Replacing the vaulted skylight with a more reliable solution is a practical and understandable improvement; and,
- Provision of a materials board would have been a helpful addition to the design package.

The Applicant made some general comments in response to the Panel's comments, as follows:

- The Plaza area is currently in a secured area and quite dark, therefore the landscape changes are intended to balance the space and make it accessible;
- The suggestion to retain the trees will be passed on to the Landscape Architect;
- While the budget restrictions are quite prescriptive, the concealed fasteners would be more appealing, so hopefully the Panel's comments will help to convince the client of this; and,
- The intention of the cladding is to last 30 years, therefore the materials presented are the best choices despite the change in appearance to the building.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel support the project as presented, with consideration of the following five conditions:

- *Retention of existing trees;*
- *Consideration of a different soffit material on East elevation;*
- *Use of concealed fasteners;*
- *Review of two tone window frames; and,*
- *Consideration of all landscape comments.*

CARRIED.

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

Procedural Note: Sarah Siegel recused herself due to a conflict of interest with Item 4.2.

4.2 810 Agnes Street

**SDP00216
REZ00155**

Mike Watson, Planner, summarized the staff report dated July 24, 2018, regarding the proposal for a residential tower at 810 Agnes Street, which would include an underground parking lot, private amenity space. Additional density has been proposed on this site in exchange for the design and construction of park space adjacent to the site, and the provision of a public amenity area within the building.

Mr. Watson further outlined the questions that the Panel was asked to consider, and noted the following aspects of the project:

- Skytrain is close by to the site;
- The site is sloped steeply;
- Details of the neighbouring buildings and the number of storeys in each;
- The history of the park space, which was gifted to the City by the Chinese Benevolent Society, and was designated as a future park area with Chinese influence in its design;
- Applicable design guidelines, and City policies, including the Family-Friendly Housing policy, for the proposed building;

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

- The Panel is asked to keep in mind that for buildings of this height, the City does expect a higher level of architectural design as they are going to be prominent buildings; and,
- Next steps for the submission would be up to the Panel's discretion.

Jeff Mok, IBI Group, Sarah Siegel, Hapa Collective, and Dan Roberts, Kane Consulting, provided a PowerPoint presentation covering the following information:

- Statistics of the proposal, including number of units, square footage, parking details, and proposed FSR;
- Site context, including views from above and 360 views from the street;
- Details and history of the Agnes Street Park and the process undertaken thus far, including stakeholder meetings, public consultation, and feedback from City committees;
- Context of the park within the downtown area, programming concepts, and design principles;
- Park landscape design, including sections and an accessibility diagram, planting, water feature and screen details, programming ideas, context within the street and neighbouring buildings;
- Tower placement on the site, which has been pulled over towards Blackie Street in order to maximize the green space;
- Renderings of the building from multiple viewpoints;
- Shadow studies, showing significant parcels of light;
- Grading, parking levels and living levels, with details of the types of units, setbacks, stepping and terracing;
- Community and rooftop amenity areas;
- Inspiration for the design of the building and landscape design;
- Renderings of the building at street level, and street elevations, showing stepping;
- Renderings of the parks and entrance to the community amenity space;

- Landscape concepts for the building on each street and each level;
- Sustainability features, including comments on walkability, close proximity to transit and bike parking;
- Passive First model, including a 50% window to wall ratio, which will allow desirable views while having solid walls and insulation;
- Corner units in the tower, which would allow future owners of the units to open windows for cross ventilation; and,
- Elements that incorporate Step Code principles.

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

- The white that is shown throughout the project would be painted concrete;
- The edge of the accessible walkway from the park onto Victoria Street may have a berm in order to lessen the drop into the parkade, which would tie it in to the park, but this has not been fully determined yet;
- The glassy look would be achieved by using a Spandrel glass;
- View impact studies have been conducted on the building from 833 Agnes, and even with positioning the tower in the centre of the site, it is evident that there would be view blockages, however given the density of the site, it was felt that pushing the tower towards Blackie Street would be the best placement to benefit the whole area;
- The treatment to the road and planting on Victoria Street will be coordinated with the adjacent project at 823 Carnarvon Street;
- 50% or more of the building would be Spandrel;
- The species of tree in the middle of the park is still to be decided upon, and will determine the growth time and height; and,
- The open space at the side of the lobby is intended to be a lounge area.

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

- The City does not anticipate a great deal of parking demand for the public amenity space and park, as it is intended to serve the neighbourhood, however it would depend on how the amenity space is used, and this has not been determined yet;
- The City is content that the proposed increase in height and density over zoning would sufficiently provide for the funding source of the park space under the density bonus program; and,
- Currently to the Southwest of the site are residential buildings and a two-level podium on the other side of the park.

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

Question 1: Comments from the panel on the tower – street interface would be appreciated.

- The renderings make the building look nicely portrayed – recommend a similar direction on Agnes and Victoria;
- Encourage the increased demarcation of entrances on ?? street;
- Working more rain protection into the entrance lobbies might help create a street interface that better aligns with the design guidelines;
- The loading area near the main entrance needs further resolution;
- The eight foot wall at Victoria Street is substantial and would benefit from a reduction in height; and,
- Consider increased pedestrian safety on street through improvements to the driveway entrances.

Question 2: Comments from the panel on the proposed building materials would be appreciated.

- In general, the use of metal and other proposed materials are appropriate, however the glazing needs further clarification;
- The plans and elevations are not in sync in terms of the glazing – it would be beneficial to see a more realistic representation of the desired opacity;
- Consider a different material on the boxes, such as metal panels on the fascia and returns, and perhaps consider using the copper colour deeper into the balconies;
- Caution on use of metal, as it can become dated quite easily;
- Consider an alternative to the painted concrete on the boxes, such as a white metal panel; and,
- It is unclear if the Spandrel will achieve the desired effect.

Question 3: Comments from the panel on the proposed balconies and projections would be appreciated.

- The balconies are successful, with the use of the frames/boxes and the additions of colour, and appear welcoming; ad,
- Consider changing the glass to bring out the concept of the stacked boxes and make a stronger expression.

Question 4: Comments from the panel on the proposed building's conclusion would be appreciated.

- The bottom of the tower appears blunt and unresolved and seems to dissipate into the ground;
- On the rooftop, the parapet seems unresolved – consider setting back the guard rail and treating the top with the same generosity as at street level;

- The ping-pong table on the roof may not be practical; and,
- An increase in vegetable gardens on the rooftop could be a beneficial use of space and light.

Question 5: Comments from the panel on the proposed building entrance and its function would be appreciated.

- The building's entrance is successful in the renderings; and,
- The incorporation of the two lobbies acknowledges the topography and desire to face the street.

Question 6: Comments from the panel on the relationship of the townhouses to Agnes and Victoria Streets would be appreciated

- The tall blank wall on Victoria Street is of concern for the street – consider the use of planters, an intermediate landing, or terraces to create a softer edge;
- Having the Victoria Street units above grade is effective and will benefit the future residents, but will still provide eyes on the street;
- Consider repositioning the Victoria Street townhouses so that they face the park; and,
- The townhouses relate well at Agnes Street.

Question 7: Comments from the panel on the Blackie Street frontage would be appreciated.

- The Blackie Street frontage and the bike entrance work well;
- The Blackie Street elevations in the package were unresolved, however the renderings look better; and,
- Recommend further resolution of the public realm and use of the glazed space on Blackie Street;

The Design Panel made other general comments about the project, as follows:

- Appreciation was shown for the proposal and the concept of the building, with the Panel noting that it has nice subtleties and expression;
- The massing seems appropriate given the location downtown, with nearby transit and amenities;
- The height is supportable as the public benefits of the associated park are worthwhile;
- The steep topography has been reflected through the use of townhouses and stepping up to the tower;
- Support the generosity of rest places on the slope;
- Consider a parking allowance for the park amenity space;
- Continue working on the edge of the blank wall near the amenity space – its use may become more apparent with confirmation of the amenity space;

- The engagement of the park, the comprehensive approach to the landscape, and the meaningful play space is to be commended;
- The park's intention is well described and will be integral to the public realm;
- The Panel encouraged staff to come up with comprehensive guidelines/policies for the use of the proposed public elevator;
- The use of the proposed screens on the edges of the park may break it off from the public realm and cause CPTED issues – increased permeability of the screens may help;
- In regards to the tenancy of the amenity area, an entrance off the street may be beneficial if a retail use is proposed; and,
- In terms of the package, proper resolution of the drawings is still needed and it would be helpful to have a 3D model in these types of projects.

The proponents thanked the Panel for the comments about the Spandrel affecting the look of the building, and noted that in past projects, adjusting colours had the effect of making it look glazed and transparent so they may explore that option.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel request the applicant to resubmit with consideration of the comments.

CARRIED.

Joey Stevens voted in opposition to the motion.

Procedural Note: Sarah Siebel returned to the Panel.

4.3 800 Boyd Street

DPQ00167

Hardev Gill, summarized the staff report dated July 24, 2018, regarding the proposal for the construction of a new mini-storage building, including landscaping improvements and a new caretaker suite, at 800 Boyd Street, and noted that this is a resubmission from March 27, 2018. Mr. Gill asked the Panel to make comments on the application, taking into consideration the original questions posed and how the applicant had addressed the Panel's initial comments.

Karla Castellanos, KCC Architecture and Design Ltd., noted that the Panel's comments had been taken into consideration, and the owner of the property had explored several options for the tower, however once everything had been taken into account, including the budget and intent of tower, they had returned to the original idea of the tower.

Ms. Castellanos made the following comments:

- Mentioned the context of the site and explained that to the east of the site is a storage locker facility, which will block view of the building from the highway and from Boyd Street;

- Provided an illustration of the new building within the surroundings and showed a section of the property to illustrate the context and colour proposition;
- The client would like to make the new tower a focal point for the business, provide street presence and denote the location of the business in the area;
- The tower is intrinsic to the facility to keep the business operational;
- The storage containers to the left of property can often be piled five high directly adjacent to the proposal, which would take away from the tower's hierarchy at street level;
- The project complies with current zoning and within the next few years it is predicted that more construction and height would come in the area;
- Regarding the colour scheme, the feature colours have not changed from the original presentation, however new colours have been incorporated;
- Regarding materiality, while the client would be interested in using wood and other "real materials", these would be a challenge in terms of maintenance, so they have kept with metal cladding with the appearance of wood; and,
- No landscape plans have been included with this submission.

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

- The only changes made to the landscape plans are:
 - A change in tree species has been made; and,
 - A slope that coordinates the height of the parking with the street will be created.

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

- The application has not changed significantly enough to warrant support of the proposal;
- Appreciate the additional context provided, however the Panel's comments have not been adequately addressed;
- The presence of the proposed tower on Boyd Street would be out of proportion and character for Boyd street;
- If the intention is for the tower to be noticeable, the proposed height is generous enough that the building would be visible from any location on the site;
- The proposed tower will be overly tall and larger than the neighbouring containers and shopping centre;
- The overall scale and massing of the tower is not appropriate given the roof treatment and overall character of the building;
- While the proposed height is tall, it may reflect future development on Boyd Street;
- The decision to use a wood-like material on the building is still unclear;

- The view studies from the North included in the revised plans have alleviated the previous concerns;
- In future, it would be useful to include the landscape plans to present an impression of the proposed streetscape; and,
- A sidewalk treatment would be helpful to provide for pedestrians crossing the street to the other side.

The proponent made the following comments in response to the Panel:

- The landscape plans were received too late to be included in the package, and therefore the landscape architect did not attend;
- Stressed the client's concern with Boyd street and the changing retail landscape (3 anchor stores of Queensborough Landing are moving away);
- The bylaw supports the height, therefore it is permitted to build as high as proposed.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the New Westminster Design Panel request the applicant to resubmit their application with consideration of the comments.

CARRIED.

Derek Newby and Sarah Siegel voted in opposition to the motion.

4.4 647 Ewen Avenue

**OCP00025
HER00668**

Hardev Gill, summarized the staff report dated July 24, 2018, regarding the proposal for a five townhouse unit at 647 Ewen Avenue. Two of the five townhouse units would be within the existing 1939 Slovak Hall, which is proposed to be retained and restored as part of this application. The remaining three townhouses would be within an addition to the rear of the Slovak Hall. Through the HRA, the Slovak Hall would also be protected with a Heritage Designation Bylaw.

Mr. Gill noted the questions that the Design Panel was asked to consider, and reviewed the following details of the proposal:

- Current zoning and requirements to change the OCP;
- Details of the requested variances;
- Compliance with the City's Family-Friendly Housing policy; and,
- Details of parking and amenity space within the unit.

In response to a question from the Panel, Mr. Gill noted that the proposed development would meet all floodplain requirements.

Lambert Chow, Birmingham & Wood, provided a PowerPoint presentation covering the following information:

- Reviewed the history and present condition of the Slovak Hall, noting that it contains a false front façade;
- Site context and neighbourhood;
- Proposed changes to be made to the Slovak Hall and initiatives to retain the heritage building and raise it to meet floodplain requirements;
- Materials to be used on both old and new buildings;
- Connection to be used to delineate between historic and new;
- Contemporary additions, such as monotone colours, which intend to allow heritage conditions to stand out;
- Details of units, outdoor spaces and parking; and,
- Proposed berm to address the 7 foot grade change.

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

- The installation of a sidewalk on Wood Street would be addressed through the off-site works and service agreement, to be confirmed with the Engineering Department;
- The trees on the east perimeter would be removed, as the berm would likely not allow the trees to survive;
- The parking area noted at the east end is part of the property;
- View studies have not yet been conducted;
- Hedges are proposed as landscaping on the east edge of the property, which has been agreed to by the neighbour, as it would create a buffer and reduce overlook into their property;
- The floors indicated in the sections are at the floodplain level and are at the lowest level possible;
- No studies have been carried out yet on the north lane façade, but increasing the amount of glazing is being investigated;
- It is yet unknown whether the placement of the utilities (hydro and telecom) on the property would be revised; and,
- There is currently no landscape architect on this project, however there is an arborist.

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

Question 1: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to how this proposal addresses the streetscape along Wood Street and Ewen Avenue in regards to providing a safe and attractive development and connectivity between the public and private realm.

- The Wood Street streetscape provides an effective townhouse rhythm while respecting a heritage building;

- Consider a revision to the number of steps required to reach the floodplain level on Wood Street;
- The Wood Street streetscape may be better resolved with increased landscaping and berming to make a softer appearance;
- The parapet of the upper level of the Wood Street elevation is above the heritage line and could be lowered or a clear guardrail could be used; and,
- Consider the amount of concrete that will be exposed at the berm and perhaps implement additional landscape screening.

Question 2: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the overall scale and massing of the building.

- Overall, the Panel was supportive of the scale and massing, noting that it is successful, thoughtful and delicate.

Question 3: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the interface with the adjacent lane way and existing residential developments to the north and east.

- The Panel was supportive of the interface with the neighbours, noting that the building would fit in well;
- The setbacks are respectful and the building would integrate well into the neighbourhood;
- Consider the addition of more windows or stepping on the lane elevation; and,
- Ensure there is adequate space allocation and an enclosure for garbage.

Question 4: Staff seeks input from the NWDP in regards to the selection of building materials and color scheme for the proposed development.

- The Panel was supportive of the building materials and proposed colours, noting the following:
 - The materials and colour choices are thoughtful and are in keeping with the heritage feel of the building;
 - The neutral colour scheme works well with the contemporary expression of the new section of the building; and,
 - Wood windows in the townhouses would be appropriate.

Question 5: Staff would like to obtain feedback on how the heritage component interacts with the newer contemporary designed units at the rear.

- The design expresses a well-considered juxtaposition of modern and heritage elements;
- The Panel had mixed opinions on the appearance of the proposed dormers in the heritage building, however there was no opposition expressed;
- The dormers could be more distinctive and reflective of the heritage building, but do not need to be a feature;
- The connection between the buildings is subtle and works well;

- Maintenance and CPTED issues in the connection between the buildings could be issues to manage;
- Consider the introduction of some green stucco into the lower sections of the townhouses in order to further emphasize the connection between the buildings; and,
- Further consider the existing entry of the heritage.

The Design Panel made other general comments about the project, as follows:

- In terms of the drawing package, a context plan and landscape grading plan would have been useful additions;
- Handrails on the stairs are missing from the drawings;
- Appreciation was shown for the design of the project, with the following comments:
 - Simple and contemporary architecture;
 - Split-level design is successful;
 - A strong project with good juxtaposition;
 - A nice addition to the hall;
 - The design supports the variances requested;
 - This project presents a unique opportunity to provide different housing and maintain the restoration of the Hall;
 - A modern intervention of a historic building;
- In regards to landscape, the Panel made the following comments:
 - Highly recommend the incorporation of a Landscape Architect's opinion;
 - Consider the addition of a roof deck;
 - Consider the fact that the proposed boxwood hedge at the east edge of the property will not be more than six feet tall;
 - Consider an increased landscaper buffer at the lane;
 - The existing willow seems iconic and important to the feeling of the building, and it may be an idea to look into its health in order to retain it;
 - Seating could be incorporated near the front willow tree as a potential gathering place; and.
 - Consider the retention of the neighbouring trees, as they would allow for screening and may be retained, even with the berm.

The arborist on the project noted that the willow tree at the front is healthy, and the willow trees at the back are not very healthy, however the neighbours would like to retain them.

MOVED and SECONDED

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

CARRIED.

Chris Block voted in opposition to 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

The next meeting of the New Westminster Design Panel will take place on Tuesday, August 28, 2018, in Council Chambers.

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Certified Correct,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Meredith Mitchell
Chair

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Heather Corbett
Committee Clerk