

Present:

Chair - L Mickelson
D. Newby
M. Ehman
M. Vance
T. Coady
K. Johnston
S. Forrest
M. Younger

Guests:

C. Kay, Townline
S. Jedreicich, Townline
C. Mackintosh, GBL Architects
S. Lyon, GBL Architects
A. Pau, DKL Architects
J. Saliken, Chandler Associates
C. Block, Chandler Associates
M. Chan, PMG
M. Thomas, Fleetwood West Development
R. Hart, Fleetwood Community Association

Staff Present:

T. Ainscough, City Architect
M. Rondeau, Senior Planner
L. Luaifoa, Administrative Assistant

A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was Moved by M. Ehman
Seconded by D. Newby
That the minutes of the Advisory Design
Panel meeting of February 12, 2015, be received.

Carried

B. NEW SUBMISSIONS**1. 4:00PM**

File No.:	7914-0208-00
New or Resubmit:	New
Description:	Rezoning, DP and Consolidation/Subdivision for a proposed 25-storey high-rise residential building with ground-oriented townhouses
Address:	10158, 10170 and 10182 - 133 Street and Portion of 13333 Old Yale Road, City Centre
Developer:	Chris Kay of Townline Homes Inc.
Architect:	Stu Lyon, GBL Architects
Landscape Architect:	Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
Planner:	Pat Lau
Urban Design Planner:	Mary Beth Rondeau

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

- This proposal is for a development permit for a 25-storey residential tower on Old Yale Road and 133 Street, near Holland Park.
- The height is proposed to be several storeys above the policy for the site at 60m (approx. 20 storeys). Across the street on 133rd is set at 6 storeys which is a steep incline of towers down to lower buildings but the tower location is

setback from 133rd so that a lop-sided streetscape won't be created. Staff generally support the proposed height.

- A large boulevard with inside sidewalk is proposed as part of contribution to green space in the City Centre.
- The density utilizes the maximum plus 20% considered in City Centre.
- Staff generally supports the use, form and density of this proposed project.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site plan, building plans, elevation and landscape plans and noted the following:

- This odd shaped site is two blocks from Surrey Central. The adjacent Senior Care Building is leased and is anticipated to be re-developed in Phase 2 for a residential tower.
- One of the key considerations of this development was a new road access connecting Old Yale Road to the new development.
- The ground floor of the tower is an over height floor that lets out onto a landscaped amenity space which is enclosed by the tower on one side. The tower has 10 units per floor totaling 248 units with no desire for penthouse suites. All units have generous balconies.
- The building is a mixture of brick, spandrel glass and metal panel.

S. Forrest joined the meeting at 4:21 pm.

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

- Existing trees will be retained on the edge of property.
- A generous canopy will come out to the side at the corner of the lobby entrance. Landscape will peel off on both sides of the framed entry.
- The setback is generous on Old Yale Road. A typical boulevard will be replaced on Old Yale Road with large coniferous planting that lead into larger green scapes.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

Rezoning, DP and Consolidation/Subdivision for a proposed 25-storey high rise residential building with ground-oriented townhouses, 10158, 10170 and 10182 – 133 Street and Portion of 13333 Old Yale Road, City Centre

File No. 7914-0208-00

It was

Moved by T. Coady

Seconded by D. Newby

That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)

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

Carried

STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS

The Panel considered the presentation and drawings well done and appreciated the building model.

Site

- The long term site plan rationale is sensible and well considered.
- The site works well with context of the neighbourhood.
- The public realm boulevard along Old Yale Road is generous and welcoming along a busy street.
- Consider making use of the area behind the townhouses as the open amenity area is a little disproportionate to the indoor.
- Address north boundary retaining wall for the parking garage and relationship to the existing neighbours.
- For the outdoor amenity area:
 - Suggest more play space although it is great to see that there is any space available. The play space would benefit from better sunlight.
 - Amenity area is constrained to accommodate the 250 units.
- Consider closely the pathways through the site particularly the path from the parking to the townhouses.

Building Form and Character

- Generally, the height and density were supported and it was considered that the architectural concept was good; it just needs more design development.
- The form and configuration holds promise to advance the transition of the community to a higher density. Modern approach is appropriate and pleasing.
- Support the character of the townhouses. The design is clean and elegant and practical for the area. The orphan group of townhouses could either be completely different or the same.
- Concerns with the transition between the townhouses and the tower.
- Recommend re-thinking proportion of articulation on the middle of the tower. Response can be more rational and consider solar for each elevation. Consider keeping with the middle sketch that was presented.
- Concerns with the shallow balconies on the units facing Old Yale Road.
- The lobby entrance seems small in relation to the townhouse. Consider elevating entrance a bit and consider the private entrance of the adjacent townhouse.

Landscaping

The Urban Designer Planner read written comments provided by the Landscape Architect:

- The shared amenity area could be further improved with sliding or rolling doors. The 'feature paving of lobby and common amenity areas' illustrate sliding pavers with planting or lawn. This landscape treatment is typically high maintenance and looks good if well-maintained.

- The grades on the existing survey and proposed plan appear challenging for tree retention. A certified arborist report with survey and recommendations for tree retention should be reviewed as part of this proposal.
- The landscape plan shows opportunities for urban agriculture in a long rectangular planter underneath the existing conifer tree canopy. Urban agriculture in this area is unlikely.
- The retaining walls at the new road should be carefully detailed.

CPTED

- Consider clear separation of private and public space particularly at the gap between townhouses on 133rd. Recommend area to be well lit and consider gates and small fencing.

Accessibility

- Disabled parking spaces should be increased from 2 to 10. Recommend 2 spots per level.
- 5% of suites should be wheelchair accessible.
- Recommend elevator button panels to be placed horizontally and power doors at entrances.
- Recommend call buttons at entrances and emergency call button on each parking level.

Sustainability

- Maximize the use of balconies throughout for solar shading of the suites.
- Stormwater detention is a challenge over structural parking. Suggest utilizing “green corridor” areas outside of parking footprint as part of stormwater management vs only via detention tanks.
- Consider response to solar oriented with glass and shading.

2.

5:00PM

File No.:	7914-0121-00
New or Resubmit:	New
Last Submission Date:	N/A
Description:	A general site application for a proposed OCP Amendment from Urban to Commercial, a Rezoning from RF to CD (based on RM-45 and C-8), and a General Development Permit to allow a mixed-use 1 to 6 storey transit oriented development (TOD) of approx. 244 apartment units, 6 live/work townhouse units, approx. 3,000 m² of commercial/retail space and 1,350 m² of office space
Address:	15289-88 Avenue, Fleetwood School Site
Developer:	Tom Morton, Fleetwood West Development
Architect:	John Saliken, Chandler Associates Architecture Ltd.
Landscape Architect:	PMG
Planner:	Donald Nip
Urban Design Planner:	Mary Beth Rondeau

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

- This transit oriented development is located in the Fleetwood Town Centre near the busy streets of 152 and Fraser Highway.
- The extension of Fleetwood Way and an east/west road through the site will create a calmer village TOD inward from the busy arterials: 152nd and Fraser Highway.
- Staff generally supports use, form and density.

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

- The proposal is for a mixed-use, for commercial/retail, residential and office space. The overall configuration of the site is formed by the north south road. The east west connector will bring some bearing on to how the overall site will be developed.
- The site is proposed to be phased starting at the west and going east.
- There are 2 retail buildings proposed at later phases.

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

- Stormwater management features are being considered and the green roof of the parking adds amenity to the proposal.
- On the east side, the communal amenity space for the residents will create an opportunity for social gatherings and the ability to interact with neighbours.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

A general site application for a proposed OCP Amendment from Urban to Commercial, a Rezoning from RF to CD (based on RM-45 and C-8), and a General Development Permit to allow a mixed-use 1 to 6 storey transit oriented development (TOD) of approx. 244 apartment units, 6 live/work townhouse units, approx. 3,000 m² of commercial/retail space and 1,350 m² of office space

File No. 7914-0121-00

It was

Moved by M. Ehman
Seconded by T. Coady

That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)

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

Carried

STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS

The Panel generally supported the use, form and density of the project and considered the plans showed an excellent arrangement of the buildings and pedestrian circulation.

Site

- Phase 1 – residential needs its own open amenity. Suggest using roof of building.
- Ensure “cut” for the public plaza along 88 Avenue is high enough and wide enough to create a sense of invitation.
- The site and surface parking could be designed more like University Village in Seattle with more landscaping, benches, art etc.
- The motor court should be reduced in scale.
- The site planning at the east end of the site is odd with commercial and surface parking.
- Concern for parking. It should be underground and there is not adequate parking for residents. 1 per unit should be increased to 1.3 stalls per unit.

Building Form and Character

- Site could stand greater residential density, provided outdoor space can be provided.
- Good permeability into north/south corridors. Address solar orientation of west and south sides of buildings perhaps set a few degrees off the grid.
- Townhomes along 88th need better integration. Work these 2 storey elements into the apartments.
- Consider when building designs come back that the buildings are a family of buildings and colour materials and articulations should vary more than shown.
- Provide amenity space inside buildings to ensure activity on commons.
- Address parkade ramps and their relationship to the adjacent amenity, particularly Building B.
- Cedar exterior materials are suggested and are likely unrealistic.

Landscaping

- Consider the introduction of urban agriculture.
- The Urban Designer Planner read written comments provided by the Landscape Architect:
 - Consider more creative use for outdoor space in Phase 1 amenity.
 - Good light into open amenity. Suggest really working to activate these spaces for buyer profile/first time buyers.
 - The majority of the site and planting, including trees, is on slab. Important to provide adequate soil volumes and species selection.
 - In general, the landscape design does not respond well to the architecture. The building design uses clean lines and bold materials for a contemporary aesthetic. The landscape could respond better, using lines and geometries from the buildings to strengthen the public and shared amenity areas.

CPTED

- No specific CPTED issues were identified.

Accessibility

- Comments on accessibility will be made on future presentations.

Sustainability

- Suggest looking for opportunities for stormwater infiltration at podium level, internal roads(pervious pavement) and terraces
- Suggest investing “energy sharing” concept between different building uses, i.e. cooling demand in retail and heating demand in residential.


C. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, April 9, 2015.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.



Jane Sullivan, City Clerk



Leroy Mickelson, Chairman
Advisory Design Panel