

**Present:**

Chair – L. Mickelson  
M. Ehman  
M. MacCaull  
D. Newby  
D. Ramslie  
M. Vance

**Guests:**

Shoghig Attal, Studio One Architecture  
Tomas Wolf, Studio One Architecture  
Maciej Dembek, Barnett Dembek Architects  
Marlene Messer, PMG Landscape Architects

**Staff Present:**

M. Rondeau, Acting City Architect  
L. Luaifoa, Administrative Assistant

---

**A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES**

It was

Moved by M. Vance

Seconded by M. MacCaull

That the minutes of the Advisory Design

Panel meeting of February 25, 2016 be received.

Carried

**B. NEW SUBMISSIONS**

**1. 5:00 PM**

<b>File No.:</b>	<b>7915-0344-00</b>
<b>New or Resubmit:</b>	<b>Resubmit as 6-storeys</b>
<b>Last Submission Date:</b>	November 26, 2015
<b>Description:</b>	Rezoning and DP for three 6-storey apartment buildings with a stand-alone amenity building. The proposal has changed from 4-storeys to 6-storeys since last ADP review.
<b>Address:</b>	<b>10555, 10577, 10595 and 10607 – 140 Street</b>
<b>Developer:</b>	Victor Setton, Porte Homes
<b>Architect:</b>	Shoghig Attal and Tomas Wolf, Studio One Architecture
<b>Landscape Architect:</b>	Patricia Campbell, PMG
<b>Planner:</b>	Pat Lau
<b>Urban Design Planner:</b>	Mary Beth Rondeau

**The Acting City Architect** noted that the application was supported by the ADP for 4-storey buildings. Prior to that, an application for 6-storey buildings was supported at Council. This new proposal is returning to 6-storey buildings.

**The Project Architect** presented an overview of the revised plans and highlighted that the new proposal consisted of 353 units instead of 236 units and an increase of density to a 6-storey building.

**The Landscape Architect** presented an overview of the landscape plans and highlighted that the proposed plans cater to a cross section of clients and targets young families.

**ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW**  
**Rezoning and DP for a 3-storey commercial development**  
File No. 7915-0344-00

It was Moved by D. Newby  
Seconded by M. Ehman  
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)  
recommends B – that the applicant address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department and resubmit the project to the ADP for review.

Carried

**STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS**

The Design Panel supported the increase in density in principle and commended the detailed package and presentation.

**Building Form and Character**

- Courtyard feels smaller with the new 6 floor height and may benefit from great variation and articulation.
- Consider altering massing of upper two floors to allow more daylight into the courtyard and to make courtyard facades less overwhelming.
- Consider a “tot lot” to accommodate the targeted audience which is, mainly families.
- Architectural resolution is well done acknowledging that the 6-storey form is difficult to solve. The corner element is welcomed as is inclusion of masonry cladding at street level. Consider variations in the 6-storey height along the streets.
- The new scheme is conservative compared to the previous and perhaps some colour variation may enliven the new scheme.
- Concerned with conflict between bedrooms and diagonal link.
- Consider reducing the size of the master bedroom and ensuite space to increase the living/dining room space.

- Amenity Building:
  - Consider integrated stairs into the building.
  - The 2<sup>nd</sup> floor gym will be very loud for people using 1<sup>st</sup> floor amenities, consider additional acoustic measures between floors.
- It is difficult to see/read the project sign without a backing. Consider mounting the sign on the face of the C channel.

### **Landscaping**

- The corner plaza at 105A and 140 Street seems obligatory. Consider improving the generosity of the public realm.
- The garden plots to the north of the amenity building are a welcomed addition; however, do not have sufficient access to sunlight at the proposed location.
- The landscape allows for good permeability and urban cooling.
- It was noted that recommendations from the Panel for the landscape portion have been addressed.

### **CPTED**

- Consider increasing ground light in the dark courtyard.

### **Accessibility**

- Recommend increasing disabled parking spaces to 10.
- Recommend the call button panels be placed in the 4 lobbies and are horizontal, not exceeding 42" from the floor.
- Recommend elevator button panel be placed horizontally and not exceed 42" from the floor.
- Recommend 5% of units be disabled accessible.
- Most adaptable units are located on floors 2-6. Considering locating more at the ground floor.

### **Sustainability**

- Rationale approach to glazing.
- Support the restraint on the articulation of the envelope.
- Support the use of horizontal solar shading to manage unwanted solar gain on the south elevation.
- Support connection to district energy.

2. 5:45 PM

<b>File No.:</b>	<b>7915-0390-00</b>
<b>New or Resubmit:</b>	<b>Resubmit</b>
<b>Last Submission Date:</b>	January 28, 2016
<b>Description:</b>	Rezoning, Subdivision (consolidation) and DP for 6-storey, 156 unit apartment building
<b>Address:</b>	<b>13270 &amp; 13286 King George Boulevard, 11079 &amp; 11089 Ravine Road</b>
<b>Developer:</b>	0707784 BC Ltd. (Rana Khaliq)
<b>Architect:</b>	Maciej Dembek, Barnett Dembek Architects
<b>Landscape Architect:</b>	Marlene Messer, PMG Landscape Architects
<b>Planner:</b>	Christopher Atkins
<b>Urban Design Planner:</b>	Mary Beth Rondeau

**The Project Architect** presented an overview of the revised design plans that include recommendations and comments from the Design Panel. A few highlighted improvements included: an additional elevator, additional green space created in the courtyard and the use of different types of windows.

**The Landscape Architect** provided an overview of the landscape plans and noted that the outdoor has enlarged with a lot more green space to provide separation.

**ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW**  
**Rezoning and DP for one-storey commercial building**  
 File No. 7915-0390-00

It was Moved by M. Ehman  
 Seconded by M. MacCaull  
 That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)  
 recommends A - that the applicant address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department.  
Carried with D. Ramslie opposed.

**STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS**

The Design Panel noted the complexity of the building envelope and in general, felt that the development improved and is better resolved with previous comments of the Panel addressed.

**Building Form and Character**

- Playful colour deployment is an interesting idea, can be carefully developed to be successful.
-

- Consider pairing back to a simpler expression as it feels like much more materials have been added to the façade treatment.
- Reconsider the roof amenity roof element – isn't necessary. The material durability is in question as well.
- Galvalume shrouds are not necessary.
- Commend the amenity space with access to sunlight. The lower amenity building would benefit from a green roof with potential to occupy it.
- The material for the roof is not as durable, consider an alternative.

### Landscaping

- Thoughtful approach to the landscape. Commend the tidy arrangement of unit outdoor space and common space.
- Consider inclusion of play space.

### CPTED

- No specific CPTED comments.

### Accessibility

- No additional comments regarding accessibility.

### Sustainability

- Consider less corners and jogs in the exterior walls to lessen the articulation of the building to reduce complexity of the envelope.
- Support the use of heat recovery ventilation suite by suite.
- Support high efficiency drip irrigation.
- Support drainage efficiency requirements.


## C. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS


## D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for **Thursday, April 7, 2016.**

## E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

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

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