

Present:

Chair – L. Mickelson

Panel Members:E. Mashig
B. Heaslip
J. Makepeace
G. Wylie
N. Baldwin
T. Bunting
T. Wolf**Guests:**Igor Nardin, OCA Architects Inc.
Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture
Russ Vandergraaf, Field & Marten
Yuri Afanasiev, WG Architecture Inc.
M. Jaszczewski, WG Architecture Inc.
Navi Jagpal, Jagpal Development Ltd.
Andrea Scott, PJ Lovick Architects Ltd.
Mary Chan, PMG Landscape Architects.
Bhupinder Johal, Carelink Investments Ltd.
Kevin Shoemaker, Polygon Harvard Gardens
Scott Baldwin, Polygon Harvard Gardens
Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill Architects
Daryl Tyacke, Eckford Tyacke & Associates
Paul Peters, Eckford Tyacke & Associates**Staff Present:**M. Rondeau, Acting City Architect -
Planning & Development
T. Ainscough, City Architect -
Planning & Development
H. Bello, Senior Planner - Planning
& Development
H. Kamitakahara, Planner,
Planning & Development**A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES**

It was

Moved by J. Makepeace

Seconded by T. Wolf

That the minutes of the Advisory Design

Panel meeting of December 12, 2013, be postponed until the next meeting, due to the fact that several pages of the minutes are missing.

Carried**B. SUBMISSIONS****1. 4:10 PM**

File No.:	7913-0172-00
Description:	Residential Care Facility
Address:	9002, 9010 - 158 Street; 9020, 99067, 9045, 8997 - 160 Street; 9080 - 159 Street Elim Care Facility (Fleetwood)
Developer:	Elim Housing Society
Architect:	Igor Nardin, OCA Architects Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture
Planner:	Shawn Low
Urban Design Planner:	Mary Beth Rondeau

The **Urban Design Planner** presented an overview of the proposed project and highlighted the following:

- Provided context of Fleetwood location of the Elim facilities.

- 160th is a main street in Fleetwood. The site is on a private driveway so not as visible location as on a public street.
- The campus buildings are generally more traditional character with pitched roof. This building is proposed with flat roof.
- The project has Fraser Health funding.
- Generally Elim is a good neighbour in the Fleetwood area. The campus is very much a part of the Fleetwood village.
- Staff have no specific issues on this application.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site plan, building plans, elevations, cross sections, and streetscapes and highlighted the following:

- Elim is a large site in North Surrey. It is a true aging in place complex. Variety of housing types/care provided.
- The site slopes so the buildings respond with access at different floor levels which is also related to the entrances to both the new facility and the existing building to the east.
- Commercial use proposed on the ground floor.
- The building is proposed as concrete construction.
- The campus buildings are all slightly different.
- The building under the subject proposal has a flat roof which has several benefits. The scale is similar to surrounding 3 storey buildings. Also, it is a cost saving measure not to put a pitched roof on a concrete building. Materials are consistent with residential materials, with hardie board, exposed wood and brick.
- The mechanical systems are being assessed. Geothermal was used on the existing building but has not been effective.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the landscape plans and highlighted the following:

- Continuation of a character of walking and circulation, very similar to other housing.
- The private road has a public feel with a sidewalk on each side and street trees.
- There is a private seating area at one of the entries.
- There is an arcade walkway adjacent to the parking along the west driveway.
- Landscaping is floral, fragrant, colourful to provide visual and scent stimulation.
- The whole site is irrigated and is a high efficiency system.

E. Mashig arrived at 4:25 pm.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

Elim Care Facility

**9002, 9010 - 158 Street; 9020, 99067, 9045, 8997 - 160 Street; 9080 - 159 Street,
Fleetwood**

File No. 7913-0172-00

It was
recommends that the applicant address the following recommendations and
revise and resubmit to the Advisory Design Panel.

Moved by T. Bunting
Seconded by T. Wolf
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)

Carried

STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS

Site Design

- Generally, the building siting was supported. However, the clarity of the entry sequence appeared unclear between the upper driveway and the lower shared entry between the buildings.
- The grades appear to be relatively well resolved.
- Consideration could be given to more open space in the campus precinct.

Form and Character

- Have difficulty with commenting on the elevations because they are very small and look different from the 3D model.
- The majority of members considered the flat roof concept to be workable. However, it would still need to be refined to have more relation to the other campus buildings.
- The formalities of some of the facades are not of the same informal vernacular as the rest of the site.
- Looking at the massing, the corners appear to be bathrooms with no windows, and no materials indicated. Can't read the labels of the materials on the elevations.
- The hardie and the brick are fine but sometimes the brick elements are so small that they don't serve any purpose.
- Consider the materials and colours related to the uses of the building and the base/middle/top.
- The front entry at the upper level is not well defined and there is too little detail to assess it.
- Consider access to the north flat roof and the roof treatment for overlook from surrounding units.
- Consider indoor/outdoor access for the multi-purpose room.

Landscape

- The indoor/outdoor relationship with the garden is not there and needs refinement.
- Complement the lounge space, like the indoor/outdoor relationship.
- Think about the views to the parking lot and the best place for that terrace.

CPTED

- No specific comments.

Accessibility

- Power doors at entrances and elevator buttons.
- Parking for large events at Elim is a concern in the area and particularly for accessible parking.

Sustainability

- It would be nice to have a list of features that are actually planned for this building, instead of listing what has been implemented elsewhere.
- Hope that something similar carries on with this building, eg. geothermal.
- Suggest solar domestic hot water be provided given flat roofs.
- Heat recovery ventilation (HRV) should be considered throughout.
- Consider a green roof for the majority.
- Irrigation, there is an opportunity to collect the stormwater.

The **Project Architect** made the following comments on the Statement of Review:

- Every building has power operated doors at main entrances.
- The parking for events is acknowledged as an issue.
- With respect to the language, this isn't a stand-alone building. It is linked to other buildings and it has multiple entrances. This will be accessible from various locations. Most of the underground circulation will filter to this building. We have to provide underground access to all of these buildings.

2. **5:08 PM**

File No.:	7913-0058/59-00
Description:	East Newton Industrial Park
Address:	6657/6680/6683 – 152A Street (Newton)
Developer:	Navi Jagpal, Jagpal Development Ltd.
Architect:	Yuri Afanasiev, WG Architecture Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture
Planner:	Misty Jorgensen
Urban Design Planner:	Hernan Bello

The **Urban Design Planner** presented an overview of the proposed project and highlighted the following:

- This project is in the East Newton Business Park. This proposal is similar to projects approved for sites to the north and east of this submission.
- The project is consistent with the NCP in terms of use. It is important that there is an industrial component in keeping with the business park designation.
- The project has been reviewed extensively by staff, essentially to find a solution that properly address grade constraints particularly for Building B, and incorporate the industrial component required in the NCP.

The **Project Architect** presented an overview of the site plan, building plans, elevations, cross sections, and streetscapes and highlighted the following:

- Building A (Banquet/Industrial) has the main entry oriented to the corner plaza.
- Building B also has strong entrance on 152nd Street and the shape of the building flows with the multi-purpose walkway along 152nd.
- For site security, the balcony needs to be secured. What we are planning to do is put the roll-up screens (aluminum mesh) to cover the accesses at night. Also gates to parking when closed.
- For sustainability, the glazing is less than 40 percent. There are horizontal shades to reduce the impact. On the east elevation, the majority is spandrel (opaque) glass. The entry banquet hall glass has structural elements which create certain shades.
- For materials, we've been using the concept of contrast between glass and solid. Main building will be concrete and big surfaces of glass.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the landscape plans and highlighted the following:

- The landscape follows the master plan character for the general area.
- The parking area behind Building B is lower than the street so there is sloping landscape proposed at either side going down to the parking level.
- Maintained an overall character of plant material in texture and material for the overall campus of the area.
- There are bioswales incorporated that are typical of the area, that are fully incorporated as required by civil.
- Some permeable pavers are proposed.
- Garbage areas are fully screened.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

East Newton Industrial Park

6657/6680/6683 – 152A Street, Newton

File No. 7913-0058/59-00

It was

Moved by N. Baldwin

Seconded by G. Wylie

That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)

recommends that the applicant address the following recommendations and revise and resubmit to the Planning staff.

Carried

STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS

Site Design

- The site appears to be well laid out and a good resolution of the variety of uses proposed.
- Good to emphasize the area as a campus for continuity.
- The slope on the site has been well integrated with industrial tucked below.

Form and Character

- It's a nice vocabulary with a lot happening.
- The design is ambitious for these types of buildings and the detailing will be very important to pull it off.
- The stepping of the tops of the concrete frames on the west elevation of the Banquet Building A could be deleted.
- Building B is the stronger one architecturally including the identification of the entrance from the street. But from the parking lot there is not the same prominence. That entry should be shown in a more forceful way. Maybe take the red feature on the west through to the east side entrance massing.
- Reflective glass, it was something that was sort of abandoned in the 1980s because it does not allow natural light into the building. You don't get to see outside. It is not a nice feeling inside with reflective glass and at night. The extent of reflective glass should be reconsidered.
- Entrance canopies are fairly heavy particularly on the banquet Building A.
- It's unusual to have the retail accessed from the back balcony. Balcony walkway should be covered with a less solid, more varied treatment.
- 250 ft. long corridor for office is unusual.
- The signage is good and should be locked into the drawings at this stage.
- The height of the banquet hall is low. Probably going to end up with 12 ft. height at the most.

Landscape

- The landscaping is very good for an industrial project.
- The layered planting along 152nd Building B is good.
- The entrance to Building A banquet hall needs some more flushing out. It is really complex right now. Make sure your pedestrian zone crossing is well defined and is a safe place for people to walk to the building.
- You probably will have 1000 people in the banquet hall at some point, and there is no space in front or outside for people to congregate. Open space for people to talk to each other.
- Generally, the landscaping looks quite intensive for a project like this. Hopefully the outside spaces will be used.

CPTED

- The efforts for site security were considered positive.

Accessibility

- Make sure the elevator button panel is horizontal.
- Power doors at the entrances.
- Wheelchair accessible washrooms.
- Parking – 2 parking spaces for that building is inadequate. Increase that if possible to 4 to 6 for the banquet hall.

Sustainability

- Building B is much better resolved for shading and Building A could follow better.
- Less glass would be better. If the building is only used at night, and it is only for the look, I think you could achieve the look without using so much glass.
- Good use of permeable paving and swales.

- Consider a mechanical system that goes beyond code minimums.

B. Heaslip left the meeting at 6:00 PM

3. **6:00 PM**

File No.:	7913-0088-00
Description:	Care Facility
Address:	Highway 10 & 132 Street (West Newton & Highway 10)
Developer:	Carelink Investments Ltd.
Architect:	Andrea Scott, PJ Lovick Architects Ltd.
Landscape Architect:	PMG Landscape Architects
Planner:	Donald Nip
Urban Design Planner:	Hernan Bello

The **Urban Design Planner** presented an overview of the proposed project and highlighted the following:

- The project is in the West Newton / Highway 10 NCP area. The NCP designates the site for a care facility which is consistent with the proposal.
- Across the street to the west, a proposal in process for a small commercial plaza anchored by Tim Horton's.
- The rest of the neighbourhood to the east and west is essentially single family with a new park recently developed further to the west. In the future the NCP calls for some multi-family. There is a detention pond next to the site. In essence it is a dry pond. It is part of the drainage of the area.

The **Project Architect** presented an overview of the site plan, building plans, elevations, cross sections, and streetscapes and highlighted the following:

- A multi-purpose path has been incorporated along Highway 10 and meanders around the existing large conifer trees and along the east side of the adjacent detention pond.
- There is a 10 ft. sound barrier along Highway 10 that will be taken down.
- The ground floor is independent living and the second and third floors are assisted living.
- The second and third floors have their own dining, entertainment and fitness areas.
- The internal courtyard is accessible as a shared common space.
- The operation of the facility is by an experienced operator approved by Fraser Health, but has private funding.
- For sustainability, a white roof is proposed, which reduces heat. There are large overhangs and trellises to reduce the solar gain. Drainage and permeability measures are also proposed.
- The building materials include hardie-panel with brick accents. The canopies and soffits are in wood, and all the trims are in metal.

The **Landscape Architect** reviewed the landscape plans and highlighted the following:

- In consideration of the residential neighbourhood, there is a residential flavour along the street edge.

- There are garden plots for residents who are interested in gardening. This is along the south exposure to provide good light for this use.
- Ground-floor units all have access to the pathway along the south side.
- The plant materials used are diverse to allow for seasonal interest in terms of colour and texture. Textures in the various seasons with colours, textures, berries, etc.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

Care Facility

Highway 10 & 132 Street, West Newton & Highway 10

File No. 7913-0172-00

It was Moved by T. Wolf
Seconded by G. Wylie
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)
recommends that the applicant address the following recommendations and
revise and resubmit to the ADP as an electronic review.

Carried

STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS

Site Design

- Generally, the Panel considered the site layout to be well resolved particularly the multi-use paths and tree retention.
- Consider connecting the internal walkway around to the main entrance.

Form and Character

- The architectural design is interesting but needs further refinement and a lot more detailing to come. Several elevations are not detailed.
- Fatal error of the scheme is the units facing the internal courtyard. The shared access as a community space compromises privacy given the depth and the limited prospect is not sufficiently livable. This should be resolved to make the proposal supportable. Perhaps the 6 units could go to a 4th floor.
- The ground floor dining area should have some associated outdoor space.
- There is too much hardie - brick should be used more consistently as an element to balance the building.
- It would be nice to give scale at the corner by treating the top 2 floor dining areas as more of a feature element.
- The exterior needs simplification. The brick could be more consistent.
- More overhangs may be needed.
- The main drop off doesn't function well and could improve the design. There are some tight parking spots. There is a tiny access to a courtyard that comes in from the side and the scooter parking is blocking the transparency. In the elevations, it kind of gets lost too. Could be more identifiable.

Landscape

- Really appreciate the generous planting and layering, and bringing in the residential scale.
- The existing trees being retained is the right thing, but you’re not going to get any views from the dining area.
- The circulation around the building is good.
- The garden plots are great.
- The generous social spaces are good.
- The deep shade planting in the internal courtyard is unlikely to work.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Accessibility

- The accessibility is probably better than most buildings so I won’t comment on that.
- The elevator button should be horizontal.
- There should be power doors at the entrances.
- In amenities area, make sure that the washrooms are wheelchair accessible.

Sustainability

- Passive shading would be good.
- Recommend HRV for all of the corridors, hot water radiant floor heat for long term efficiency.
- Use high efficiency air conditioning for common areas possibly geothermal to cover cooling load.
- Waste heat can be used to pre-heat domestic hot water which is a very large load with this use given kitchen, laundry, etc.

4. **7:00 PM**

File No.: 7913-0214-00
 Description: Harvard Gardens
 Address: 15168 – 33 Avenue, Rosemary Heights West
 Developer: Kevin Shoemaker, Polygon Harvard Gardens
 Architect: Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill Architects
 Landscape Architect: Eckford Tyacke & Associates (ETA) Landscape Architecture
 Planner: Ron Gill
 Urban Design Planner: Hernan Bello

The **Urban Design Planner** presented an overview of the proposed project and highlighted the following:

- The project is located in the Rosemary Heights West NCP. This is the latest phase of this comprehensive development currently under construction.
- One of the issues we worked with applicant was resolving the grading and interface of proposal with the multi-use pathways to the east and south.

The **Project Architect** presented an overview of the site plan, building plans, elevations, cross sections, and streetscapes and highlighted the following:

- What we are trying to do is develop a precinct with a fairly consistent character.
- The architectural precedent/inspiration is from Boston.
- The adjacent building is the clubhouse amenity for the whole precinct, called the “Rowing Club”.
- The entrance opens right through so you can see through to the courtyard. The courtyard is oriented to the south.
- On the east side there is a multi-use path which wraps around the site and continues on all the way to the Nickelmekl River.
- There were some challenges with grades to make sure that we could incorporate the multi-use trail and have it be accessible.
- The materials break up the length of the facade. Brick is used, and in between we’ve changed the colour and the character. Hardie-panel finishes are in between the brick. On the 152 Street side, the main project monument is at the corner.
- The parking had to be dropped substantially to allow room for a protection zone for the multi-use pathways.
- The heating is proposed as electric baseboard and Polygon has standard packages for sustainability in these types of buildings.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the landscape plans and highlighted the following:

- At the front of the building, playing off the architecture, we are proposing a clean stone-clad wall to play off the Bostonian flavour of the buildings. Announcing the entry are Oak trees.
- On 152 Street, in conjunction with the multi-use pathway, proposing a more native palette.
- There is a flat accessible entry into the building from 33 Avenue.
- The courtyard is meant to play off the campus quadrangle. Desire lines, activity centre, ornamental trees on berms.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

Harvard Gardens

15168 – 33 Avenue (Rosemary Heights West)

File No. 7913-0214-00

It was

Moved by T. Bunting

Seconded by J. Makepeace

That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)

recommends that the applicant address the following recommendations and revise and resubmit to the Planning staff.

Carried

STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS

Site Design

- The Panel considered the site layout to be well resolved.

- It would be good to have more mix of use with commercial to encourage walking.

Form and Character

- It's a really well-worked project. Appreciate the documentation and details.
- This generation of Polygon character is better than the previous. This is much more urban in the form. The in-board balconies help a lot. The way it addresses the public realm is much better.
- It is a good interpretation of what was stated into bringing the Bostonian look back.
- The courtyard is as tight as it should be to get enough light into it.
- Consider using lighter hardie-panel materials particularly in the courtyard. Dark gray and black could get a little dark.
- The depressed grade on the SE corner is not ideal but is well handled considering.
- Concern is the extension of the firewall into the courtyard. Would like to see the deck of unit C3 moved west so that it is disengaged from the firewall.
- The 500 ft. long corridor, 5 ft. wide is daunting. Would like to see shortened or more interest such as varying width.

CPTED

- There were no specific issues identified.

Landscape

- Very generous planting, it will be beautiful.
- Really complimentary landscaping to architecture.
- The courtyard space will be a well-utilized space. It is generous in its size.
- There is no interior games room/common space/multi-purpose area. There is a nice opportunity to have an indoor space linking to the outdoor space even given the amenity building next door.
- The diagonal desire lines, I understand the intent but the smaller triangles can be wasted space.
- The ratio of outdoor seating to the number of units, think about that. Outdoor picnic tables and barbeques could be added.

Accessibility

- Recommend power doors at the entrance.
- Call buttons at a level accessible for wheelchairs.
- The more disabled parking the better.
- The elevator buttons should be at a horizontal panel.
- The parking lobby – provide an emergency call button there.
- Recommend 5% of the units are wheelchair friendly.

Sustainability

- Sustainability wise, it is pretty standard, wood frame, electric heat.
- Would like to see hot-water heat or some other alternative to electric heat.
- Consider HRVs to improve the air quality of each unit.

C. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

1. Proposed 2014 Meeting Schedule for ADP

It is requested that the ADP pass a motion to adopt the proposed ADP meeting schedule for 2014.


Postponed to the next meeting.

D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, January 30, 2014.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.



Jane Sullivan, City Clerk



Leroy Mickelson, Chairperson,
Advisory Design Panel