

Present:

Chair - L. Mickelson
Panel Members:
N. Baldwin
C. Taylor
T. Wolf
S. Vincent
J. Makepeace
K. Newbert
B. Heaslip
G. Wylie
M. Searle

Guests:

Lance Barnett, Barnett Dembek Architects
Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture
Roman Dypchey, HY Eng. Ltd.
James Randhawa, Isle of Mann Group of Companies
Neil Banich, Wensley Architecture
Amanda Ross, Wensley Architecture
Mark Van der Zalm, Van der Zalm & Associates Inc.
Rajinder Singh, Van der Zalm & Associates Inc.
John Tierney, Lark Group

Staff Present:

T. Ainscough, City Architect
M. Rondeau, Senior Urban Designer
- Planning & Development
H. Bello, Senior Planner - Planning
& Development
Rebecca Thaster, Intern
H. Dmytriw, Legislative Services

A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was

meeting of April 24, 2013, be received.

Moved by K. Newbert

Seconded by S. Vincent

That the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel

Carried

B. SUBMISSION

1.

4:00 PM

File No.:

7911-0165-00

New or Resubmit:

New

Description:

**OCP amendment, REZ, DP for Two - Four Storey
Apartment Buildings**

Address:

14605 Winter Crescent

Developer:

James Randhawa, Isle of Mann Group of Companies

Architect:

Lance Barnett, Barnett Dembek Architects Inc.

Landscape Architect:

Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture

Planner:

Catherina Lisiak

Urban Design Planner:

Mary Beth Rondeau and Hernan Bello

The Urban Design Planner presented an overview of the proposed project and the design brief was provided on table. The project is a residential/condominium development consisting of two buildings with a break between the two buildings.

- There is a significant grade change of approximately 7.5 meters from the south- east corner to the north-west corner.
- The solution to smoothing the interface between the sidewalk and the building main entrance generally meets City expectations.
- Exposed garage wall main entry on Crescent Rd. – Panel and applicant are asked to comment on design and landscape treatment.

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

- King George Boulevard has a number of businesses.
- Several single family homes are located on Winter Crescent directly across the street from the proposed condominium development.
- Building 1 – steps up 1 storey from the street to the courtyard; will meet the grade at the main entrance.
- Building 2 – steps down 1 storey from the street to the courtyard.
- The third level of Building 1 is stepped down to deal with the significant grade change.
- Both buildings will be 4-storeys in height and will include 73 two bedroom, and one bedroom and den residential units.
- A break between the buildings is a breezeway connecting the outdoor amenity area to the street.
- Building 2 main entry – to be located on the second floor with at-grade access to Winter Crescent.
- Building 1 main entry – access is at grade from Crescent Rd.
- Crescent Rd. – will connect to adjacent properties and access King George Boulevard and the underground parking.
- A central exterior stair leads from Crescent Rd. to the outside amenity area and amenity room.
- There is a small retaining wall at the south side of the courtyard entry.
- The architecture is Whistler style, much like the Fairmont Hotel.
- The gable element on the rendering has been removed as the gables impeded the balconies behind.

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

- The concept was to create an oasis complete with plantings and trees.
- The underground parking will be edged with small flowering trees/shrubs.
- The grade is significant and the setback was used for triple rows of plants.
- Two western red cedar trees on the south west side of the site were saved.
- Building 2 – major grade change at the SE corner. There is a 6.5 foot difference from the sidewalk to the building. Pathways to be coordinated to the flat walkways on the west.
- Screen plantings along the sidewalks, fencing and retaining wall were pushed back to avoid the tree protection area.
- A retaining wall along the street frontage will be stepped back and have planting beds 10-12 feet wide.
- Screen fencing along the top of the walls will be coordinated with the City.
- Feature trees will signify the main entry.
- There is a grand looking staircase at the entry between the two buildings.
- The amenity area at the back will be open. The kids' play equipment will be a mix of adventure play features and equipment, e.g., a whale tail, wooden boats, and a rock to climb on.
- The amenity patio to be a mix of grass and walking surfaces and have a view to the community garden.
- Patios in courtyard – at grade with slab, will be individually fenced, have private yard space and Alan block retaining walls with stairs up.
- Correct soil depths provided for tree plantings (18") and sod (12").

- Crescent Rd. street interface – will have an 18” high retaining wall/parapet wall, of Alan block, aluminum rail and fence, with street trees and stairs to patios.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW
OCP amendment, REZ, DP for Two - Four Storey Apartment Buildings
14605 Winter Crescent
File No. 7911-0165-00

It was Moved by N. Baldwin
Seconded by J. Makepeace
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)
recommends that the applicant address the following recommendations and
revise and resubmit to the Advisory Design Panel.
Carried

STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS

Site

- Generally good response to site and topography.
- Good resolution of site planning, grade changes, access and amenity.
- Some ambiguity on access to the open amenity between the buildings.
- The large retaining wall on the north should be clad in a high quality material, e.g., the building's stone.
- Wall and fencing along south west property line appears massive. Confirm the retaining walls on the south side are not offensive to the neighbouring site.
- Site grading well handled, however, the 'grand' staircase to the amenity area seems quite large especially if this is to be a private space. Consider reducing the stair width and "jogging" the alignment. The additional area from reducing the stair width could be planted and should have a gate/fence to control access.

Building Form and Character

- Consider using cladding or natural stones (large basalt stones) to transition the grade.
- Consider massiveness of roof with nothing going in there. Consider reducing the overall mass by utilizing the space, e.g., dormers?
- Like the scale of overall massing, as is appropriate to a manor house.
- Concern with rear retaining wall with fence on top. A security concern.
- Careful detailing of the façade –
 - Rich "Whistler detailing" is missing.
 - Use of cultured stone is very spotty and limited. Should be used in larger element areas, lower down, e.g., at retaining walls.
 - Hardie Panel does not support Whistler style architecture and needs resolution. Perhaps use Hardie Plank.
 - Unless roof mass is reduced, recommend cedar shingles, not duroid, due to roof mass.
- Details of retaining walls need to be developed.
- Joint details for cladding needs to be developed.

- Suggest using stain rather than paint for wood elements to reveal their natural qualities.

Landscaping

- It is good to be able to save the two western red cedar trees.
- Hard landscape treatment good. Landscape response good but if possible mound up and landscape to lessen impact of retaining walls.
- Treatment of hard landscaping [retaining walls] needs careful approach and cladding with some quality materials.

CPTED

- “Grand” stairwell is of concern; wide and prominent, looks like a thoroughfare [public access]. Narrow the main staircase and move back.
- Amenity space is too shared and unconfined. Sounds will echo.
- Consider site way finding for addresses; exit door at top of stair to courtyard may be confusing for emergency response.
- Crescent Rd. is close to a north south egress and will be the first turn into a residential area from KGB; possible path for opportunistic crime, e.g., review ground floor and garage.
- South Surrey’s property crimes are related to underground parking. Have internal gate for visitor parking and way finding from the parkade up.
- Foot traffic goes in a “V” from south end of site. How to treat pathway? Consider desire line across corner.
- Facades and retaining walls without plantings will get tagged.

Accessibility

- Entrance elevator call button panel to be on horizontal.
- Entrances to have power doors.
- Emergency call buttons in parking lobby.
- Parking entrance call button panel to be accessible.
- Disabled parking okay.
- Amenities to be wheelchair accessible.
- 5% of units to be wheelchair friendly, e.g., easily adapted for the disabled.

Sustainability

- Consider storm water management opportunities.
- HRVs for suites would be good.
- Low flow plumbing fixtures should be considered.
- This is a green field site therefore should retain as much water on site as possible. Consider rainwater harvesting to use for irrigation and flush toilets.
- Consider hot water heat with low temperature for power convectors for heat with condensing boilers.
- Comprehensive Sustainability Strategy needs to be developed.

2. **4:45 PM**
- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| File No.: | 7914-0021-00 |
| New or Resubmit: | New |
| Description: | Rezoning and DP for a proposed 12-storey office/retail building. |
| Address: | 9639-137A Street |
| Developer: | John Tierney, Lark Group |
| Architect: | Neil Banich, Wensley Architecture |
| Landscape Architect: | Mark Van der Zalm, Van der Zalm and Associates |
| Planner: | Pat Lau |
| Urban Design Planner: | Mary Beth Rondeau |

The Urban Design Planner presented an overview context area and highlighted the following:

- The use, form and density generally meet the policy intent for the area.
- Staff have no specific issues with the proposed development.
- 137th Avenue is not intended as a primary retail street, rather intended to service the hospital district.

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

- Phase 1 (CC1) building has just been completed.
- Phase 2 is this CC2 building.
- There is an inner service lane and courtyard between the two buildings. Hardscaping will be done as a singular plaza.
- The underground structure will connect to CC1 and to have 4 levels of underground parking. There will be two main entrances at both corners and to front onto the service lane.
- The building has two podiums. The tower is offset and will maintain the view corridors on the north side. The second building is simpler.
- The new building will have lighter spandrels and be framed by orange metal panel. A simple pallet with V-shaped columns at the entries.
- Sun screening fins on the west side will be in more abundance than the first building. The south side will have an extended horizontal plate to the south elevation.

Sustainability –

- Going for LEED Gold certification, focusing on water credits, energy, storm water management and urban management. Reusing the water for irrigation and toilet flushing.
- A very efficient mechanical system for energy credits.
- Envelope and roof insulation values increased above minimum; higher performing glazing and tailoring of the fins with early energy modelling.

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

- To create a district of CC1 and CC2. Are working successfully with city engineering to get approvals to have a paving treatment on the driveways from CC1.

- The quality of landscaping materials and site furnishings will be carried through to CC2.
- A bioswale mimics CC1 to get infiltration on the site which is unique considering the extent of the parking there. The parking structure was cranked down in order to get soil volume for planting trees in raised planters.
- A large publicly accessible planted outdoor terrace/amenity space is on podium.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

Rezoning and DP for a proposed 12-storey office/retail building.

9639-137A Street

File No. 7914-0021-00

It was

Moved by S. Vincent

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 - with C. Taylor opposed.

STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS

Site

The central courtyard scheme is nice and integrating with CC1.

Building Form and Character

- Like the variety of plates and entrances. Would like to see more height and as a trade-off, reduce the podium size (if desired by applicant).
- The deep covered parking area is a concern. It will need very good artificial lighting to be welcoming. Would be much better if the new building is pulled back and the courtyard is opened up, landscaped and treated as a true connecting open space between the two buildings yet still maintaining its function.
- Positioning of the tower on the site is appropriate.
- Tower could touch the ground more clearly perhaps at the main entry instead of appearing to be in the middle of the podium.
- Entries are not really well identified and columns could use design development.
- The expression of the base (podium) is very busy. The expression seems confusing and arbitrary—the thin “white” projections seem alien and at odds with the orange frames.
- Good use of materials/colour without a repetition of CC1.
- The orange colour on CC2 does not seem to have the same level of clarity of defining the forms as on CC1. The CC2 tower is split into two cubes with an outline around it. Rethink the orange elements and noting that the penthouse is the largest element.
- Good street edge with commercial frontage. Review strategy around shading abilities. 12-14” width won’t do much for shading. Suggest more fenestration with vertical shading, or deeper to help them stand out and be more purposeful.
- Signage is well thought out on entrances to the pedestrian streetscape experience.

Landscaping

- Landscaping is well done. Appropriate continuation of materials and furniture.
- Like the subtle paving gestures from podium to ground level. Salt and pepper paving good.
- Recommend using structural soil trench for the street trees.

CPTED

- Under building area off service lane should be carefully considered, if lit properly, will help with patrols.
- Underground parking can be vulnerable after hours. Look at security opportunities for staff parking. Separate staff parking from public parking.

Accessibility

- Accessibility is very good.
- Disabled washrooms to have power doors.
- Level 2 washroom doors swing into disabled washroom stalls. Redesign so the doors swing out.
- Elevator panels to be on horizontal.
- Emergency call buttons in lobbies at garage.
- Power doors at entrances.

Sustainability

- LEED Gold certification goal is good. Would have been good to see the score card.
- Site and water management thought out and well done.
- Energy use is well done. Envelope – better than code is nice.
- Shading seems appropriate with horizontal on south and vertical on east and west. South should be deeper to be effective.
- This building will be located in the new Surrey DES area which will require DES to provide hot water for all space heating. It is likely that water source heat pumps will not be allowed. This will need to be discussed with the City of Surrey DES Department.
- This is a green field site, therefore it should retain as much water on site as possible. Consider using rain water harvesting for flush toilets.
- Use higher than code R-values. Only 40% glazing is permitted. Define: “higher than normal R-values”.

C. RESUBMISSIONS**D. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS****E. NEXT MEETING**

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, May 22, 2014.

F. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.



Jane Sullivan, City Clerk



Leroy Mickelson, Chairperson
Advisory Design Panel