



THE CORPORATION OF THE
CITY OF WHITE ROCK

15322 BUENA VISTA AVENUE, WHITE ROCK, B.C. V4B 1Y6

A **DIGITAL MEETING** of the **ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL** will be held using **MICROSOFT TEAMS** on **TUESDAY, October 19, 2021** at **3:30 p.m.** for the transaction of business listed below.

A G E N D A

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Advisory Design Panel adopts the **October 19, 2021** agenda as circulated.

3. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Advisory Design Panel adopts the minutes from the **September 21, 2021** meeting as circulated with this agenda.

4. APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS TO THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

- 4.1 877 Kent Street** - Proposed rezoning from the RT-1 Two-Unit (Duplex) Residential Zone to the RS-2 One Unit (Small Lot) Zone to enable a subdivision of the lot into two lots having frontage of less than 12.1 metres. Section 22.1 of the Official Community Plan classifies the proposal as “intensive residential development”, subject to the Mature Neighbourhood Development Permit Area Guidelines found in Section 22.9 of the Plan.

Applicant: Sue Gill | Designer: Paragon Designs | Landscape Plans: Huckleberry Landscape Design

5. CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING

HOW TO ACCESS DIGITAL MEETING

To join the “Microsoft Teams” meeting, please email gnewman@whiterockcity.ca to receive an invitation (quote “White Rock ADP Meeting” in the subject bar). Meetings of the ADP are open to the public, however, only members of the Panel and representatives of an application are permitted to discuss the merits of a proposal.

MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT:

J. Muego, Chairperson
P. Rust, Vice Chairperson
P. Byer
N. Waissbluth
R. Dhall
F. Kubacki
S. Greysen, BIA Representative

ABSENT:

None

STAFF:

G. Newman, Manager of Planning, Neethu Syam, Planner,
Emma DeMelo, Planning Intern, Jordan Pelzman, Planning &
Development Assistant II

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:30pm.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Advisory Design Panel adopts the September 21, 2021 agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Advisory Design Panel adopts the minutes from the July 20, 2021 meeting.

CARRIED

4. SUBMISSIONS TO THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

4.1. 14937 Thrift Avenue, 1441, 1443, 1445 & 1465 Vidal Street

G. Newman provided an introduction to the scope of the application.

Presentation provided by Architect & Landscape Architect:

- Eric Poxleitner, Architect, Keystone Architecture
- Lukas Wykpis, Architectural Technologist, Keystone Architecture
- Stephen Heller, van der Zalm & Associates

Peter Fassbender also attended the meeting as a representative of the Applicant.

J. Muego initiated a round of questions following the Applicant's presentation.

The questions raised by members of the Panel are numbered (e.g., "Q1") in addition to the responses provided by the Applicant's Architect / Landscape Architect (i.e., "R").

Ruchir – acknowledged positive changes – would recommend adding a little more planting on the west side (at south end) to provide separation to residential properties to the west; Q1) 12 trees on the top terrace – require structural support for the soil volume on the wood frame structure – R) will need to look at the structure elements closely moving forward; Q2) have you considered 10m³ per tree and related load impacts – R) have engaged structural engineer and confident this can be addressed; Q3) – planters and space on the west side separation from the property line – R – approximately 8 feet of space, plantings into ground adjacent to property line along west Q4) – what is the length of the study space and the balcony outside? R – 7 feet of study space, 5 feet balcony [concern with the amount of natural light into the bedroom]

Nicholas – Q1) are all the units having the closet removed R – any unit having a similar layout to representative unit would be designed with a similar built-in closet and study space Q2) will the location of the closets/study spaces have an effect on where the windows are placed? Will the depth of the study have an impact on the appearance of the building from the exterior? R – will not affect the exterior design of the building

Fay – Q1) is playground on the top level R – yes; Q2) 8 foot tiered wall on the west side of the building? – R – yes; (comment) – like the plantings / terracing Q3) – are there too many rooftop trees proposed? (comment)

Phil – Q1) – 4th floor unit privacy and impact of the noise impacts between amenity areas – how will outdoor activity on the 4th floor affect the privacy of the users of Unit 409? R – no openings along the wall and buffering to separate active space with the unit Q2) what was the response to a previous comment of having the corridor separating the units from their outdoor space? Also a concern about security of these units. R – considered but complicated by structural challenges and linkages to exit stairs – concern regarding interface between the unit and the amenity to be addressed through interior design elements Q3) concern about stormwater detention – runoff into municipal system R – working with the City on the civil design components of the project – Q4) is there a detention tank? R – (Greg) would look at detailed civil designs following receipt of 3rd reading of any zoning bylaw amendment – would look for post-development stormwater flows to match pre-development flows Q5) are the P1 and P2 parkade footprints the same – compared to original design – has the north side wall been pulled back? R- P1 and P2 footprints are the same. P3 was pulled back substantially because of the reduction in the scale of the project, P1 and P2 are different from P3 north wall, but were pulled back away from the root protection zone by approximately 2 feet; Q6) energy step – Will Step 2 will be a requirement by 2022 or 2023 in the BCBC and

pushing for Step 3? – R – will build to requirement of the Code – White Rock has not yet adopted a higher (step) requirement – Q7) Statement made at last meeting that the development has “kept the trees”, but based on arborist report is it correct that all 12 trees on the site are to be removed and only ones being kept are those offsite. R – Correct, there are no onsite trees, and only offsite tree, that can be kept. Q8) Would there be some agreement to guarantee the future viability of the trees on north and west sides? [Greg] – securities would held for the retention of protected trees with requirements for monitoring

Sharon – (comments) – looks like there is an opening next to the amenities, a locking gate that can only be accessed by those going to their private spaces, not accessible by others - energy step code --- the higher the code the more expensive the construction / design – impacts to future owners – support adding interest throughout the corridor

Paul – Q1) what is the quantity and quality of storage – will storage end up on the balconies? R – could look at adding additional storage within P3 to add space Q) – what does the storage compartment look like (chain link?)? Q) could the space be converted to storage? R- will look into this Q) rooftop space / patios – what is the partitioning made of? R) 6-foot-high solid cedar fence – Q) – what is the buffering for social activity?

Joe – Q) – confirm floor-to-floor ceiling height from Level 3 to Level 4 – R) 10 feet – would be 9 foot ceilings – would mean 1 foot structure – Q) will there be a need for a raised step from the corridor to the patio space? Q) wouldn't the step need to be inside the corridor R) yes, there would need to be a step – Q) what is the mechanical system R) pressurization units for the corridors – Q) how will the functional elements of the building be addressed in the design – hot water, heating, R) would be a communal boiler / hot water system – has yet to be decided – potentially include ceiling mounted cassettes Q) have you considered the wall separating the corridor from the amenity space – 172 lineal feet – have you thought about opening this up? R) have tried to maintain some privacy for the users of the space – comment – there is value in having some visibility along the corridor to help animate the corridor / space Q) ref to RA1.21 – what is the guard rail – inclusion of material on the railing R – plantings on top of the railings Q) would be irrigated? R) would be addressed by the property manager

J. Muego asked for **comments** on the proposal (focus on urban design, form and character)

Paul – could add some of the balcony to the living space for the bachelor unit – 9 foot ceiling could be dropped in some places

Ruchir – welcome the changes made to the landscape – southwest side concern with the separation of the parkade and so many floors looming on the property line (not enough for the plantings proposed) – rooftop/landscape concerns with the number of trees and the volume of soil required – would suggest replacement of trees within shrubs – add screens –

might want to consider the implications of those kind of plantings on the structure ~82m corridor – concern with the length – concern with lighting within the units – could intersperse the smaller units with wider units – to allow for improved opportunity for lighting within the units - would like Architect to rethink design of corridor wall within the 4th storey (introduction of glazing)

Nicholas – concern the building is too long (400ft long) – should have included a break in the building – the length of the building has creating a domino effect of issues related to landscaping and relating the project to existing development

Fay – want the building to provide feasible living spaces for residents of the community – will the rooftop be able to support the trees – like the built-in closets and the study

Phil – Continue to have the same basic concern with the length and mass of the building - that it is not compatible with adjacent developments. Appreciate drop in the height and number of units of the building, but ADP has been reacting to details within the context of this overall design and has done as much as it can. Now up to Council to deal with the length and size when it considers the zoning amendment and major development application

Joe – Panel to give recommendations (not make a decision) – to Architect – a little disappointed with the lack of changes – simple ways to improve light penetration – fixed to amenity areas and suites – believe the design remains largely unchanged – storage remained limited – concern with quality of life perspective not enough has been done – struggling with aspects that could be improved

J. Muego provided an opportunity for the Applicant to **respond to comments**

Peter F – acknowledge a number of steps remain in the approvals process, bylaw readings, structural and civil designs – WestStone working with design team to ensure the building is livable – focusing on target markets – recognizing technical work complete

A **motion** was presented by P. Byer as follows:

That the Panel recommendation that the project proceed to Council for its consideration despite on-going concerns as outlined in the meeting minutes.

Moved by P. Byer | Second by F. Kubacki

The motion was withdrawn by both movers after discussion. An alternative motion was presented, being:

That the Panel deny the application, as presented.

Moved by Ruchir | Second by P. Rust

Vote regarding the Motion

- P. Rust – support
- R. Dhall – support
- N. Waissbluth – support
- P. Byer – support
- F. Kubacki – support
- J. Muego – support

CARRIED

5. CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting concluded at 5:45 pm.

J. Muego
Chairperson, Advisory Design Panel

G. Newman
ADP, Committee Secretary