

## **NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL**

**Tuesday September 27, 2011 3:00 p.m.  
Committee Room No. 2**

### **MINUTES**

#### **VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Eric Pattison - Chair, AIBC Representative  
Chris Block - AIBC Representative  
Paul Goodwin - AIBC Representative  
Keith Ross - BC Society of Landscape Architects  
Mark Vance - AIBC Representative  
Steve Wong - BC Society of Landscape Architects (arrived 3:07 p.m.)

#### **MEMBERS REGRETS:**

Tom Morton - Development Industry Representative (UDI)

#### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Jim Hurst - Development Planner  
Barry Waitt - Senior Planner  
Donna Martin - Donna Martin

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m.

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

There were no additions to the agenda.

#### **2.0 NEW BUSINESS**

There was no New Business.

#### **3.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

##### **3.1 Adoption of the Minutes of July 26, 2011**

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

*THAT the minutes of the New Westminster Design Panel meeting held on July 26, 2011 be received and adopted.*

**CARRIED.**

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

#### 4.0 INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS

There were no information presentations.

#### 5.0 DESIGN APPROVALS

##### 5.1 1016 – 1022 Fourth Avenue

File: REZ00042

An application has been received to consolidate the properties at 1016, 1020 and 1022 Fourth Avenue, and rezone the property to allow subdivision into five lots and allow a triplex on each of the new lots. (**Brian Hart and Company**)

Jim Hurst noted the Panel's concerns from the December 14, 2010 meeting asking for member's comments on the suitability and liveability of the lower units. The new sustainability report card was used for this project. The lower units meet the requirements of secondary suite standards. It was noted garbage may become an issue in the future with respect to recycling.

Brian Hart reviewed the project noting the secondary suites are two bedrooms (1100 sq. ft.). Garbage and recycling will be placed next to the storage area. Mr. Hart reported on the changes to the design to maximize light in the units. Patios are 2 feet below grade and could easily be adapted to a ramp. The kitchen would need some adapting as well.

Mr. Hart offered pegging LEEDS standards for smaller projects is not necessarily the best measure in some areas and perhaps smaller projects should be judged on smart design.

Rebecca Colter, DMG Landscape Architects, reported on the landscape design objectives.

##### **Questions from the Panel:** *(Response in italics)*

- Is the intention to walk between the cars to enter the unit? *Mr. Hart responded in the affirmative.*
- What are the setback requirements? *The setback requirement is the same as small houses.*
- What are the parking requirements? *The application will require a variance for the number of spaces and visitor parking*
- How does the 10% perimeter rule apply? *Council would have to support a variance.*
- What species of trees will be used? *Large columnar growing trees will be planted.*
- Have you done the spatial calculations for the lots? *It will be 7%*
- Is there a strategy for saving the trees on the adjacent property? *An arborist will need to evaluate those trees. Some of the trees on the adjacent property were removed this summer.*
- Would it be possible for units to share a walkway? *Functionally this is the only way that could be done for public access on one side and private access on the other side.*

- Can you do a “cross access agreement” for the walkway? *Mr. Hart stated he is reluctant to enter into that type of agreement.*

**Comments from the Panel:**

- Would like to see more legible landscape plans in advance of the meeting;
- Like individuality of the planting plan but miss consistency;
- Consider using unit pavers rather than stamped concrete in patio area;
- Concerned the parking will shut off the site;
- Suggest the hard surface between the buildings be permeable;
- Closet would be better on other side of units;
- Concern about recycling carts going through back lane;
- Have difficulty with site planning with respect to parking being exposed could it be underground?
- The setbacks on side yard relative to neighbours does not seem adequate;
- Setback on west side could be revised to acknowledge neighbours;
- Take exception to the way proposal develops Augusta Street; not an improvement over what is there
- Too much paving, parking seems minimum and gates not accessible;
- Streetscape elements not appropriate on lane;
- Form would benefit from being more articulated;
- Roof line is too prominent;
- Liveability of lower unit might benefit from higher ceilings;
- No opportunity for landscaping on patios;
- Fence between units seems a bit oppressive;
- Landscaping replacement minimal and not adequate could add more trees;
- Street trees should be shown on the plan;
- Trees on Augusta Street block pedestrian access;
- Difficult site to work with; has significant defects;
- Can't support parking access from Augusta Street
- Liveability of lower units questionable; no opportunity for plantings;
- Application may meet the secondary suite guidelines but does not necessarily make it liveable;
- Landscape creates too much chaos with such a small scheme;
- Colour scheme too varied;
- Design solution needs further study.

Mr. Hart offered the following comments:

- Produced the colour panel and noted material is hardiplank;
- Was advised the City did not want underground parking;
- Changes along Augusta could work over time;
- Setbacks are to 6 inches short of the normal setback;
- Parking takes up 18 feet of 30 foot space so there is room for a gap;
- Garbage pickup may be on Fourth Avenue. At this time no decision has been made as to how garbage will be handled;
- Lower landscape is meant for container planting by owners.

- The unifying element will be the street trees.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the application to consolidate and rezone the properties at 1016, 1020, and 1022 Fourth Avenue to allow subdivision into five lots and allow a triplex on each of the new lots be brought back with the following considerations:*

- *Need unifying elements for multi-building project with respect to trees, colours and architectural character;*
- *On Augusta Street need further consideration of parking layout, access to units, garbage lockers/recycling and trees;*
- *With respect to liveability of lower units, reconsider master bedroom windows, design quality of outdoor patios;*
- *Side setbacks to adjacent to apartment building should be given more consideration;*
- *Greater extent of soft landscaping throughout the site should be reviewed;*
- *Complete submission packet should be available to the Panel before presentation.*

**CARRIED.**

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

**5.2 1209 – 1211 Fourth Avenue**

**File: REZ00057**

An application has been received to rezone the above captioned property from Single Detached Dwelling Districts (RS-2) to a Comprehensive Development District to allow the construction of eight townhouse units. (**Brian Hart and Company**)

Jim Hurst reviewed the site context and Official Community Plan (OCP) considerations. Staff identified the following issues for Panel comment:

- Proposed architecture in relation to the OCP
- Appropriate roof form for the area.

Mr. Hart presented On-Table context photos noting the site challenge is the cross slope. He gave an overview of the proposal with respect to the site context, access, materials, parking, garbage, and basic landscaping.

Ms. Colter, DMG Landscape Architects, noted all plantings were chosen for erosion control of the slope.

**Questions from the Panel:** *(Response in italics)*

- How do you fit this proposal into the historical character of the area? *Mr. Hart responded that the only heritage context in this area is minimal. This is an area without a real identity.*

**Comments from the Panel:**

- Like seeing colours for a change;
- Driveway between buildings is a “mean space”;
- Suggest removing 4 parking stalls along lane and making the space a courtyard;
- The reality of having front door entrances on lane is not the best plan;

- Flat roofs lend the opportunity to use for amenity space;
- Materials – wrapping corners a challenge;
- Courtyard rather stark needs improvement;
- Like design/colours; like to see something other than hardipanel;
- Consider reducing width of garage door and using the space for greenery;
- Too strong of a vertical element, needs horizontal articulation to break up verticality;
- No problem with flat roof just emphasize horizontal lines;
- Needs a unifying element in plant material;
- Like vertical treatment and style for neighbourhood;
- Flat roof should have more access so views can be enjoyed;
- Outdoor amenities should be brought up to the living space;
- Roofs could be green outdoor spaces;
- Do not think back units work with the entry in lane;
- Parking is wasteful on this site;
- Landscape lacking;
- Streetscape should unify;
- Address street furnishings;
- Back units need front orientation;
- Privacy issues on roof;
- Support architectural design;
- Character of roof edges needs articulation;
- Consider opportunities for outdoor space possibly extend balconies beyond building;
- Explore having roof decks;
- Introduce green plantings into courtyard.

Mr. Hart offered the following comments:

- The courtyard design is complicated as one side is up slope and one side is down slope.
- Roof use is a problem with respect to becoming a blockage of view for other buildings.
- The chestnut tree will be removed.

## **6.0 DOWNTOWN INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS**

### **6.1 414 – 422 Royal Avenue**

**File: SDP00184**

Barry Waitt, Senior Planner advised the purpose of this report is to generate discussion about the possible design responses to six storey wood frame apartment development proposals using a case study.

This application is a Special Development Permit. It is RM-6 zoning which permits a Floor Space Ratio of 3.0.. The proposed building is a 6-storey wood building.

The application would require variances for parking, side yard setbacks, height and length of the building.

Permitted height -40 feet	Proposed height – 66 feet
Permitted width – 118 feet	Proposed width – 227 feet
Required side setback – 18.9 feet	Proposed side setback – 18 feet
Required number of parking spaces - 181	Proposed number of parking spaces 161

**Comments from the Panel:**

- Space unusual not offended by bulk or articulation
- Link more horizontally
- The narrow brick columns should maybe be wood
- Needs more solidity and less windows
- No obligation to express the fact that they are 3 separate buildings
- Seems busy for Royal Avenue
- Not very grand
- Without context of transportation plan, difficult to design
- Height and step back should be balanced with setbacks
- Townhouses will give some scale at the sidewalk level of Royal Avenue
- Roof needs to work into architecture
- Might want to look at floor length of parking area and consider stepping
- No problem with variances
- Brick detracts from overall expression
- Like townhouse at bottom; staggered datum may help
- Good expression with flat roof and sawtooth variation, loose expression coming down building
- Expression of main entry could be stronger
- Address lighting needs in studio units
- Use of materials, articulation nice
- The wood soffit should be carried throughout
- More detail on balconies
- Proportion good, orientation good
- Windows are an issue
- Massing a concern but not on Royal Avenue, on Cunningham Street
- Landscaping important to have as buffer
- Like thought about doing something on Royal Avenue
- Interesting form, admirable job
- 6 stories mitigates length
- Design carefully around detailing
- Wood soffits would be excellent
- Finishes – play with materials to find balance
- Suggest use of brick in landscape with decorative iron work to anchor
- Like townhouse idea
- Need some relief on the flat roof
- Landscaping strong – quality will be important

Staff will bring this application back at a later date for comment and a recommendation to the design panel.

**7.0 DOWNTOWN DESIGN APPROVALS**

**8.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION**

**9.0 CORRESPONDENCE**

**10.0 NEXT MEETING**


**October 25, 2011 at 3:00pm in Committee Room No. 2 as required.**

**11.0 ADJOURNMENT**

**ON MOTION**, the meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.



**Eric Pattison**  
Chair



**Donna Martin**  
Committee Clerk