

**Present:**

L. Mickelson - Chair  
C. Taylor  
D. Newby  
N. Baldwin  
S. Vincent  
M. Ehman  
M. Vance  
M. MacCaull  
D. Ramslie

**Absent:**

M. Young  
S. Forrest  
G. McGarva  
T. Wolf  
E. Mashig  
B. McGinn  
T. Coady  
Cpl. M. Searle

**Guests:**

P. Oostelbos, Orgaworld  
R. Lauzan, Orgaworld  
M. Yn, Stantec Architecture  
T. Dickson, Barnett Dembek Architects  
B. Casidy, Barnett Dembek Architects  
M. Dembek, Barnett Dembek Architects  
D. Kohli, Barnett Dembek Architects  
M. Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture  
T. Kyle, M2 Landscape Architecture  
C. J. Kavolinas, C. Kavolinas & Associates Inc.  
R. Wallis, Focus Architecture  
C. Hogan, Focus Architecture Inc.

**Staff Present:**

T. Ainscough, City Architect  
M. Rondeau, Senior Planner  
C. Craig, Administrative Assistant  
L. Pitcairn, Planner  
R. Costanzo, Manager Operations  
B. van Drimmelen, Project Specialist

---

## APPOINTMENTS

The City Architect introduced four (4) new architect members to the Panel: M. Higgs, K. Johnston, M. Vance (attending), and M. Ehman (attending). Recognition was also noted for outgoing architect members: Brian Wakelin, Tom Bunting, Nigel Baldwin and Tomas Wolf. Also in attendance for their first ADP meeting are newly appointed ADP members: Marc MacCaull, Development Industry representative and Dave Ramslie, Sustainability Advisor.

### A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was

minutes of the November 27, 2015 meeting.

Moved by C. Taylor

Seconded by S. Vincent

That the Advisory Design Panel receive the

Carried

**B. NEW SUBMISSIONS****1. 4:15 PM**

<b>File No.:</b>	<b>7915-0004-00</b>
<b>New or Resubmit:</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>Last Submission Date:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Description:</b>	<b>DP for a 3P Biofuel Facility Port Kells</b>
<b>Address:</b>	<b>9752-192 Street</b>
<b>Developer:</b>	<b>Orgaworld</b>
<b>Architect:</b>	<b>Michael McNaught, Stantec Architecture</b>
<b>Landscape Architect:</b>	<b>Stantec Architecture</b>
<b>Planner:</b>	<b>Lee-Anne Pitcairn</b>
<b>Urban Design Planner:</b>	<b>Mary Beth Rondeau</b>

**The Urban Design Planner** presented an overview of the proposed project.

- This is a public facility and will benefit from the ADP review. The proposed use has significant positive benefits for recycling and sustainability.
- The proposal fits well within the industrial-area zoning. No significant issues with this proposal with regard to form and density.
- This project has a very tall filtration stack. As the site is well-nestled into the Port Kells area, a tall, simple mono-stack would fit well into the surroundings.

**Rob Constanzo, City of Surrey Engineering noted the following:**

- There are sustainable benefits from deriving gas from food waste (carbon neutral). This biofuel facility will significantly decrease the amount of metric tons of waste that is produced each year. It meets many of the objectives of the Sustainability Charter.

**The Project Architect** presented an overview of the site plan, building plans, elevations, cross sections, and streetscapes. Images of the facility were shown to illustrate size, colour coding and general site. The following was noted:

- The building programme is expressed in blocks in the layout and architectural resolution of the building.
- The plan is to utilize this building in an educational capacity for tour groups/children's school groups, etc. Observation windows will be incorporated into the design; three (3) different locations within the facility will be zoned for public access.
- Developing a strong face of the building facing 192<sup>nd</sup> is important. The entrance is a structural system with wood (cross-laminated timber panel roof) and a beacon (prominent even in the daytime and nighttime).

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

- Planting was designed to screen as much as possible. The rooftop will be host to a demonstration garden and various plantings to educate children on compost usage.
- Roof water containment is an issue that is still being reviewed (to see if the bioswales can hold water for a longer period of time).

**ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW**  
**DP for a 3P Biofuel Facility Port Kells, 9752 - 192 Street**  
File No. 7915-0004-00

It was Moved by C. Taylor  
Seconded by S. Vincent  
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)  
recommends that the applicant address the following recommendations and  
revise and resubmit to *Planning staff*.

Carried

**STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS**

**Site**

- It is an industrial building in the middle of an industrial area; not conflicting with anything, the building is doing exactly what it was designed to do.
- It is wonderful to see a public compost facility operating within the city, in a primarily industrial area.

**Building Form and Character**

- General support of the scheme and variances for the stack height and reduced yards.
- Strong, simple programme diagram well-represents the function of the facility. The structure is very rational with regard to its design, colour coding and scale. The colour and graphics are excellent tools of communication.
- The wood entry canopies are inconsistent with the simplicity of the building. The odd angle bracket on the canopy seems irrational for an industrial building. Metal such as galvanized steel would be more congruous with the overall look and feel of an industrial building - no need to make the entrance of the building sentimental.
- To give the building form a more distinctive feel, consider developing visitor experience, starting from the entrance and progressing through the facility. Make something of the educational opportunity of the south walkway to the viewing canopy.
- The limited frontage makes the site organization difficult to resolve. The current arrangement makes the building less prominent to the street (192 Street).
- The filtration stack can be supported either simply as shown or there may be an opportunity to express the purpose of this element more visually.

### Landscaping

- A number of steps have been taken to maximize the landscaping given the confines of the industrial area. There is a good mix of planting that is both practical and aesthetically pleasing.
- Consider defining the public parking area and entry zone with a change in paving material or pattern.
- Encourage the continuation of stormwater drainage on-site as much as possible (as noted in the presentation).

### CPTED

- For safety purposes, a fence around the site would be welcomed.

### Accessibility

- Universal parking is adequate; allow one (1) stall for disabled parking.
- Consider unisex washrooms with power door access.
- The viewing area wall height should be less than or equal to 42" high for accessibility.
- Elevator buttons should be horizontal.

### Sustainability

- This facility has large amounts of heat produced; heat recovery where possible should be considered.
- Embrace the opportunities for education - this is an important visceral experience for people to witness closed-loop waste processing.

## 2. 5:00PM

<b>File No.:</b>	<b>7914-0362-00</b>
<b>New or Resubmit:</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>Last Submission Date:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Description:</b>	<b>DP for a 2-storey commercial retail building</b>
<b>Address:</b>	<b>8645-160 Street</b>
<b>Developer:</b>	<b>JJM Estate Management Ltd.</b>
<b>Architect:</b>	<b>Colin Hogan, Focus Architecture Inc.</b>
<b>Landscape Architect:</b>	<b>C. Kavolinas and Associates Inc.</b>
<b>Planner:</b>	<b>Jeff Denney</b>
<b>Urban Design Planner:</b>	<b>Mary Beth Rondeau</b>

**The Urban Design Planner** presented an overview of the proposed project and highlighted that this is a new building.

- The project borders a portion of 160 Street, south of Fraser Hwy. Previously it was a 4-storey mixed-use proposal in the same form that is shown now (L-

shaped form). Directly behind the site, the developer recently finished the first phase of an apartment building.

- The breezeway has narrowed slightly and shows a future gate option, and the building appears long on the street frontage.
- Two-sided retail is proposed and there are a number of precedents for successful two-sided retail in Surrey. The street fronting is treated as primary frontage. The secondary frontage is located at the back parking side with less signage and windows.
- Staff have no specific issues with this proposal. There are some minor items regarding the impact for the existing residential apartment building overlooking (roof screening and mechanical, etc.).

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

- This project has a long frontage along 160 Street, breaking up the building into two (2) distinct sections by using a breezeway/bridge with a taller element. There is a massing feature at the corner, with more glass and some steel. Different materials on the south end have been used to relate to the existing retail building adjacent to it (brick and painted concrete). A decorative trellis element has been proposed in order to help keep the massing taller.
- A daycare is planned for the northern portion of the upper floor (complete with a secured roof-deck). Daycare entry would be allowed to happen from both the back parking and street side (red metal entry to help signify this area).
- The signage along 160 Street gives more prominence to the street-front retail and activates the street. The glass on the backside of the building is limited and has much less signage.
- With regard to underground parking, there is a security grill to close the space off at night. CPTED requirements are met.
- The main floor is intended to be entirely retail, broken up by the breezeway (which is host to a bike rack and mail boxes for tenants). The second floor will be office space.

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

- From the previous development, there is some existing landscaping that was installed (shrubs and some deciduous trees will remain; anything that is destroyed will be refurbished as this development goes progresses).
- This is a very urban environment so the street trees are in grates. The design incorporates what is currently going on in the Fleetwood-area (pedestrian-oriented and urban).

**ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW**  
**DP for a 2-storey commercial retail building, 8645 - 160 Street**  
File No. 7914-0362-00

It was Moved by D. Newby  
Seconded by C. Taylor  
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)  
recommends that the applicant address the following recommendations and  
revise and resubmit to the ADP.

Carried

**STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS**

**Site**

- The site layout with the building at the street is supported as previously approved. It has good relationship with the residential project across the street.

**Building Form and Character**

- Commend the modern design that lacks some of the sentimentality that often comes with a project of this type.
- There is good articulation, though sometimes appears arbitrary and over-complex.
  - The elements could be simplified while accentuating the corner element and the breezeway.
  - There seems to be an awkward relationship between the projecting corner element and the cornices
  - The wood trellis at the daycare roof appears fussy and adds another type of façade.
  - The depth between some of the façade elements is minimal and appears as an arbitrary change of material.
- The weather projection is elevated too high to be useful.
- Logically the daycare will only have one (1) entry, and it should be placed near the elevator. The side entry cuts off access to the outdoor play area which will also need a portion covered. Daycare design should take better consideration of Health Authority guidelines.
- Retail windows should wrap at the breezeway.
- The individual letters on a framed support could tend to conflict with each other and hamper the legibility of the signage.
- The mechanical units on the roof are too small and need to be shrouded.

**Landscaping**

- Clarify the existing landscaping along the western edge of the parking.
- The landscaping is very urban and overall, creates a nice edge.

- At the expense of 3-5 parking spaces, adding in some trees for screening on the west side would be good.

### CPTED

- The breezeway appears too tight and may create some CPTED issues. Allowing for more space and breathing room being built into the space, rather than relying on technology to solve safety issues would be more appropriate.

### Accessibility

- Two (2) disabled parking stalls designated (one (1) in the underground).
- Where possible, ensure all washrooms and entrances have power doors.
- Emergency call buttons and all elevator buttons should be horizontal for easy accessibility.
- Ensure that the building follows fire code for emergency access.

### Sustainability

- Weather protection could be lowered and do double duty with respect to increased solar shading in the wintertime (reduce some solar glare and the potential of overheating of retail spaces).
- The skylights added for daylighting are excellent as the tenants will not require any artificial lighting for approximately 90% of the time.
- Consider adding solar shading to the offices.
- Consider high albedo roof materials.
- Raised planters on the daycare roof could provide stormwater opportunities and interest.
- Protected bike parking underground would be useful for employees.

### 3. 6:00PM

<b>File No.:</b>	<b>7914-0057-00</b>
<b>New or Resubmit:</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>Last Submission Date:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Description:</b>	<b>DP and RZ for 5-storey residential apartment buildings</b>
<b>Address:</b>	<b>15331/45/55/61/71-101 Avenue</b>
<b>Developer:</b>	<b>Darshan Kohli</b>
<b>Architect:</b>	<b>Maciej Dembek, Barnett Dembek Architects Inc.</b>
<b>Landscape Architect:</b>	<b>M2 Landscape Architecture</b>
<b>Planner:</b>	<b>Jennifer McLean</b>
<b>Urban Design Planner:</b>	<b>Mary Beth Rondeau</b>

The Urban Design Planner presented an overview of the proposed project and highlighted that this is a new building.

- The site is located in Guildford in a residential area with similar type of developments in the area with long forms. This proposal has a break in the middle of the massing.
- A reduction of indoor amenity space is requested and supported by staff given the site is located close to the town centre, but also to the Guildford recreation centre and pool. The outdoor amenity is also requested to be reduced but does not include the long area inside the rear yard setback which is shown as amenity on the drawings.
- Staff support the use, form and density and are seeking advice on the more detailed architectural resolution.

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

- This is a five-storey building with two-storey townhouse units along the street. The indoor amenity is directly behind the two-storey lobby space which is set back (at grade).
- Exterior architecture has vaulted roof elements with large-scale decks on the top floor and column elements.
- Hardie panel has been incorporated into the design, along with two different types of stone (on the columns along the street and the first story of the colonnade).

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

- The amenity area is on the north side with very little sun and is very long and narrow, so that the landscaping was carefully thought through and includes trees and grass mounds.

#### **ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW**

**DP and RZ for 5-storey residential apartment buildings, 15331/45/55/61/71 - 101 Avenue, Surrey**

File No. 7914-0057-00

It was

Moved by C. Taylor

Seconded by D. Newby

That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)

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

Carried

#### **STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS**

##### **Site**

- The form of the building is appropriate in the area. The townhouses along the street (101 Avenue) provide a good street front.



### **Building Form and Character**

- Generally, the strong expression of the balcony/column element is supported rather than smaller busy elements. However, this element needs further design development. The columns could be too small in diameter to be believable as masonry. The scale of the fifth storey could be reduced if the roof line was simplified.
- The cedar soffits are an important quality element and provide a nice contrast. Consider deeper, lower weather protection at the entrance.
- Suggest looking at new Hardie panel material as it avoids various issues with weathering. Good that trim is the same colour rather than contrasting.
- Consider using the lighter coloured material on the north façade.
- Two elevators should be provided considering the amount of people in a five-storey residential apartment.
- Potentially there is an overabundance of one-bedroom units (approximately 40%). In order to accommodate more families and make it more marketable, consider increasing these to two-bedroom units, as well as increasing the ensuite sizing.

### **Landscaping**

- Generally the landscaping is well-done. There is an opportunity, given the lack of sun, to enhance a south facing space such as at the main entrance.
- The slab along the north edge could be dropped over the parking to allow for deeper soil.
- Concern was expressed with regard to the BBQ and children's play area in the far east corner of the property - given the noise it would produce for the residents of the building.
- Grass mounds are good (playful) but require a high amount of maintenance (difficult to keep green and healthy). If possible to design these artificially or use a different material to achieve the same result.

### **CPTED**

- No specific CPTED comments.

### **Accessibility**

- 5% of the units are required to be wheelchair accessible.
- There are currently only two (2) designated parking for disability; an additional *visitor* disability parking stall should be incorporated
- Ensure that there are power buttons at the entrances, elevator buttons are horizontal. Would be in favour of an emergency call button in lobby and underground parking area for security.

### **Sustainability**

- Consider some retention on-site for storm water that is collected from the roof.

4. 7:00PM

<b>File No.:</b>	7914-0256-00
<b>New or Resubmit:</b>	New
<b>Last Submission Date:</b>	N/A
<b>Description:</b>	<b>DP and RZ for 4-storey 74 unit apartment building; (162 unit townhouse - included for context only, not for review by ADP)</b>
<b>Address:</b>	<b>8158 King George Blvd.</b>
<b>Developer:</b>	Dawson Sawyer
<b>Architect:</b>	Maciej Dembek, Barnett Dembek Architects Inc.
<b>Landscape Architect:</b>	PMG Landscape Architecture
<b>Planner:</b>	Helen Popple
<b>Urban Design Planner:</b>	Hernan Bello

**The City Architect** presented an overview of the proposed project and noted that the focus of the ADP review is limited to the apartment building; the townhouse portion is part of the same DP application but is provided only for context. The focus of staff review to date has been mainly on site planning and staff are generally supportive of the proposed layout.

- This project is a 74 unit apartment building and 162 townhouses, in the Newton area, located on King George Blvd. (good positioning for future LRT corridor, rapid bus). Site context includes existing trailer parks (significant crime in this area).
- Transportation dedication onsite includes an east-west road at the northwest corner of the site and a north-south road on the east side of the apartment building.
- There is a four-metre grade change along King George Blvd.
- The applicant has made major changes to the grading since the original ADP submission to respond to the slope along King George Blvd. Intent is to step the main floor so that it is between 0.6 and 1.5 m above grade.

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

- The project faces King George Blvd., with mobile home parks surrounding it. There is a significant grading change along the King George interface. The grading has been revised to step the building down at the north end and follow the grade along King George Blvd.
- The entrance to underground parking is at the lowest end of the site (enters straight as opposed to going down a ramp).
- There are a variety of unit types, ranging in size from 400 sq. ft. to just over 900 sq. ft. The building is 77 units with a single elevator. Balconies are five ft. deep on studio units.

- Regarding architectural expression, this is a large-scale building with pop-up elements that interact with the streetscape.

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

- The landscaping is developed to reflect a very lush green feeling with the use of different plant materials to generate a variety colors and textures throughout the seasons.
- There is a double row of street trees (tree canopy) which is pulled away from the busy streetscape of King George Blvd. The edge of the public realm will be defined by evergreen shrubs.
- The entrance has been opened up to reinforce the entryway into the apartment building (trees flanking the entrance with pots and a bench).
- There is no outdoor children's play area for the reason that Bear Creek Park is approximately 300 metres away which provides ample outdoor amenities and would be redundant if built within the site.
- A garden landscape has been created with generous open space so there is some yard, offering a generous amount of lighting. There are 40 trees proposed (evergreen, flowering, and deciduous), 1300 shrubs and various types of greenery.

#### **ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW**

**DP and RZ for 4-storey 74 unit apartment building; (162 unit townhouse - included for context only, not for review by ADP), 8158 King George Blvd.**  
File No. 7914-0256-00

It was

Moved by S. Vincent

Seconded by M. Vance

That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)

recommends that the applicant address the following recommendations and revise and resubmit to *ADP, at the discretion of Planning staff.*

Carried

with M. Ehman and D. Newby opposed.

#### **STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS**

##### **Site**

- The general arrangement is appropriate; the location and distribution of different elements is pleasing to the eye.
- Fits well with future multi-family destination of surrounding lands.
- This brings wonderful relief to King George Blvd. Pedestrians can now walk between a double row of trees rather than close to the street. The site seems well-connected to transit.
- Good to have multiple outdoor amenity spaces. Anything that can be done to enhance the outdoor amenity space would benefit a prospective buyer. Grading scheme is good and seems to naturally work well with the parking

entrance. However, the northwest corner ends up with the sidewalk higher than the unit. In terms of the liveability of that unit, it seems very basement-like and not as marketable.

- Consider building a children's play area within the site. The development is large and there will be children living in the units. Infants and toddlers need places to play on site; provide something different than a BBQ pit so that kids would benefit.
- Building entry and weather protection should reach out to King George Blvd.

### **Building Form and Character**

- Hardie shingles tend to wrap indiscriminately around the end but does not define the individual forms. The ends of the building do not relate as successfully to the middle of the building. However, there is general rhythm along the length of the building. The subtle difference on the rear side of the building is good.
- Not sure why elements go up and down; consider simple base, middle and top.
- The roof line is highly problematic and unsettling. The corner elements and the balconies are somewhat weak and are a problem for the overall design. The asymmetrical gables are also not helpful as they could be more dignified.
- Louvre panel – unless the panel is functional, revise to integrate better with character of the building.
- Marketability – consider incorporating larger ensuites and more storage, substituting more two bedroom units, and ensuring two elevators in the building. Also consider finding a way to increase usable space with kitchens, etc. Particular to 'J' units, reconsider the location of the unit's washer and dryer to maximize space and efficiency.

### **Landscaping**

- There are lots of opportunities to include passive play areas for children integrated into the outdoor amenity area, not just a box of play equipment, e.g., add some stepping logs. This will provide an extra dimension for children.
- Wonderful diversity of plants and vegetation; a true oasis. Very good attention to detail, and nice flair at the entrance with the potted plants. Overall, well done.
- There is potential conflict between the outdoor amenity and unit 'K'.
- Do not try to landscape beneath the balconies on the west side of the building.
- Consider different tree other than *Styrax Japonicus* as it requires a high level of maintenance and is irritating with the change of seasons (pollen, dropping seeds, etc.).

### **CPTED**

- Good buffers around the perimeter edge. There are some areas where a gate could be included to create more sense of a private area (on the King George Blvd. side and the mews side).

**Accessibility**

- Ensure a wheelchair-accessible washroom in the amenities room.
- Horizontal elevator buttons and call buttons should be noted.
- Provide a minimum of three disabled parking spaces.
- 5% of units should be wheelchair accessible.

**Sustainability**

- Stormwater management should be pursued.
- Consider investing in high performance glazing on the west façade, which can increase the livability and reduce the traffic noise generated from King George Blvd.


**C. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS**


**D. NEXT MEETING**

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, February 26, 2015.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Leroy Mickelson, Chairman  
Advisory Design Panel