

City of Chilliwack
DESIGN REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2020 – 3:30 pm
Held Electronically

Council Members:

Councillor Chris Kloot, Chair
Councillor Bud Mercer, Vice Chair

Design Review Advisory Committee:

Chris Klaassen, Development
Scott Pelletier, Planning
Michelle Savich, Community Member
Jesse Hildebrand, CADREB Representative
Hendrick Guliker, Intern Architect
Mark Andersen, Community Member
Kim Harder, Community Member
Blair Arbuthnot, BCSLA Representative
Patrick Stewart (AIBC)
Brendan Robinson, Community Member

City Staff:

Gillian Villeneuve, Manager of Development Planning
David Blain, Director of Planning and Engineering
Richard Fortin, Manager of Parks Planning
Sergeant Krista Vrolyk, RCMP (Alternate)
Trish Alsip, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Kloot was Chair and called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved /) That the Agenda for the Design Review Advisory Committee meeting of Monday,
Seconded (June 8, 2020 be adopted as circulated.

Carried unanimously

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Moved /) That the Minutes for the Design Review Advisory Committee meeting of Monday,
Seconded (April 27, 2020 be adopted as circulated.

Carried unanimously

4. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATIONS

Glenn Froese, Justin Dyck and Leon Schroeder, CHP Architects and Sunny Gill, Highstone Developments were present.

a) DP001087 – 45631, 45635 & 45647 Spadina Avenue

The Manager of Development Planning provided a presentation regarding this application for a new four storey 44-unit apartment development within DP Area 6 (Infill) within the subject property. The presentation included an overview of the proposal, location map, ortho map, site plan, proposed elevations, signage, landscaping and recommendations. A Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) report was prepared in conjunction with this application.

Discussion ensued regarding visitor parking; staff noted visitor parking is available on-street and that all parking requirements have been met. A query was raised regarding the requested variance to waive the storage lockers on the ground floor or within the parkade; the applicant noted there is a surplus of 28 lockers over and above the 44 required, and as such, allows for one storage locker per resident unit to be located on the same floor as the associated residential unit. Additional bike storage is to be provided within the parkade at no extra cost to the tenant.

Discussion ensued regarding the front lot line setback along Spadina Avenue and Edwards Street; staff noted an approximate 3m wide landscaped buffer will separate the proposed development from the sidewalk. Concern was raised regarding the potential for graffiti along the concrete wall on the northern (rear) property line; the applicant noted brick veneer is proposed along the portion of the wall facing pedestrian traffic, and the exposed portions of the concrete wall will be painted and designed with architectural reveal lines to create a pleasing pattern. Also noted, is the statutory right-of-way (SROW) located along the northern (rear) property line which prevents any additional capacity for landscaping. However, the parkade setback of 3m will provide some relief from the massing of the building. Adequate screening between land uses is proposed along the northern property line with a 1.8m tall wooden fence and a green wall cable system, serving to reduce the visual impact of the building from the single family dwelling to the north.

Discussion ensued regarding the disproportionate scale of the entranceway. It was suggested to incorporate a more prominent design to the entranceway to match the overall appearance of the remainder of the building. A query was raised regarding pedestrian connection to the parkade; the applicant noted the proposed plan includes a secured gate with key fob access.

Moved /) That the Design Review Advisory Committee supports the proposed DP001087 and
Seconded (recommends Council approve the application subject to the following conditions:

- that signage be posted at the parkade entrance indicating that it is for the use of tenants only, as per CPTED recommendations;
- that the exposed walls and columns in the parkade be painted white or light colour to enhance the light levels and provide clear visibility, as per CPTED recommendations;
- that a wall be constructed at the bottom of the two stair shafts in the parkade to prevent access to the areas under the stairs, as per CPTED recommendations;
- that consistent, even exterior lighting be provided, included within a lighting plan to be submitted prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, to ensure adequate lighting is provided for all walkways, parking areas and entrances to reinforce site security and resident safety;
- that any utilities and/or equipment be screened from view with appropriate and architecturally coordinated materials with detailed plans provided at time of Building Permit; and,

4. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATIONS (continued)

- that the applicant be encouraged to enhance the design of the entryway to be in scale with the remainder of the building.

Carried unanimously

Glenn Froese, Leon Schroeder, Justin Dyck and Sunny Gill left the meeting at 4:00 pm.

Jesse Rayner, JCR Design was present.

b) DP001196 – 44755 Yale Road

The Manager of Development Planning provided a presentation regarding this application for a new workshop and office development within DP Area 7 (Industrial) within the subject property. The presentation included an overview of the proposal, location map, ortho map, site plan, proposed elevations, signage, landscaping and recommendations. A Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) report was prepared in conjunction with this application.

Discussion ensued regarding the lack of streetscape appeal of the development; a suggestion was made to incorporate more articulation along the south-facing front façade along Yale Road which is visible to the travelling public and to incorporate additional trees along the Yale Road frontage to enhance the overall attractiveness of the development.

Concern was raised regarding the lack of screening proposed for the perimeter of the property on the west, north and east sides, screening the service bays and storage area. A suggestion was made to incorporate full screening with privacy slats along the entire fence line surrounding the entire property.

A query was raised with respect to the rationale for the colour scheme; the applicant noted it is an existing building utilized by Union Tractor Ltd. / Pollard Equipment, and the colour choice is based off of the corporate colour scheme. The applicant noted articulation to the building will be limited with façade upgrades only and no expansion of the footprint; however, is amenable to providing further visual enhancement through varying colours, accents and materials such as timber and/or metal materials.

Discussion ensued with respect to the lack of an employee amenity area; a suggestion was made to integrate an employee amenity area to include additional landscaping in order to assist in further greening of the site as well as installing a bicycle parking facility.

Moved /) That the Design Review Advisory Committee supports the proposed DP001196 and
Seconded (recommends Council approve the application subject to the following conditions:

- that the pedestrian pathway be extended in front of the main entrance and around to the east side of the building to the pedestrian entrance/exit doors, and shall be raised, marked or finished in an alternate surfacing to differentiate vehicle/pedestrian areas;
- that any utilities or equipment be screened from view with detailed plans provided at time of Building Permit;
- that a detailed lighting plan be submitted, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, to ensure adequate lighting is provided for all walkways, parking areas and entrances in accordance with the recommendations of the CPTED report;

4. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATIONS (continued)

- that the streetscape / front façade of the building be improved through varying colours and materials as well as landscaping, including additional trees;
- that full screening / privacy slats be provided along the entire fence line surrounding the property;
- that an employee amenity area be included within the site design to incorporate additional greening on site; and,
- that bicycle parking facilities be installed.

Carried unanimously

Jesse Rayner left the meeting at 4:25 pm.

Rochelle Wallis, Focus Architecture Incorporated and Kacy Otter and James Funk, Diverse Properties Ltd. were present at the meeting.

c) DP001220 – 45500 Campus Drive

The Manager of Development Planning provided a presentation regarding this application for a new townhouse development “Lot 1” within DP Area 6 (Infill) within the subject property. The presentation included an overview of the proposal, location map, ortho map, site plan, proposed elevations, signage, landscaping and recommendations. A Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) report was prepared in conjunction with this application.

Discussion ensued regarding the variance proposed to reduce the required number of visitor bicycle spaces from 54 to 6. Staff consider the provision of 6 visitor bicycle parking spaces insufficient given the level of density of the development and recommend a minimum of 15 visitor bicycle parking spaces. Follow-up discussion ensued regarding the number of people who would park their bicycles at a bicycle rack or at the entrance of a specific townhouse or garage. It was suggested to incorporate 15 bicycle parking spaces.

A query as to whether electric vehicle (EV) charging standards are proposed for residential parking; staff noted a comprehensive review and revision of the Zoning Bylaw is underway which will include electrical vehicle (EV) charging standards. The CD-30 Zone that applies to this property requires EV charging stations for the future phases of commercial and apartment development.

Discussion ensued regarding the materials proposed for the fascia located on the interior of the balconies; the applicant noted hardi board is proposed.

A query was raised as to what form and character is proposed for the entire development; staff noted the development area was recently rezoned to the CD-30 (Comprehensive Development-30) Zone. This proposal is part of “phase 1” of the CD-30 development.

A question was asked regarding the status of the building in the northwest corner near Dieppe Street and Keith Wilson Road; staff noted the building in question was being used by an RCMP tactical unit. The Design Review Advisory Committee reviewed the previous application for form and character of the proposed fence/screening around the perimeter of the property. The current use of the building is unknown at this time; however, the lot is designated for future apartment-use.

4. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATIONS (continued)

James Funk, Diverse Properties Ltd, requested clarification regarding the visitor bicycle parking spaces and the rationale for additional visitor bicycle spaces. Comparisons were discussed regarding standalone apartment buildings in the CD-30 zone requiring only 6 visitor bicycle parking stalls; staff noted the CD-30 Zone requires 6 visitor bicycle parking spaces to be provided for each multi-family residential building. There are 9 separate townhouse buildings proposed, and as such, 54 visitor bicycle parking stalls are required. Discussion followed regarding inclusion of bicycle spaces in the future commercial areas.

Moved /) That the Design Review Advisory Committee supports the proposed DP001220 and
Seconded (recommends Council approve the application subject to the following conditions:

- that the required visitor bicycle parking spaces (type “B” parking device) be reduced from 54 to 15 (0.25 stalls per unit);
- that a lighting plan be submitted prior to the issuance of a Building Permit to ensure that the lighting recommendations are adhered to (with the exception of providing pedestrian height lighting in the pathways), as identified in the CPTED Report;
- that all utility equipment, including mailboxes, be screened from public view through a combination of landscaping and fencing; and,
- that signage/labeling stating “NO PARKING – FIRE LANE” be provided to maintain the minimum required clear width and to ensure that no parking or obstruction occurs within the strata road and vehicular turn-around area.

Carried unanimously

d) DP001221 – 5525 Vedder Road

The Manager of Development Planning provided a presentation regarding this application for a new mixed use commercial and residential development within DP Area 6 (Infill) within the subject property. The presentation included an overview of the proposal, location map, ortho map, site plan, proposed elevations, signage, landscaping and recommendations. A Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) report was prepared in conjunction with this application.

Discussion ensued with respect to safety concerns for traffic turning left north-bound from the development onto Vedder Road; staff noted the Vedder Road Widening project is included in the City of Chilliwack's 2020 10-Year Financial Plan (CMP Budget) which includes a ‘no left turn’ covenant.

Concern was expressed regarding a lack of streetscape along the frontage of the development adjacent to Vedder Road. It was suggested to incorporate a more detailed base of the mixed-use building in order to break the façade down to a pedestrian-oriented scale and to create visual interest and character at the street level.

Concern was expressed regarding the orientation of the development which primarily faces inwards towards the parking lot; the proposed commercial retail units (CRUs) do not have pedestrian access from Vedder Road. It was suggested to site the development with the commercial rental unit (CRU) doors facing onto Vedder Road to provide pedestrian access directly from Vedder Road and to incorporate additional design features ie: welcoming breezeway/courtyard, patios or interactive features.

4. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATIONS (continued)

Discussion ensued regarding the proposed design to incorporate the main pedestrian entrance (lobby) in the same space with the CRUs. Concern was expressed with respect to this creating confusion for user groups and providing an excuse for offenders to loiter and “tailgate” behind residents into the lobby. Residents may not feel comfortable or safe in this environment. It was suggested relocating the CRU doors so they face Vedder Road and that the main pedestrian entrance point to the building be designed for solely residents and visitors, as recommended in the CPTED Report.

In response, the applicant noted the interior proposed entrances was preferred as merchants / future tenants would not want two sets of doors / frontages. A suggestion was made to stagger the frontage along Vedder Road with some units facing inwards toward the parking lot.

Discussion ensued regarding elevator access. The applicant noted elevator access is available for both residential and commercial units and is a shared lobby during the day; however, the elevators are locked from the commercial area and is for resident-use only during evening hours.

Discussion ensued regarding the location of proposed planters in the parking lot, adjacent to Building 2. It was suggested to consider alternative locations for the planters to avoid damage by vehicles or vehicle overhang.

Moved /) That the Design Review Advisory Committee recommends the proposed DP001221 be
Seconded (referred back to staff to work with the applicant on a revised design that addresses the following items:

- That additional design detail and building articulation be incorporated into the proposed mixed use building to:
 - Create outdoor courtyards or seating areas
 - Break the façade down into a more human scale and to add visual interest
 - Create direct pedestrian entrances to commercial units from Vedder Road
- That CRU doors face Vedder Road and the main pedestrian entrance point to the building be designed solely for residents and visitors in keeping with the CPTED report recommendations
- That the proposed planters adjacent Building 2 be reviewed to avoid damage by vehicles, such as through an increased area for vehicle overhang
- That the CPTED report be updated to reflect/comment on design changes

Carried unanimously

Rochelle Wallis, Kacy Otter and James Funk left the meeting at 5:25 pm.

Kevin Welsh, Applicant was present.

e) DP001228 – 9194 Edwards Street

The Manager of Development Planning provided a presentation regarding this application for a new apartment building within DP Area 6 (Infill) within the subject property. The presentation included an overview of the proposal, location map, ortho map, site plan, proposed elevations, signage, landscaping and recommendations. A Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) report was prepared in conjunction with this application.

4. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATIONS (continued)

A query was raised with respect to the lack of visual interest along the north elevation. It was suggested to incorporate additional design details ie: window treatments to provide contrast and visual interest. The applicant noted the north elevation is the least visible elevation; however, is amenable to the suggestion.

A query was raised regarding access to the common amenity area; the applicant noted the common amenity area can be accessed through the parkade or along side the north elevation. It was suggested to provide improved accessibility to ensure the common amenity area is accessible by all residents and visitors. The applicant was amenable to the suggestion.

Discussion ensued regarding the landscape plan with respect to the lack of trees on the south elevation; it was suggested to incorporate additional landscaping to provide a more visually attractive space along the south property line. It was also suggested the landscaping plan proposed for the north elevation be reviewed to ensure the proposed tree species are appropriate for the location.

Moved /) That the Design Review Advisory Committee supports the proposed DP001228 and
Seconded (recommends Council approve the application subject to the following conditions:

- that the front landscaping requirement be reduced from 40% to 25% to accommodate the driveway access and vehicle parking;
- that 'private property' signage be posted at the entrance of the property and on the walls of the parkade and visitors' entrance on Edward Street as per CPTED recommendations;
- that fencing be provided along the property boundaries (where possible), particularly along the north property boundary, in order to ensure adequate screening between adjacent lots;
- that bollard style photocell lighting be installed around the visitor parking and amenity areas and that photocell lighting be installed on the wall of the parkade and main entrance to the building as per CPTED recommendations;
- that low level lighting be provided along the pedestrian pathways and included within a lighting plan to be submitted, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, to ensure adequate lighting is provided for all walkways, parking areas and entrances to reinforce site security and resident safety;
- that any utilities and/or equipment be screened from view with appropriate and architecturally coordinated materials with detailed plans provided at time of Building Permit;
- that the North elevation be improved through additional design details, ie: window treatment;
- that the landscaping proposed along the North elevation be reviewed given concerns regarding survivability of trees;
- that more trees be included along South elevation; and,
- the applicant confirm the connection to the common amenity area is accessible by all.

Carried unanimously

5. DELEGATION / PRESENTATION

6. INFORMATION

Discussion Notes

Discussion notes from Thursday, May 14, 2020 were provided to the Committee for information.

7. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held at the Call of the Chair.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm.

Councillor Chris Kloot, Chair