

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:	C. Isaak, Director of Planning & Development Services 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 May 18, 2021 agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Advisory Design Panel adopts the minutes from the April 20, 2021 meeting as amended.

CARRIED

4. SUBMISSIONS TO THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

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

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. P. Byer asked for clarification regarding the scope of the rezoning application and potential relief being sought from the City of White Rock's Zoning Bylaw. G. Newman and C. Isaak provided clarification as it relates to parking and the existing zoning of the subject properties. G. Newman also acknowledged recent direction from Council regarding amendments to the

Official Community Plan as they relate to height permissions within the Town Centre Transition land use designation as well as the need for an “affordable housing component” with any project greater than four storeys in height, to a maximum of six storeys.

Welcoming remarks by P. Fassbender (Weststone representative). Reference to potential 4-storey alternative. G. Newman provided that any substantive change to the design would necessitate a review by the Panel.

Presentation provided by Architect & Landscape Architect:

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

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”).

R. Dhall - Q1 - trees on the rooftop planters? Sufficient to accommodate the weight of the trees – 10m³ volume requirement can be difficult Q2 - efforts to retain history – R – applicant has endeavored to retain trees as means of supporting the heritage of the area – Q3 – access control around pad-mount transformer (PMT) - Q4 – efforts to open the northern portion of the site up (trees and solar exposure) – R – desire to continue plantings from the existing stand of trees on the north – Q5 – opportunity to establish storage on rooftop for maintenance of amenity materials – R – typically defer to architect at the stage of detailed design

F. Kubacki – concern with access to private patios being limited – R – shared common rooftop amenity has been programmed to serve diverse needs of all residents – Q2 – larger rooftop patios tied to larger units – R – yes – Q3 – what is separating the patios? – R – landscape planters, glazed fencing between patios

S. Greysen – Q1 – clarification of rental tenure housing – how would this be secured – tied to single owner – R – Newman – to be secured through zoning – likely that rental component would be tied to a single owner - Q2 – why the need for parking increase - could have less given size of units

P. Byer – Q1 – is the footprint the same? – R – the footprint has been brought back from the north side, and is the same as was presented in October – Q2 – efforts to retain the trees – R – on-going discussion Q3 – is the rooftop colour light? – R looking at options on the colour Q4 – is the size of the smallest unit (323ft²) the same as before? R – same square footage – less of the smaller units – Q5 – accessibility design – adaptable units – do the plans address accessibility – R – 100% wheelchair accessible – adaptable units (13) designed with bigger doorways – ramp to entranceway – Q6 – has this been looked at from the Energy Step Code program – R – can meet ESC as required by White Rock

J. Muego – Q1 – unit mix – 14 adaptable suites (all 3 bedroom suites) – confirm? R – that’s correct – Q2 – rooftop screening planned for rooftop units (would add to perceived mass of building) – R – don’t have input on the screening but hoping to locate mechanical units within the 4th storey rooftop amenity – Q3 – what is the ESC requirement in White Rock – R – G. Newman – don’t require Step Code, must satisfy BC Building Code – Q4 – sound attenuation in the design of the units – R – looking at, for example, improved performance of windows facing the amenity spaces

P. Fassbender – units designed for people to age in place

Note: P. Rust experienced some technical difficulties and was temporarily disconnected from the meeting. Mr. Rust rejoined the meeting via phone shortly after the Architect’s presentation so that he could further participate in the discussion.

P. Rust – BC Housing Guidelines – specify standards for size of units & bedrooms – some areas where they come short of meeting minimum standards of BC Housing Guidelines – e.g., D2 (409 in plan) – bedroom – can’t get around the bed because of the kink in the plans – Q1 – balcony arrangements – lack proportion relative to unit size (e.g., 407) – why? Broad issues – storage – opposite the elevator – take out three units to provide more storage space – concern with fundamentals

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

P. Byer – height on south side – 6 storeys & on north 5 storeys + stairway – J. Muego – recognized the importance of framing height in terms more acceptable to public – G. Newman provided clarification of height measured per zoning – need to look at context – building may need to be broken up along the block – large size of building – too big – it would look like a big ship placed among smaller boats if they were in the water (much prefer the reduced design with one less storey, 4 storey) – would recommend rejection at this point

R. Dhall – C1 – okay response to earlier comments – still bulky – site management and circulation – north and west edge – what’s happening – access to be permitted – eyes on the street – security – more resolution and clarity – elements of design – architecture and landscaping – ability to house big trees – building that is half rental – not a best solution – on pedestals versus built in planters – a lot of programming in landscaping – type of plants – shade plants – window angles unresolved – clash – cascade – access to natural light in some of the units – odd kinks in the walls of some of the building walls

F. Kubacki – C1 – okay with five level proposal – a lot of development in the area as well – didn’t see a lot of residential amenities (e.g., common garden area) – not a lot of storage units

S. Greysen – C1 – transformative neighbourhood – 12 storey building immediately north of the proposal – C2 – housing crisis (supply) – shouldn’t cut back on developments that are otherwise allowed by policy – C3 – area on transit – walkable – respectful of neighbourhood

– good job of aesthetically allowing the project to fit within the neighborhood – need more housing – not a concrete high rise

J. Muego – transitional area (tall buildings and lower in area) – need design where most people are happy – has design solved this? – proponents have improved design – still a lot of development to occur – projects isn't getting geared up to go to building permit – window placement / type will come and be resolved – still some things remain at conceptual level – need to know more about the interface along Thrift – need more focus on perception of design at human level – desirable to introduce townhouse design at street level – not feasible in all projects given access requirements

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

P. Fassbender (Weststone) – every project requires detailed design following Panel review – need to design building to integrate with the slope – developer needs to be able to build a unit that is financially viable – issues like rooftop planting, access around the site, various landscape elements – efforts to retain trees and modify design to respect neighbours to the north and west

L. Wykpis / E. Poxleitner (Keystone) – research completed on unit sizes – marketable – perceptions of size and scale of buildings – site has given the opportunity to step the building back – will not be seen as a tall building

D. Jerke (VZA) – north and west side – there will be maintainable access to those sides of the building

J. Muego – need to balance professional expectations with what is sought of the Applicant – ability to age in place – adaptable units not limited to 3 bedroom units – other comments?

R. Dhall – like efforts that the applicant has gone to at this time – scheme, movement, circulation – capable of developing that to that level – south side of the design – needs to be articulated further – not incidental comments – need to see how the site will function – confident they will be addresses moving forward

P. Rust – sense of what is appropriate in that setting – great ship just pulled up to the dock – doesn't relate to the other boats that have pulled up to it – design still needs to be beat up a little more – look forward to seeing some refinement in the design – suspect they will resolve issues noted by the Panel

S. Greysen – if make building smaller – less units – not addressing affordability – should work towards design guidelines outlined by the City – affordability a huge issue – densify

P. Fassbender (Weststone) – comments respectfully received and will be considered moving forward – change affects people differently – some people in favour and some not – current and future needs

P. Byer – purpose of the Panel – form and character – fit within the neighbourhood. This design is too tall and wide and does not fit within the character of the neighbourhood.

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

That the project be conditionally accepted subject to addressing the comments provided by Panel during the meeting

Moved by R. Dhall | Second by F. Kubacki

Comments pertaining to the motion:

P. Rust – not happy with the design

P. Byer – will vote against – would like to defer to see the project with the lower design come back to the Panel

Vote regarding the Motion

R. Dhall – support

P. Byer – non-support

P. Rust – support

F. Kubacki – support

J. Muego – support

N. Waissbluth – absent

CARRIED

5. CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting concluded at 6:15 pm.

J. Muego
Chairperson, Advisory Design Panel

Greg Newman
ADP, Committee Secretary