

Attachment #11

New Westminster Design Panel Minutes

NEW WESTMINSTER DESIGN PANEL

Tuesday, June 23, 2020 at 3:00 p.m.

Meeting held electronically under Ministerial Order No. M192

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Taichi Azegami	- Architectural Institute of BC (AIBC) Representative
Geoff Lawlor	- Architectural Institute of BC (AIBC) Representative
Fabian Leitner	- Urban Development Institute (UDI) Representative
Sarah Siegel	- BC Society of Landscape Architects (BCSLA) Representative
Mark Thompson	- Architectural Institute of BC (AIBC) Representative

REGRETS:

Achim Charisius	- Architectural Institute of BC (AIBC) Representative
Mary Wong	- BC Society of Landscape Architects (BCSLA) Representative

GUESTS:

Eric Cheung	- Regal Century Management Inc.
Robert Duke	- Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc.
Joceline Martel	- Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc.
Jason McDougall	- Perry + Associates
Michael Patterson	- Perry + Associates

STAFF:

Mike Watson	- Senior Planner
Carilyn Cook	- Committee Clerk
Heather Corbett	- Committee Clerk

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

1.0 HOUSEKEEPING

1.1 Virtual Meeting Introductions

Heather Corbett, Committee Clerk welcomed Panel members to the meeting and briefly reviewed how to use the online meeting functions.

2.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

2.1 Adoption of the Agenda of June 23, 2020

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the agenda of the June 23, 2020 New Westminster Design Panel (NWDP) meeting be adopted, with the following addition:

- 7.1 Additional UDI Representative to NWDP

CARRIED.

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

3.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

3.1 Adoption of the Minutes of May 26, 2020

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the May 26, 2020 New Westminster Design Panel meeting be adopted, with the following correction:

- On page 1, date of meeting should read May 26, 2020.

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 51 Elliot Street – Rezoning and Development Permit for Proposed Multiple Unit Residential Tower

Mike Watson, Senior Planner, summarized the staff report dated June 23, 2020, regarding the application for a Rezoning and Development Permit for a residential high-rise development at 51 Elliot St, with 281 overall units, including below-market rental housing and a not-for-profit child care facility.

Mr. Watson reviewed the site's location, policy context and the City policies that affect the application, and asked for the Panel's response to the set of questions in the staff report.

Robert Duke, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc., and Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, provided a presentation regarding the application, highlighting the following information:

- Site location details, including a transportation diagram and aerial, context and street views;

- Composition of building, including residential units, daycare area, amenity areas, and parking;
- Site plan, grade changes, tower separations from adjacent buildings, and view corridors from adjacent streets towards Albert Crescent Park;
- Existing pedestrian pathways, access points and setbacks designed to maintain livability and optimize the adjacency to the park;
- Details of concept studies and precedent images for the tower, with water and the sculpting of stones lending expression to the geometry and flow of the shape of the building and balconies;
- Floor plans, elevation drawings, materials and shadow studies for the building;
- Landscape plans, including improvements to the public pathway;
- Palette of materials, and details of water feature, childcare play area, dog area, patios, amenity areas, and enclosed yards; and,
- Precedent images demonstrating theme, materials and planting.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Duke and Mr. Patterson provided the following information:

- The proposal includes exterior bike parking, bike lockers on all floors, and a bike repair room within the building, and the proposal allows for connections into the City's pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure;
- The childcare facility is proposed as a stand-alone structure which would interface with the building through a connection on the parking level, where there are parking spots for the employees; and,
- The project team has been liaising with daycare operators for optimal design requirements; however, the building would be built as a shell for the operator to design.

In general, the Panel noted that the proposal successfully addresses the City's inclusionary housing policy, and is commendable, particularly given the grading challenges of the site.

The Panel noted the following comments in relation to the staff questions asked in the above-noted staff report:

Question 1) Comments from the panel would be appreciated regarding how the building contributes towards the Albert Crescent Precinct vision, especially in regards to:

- *Human scale development;*
 - *Integration / relationship of the building with the street, adjacent pedestrian pathways, and Albert Crescent Park; and,*
 - *Inclusion of well-articulated ground-oriented housing.*
- The proposal responds to the site's grade change very well with the use of townhouses;

- The edges of the proposed development and the connection of the building to the park are well-resolved;
- The proposed development could make Albert Crescent Park feel removed from the rest of the City and lose the connection between the park and the downtown;
- Views from Carnarvon Street into the park may be obscured by the daycare;
- Applying a bolder approach to the shape of the daycare building could provide an improved visual connection and access to the park from Carnarvon Street;
- The geometry of Albert Crescent Park is very strong and there may be an opportunity to recognize this geometry within the proposed development's design; and,
- Consider the location of the public walkway relative to the developments, as there may be an opportunity to improve its location and make it feel more public.

Question 2) Comments from the panel regarding building separation and privacy, especially to the north and south, would be appreciated.

- Appreciation was noted for the mix of urban interface to the North and the park interface to the East side of the building;
- The proposed separation to the North is successful because it creates an urban feel;
- No concern was noted in terms of the density or proximity of the proposed tower to surrounding towers; and,
- The location of the tower is reasonable considering the grading on the site and the accommodation of view corridors of the neighbouring tower.

Question 3) Comments from the panel regarding building shadow impacts on the public realm would be appreciated.

- The shadow impacts of the proposed development on the public realm are not unreasonable or excessive, and are as expected within an urban, high density area.

Question 4) Comments from the panel regarding the revised materials, texture of the materials, material colours, and the material detailing would be appreciated.

- The material palette is successful and clarifies the concept behind the building;
- The proposed materials contrast with the masonry used in adjacent developments, and the recommendations in the design guidelines for residential uses;
- The balcony concepts and activation of greenspaces through the rooftop areas are successful; and,

- The design concepts of rocks and water could be applied even more to the grounds of the development.

Question 5) Comments from the panel regarding the integration of residential tenures and the childcare use would be appreciated.

- The integration of the proposed building's uses are successful, particularly around the base, where the slope of the site is difficult;
- It works well to have different residential types on separate floors of the building;
- Further consideration may be needed in terms of the drop-off, parking and access requirements of the childcare centre;
- The shape of the childcare centre may need to be evaluated further with consideration of the operator's requirements;
- Consider providing covered outdoor space for the childcare centre;
- Further consideration could be given to bicycle circulation within the building; and,
- The project's amenities are very successful.

MOVED and SECONDED

That the Design Panel support the application, taking into account the feedback provided by the Panel.

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

7.1 Alternate Urban Design Institute (UDI) Representative on Design Panel

Heather Corbett, Committee Clerk, discussed a previous request for information by the Panel on the process to add an alternate UDI Representative to the Design Panel. Ms. Corbett noted that alternates are not provided for within the City's Advisory Committee Policy, and that, as the terms of reference for the Panel are approved by Council, Panel members would be welcome to provide feedback to Council about the composition of the Panel.

Panel members noted the following comments:

- In other cities, there are backup members from UDI in cases where recusal may be necessary;

- If a second UDI member were to be appointed, it would be preferable for the Panel to permanently increase by one member, rather than have designated alternates;
- It may be best for UDI to send a letter to Council on this matter, rather than comments come from the Design Panel; and,
- Recusal by members is standard procedure on Design Panels in the region.

8.0 CORRESPONDENCE

There were no items.

9.0 NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, July 28, 2020, via electronic meeting.

10.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting was adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

Certified Correct,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Fabian Leitner
Chair

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Heather Corbett
Committee Clerk