

PRESENT: K. Otter
I. Tom
L. Sinclair
L. Nielsen
H. Steiss
R. Drew
A. Sinha

ABSENT: None

NON-VOTING MEMBERS: Sharon Greysen

GUESTS: Majd Makdissey, Applicant
Yiwen Ruan, Landscape Architect
SFS Construction, Owner

STAFF: A. Berry, Director of Planning and Development Services, Chairperson
N. Syam, Planning Division Lead
S. Bihari, Planning & Development Assistant II

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairperson provided a welcome and introduced members of the panel.

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

It was **MOVED** by L. Nielsen and **SECONDED** by A. Sinha to approve the Agenda THAT the Advisory Design Panel adopts the May 21, 2024, Agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was **MOVED** by K. Otter and **SECONDED** by L. Nielsen THAT the Advisory Design Panel adopts the Minutes from November 22, 2024, meeting as circulated.

CARRIED

5. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Chairperson provided an overview of the ADP Terms of Reference to the panel members, to which no objections were made.

Before proceeding to the submitted application, the Chairperson asked the panel members if there were any conflicts of interest. At this time, A. Sinha had recused himself and left the meeting.

6. APPLICATION SUBMISSION TO THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

N. Syam, Planner, provided an overview of the policy and regulatory framework applicable to the application under review by the ADP. The following subsection outlines the Minutes of the meeting as they relate to the application.

6.1. Application: 1363 Johnston Road – Mixed-Used Development – Majd Makdissy, Applicant

The applicant provided an overview of their proposed mixed-used development.

The Landscape architect provided an overview of the proposed landscaping for the development.

Members of the Panel asked the applicant about the following to clarify the application:

- A question was raised about the reduction in parking spaces from 19 to 14 stalls. Will there be accommodation for residents for the parking spaces. For example, Compass Card. *(Applicant confirmed there is a reduction in parking stalls, however there was a Traffic Study conducted, the owner will provide a Compass Card in lieu of shortage of parking stalls)*
- A question was raised about the accessible parking stall, it was not clear if this was solely for the residents or the commercial unit as well. *(Applicant confirmed one (1) accessible parking stall per Zoning Bylaw and advised the three (3) commercial parking and loading stalls will be shared for visitors and customers.)*
- A question was raised about the location of the commercial parking stalls in connection with the location of the CRU. How will customers have access to CRU from parking at rear? *(Applicant showed a set of stairs which will provide access for customers to Level 1 which will provide direct access to the CRU)* Follow up question was raised by the same panel member about a customer only has access to CRU by accessing stairs from parking at rear. *(Architect confirmed this is correct)*
- A question was raised about if the developer will provide Compass Pass in perpetuity to residents? Will each parking stall have EV charging? *(Staff stated applicant is seeking a variance for parking which is part of the proposed rezoning application where Council will need to consider the components of the Parking Study and what the developer is offering in lieu of the parking spaces is appropriate from a zoning perspective)*
- A question was raised about if each parking stall will have EV charging? *(Staff confirmed applicant is proposing EV parking spaces. Developer is required to provide rough-in infrastructure)* Follow up question directed to applicant: Will EV rough-in infrastructure be required for all parking stalls? *(Architect was not sure, and will confirm with Zoning Bylaw)*
- Comment was made that there is a new push to have electric bicycle charging as well.

- A question was raised about whether there will be a visible address for the residential component of the building? (*Applicant confirmed, yes there will be*)
- A question was raised about whether the planters under the commercial area will be irrigated as they are under balcony and not receiving natural water. (*Landscape Architect confirmed all plants will be irrigated.*)
- A question was raised about how the storm water detention tank will be used? (*Applicant advised the detention tank to slow the water going to the storm sewer system.*)
- A question was raised about the number of commercial units in the 1000sqft space (1-3 units)? (*Applicant advised it would be best for 1 or 2 commercial spaces*)
- A question was raised about the commercial parking spaces provided, are these sufficient for this space? (*Staff advised 1 loading bay is required based on the floor area of the CRU and the number of commercial parking spaces meets the requirement.*)
- A question was raised whether there is an accessible ramp to enter the building? (*Applicant confirmed there is. Staff confirmed this is required per the BC Building Code.*)
- A question was raised regarding the open courtyard and what happens when there is a large amount of rain, where does the water go? Is it attached to the water detention tank? (*Applicant confirmed, yes, the drainage is attached to the storm water tank*)
- A question was raised regarding whether the building will be strata or rental? (*Applicant did not know, this would need to be confirmed by the owner. Staff advised this would be intended for Council through rezoning process and not intended for the ADP to comment on.*)
- A question was raised regarding the colour strategy for the reveals in the hardi panel? How are the panels fastened? Revealed or hidden fastened? (*Applicant advised it will be contrasting colour – dark grey. Cement panels are face fastened most of the time.*)
- A question was raised whether there would be any possibility of having landscaping in the lane? (*Landscape Architect advised there is no space due the Site Plan*)
- A question was raised regarding the exit stairs on the third floor and if it is a possibility to make 2 stairways instead of 4? (*Applicant advised this was a recommendation per the Code Consultant and 4 stairs ways are required*)
- A question was raised regarding what type of aircondition unit will be used? (*Applicant advised they will have split units, 1 outdoor unit on balcony and 1 in interior.*)

Members identified their issues and concerns about the proposal as summarized below:

- A concern was raised about plants proposed in the courtyard and insufficient natural light for the plants to survive. All plants need to be re-reviewed. Plants in the planters will not receive enough soil volume. (*Landscape Architect will review the plants proposed and will revise to choose shade tolerance plants*)

- A concern was raised about the planting schedule for the Courtyard plan being the same planting schedule for the Public realm (sidewalk). Symbology was inconsistent with what was shown on plan.
- A concern was raised to not over engineer the storm water detention tank as this can easily occur. Suggests a rain barrel component which can function the same way and would help to provide the same function without having a significant mechanical investment.
- A concern was raised about the sidewalk layout and public realm details didn't provide much to review and to improve street elements.
- A concern was raised about potential issue with the grade change between sidewalk and the residential and commercial entrance.
- A concern was raised about the storm water elements, would recommend some improved multi-functional elements such as low-intensity development. For example, rain gardens or improved soil volume for the streetscape component.
- A concern was raised about the existing tree on sidewalk (Plant 2834), it will be severely constrained in the existing tree pit. Depending on construction activity and sidewalk works, this could cause negative harm to the tree.
- A concern was raised about landscape and lighting, don't negatively effect residents especially on lower levels.
- A concern was raised about Landscaping Section 22.4.2, application only reads "Civil to Comply", this should be detailed as no additional information was provided.
- A concern was raised about the images on the plans being out of date as the street view does not match the current streetscape and to update the images on the plans.
- A concern was raised about the size of the building due to the initial date of this application and the possibility to increase density as it is on a transit route. *(Staff advised that the Province has not designated the City of White Rock a transit oriented area at this time. The proposal is consistent with the OCP designation.)* – **This is concern is out of scope for this application**
- A concern was raised about the open courtyard and outdoor elements (rain, snow), perhaps a glass cover would be better. *(Applicant advised there was a glazed roof proposed however Engineering department did not agree. In regard to the outer elements, there will be proper drainage as the outer walls are considered exterior walls.)*
- A concern was raised about the CPTED issues at the SE corner where there is an alcove off of sidewalk
- A concern was raised about the commercial parking spaces and the hallway where the customer will be walking through. This hallway would also be used by residents which creates a CPTED issue.
- A concern was raised about accessibility and reconciling the grades at the NE corner of property where the commercial and residential entry.

- A concern was raised regarding the railing design on the ground level and redesign it to look less residential.
- A concern was raised regarding the deck space on the ground level and whether more covering would be a better option.
- A concern was raised regarding the location of the residential and commercial entry ways. Review ways to make them more distinguishable.
- A comment was made to extend the stairway on the SE corner all the way to the property line and this may resolve the alcove issue.
- A comment was made regarding the elevator overrun and to show that it will not extend beyond the parapet.
- A comment was made regarding the dark-coloured frames as these are sometimes are not in stock or discontinued and to encourage to keep these in the project until the end.
- A comment was made regarding the black parapet cap, may want to consider the same colour of building.
- A comment was made regarding providing glazing between the interior hallways on the ground floor. It may help with CPTED issues.
- A concern was raised about covering the courtyard, possibly one that opens and closes.
- A concern was raised about a restaurant occupying the CRU, this may not be suitable for the residents of the building due to the venting.
- A concern was raised regarding the 4 stalls, including the handicap stall would need to back out of parking gate which causes safety issues.
- A concern was raised about the safety of the back entry into the building to access the CRU unit.

S. Greyson left the meeting at 4:51pm.

The chairperson summarized a high-level summary of questions and comments provided by panel members.

Following the receipt of final comments, the Chairperson asked panel members for a motion.

R. Drew put forward the motion THAT the Advisory Design Panel recommends to Council that the Major Development Permit for 1363 Johnston Road (20-020) be approved subject to the following considerations made to the satisfaction of Staff:

- Feasibility of parking (pragmatic of moving in and out)
- To resolve all CPTED issues (all CPTED issues listed by the panel and regarding the SE corner)
- Courtyard landscape be reviewed in detail (include storm water tank)

- Drawing package represent future signage addressing on the building
- Option for covering the atrium be considered
- Increased integration of green infrastructure elements which may be incorporated through the public realm, streetscape, rear lot or the building lot itself such as the courtyard or roof

It was **MOVED** by I. Tom and **SECONDED** by L. Nielsen

CARRIED

7. CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting concluded at 5:11pm.

A. Berry
Chairperson, Advisory Design Panel
City of White Rock

Sophia Bihari
Planning & Development Assistant II
City of White Rock