

City of Maple Ridge
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
AGENDA

July 18, 2018, 4:00 pm
Blaney Room, Maple Ridge City Hall

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
3. **ADOPTION OF MINUTES– June 20, 2018**
4. **PROJECTS**
 - 4.1. **Development Permit No: 2017-061-DP 4:10 PM**

Applicant: Iredale Architecture
Project Architect: Peter Hildebrand, Iredale Architecture
Project Landscape Architect: Jennifer Stamp
Proposal: a) 7 phase comprehensive mixed use conceptual plan
b) mixed use commercial/multi family development
Location: 22255 Dewdney Trunk Road
File Manager: Adrian Kopystynski
 - 4.2. **Development Permit No: 2017-461-RZ 5:20 PM**

Applicant: Wayne Bissky
Project Architect: Wayne Bissky
Project Landscape Architect: Paul Whitehead
Proposal: To create two low rise medium density apartments
Location: 11641 227 Street
File Manager: Wendy Cooper
 - 4.3. **Development Permit No: 2018-201-DP 6:20 PM**

Applicant: Trisha Firth
Project Architect: Brian Shigetomi
Project Landscape Architect: Qing Hua Qu
Proposal: To build a five storey multi-family building with 2 levels of underground parking
Location: 11718 224 Street
File Manager: Wendy Cooper
 - 4.4. **Development Permit No: 2017-390-DP 7:15 PM**

Applicant: Conconst Management Inc
Project Architect: David Echaiz McGrath, Wensley Architecture Ltd.
Project Landscape Architect: David Jerke, VanDer Zalm and Associates
Proposal: 32 unit townhouse development
Location: 23084 and 23100 Lougheed Hwy
File Manager: Adrian Kopystynski

5. **NEW & UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
6. **CORRESPONDENCE**
7. **QUESTION PERIOD**
8. **ADJOURNMENT**

/aa

QUESTION PERIOD

Question Period provides the public with the opportunity to ask questions or make comments on subjects that are of concern to them. Each person will be given 2 minutes to speak. Up to ten minutes in total is allotted for Question Period.



**City of Maple Ridge
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL**

The Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Maple Ridge Advisory Design Panel held in the Blaney at Maple Ridge Municipal Hall, 11995 Haney Place, Maple Ridge, British Columbia, on Wednesday, June 20, 2018 at 3:57 pm.

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

Craig Mitchell, Chair	Architect
Shan Tennyson, Vice Chair	Landscape Architect
Shida Neshat-Behzadi	Architect
Stephen Heller	Landscape Architect
Steven Bartok	Architect

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Adrian Kopystynski	Staff Liaison, Planner 2
Amanda Allen	Committee Clerk

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

R/2018-024

It was moved and seconded

That the agenda for the June 20, 2018 Advisory Design Panel meeting be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

Note: Steven Bartok joined the meeting at 3:59 pm

3. **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

R/2018-025

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the Maple Ridge Advisory Design Panel meeting dated May 16, 2018 be adopted.

CARRIED

4. PROJECTS

- 4.1 **Development Permit No:** 2013-087-DP
Applicant: Bernard A.J. Mottet, Mottet Architect Inc.
Project Architect: Bernard A.J. Mottet, Mottet Architect Inc.
Project Landscape Architect: Mary Chan-Yip, PMG Landscape Architects
Proposal: 19 Townhouse units
Location: 23500 and 23550 Larch Avenue
File Manager: Adrian Kopystynski

The Staff liaison provided an overview of the 19 unit townhouse development project. The project team made a presentation of the project plans.

R/2018-026

It was moved and seconded

That File No. 2013-087-DP be supported and the following concerns be addressed as the design develops and submitted to Planning staff for follow-up:

Landscape Comments:

1. Reduce the mass of the fence along the East property line through a combination of reduced fence height, lattice and/or other feature and vary the type, colour and height of landscaping along the upper tiered wall;
2. Consider adding a fence with a locked gate between the pathway of buildings 15 and 16 to address CPTED concerns at the dead end;
3. Provide units 7, 8, 9 and 10 with stair access to the service road so it can function more as a trail and reduce CPTED concerns;
4. Move the backyard tree for units 16 -19 to the corner of the yard to provide more useable lawn space;
5. If possible, provide seating or other amenity features with paving bump out and benches. For example, planting between units 3, 4, 5 could be cut back at the service road to provide a seating/amenity area;
6. Show location of the future access from the development to the adjacent park;
7. Show guardrail or fencing along the edge of the retaining walls where required for safety;
8. Include a section of the West property line showing conditions between the service road and the adjacent park.

Architectural Comments:

1. Develop the elevations on the facades facing Larch Avenue. For example, articulation of varying materials;
2. Provide an improved materials palette and composition;
3. Revise the roof exposure facing the interior street to reduce the amount;
4. Consider a gate or fence to unite the Eastern and Western sections;
5. Provide a better balance between the stone pedestal and wood columns above;
6. Review the location of the door for the powder rooms;
7. Improve weather protection at front entrances.

CARRIED

4.2 **Development Permit No:** **2017-221-DP**
Applicant: Grace Yu
Project Designer: Grace Yu
Proposal: Triplex under draft RT-2 bylaw
Location: 22032 119 Avenue
File Manager: Chee Chan

The Staff liaison provided an overview of the triplex project and reviewed the proposed triplex guidelines. The project designer gave a presentation of the project plans. There was discussion that the services of a professional landscape architect be retained for the landscape design of the project.

R/2018-027

It was moved and seconded

That File No. 2017-221-DP be supported and the following concerns be addressed as the design develops and submitted to Planning staff for follow-up:

Landscape Comments:

1. Landscape comments will be provided by City of Maple Ridge staff.

Architectural Comments:

1. Consider sidewalk re-alignment to the front entrances so that the sidewalk is more central to the property and less dominant towards one specific entrance;
2. Provide column detailing at the base of the column and at the top of the column;
3. The design of the bay window needs to be addressed for building envelope purposes in order to allow for the insulation;
4. Review the orientation of entry closets;
5. Re-evaluate the projections along each side of the residences; consider articulation through use of different material;
6. Add chimney cap detail to faux chimney;
7. Move the West window so that it does not align with the faux chimney;
8. If possible, consider adding street vegetation to buffer between each garage and gravel parking spaces to vitalize the lane;
9. Provide foundation planting along West and East elevations;
10. Provide additional shrubbery between bushes and rear elevation;
11. Treat entrances similarly with the stone and wood column detailing;
12. Consider coordinating muntin bars so they do not obstruct sightlines and show window openings.

CARRIED

- 4.3 **Development Permit No:** **2017-455-DP**
Applicant: Graham Farstad
Project Architect: Lance Barnett
Project Landscape Architect: Rebecca Colter Krebs, PMG Landscape Architects Ltd.
Proposal: 15 Townhouse units
Location: 10309 240 Street
File Manager: Wendy Cooper

The staff liaison provided an overview of the townhouse project. The project team gave a presentation of the project plans. The Staff liaison advised that while the current access to the development is from 240 Street, this will change as the properties surrounding the site develops. There was discussion on the impacts of closing the 240 Street access and that placement of wayfinding signage for visitors and emergency personnel as well as the address of the development be carefully considered for both the current and future access.

R/2018-028

It was moved and seconded

That the following concerns regarding File No. 2017-455-DP be addressed and digital versions of revised drawings and memo be submitted to Planning staff; and further that Planning staff forward this on to the Advisory Design Panel for information.

Landscape Comments:

1. Retaining walls between building 1 and building 3 should be parallel to the building face;
2. Add foundation planting at the base of building 3 decks in order to screen the lattice;
3. Provide a complete planting plan to demonstrate buffering against 240 Street along with other site planting;
4. Provide fence and guardrail details;
5. If possible, provide a planting strip between the South strata road and the retaining wall;
6. Add different paving treatment, minimum 6 metres wide, at 240 Street site entrance and at the future West and North access points such as coloured asphalt, stamped concrete or unit paving;
7. Add an access gate to the playground from the 240 Street side;
8. Consider adding play equipment that caters to younger children;
9. Consider adding informal seating, for example amphitheater seats, in the amenity space;
10. Add a mail kiosk near the future main site access and signage to direct traffic;
11. If required, add a log fence along the environmental setback.

Architectural Comments:

1. Re-evaluate the massing of buildings 2 and 3 that face 240 Street and the West elevation of building 3;
2. Consider a flat or low sloped roof to reduce the height along 240 Street;
3. Consider eliminating the shingle siding on the façade to give the buildings a more contemporary look;
4. Consider changing to a contrasting shade of hardie on Building 3 to avoid matching the roof colour.

CARRIED

5. PRELIMINARY PROJECT REVIEW

5.1	Development Permit No:	2017-117-RZ, DP
	Applicant:	Sarah Atkinson
	Project Architect:	Doug Johnson
	Project Landscape Architect:	C. Kavolinas
	Proposal:	45 unit 3 storey RM-1 townhouses on 3 consolidated lots
	Location:	11831, 11839, 11865 232 Street
	File Manager:	Chee Chan

The staff liaison provided an overview of the 45 unit project and the discussions underway with other Departments at the City of Maple Ridge. The following comments were provided:

- redesign based on residential, community and pedestrian elements in accordance with OCP Form and Character Guidelines;
- the form and character suggest the density of the project is not resident friendly;
- the project is massed in a fashion that does not make it residential, public, or pedestrian friendly;
- reduce the density and the number of townhouses on the site;
- current design of development is not designed to be pedestrian friendly along internal driveways. The garages are too dominant; introduce pedestrian entrances to the units from the internal driveways.
- provide context information;
- an overall landscape plan should be provided that includes context to the adjacent properties/area;
- Insufficient area is set aside to meet and coordinate Tier A SMP with site landscaping;
- plans should show compatibility with future developments;
- perimeter access to the units presents CPTED concerns, negatively impacts and is insensitive with the adjacent land uses;
- different pavement treatments between the buildings and road; pedestrian crossings delineated between the vertical walkways of the buildings and to the amenity area;
- outdoor 'amenity' areas feel like left over space – program them differently ie: BBQ area, play space, more design thought is required;
- development would benefit from a community building or public garden space;
- design for aging in place;
- enrich the palette and articulation.

6. NEW AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6.1 Developer Public Art Brochure - Review

The Staff liaison provided background on the Developer Public Art Program and the history of the Advisory Design Panel's input into developing the proposed program. There was discussion on unit affordability, what constitutes public art and the voluntary aspect of the proposed program. Interest was expressed on further expanding the criteria and process for the selection of public art.

R/2018-029

It was moved and seconded

That the Advisory Design Panel support the proposed Developer Public Art Program.

CARRIED

7. **CORRESPONDENCE** - Nil
8. **QUESTION PERIOD** - Nil
9. **ADJOURNMENT** – 7:22 pm.

C. Mitchell, Chair

/aa