

MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT:	K. Hammersley, Chairperson P. Rust J. Muego, Vice Chairperson P. Byer N. Waissbluth R. Dhall S. Greysen, BIA Representative
ABSENT:	None
GUESTS:	NA
STAFF:	G. Newman, Manager of Planning

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 January 26, 2021 agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Advisory Design Panel adopts the minutes from the November 17, 2020 meeting as circulated.

CARRIED

4. REVIEW OF TERMS OF REFERENCE & SUBMISSIONS CHECKLIST

The Panel first discussed the ADP Terms of Reference (TOR) as circulated in the Agenda. The Panel provided feedback as outlined below:

- Section 2. Composition of the Panel - removal of redundancy regarding reference to desire for Panel members to be White Rock residents and/or property owners;
- Section 5.b) – removal of “Engineer / Urban Planner” from the reference to members who must be present in order to achieve quorum. This change was made as the composition of the Panel (Section 2) did not require that members be from an engineering or planning background but, rather, acknowledged the backgrounds in reference to resident members.
- Section 6.i) Procedures (presentation to ADP) – replacement of list of presentation items as outlined in the draft TOR with a list of items as outlined in the Submissions Checklist (i.e., each of the primary deliverables as outlined in the rows of the Checklist would be listed as the items to be addressed in the presentation). Mr. Newman noted that these would include the row item in addition to examples of the content to be included / referenced in the presentation, being:
 - o Project Description (e.g., alignment with policies of Official Community Plan, tenure of housing, results of technical study, etc.);
 - o Zoning Compliance Matrix (e.g., existing and proposed zone standards, areas of zoning relief sought, etc.);
 - o Design Rationale (e.g., materials and methods of construction, sustainable design elements, efforts to retain mature trees, contributions to the public realm, etc.);
 - o Public Information Meeting (e.g., summary of feedback received);
 - o Development Permit Area (DPA) Guideline Response Table (e.g., summary of how the project upholds applicable DPA guidelines);
 - o Contextual Information (e.g., parcel fabric, ortho imagery, land use designation per OCP and zoning, etc.);
 - o Contextual Renderings and Elevations;
 - o Site and Streetscape Photos;
 - o Colours and Materials Board (e.g., samples of colour palettes and exterior finishes to be used in the project, photos of real world use of colours and materials proposed, etc.);
 - o Site Plan (e.g., siting of buildings and structures, driveways, amenity areas and programming, landscaping, etc.);
 - o Shadow Impact Study (e.g., impact of the project on adjacent properties);
 - o Wind Impact (e.g., driving rain impacts, down-draft impacts to pedestrians, mitigative measures and design);
 - o Tree Survey (e.g., plan illustrating “protected trees” as defined in the City’s Tree Management Bylaw, 2008, No. 1831 – demonstrated efforts to retain trees);
 - o Architectural Drawings (e.g., elevation drawings, floor plans, key sections to demonstrate floor to ceiling heights and structural design elements, etc.);
 - o Landscape Plan (e.g., design rationale, materials plan, specification / detail drawings, grading plans, planting plants, illustrative landscape plans – lighting details, etc.);
- Section 6 – it was noted that if an Application returns to the ADP as a result of a prior deferral, the Applicant will be expected to speak to the changes made to the proposal in response to the comments made by the Panel;

- Section 6.n) – Panel members agreed that this section of the circulated draft TOR ought to be removed as the Applicant, or their consulting Architect / Landscape Architect, ought to be present when their project is to be considered by the ADP;
- The Panel noted some grammatical and spelling corrections to be made to the ADP Submissions Checklist. In addition, the Panel noted the following as it relates to the Checklist circulated with the agenda:
- Regarding Site Photos, the deliverable ought to include photos of the subject property, adjacent properties and views of the streetscape, generally being within 50 to 100 metres of the subject property or properties;
- Regarding the Wind Impact (including Driving Rain Impact) deliverable, the Panel agreed that it should not be required for “Simple” applications and that the description of the deliverable would be prepared by Mr. Newman pending additional review of alternate approaches. It was suggested that “down draft impacts to pedestrians” be included in the description of the deliverable in addition to potential mitigative controls;
- Regarding Architectural Drawings it was noted that there may be duplication of content with respect to the reference to 3D renderings, which also appeared to form part of the deliverable for Contextual Renderings and Elevations. Mr. Newman offered to remove redundancy.

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the members of the Advisory Design Panel endorse the revisions to the ADP Terms of Reference and the ADP Submissions Checklist, as amended throughout the meeting, and that they request staff to present the revised materials to Council for subsequent endorsement.

CARRIED

5. SUBMISSIONS TO THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

None

6. 2021 ADP MEETING DATES

Draft 2021 ADP meeting dates as noted below:

Jan 26	Feb 16	Mar 16
Apr 20	May 18	Jun 15
July 20	Aug 17	Sept 21
Oct 19	Nov 16	Dec 21

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the members of the Advisory Design Panel approve of the 2021 meeting dates as noted in the agenda.

CARRIED

7. CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting concluded at 5:10 pm.

(Joe Muego, 2021 Chairperson)

Karen Hammersley
Chairperson, Advisory Design Panel

Greg Newman
ADP, Committee Secretary