

Present:

Chair - R. Drew

Panel Members:A. Callison
B. Howard
I. MacFadyen
M. Patterson
S. Standfield**Guests:**Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture
Caelan Griffiths, PMG Landscape Architects
Kenneth Kim, Architect AIBC, Kenneth Kim
Architecture
Mark Lesack, Ankenman of Associates
Martin Liew, Martin Liew Architecture Ltd.
Pat Campbell, BCSLA, PMG Landscape
Architects**Staff Present:**A. McLean, City Architect
S. Maleknia, Urban Design Planner
L. Blake, Administrative Assistant**A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES**

It was Moved by A. Callison
Seconded by I. MacFadyen
That the minutes of the Advisory Design
Panel meeting of June 27, 2019 be received.
Carried

B. RESUBMISSIONS**1. 4:00 p.m.**

File No.: 7917-0465-00
Address: 2419 & 2429 - 168 Street
New or Resubmit: Resubmit
Last Submission Date: October 18, 2018
Description: OCP Amendment to allow increase in FAR from 1.5 to 2.0. NCP amendment to allow higher unit density. Rezoning from RA to CD. Development Permit for 2 apartment buildings containing 133 apartment units and 2,060 sq.m. of ground floor commercial space in one of the buildings.

Developer: Sikander Basraon, Ikonik Homes Ltd.
Architect: Martin Liew, Martin Liew Architecture Ltd.
Landscape Architect: Caelan Griffiths, PMG Landscape Architects
Planner: Keith Broersma
Urban Design Planner: Nathan Chow

The City Architect advised that staff have no specific issues. As this is a returning item ADP discussion and comments must be limited to the items in question from the previous submission, without revisiting earlier accepted work.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site and building plans, streetscapes and elevations. The Applicant has addressed the Panel's concerns regarding the plaza, connections from the plaza and the surface parking area.

The Landscape Architect presented an overview of the general concept for the Landscape plans.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

It was Moved by M. Patterson
 Seconded by B. Howard
 That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)
 SUPPORT the project and recommends that the applicant address the following
 issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department.
Defeated
 With R. Drew, A. Callison, I. MacFadyen and
 S. Standfield opposed.

It was Moved by M. Patterson
 Seconded by A. Callison
 That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) is in
 CONDITIONAL SUPPORT of the project and recommends that the applicant
 address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development
 Department and, at the discretion of Planning staff, resubmit the project to the
 ADP for review.
Carried
 With B. Howard opposed.

Key Points:

- Consider consolidating lobbies at Bldg A.
- Consider enhancing quality of southeast lobby.
- Consider a solution that deletes the wheelchair lift at Bldg B
- Suggest changing stairs within the east side CRUs to ramps.
- Consider simplifying route from at-grade accessible parking stalls to CRUs.
- Consider removing overhead doors between visitor and commercial from parkade.
- Consider use of amenity space in the southeast corner of the building.
- Relocate some accessible parking stalls to Building B.
- Review the design of washrooms for accessibility.
- Consider site lighting.
- Consider LEED certification.

Site

- Resolve and simplify access to Building A lobby. Consider combining commercial and residential lobby.
- Suggest a grander door at the side of CRU Unit 6.
- Consider pushing the plaza out to the east and changing the streetscape to provide a grander lobby exit.
- Review all access into the plaza as the amount of circulation may give the feel of a "transit" space and not a "plaza."
- Consider connecting the interior parkade stair to the mezzanine to provide a choice of vertical access to the parkade.

- Consider access to Building B, as there is no easy access from Building A.
- Consider relocating Building B elevator due to its proximity to the drive aisle.
- Suggest removing gate between commercial and visitor parking.
- Consider relocating garbage and recycling room at the bottom of the ramp.
- Consider providing light to the southeast corner amenity room or converting it to a theatres space.
- Suggest a generously sized mail room to accommodate large parcel deliveries

Form and Character

- Appreciation for the building form, expression and materiality.

Landscape

- Consider changing the pavers in front of CRUs to provide better contrast to the City sidewalk and additional dimension in the plaza.
- Consider opportunities for lighting in the plaza.
- Consider eliminating the southern door to the residential lobby area and extend the outdoor seating area.

CPTED

- CPTED at rear in parking area improved from last submission.
- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider LEED certification.
- Follow through with the BC Energy Step Code 2.

Accessibility

- Recommend that the restrooms be wheelchair accessible.
- Provide universal access to mezzanine.
- Provide access to Building B other than a wheelchair lift.
- Consider changing stairs to CRUs along east building to small ramps.
- Relocate accessible parking stalls in the underground parkade so they have easier access to the mezzanine.
- Resolve commercial lobby access so it is less circuitous for disabled patrons.
- Provide handrails on both sides of the stairs in the southeast plaza.

C. NEW SUBMISSIONS

2. 4:45 p.m.

File No.: 7918-0235-00
 Address: 5903 144 Street in South Newton
 New or Resubmit: New
 Last Submission Date: N/A
 Description: Rezoning and detailed DP - to permit 3 mixed-use buildings containing approximately 115 residential dwelling units and 1,417 square metres of ground floor commercial
 Developer: Muiz Anandji & Sullivan Plaza Ltd.
 Architect: Kenneth Kim, Architect AIBC, Kenneth Kim Architecture
 Landscape Architect: Pat Campbell, BCSLA, PMG Landscape Architects
 Planner: Harpreet Sondh
 Urban Design Planner: Nathan Chow

The City Architect advised that staff have no specific issues, except a preference to have green space rather than surface parking between buildings B and C.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site and building plans, streetscapes and elevations.

The Landscape Architect presented an overview of the general concept for the Landscape plans.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

It was Moved by A. Callison
 Seconded by B. Howard
 That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) is in
 CONDITIONAL SUPPORT of the project and recommends that the applicant address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department and, at the discretion of Planning staff, resubmit the project to the ADP for review.

Carried

Key Points:

- Consider incorporating more articulation into the buildings, particularly at the roof and more relief to the façade.
- Consider larger mail/parcel room.
- Consider viability of CRU in Building B.
- Review climbability of horizontal guards.
- Consider more urban paving along the street adjacent to daycare.
- Consider more generous width for north/south walkways between buildings and at ramps.
- Consider placing accessible parking stalls adjacent to elevators.
- Consider accessible requirements for site furnishings.

Site

- Consider viability of the CRU located on 59 Avenue as it likely will not be a busy street.
- Suggest a generously sized mail room to accommodate large parcel deliveries.
- Suggest more access through the surface parking lot.
- Consider incorporating stair access into the ramp north of the outdoor amenity space.
- Suggest implementing a door between the elevator and Unit 101 in Building A, similar to other units.
- Consider re-evaluating the number of stairs that connect the parkade to the rest of the building.
- Review location of PMT with regard to BC Hydro requirements.

Form and Character

- Consider introducing character articulation or design elements along roof line at building corners.
- Consider providing relief to the building façade.
- Consider the material and color of the fascia above patios in order to reinforce the building volume.
- Ensure guardrails are not climbable.
- Support the generous use of brick and suggest limiting the amount of hardi-panel.

Landscape

- Consider a hard surface connection from boulevard to the CRUs and daycare space for easier drop-off and pick-up.
- Suggest making the ramp between Building A and Building B feel more open.
- Consider the amount of greenspace located behind the amenity space to help with a sense of privacy.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider applying the BC Energy Step Code.

Accessibility

- Recommend that CRU washrooms are accessible.
- Provide one Accessible parking stall in the surface parking lot.
- Ensure Accessible parking stalls located in the underground parkade are adjacent to the elevators.

- Suggest Accessible site furnishings.
- Provide a more generous ramp from the pedestrian mews.

3. **5:30 p.m.**

File No.: 7918-0403-00
 Address: 17555 and 17565 No 10 (56 Ave) Highway
 New or Resubmit: New
 Last Submission Date: N/A
 Description: Rezoning from IL to C-15, Development Variance Permit to reduce the lot size, Development Permit to allow construction of a two (2) storey commercial building (financial institution) with surface parking for sixteen (16) stalls.
 Developer: Feisal Panjwani
 Architect: Mark Lesack, Ankenman of Associates
 Landscape Architect: Bahareh Nassiri, M2 Landscape Architecture
 Planner: John Koch-Schulte
 Urban Design Planner: Sam Maleknia

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff have no specific issues.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site and building plans, streetscapes and elevations.

The Landscape Architect presented an overview of the general concept for the Landscape plans.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

It was Moved by I. MacFadyen
 Seconded by M Patterson
 That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)
 SUPPORT the project and recommends that the applicant address the following
 issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department.

Defeated

With R. Drew, A. Callison and B. Howard
 opposed.

It was Moved by A. Callison
 Seconded by R. Drew
 That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) is
 NOT IN SUPPORT of the project and recommends that the applicant address the
 following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department
 and resubmit the project to the ADP for review.

Defeated

With B. Howard, I. MacFadyen, M. Patterson
 and S. Standfield opposed.

It was Moved by B. Howard
Seconded by M Patterson
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) is in
CONDITIONAL SUPPORT of the project and recommends that the applicant
address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development
Department and, at the discretion of Planning staff, resubmit the project to the
ADP for review.

Carried
With A. Callison opposed.

Key Points:

- Consider exploring stronger brick expression of the main entry to the building to assist with the legibility of entrance and better wayfinding
- Consider resolution of east elevation fin wall and suggest terminating with a brick column.
- Reconsider requirement for let down at the midpoint of the shared access drive on the east side and pedestrian movement indication to the parking lot to the east.
- Reconsider paver infill detail.
- Reconsider more columnar trees selection facing the south side (HW 10)
- Reconsider spacing of trees against lane, it appears to be too dense
- Extend paving at drive aisle to the entire parking lot area.
- Consider bike parking for staff and guests and end of trip facilities.

Site

- Reconsider requirement for let down at the midpoint of the shared access drive on the east side and pedestrian movement indication to the parking lot to the east.
- Show the curbs on the parking lot and sidewalk.
- Suggest an alternative material for the special band fill for more durability and practicality such as aggregate.

Form and Character

- Consider a stronger brick expression at the entrance to provide more prominence and better wayfinding.
- Suggest terminating the north fin wall on the east elevation with a brick column, so it appears more resolved.
- Consider opportunities to rework the corner to make the building more prominent and noticeable as part of the streetscape with the adjacent building to the east. Consider using the vocabulary of the neighboring building to inspire the corner, as the rounded corner does not appear to fit with the rhythm of the street.
- Correctly illustrate the size of the Hardie-panel utilized on the north elevation.
- Consider roof amenity for the staff.

Landscape

- Recommend removing the pedestrian connection from the front entrance onto the lane or provide alternative paving treatment to indicate a pedestrian crossing to vehicles.
- Ensure soil volumes are provided for trees on the south and the east sides of the site.
- Consider extending the herringbone paver pattern into the entire parking area.
- Consider extending permeable paving to the entire parking area and update the landscape drawings accordingly.
- Suggest a taller and more columnar tree along the frontage to help with wayfinding and the commercial building expression.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider bicycle parking for staff and customers, as well as the end of trip facilities for cyclists.
- Consider extending permeable paving on the entire parking area.

Accessibility

- No specific issues were identified.

D. NEXT MEETING


The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, August 22, 2019 at Surrey City Hall in 2E Community Room B.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.



Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk



R. Drew, Chair