



NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL

**Tuesday March 22, 2011 3:00 p.m.
Committee Room No. 2**

MINUTES

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Eric Pattison, Chair	- Chair, AIBC Representative
Paul Goodwin	- AIBC Representative
Tom Morton	- Development Industry Representative (UDI)
Keith Ross	- BC Society of Landscape Architects
Mark Vance	- AIBC Representative
Steve Wong	- BC Society of Landscape Architects

VOTING MEMBER REGRETS:

Chris Block	- AIBC Representative
-------------	-----------------------

STAFF:

Bev Grieve	- Manager, Development Services
Jim Hurst	- Development Planner
Barry Waitt	- Senior Planner
Michael Watson	- Planning Assistant
Donna Martin	- Committee Clerk

GUESTS

Judi Turner	- Assistant Corporate Officer
-------------	-------------------------------

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT a presentation of the Rules of Conduct by the Assistant Administrative Officer Judi Turner be added to the Agenda.

CARRIED.

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

Ms. Turner reviewed the role of the members, the role of the chair, types of motions, who can make motions and how they should be presented.

2.0 NEW BUSINESS

There are no new items of business.

3.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

3.1 Adoption of the Minutes of January 25, 2011

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the New Westminster Design Panel meeting held on January 25, 2011 be received and adopted with the following correction

- *Page 5 Comments from the Panel bullet 3 should read tempestuous as opposed to impetuous.*

CARRIED.

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

3.2 Adoption of the Minutes of February 22, 2011

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the New Westminster Design Panel meeting held on February 22, 2011 be received and adopted.

CARRIED.

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

4.0 INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS

4.1 326 Hospital Street (Circulated last Meeting)

File: REZ00031

Mike Watson, Planning Assistant reported a rezoning application has been received to rezone the above captioned property from RS-2 to a Comprehensive Development District. The proposed rezoning would allow a 4 unit ground oriented townhouse development. This property is not within a Development Permit area. Staff requested comments on site permeability and marketability of the over 2,000 sq. ft. units.

Merrick Hunter and Robert Weber, Chercover Massie and Associates, reviewed the project noting the following:

- Siding materials will be hardiboard & stucco
- Craftsman style
- Client wants units big enough for families (3 bedroom)
- Units will be fronting the street
- Permeable pavers to preserve drip line of tree
- Edge planting.

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

- How high is retaining wall? *The retaining wall is 2 meters at highest point. The property grade is higher*
- How do you access rear units? *The rear units are accessed from the front driveway down to parking.*
- What is next to this property on the south side? *Single family lots are on the south side.*

Comments from the Panel:

- Consider more permeable surfaces in courtyard
- Access to site could be narrowed to 12 ft.
- Opportunity to grade property down for a more sensitive access and transition to single detached dwelling to the south
- Townhouses seem bulky, however, the area is like that
- Unit size seems reasonable and will work in the area
- Units will be unaffordable to the average person
- Courtyard appears to be rather tight
- Concern about closeness to back neighbourhood
- Changing the grade is a problem
- Suggest more plantings or trees in courtyard
- Should have arborist study protection of existing trees on property line
- Would like rationale from arborist to remove existing tree
- Units size should be reviewed to make site plan work better
- Front doors to the back units should have more of a street presence and be better connected to the street
- Useful to consider all hard surfaces as potential places for permeability
- Helpful to soften and give more permeability to entrance surfaces
- Rear yard at back seems tight because of grade
- Would have no problem with setback if building did not sit up so high
- Suggest using aqua pave for more permeability
- Concern bulk and density will have impact on single family dwellings
- Site coverage too high
- Front units inadequate open space at grade
- Too many window sizes and treatments – consider simplifying
- North gable of south building less successful seems to be a lot of blank roof
- Timber brackets holding up deck appear too small and weak
- Rear setback need to be increased considering buildings relation to single detached dwelling to the south.

5.0 DESIGN APPROVALS

5.1 131 East Columbia Street

File: DP 026 (S)

Michael Watson reported a minor Development Permit Application has been received to remove and replace the existing cladding on a two storey commercial building located at 131 East Columbia Street.

Jim Hurst reviewed the context of the site. In addition to general comments on the architectural design and site development, feedback on the following design considerations is requested:

- Design context
- Is the proposal consistent with the Columbia Street East Design Guidelines
- Exterior materials

Klaus Budde, representing Ron Allen Architect, reviewed the application noting the building will be two storeys at front and one storey at the back. The north side ground floor unit and second level will be occupied by the owner with the remainder being leased out to commercial operators. A building permit has been obtained for the top half of the building and is currently under construction. In order to tie the main floor into the rest of the building, the entrance had to be recessed to allow for the swing of the door.

The intent of the owner is to clean up the front of building with corrugated metal and recessed black aluminum windows highlighted by another colour. An awning will be placed over entrance. Signage will be simple.

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

- Will whole front be galvanized metal? *Yes*
- Was the edge of the building designed to disappear? *Yes*
- What will the corner finish be? *Simplistic corner cap.*

Comments from the Panel:

- Galvanized metal seems too much in context of other proposed buildings in the area
- Like window treatment and door has good street presence
- Proposal an improvement to what is there and will be a fine addition to City
- Guidelines ask for more of a mix of traditional and modern materials
- Landscaping needs attention on the side; planting next to parking would be nice
- Design will fit well in this district
- Would like to see samples of the materials
- Do not think canopy works – too many pieces and the angle does not fit suggest T section
- Canopy would be better flat

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the application for a minor Development Permit for 131 East Columbia be supported with the following considerations:

- *Detail of exterior materials*
- *Detail of canopy*
- *Make an effort to plant along side street*

- *Colour of exterior material to be reviewed with staff approval.*

CARRIED.

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

5.2 Queensborough Community Centre (900 Ewen Avenue) File:

Jim Hurst, Development Planner reported this project was previously presented at the February 22, 2011 meeting. The City is creating an expansion to the existing Queensborough Community Centre of 13, 000 sq. ft. It will integrate a range of facilities including childcare, expanded fitness facilities, a library, Police office and administrative space and additional multipurpose rooms.

Jennifer Marshall, Urban Arts Architecture, reviewed the proposal noting the intention is to reconnect the Queensborough Community Centre to the community so people will feel more welcome. The canopy and entrance sequence have been changed to open the front of the building up more and the night lights should cause it to become a beacon to the community. The community quilt is the inspiration for multi coloured facade representing life and diversity of the community.

With respect to the landscape plan, the willow trees will be maintained and there will be a rainwater feature coming off the roof. The pathway around the building may be asphalt depending on monies available. Signage will be provided by the Parks, Culture and Recreation Department

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

- What materials will be used for the roof? *Torch down roof in highly reflective light grey.*

Comments from the Panel:

- Consider durable panel rather than cedar
- Successful in making the entrance lighter
- Concerned about indirect nature of path
- Like golden glow on soffit, hoping grey of cedar will blend
- Like architecture; changes to entry seem to improve existing building
- Not concerned about circulation; bridges are key and could be improved with site lighting for evenings
- Circulation could be improved by the addition of bike racks at each entry
- Insure pathway circumnavigates the building with landscaping accordingly
- Entry way needs more work; suggest being more generous with open area
- Space between canal and building needs to be addressed by a professional
- Suggest gravel rather than asphalt for pathway permeability
- Need more detail in landscaping
- Need to address the strip
- Nice design, fits well support
- Like new entry design feels like integral part of building
- Like multicolour paint in front

- Don't use asphalt for even temporary
- Water feature design needs resolution
- Need seating in entrance area, suggest benches
- General support, entrance works
- Need to see landscape architect's plan
- Feel the rainwater garden is too much for that area
- Way finding needs to be strong

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the proposed addition to the Queensborough Community Center at 900 Ewen Avenue be supported architecturally;

THAT the Panel requires a rendered landscape plan to be present; and

THAT the landscape plan should take into consideration the following:

- *Detailed design of entry*
- *East walkway*
- *Stream edge condition of trees.*

CARRIED.

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

A recess was called at 5:07 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 5:12 p.m.

5.3 41 & 175 Duncan Street

File: REZ00008

Bev Grieve, Manager of Planning, reported a rezoning application has been received for the property addressed as 41 and 175 Duncan Street. The application is to rezone the property to allow future development of a 406 unit multiple unit residential development and a small commercial or light industrial building.

Andrew Mindell, Creekside Architects, reviewed the design guidelines as presented in the On Table document entitled Mercer Landing Guidelines. He noted the intent of the guidelines is to provide direction for the future development of the former Star Shipyards site. The historical nature of the site will be celebrated by encouraging historical naming and preservation of industrial artefacts where possible.

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

- Will underground parking cover the entire site? *Primary parking will be under the buildings. A deck level will be established at the top of dyke level.*
- Did you consider putting the two storey employment zone building on the other side of the property for more direct access? *It was determined the building is a good buffer and it is better to have the walkway along residential where there are "eyes on the street."*
- Did you consider a six storey building? *It was put forward at an early stage but it was decided four storeys is more achievable at this time.*

Comments from the Panel:

- Like how parking is being handled

- Consider separating two middle buildings
- Historical reference is not very specific; concerned the site planning does not reflect heritage value; like to see industrial heritage be brought into landscape.
- Need more definitive circulation plan; currently some weaknesses
- Suggest bringing employment building further into project
- Uncomfortable with underground parking being higher than the dyke
- Internal streets need more detail
- Open spaces need to be connected
- Consider how to connect walkways to the rest of community
- Would like to see some insurance in the guidelines that there will be an integration between existing public roads and pathways
- Circulation systems important need a lot of thought to satisfy needs
- Historic interpretive area should reflect industrial in content and presentation
- Green spaces seem disconnected
- Need more detail regarding circulation
- Historic artefacts could better be reflected in planning
- Need professional heritage consultant to do inventory of artefacts

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the application for 41 and 75 Duncan Street be supported with the following site plan and design guideline considerations:

- *Clarification on landscaping regarding off slab native plants*
- *Location of amenity spaces*
- *Historic references need to be more specific*
- *Schematic circulation plan needed*
- *Height of parking structure above dyke and roads*
- *Integration of open spaces*

CARRIED.

Five members of the Panel voted in favour of the motion with one member opposed.

5.4 271 Francis Way (Victoria Hill Parcel J)

File: DP 009 (W)

Barry Waitt, Senior Planner, reported an application has been received for a 21 storey multiple family residential project, composed of 16 townhouse units and 232 dwelling units in the tower. The proposed building is approximately 276,300 sq ft. with an FSR of 1.86.

Martin Bruckner, IBI Group, reviewed the issues raised at the last meeting and proposed ways to address them.

- Massing of tower has been broken up
- Colouring and materials will be carried over to the townhouses
- Roofline of the townhouses will be flattened to achieve a Craftsman style
- Northwest corner has been revised to provide a more defined visual focus from Memorial Drive.

David Stoyko, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture Inc., reviewed the landscape plan noting attention has been focused on the integration of the vehicle courtyard area. There will be more room for a community garden. Plant materials meet the standards in the area. Entry has been enhanced with layering and monumentation.

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

- Where is main entrance to building? *The recessed main entrance is near the corner of Francis Way and Memorial Drive.*

Comments from the Panel:

- Well done like articulation of tower
- Landscaping has good polish to it
- Like townhouse separation at corner
- Nice to retain trees
- Like changes to address concerns
- Would like to see more brick on townhouses
- Make sure walkway down north side to ravine is welcoming to public
- Glazing gives form
- Top of tower softened
- Picking up on arc on west elevation – should read like that
- Secondary frames seem unresolved
- Balcony on southeast corner needs to be adjusted

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the application for 271 Francis Way be supported with the following considerations:

- *North walkway needs to be more welcoming*
- *Consider extent of glass on crown of building*
- *Consider articulation of secondary parapet frames.*

CARRIED.

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

6.0 DOWNTOWN INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS

7.0 DOWNTOWN DESIGN APPROVALS

7.1 810 Quayside Drive (River Market Bike Pods)

File: SDP00181

Barry Waitt, Senior Planner reported a minor Special Development Permit has been received to add a “Bike Pod” (to be used as an office) and a bike storage facility to the River Market site to accommodate a bike rental business.

Heiner Dreer, reviewed the plan for the bike storage and bike pod, highlighting the bright colours on the Pod to draw life to the area. The storage facility will be of a chain link like material.

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

- How do you access the storage facility? *The storage facility is accessed through a door on the side away from the street.*
- Is the property owned or rented? *The space is rented from River Market.*
- Where is the property line? *The property line is on the other side of the Quayside Drive.*
- What material will be used for the window and doors? *The door will be steel and the windows will be aluminum but covered at night by shades.*
- Will there be signage on the pod? *There will be signage on the pod.*
- What is the lighting on the soffit? *Lighting has been improved on the Market with the recent renovation.*

Comments from the Panel:

- Recommend black window frames and color treatment of door.
- Recommend anti-graffiti material.
- Good project.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Special Development Permit to add a "Bike Pod" to the River Market be supported with consideration of colour of window frames and door, and signage in keeping with Market.

CARRIED.

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

7.2 125 Columbia Street

**File: REZ00043
SDP00175**

Panel member Keith Ross excused himself from his duties as a Panel member as he is the landscape architect of record for this proposal.

Barry Waitt reported an application for rezoning and for a Special Development Permit has been received to allow a mixed use, twenty-one storeys multiple dwelling residential project with commercial at grade. The current proposal is for 101 apartment units, 8 townhouse units and 740 square feet of commercial with a total floor area of 112, 105 square feet and a FSR of 6.43.

Harvey Hatch, Harvey Hatch, Architect, reviewed the changes to the project noting security gates have been installed and there is visitor access on the 4th parking level.

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

- Why did you change colour scheme? *Some thought the proposed colour scheme was too flamboyant.*
- Is there a treatment proposed for Columbia Street entry along the pathway? *The entry will be patterned concrete, different from the Central Valley Greenway.*

Comments from the Panel:

- Improvement over last presentation

- Extraordinarily difficult site to build on but there is some improvement in access, materials, setback, etc.
- Glad to see a number of concerns have been addressed deserves support
- Consider pulling back spine of building
- Servicing of retail still not addressed
- Townhouse windows don't match plans with elevations
- Base should be more in style with the building
- Some improvement but don't see a reason not to follow the downtown guidelines (narrow tower above 7th floor)
- Balconies on south side are still unusable at 4 feet wide

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the proposed rezoning and Special Development Permit for 125 Columbia Street be supported with the following considerations:

- *Address character at top of tower to meet Downtown Guidelines;*
- *Treatment of Columbia Street entry – consider glazed wall;*
- *Redesign kitchens to allow larger balconies on the south side of the building;*
- *Coordinate between the plan and elevations the window size and location for townhouses*

DEFEATED.

Three members were opposed.

The applicant was asked to bring this proposal back to the Panel after considering the comments above.

Member Keith Ross returned to his duties on the Panel.

7.3 811 Columbia Street (Plaza 88 – Retail Phase)

File: SDP00158

An application has been received to obtain approval for an amendment to Special Development Permit 158 for the retail phase of Plaza 88. These changes represent the rethinking of the project in terms of the story of New Westminster that the designers wish to convey and their concern about the permanency of the chosen materials.

Stephen Scheving reported on the history of the project before turning the presentation over to Graham McGarva, VIA Architecture.

Mr. McGarva reviewed the changes to the proposal with special attention to the façade. He stated the roof design is calmer to complement the new façade.

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

- Is there a roof you look down on from the ticketing level? *No.*
- Is the hardiplank larger than residential size? *Commercial size is 4 ft. x 9 ft.*
- What is the material for the green screen in front of parking garage? *Flowering clematis will be planted along mesh for year round greenery.*

- Are the story panels meant to be changed? *There is a possibility the story panels could be changed out in the future.*
- What are the large black square panels on the roof? *The large black panels are the theatre roof vents.*
- Did you consider metal panels? *Metal panels are not economically feasible.*
- What material is the party wall? *Scored concrete.*

Comments from the Panel:

- More coherent, support changes
- Not enough texture for a huge mass; not comfortable with hardipanel
- Seems to be a conflict between commercial signage and graphics
- Feel architectural story is not clear to average person
- Like the use of colours and hidden message
- Changing panels periodically invites interest
- Comfortable with direction taken
- Concerned with use of hardipanel, fasteners will show
- Kyoto end looks interesting
- Roof articulates big masses underneath

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the proposed changes and modifications affecting the special development permit for the retail phase of Plaza 88 be supported with the following considerations:

- *Advise special care and attention to hardi panel*
- *Support story*

CARRIED.

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

8.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION


9.0 CORRESPONDENCE

10.0 NEXT MEETING

April 26, 2011 at 3:00pm in Committee Room No. 2 as required.

11.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.



Eric Pattison
Chair



Donna Martin
Committee Clerk