



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, July 20, 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 **July 20, 2021** agenda as circulated.

3. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Advisory Design Panel adopts the minutes from the **June 15, 2021** meeting as circulated with this agenda.

4. APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS TO THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

- 4.1 **1453 Stayte Road** – 21 three-storey townhome units, each of which has a two-car garage, proposed within four townhouse blocks. Applicant/Architect: Atelier Pacific Architecture Inc. (Jessie Arora) | Landscape Architect: VDZ+A

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
GUESTS:	Approximately 20 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.
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 June 15, 2021 agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Advisory Design Panel adopts the minutes from the May 18, 2021 meeting as amended.

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").

P. Byer – Q1) Have the concrete walls tied to P2 and P1 been pulled back and if so by how much? R – the walls will be pulled back on all levels Q2) how does the design / materials fit in with the west coast design sought by the DPA guidelines (22.6.1) – R – terraced design – stone and glass

P. Rust Q1) Have the parkade walls been pulled back? R – the parkade wall will be pulled back on all levels Q2) Preservation of large trees – when you do deep excavation how does that affect the water table and existing trees? – R – Stephen H commented on ability to explore this topic further – G Newman added that controls would be incorporated into the tree management permit to ensure the "cut face" around the parkade did not result in impacts to protected trees (i.e., loss of moisture)

R. Dhall - Q1) Has an enclosure been added to the rooftop so that materials could be stored on the rooftop R – space within the parkade available to support storage – Q2) Reference to ADP4.07 – requested clarification of materials as shown in the rendering R – would be hardy board with a painted finish – aluminum panel – charcoal – Q3) rationale for the design treatment of the fascia R – desire to create some strength in the horizontality of the façade - Q4) reference to northwest corner (dark regarding solar exposure) – would the trees be installed in the location (at the ground) – R – can confirm that they would be added

P. Byer Q1) energy efficiency – energy step code will become mandatory in 2023? How will the Architects make the project a Step 3 building? R – have done Step 3 and 4 buildings where required in other jurisdiction – would need to run energy model to confirm construction standard – expect they would be close to Step 3

P. Rust Q1) question regarding the purpose of a small room between the parkade and the elevator lobby within P1 (includes three doors / accesses) – R – required by the Code for the separation between the parkade and the residential units / shared lobby space Q2) Third level 319 – balcony lines seem off – R - clarification provided Q3) length of corridor seems long requiring some breaks R – some additional details can be looked at to break up the design

J. Muego – Q1) has space been allocated for rooftop mechanical as it relates to rooftop amenity spaces R – has not been developed yet but would be looked at moving forward

P. Byer – Q1) how much is strata versus rentals – R – 100% strata

F. Kubacki – Q1) reiterate tenure R – 100% strata

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

N. Waissbluth – nice to see refinements – demonstrated response to comments from Panel – “west coast design” problematic reference in OCP – current pallet does not reflect this – hardy board and aluminum – should be using most natural materials as possible – interested in southwest corner of the building where the development interacts with the neighbour – can the design of the southwest corner of the building be enhanced to avoid presenting as a blank wall for the residents of the buildings that front onto Thrift Avenue, immediately southwest of the development - reference to ADP 3.02 within the presentation slides

P. Byer – reducing the height has addressed a number of concerns – supportive of the project – tenure not an issue of concern – a lot of units are studios (~300ft²) – concern with small size of the strata units – energy step should be improved – more “west coast design” – impacts on protected trees of concern – how are storeys defined – needs to be clear for council – privacy on units at the top storey (4th storey) 407, 408 & 409 – will people using the common space affect the enjoyment / privacy of the noted units

P. Rust – reference to the rendering illustrating the project and the Beverley building to the north – misleading as it relates to the scale of the Beverley – projects tough to pencil on the basis of the scale – seems lacking in design – not in favour of the project

R. Dhall – significant evolution of the project – issues in the architectural landscape have not been resolved – three things that stand out – area needs to be more worked out in terms of being more usable / workable - lacking storage space for rooftop amenities – not supportive of the trees in the northwest corner – one plant species around four sides of the building – need more diversification of the plant types – hardy coloured in wood tones not a good idea – apart from those details don’t mind a project like this – there is a niche for smaller units in the marketplace – would have liked to see partial rental tenure

S. Greysen – strata v. rental – strata can be rented - “west coast design” came into OCP many years ago – reference to Whistler – economics moving forward need to support replication of west coast (natural) materials – maintenance and costs of repair / replacement reflected in strata fees – affordability level influenced by energy efficiency expected / required

F. Kubacki – supportive of reduction in height – sole strata less confusing than a mixed tenure building – nice addition to the neighbourhood – potential that units may be more affordable than other more recent developments

J. Muego – concern that the drop in height has thrown proportions of the building off – top floor could have had the corridor shifted to the east side of the building would have had private rooftop patios linked to the units themselves – design of the southwest façade not articulated – creates blank interface with abutting residential uses – design of the units seems unrefined – space for future tenants / owners seems compromised

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

P. Fassbender, spokesperson for the Applicant – have kept the trees for two reasons – enhancement of the environment – respect for the neighbours (protection of views) – re: step code – developers will do what they can to achieve highest level of the code achievable – will continue to advance refinements – project needs to be financially viable and something that the community can be proud of – will look at changes (e.g., storage on the roof) – a lot of work has gone into the market for smaller units – believe there is a market basis (demand) for smaller units – seniors and singles

P. Byer – a lot more could be done to improve design – would like to see the project go to the next stage – rely on Planners and Council to address remaining issues – question for P. Rust – not in support because of the design or size of units or both? – P. Rust – accumulation of items – does not achieve a standard that P. Rust is willing to accept – P. Byer – what design changes required?

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

That the Panel supports the project proceeding to Council, subject to the conditions provided by the Panel during this meeting, being addressed to the satisfaction of Staff.

Moved by P. Byer | Second by N. Waissbluth

Discussion – could the project be brought to the Panel after the project being given 1st and 2nd Reading?

Vote regarding the Motion

N. Waissbluth – support
P. Rust – non-support
R. Dhall – support
P. Byer – support >> changed vote to non-support
J. Muego – non-support
F. Kubacki – non-support

DEFEATED

J. Muego asked for a revised motion

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

That the Panel defers making a recommendation on the project pending the resolution of issues to be listed by the Panel (being the issues raised during this meeting) following which the application be brought back to the Panel and the Applicant speak to how the issues have been addressed.

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

CARRIED

4.2. 15495 Oxenham Avenue

G. Newman provided an introduction to the scope of the application as it relates to the City of White Rock Official Community Plan and Development Permit Area Guidelines.

The Applicant presented their revised proposal to the Panel.

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”).

P. Byer Q1) – landscape plan identifies that trees in the front are being retained – the rendering does not illustrate these trees R – error / omission in the rendering Q2) has the driveway been reduced in area R – Applicant believes it has been reduced – Q3) – size of the house – what is beside the house? R – the materials will be as illustrated in the landscape plan Q4) clarification of the surface material and the inclusion of a cedar fence

R. Dhall – inclusion of a window well in the concrete path – Q1) would there be a grill over the window well – R – yes there would be a metal grill over the window well Q2) any change to the driveway slope? R – size and slope have been changed – narrower and less steep – Q3) can the steps be better-incorporated into the walls so that they do not create an encumbrance to vehicles using the driveway

J. Muego – Q1) should be looking at grades – question the reliability of the materials

N. Waissbluth – Q1) does WR require a connection from the sidewalk to the front >> No

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

P. Rust – Q1) scale – need to line up the eaves – if eaves line up the design would look more control – would like to see roof overhangs increased from 2 feet to 3 feet – height of the deck to the soffit on the western half doesn’t look natural – Q2) why have the garage doors different – should be different

N. Waissbluth – unclear if the Applicant has engaged an Engineer to make sure the roof lines will work – R – has taken the designs to West Coast Truss – no issues with the project – structural aspect of the project also considered – column as shown in “Right Elevation” seems unachievable and will likely need to be revised when they look for a building permit –

update site plan so it matches landscape plan – double-check the grades as shown in the drawings as the stairs shown do not appear to work with the grades – triple check the designs with structural engineer

S. Greysen – hoping for gentle densification – can support less distinction in the garage doors – should be the same –

F. Kubacki – garage door should be similar – too different – reference to front façade – why is the glass panels within the railing at different heights – top railing on the second storey runs into the roof – east unit has a window at the façade whereas the other unit (west) does not have a window on the second level to provide natural light into the unit

P. Byer – changes since last review are interrelated – glad to see more of the existing trees being retained. Would like to see open spaces rather than a fence between the neighbours to have a more neighbourhood feel, but that is up to the owners.

S. Greysen – imperative that City directs more clearly how this is going to happen

J. Muego – needs to be a clearer understanding of what WR is looking for in the design (reference to “west coast design”) – some adjustments made – going in the right direction – some items (e.g., garage doors) need to be considered in the context of broader design – concerned with the mix of materials and their use in the design (e.g., application of stone) – some concern with the precedent of accepting a project that is not quite ready

G. Newman – potential need for the City to further evaluate the creation of duplex design guidelines

The Panel discussed some of the potential pros and cons of potentially pursuing the creation of design guidelines.

P. Byer left the meeting at 5:55 pm.

A **motion** was presented by R. Dhall as follows:

Recommend the return of the Application to the Panel so that the Applicant can demonstrate how the comments raised by the Panel have been addressed.

Moved by R. Dhall and seconded by P. Rust

N. Waissbluth – support

R. Dhall – support

F. Kubacki – support

P. Rust – support

J. Muego – support

CARRIED

5. CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting concluded at 6:07 pm.

J. Muego
Chairperson, Advisory Design Panel

G. Newman
ADP, Committee Secretary

Unadopted