

Present:

Chair – R. Drew
Panel Members:
A. Politano
B. Howard
G. Borowski
K. Shea
M. Patterson
S. Standfield (4:39 pm)

Guests:

Caelan Griffiths, PMG
Doug Johnson
Jas Bansal, Paul Sivia, SGB Properties Inc.
(Maskeen)
Kent Patenaude, Lu'ma Native Housing Society
Michael Toolan, Architect AIBC, Larry Adams,
Architect AIBC, NSDA Architects
Paul Sivia, Maskeen Deveopment
Samuel M. Chan, Architect AIBC, David Love,
B. Arch, Project Manager, Ionic Architecture
Scott Watson, Craven Huston Powers Architects

Staff Present:

A. McLean, City Architect
N. Chow, Urban Design Planner
S. Maleknia, Urban Design Planner
L. Anderson, Administrative Assistant

A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was Moved by G. Borowski
Seconded by A. Politano
That the minutes of the Advisory Design
Panel meeting of October 24, 2019 be received.
Carried

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

File No.: 7915-0452-00
Address: 6289/6295 King George Boulevard
New or Resubmit: Resubmit
Last Submission Date: June 15, 2017
Description: Rezoning and DP to permit the development of 8
townhouse units and a 6-storey mixed-use building
containing 36 apartment units and approximately
738 square metres of ground floor commercial with
underground and at grade parking
Developer: Jagdip Sivia, SGB Properties Inc. (Maskeen)
Architect: Samuel M. Chan, Architect AIBC, Ionic Architecture
Landscape Architect: Clark Kavolinas. BCSLA, C. Kavolinas & Associates
Planner: Christa Brown
Urban Design Planner: Nathan Chow

The Urban Design Planner advised the project was previously reviewed by the ADP on June 15, 2017, which at that time, contained a single storey stand alone building with commercial and childcare and a four-storey mixed use apartment building. There is no longer a proposed childcare and the site now includes a townhouse

development. Additionally, there is a significant setback to wetland that was not factored into the first scheme.

The Urban Design Planner further advised that staff support the use, form and density, and have no specific issues, except that the primary CRU access should be maintained and reinforced along the street frontage as per the OCP.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site and building plans, streetscapes and elevations, noting the specific changes to the site and building design since the original submission in 2017.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

It was

Moved by G. Borowski

Seconded by A. Politano

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 a stronger sense of arrival, both architectural and landscape.
- Reconsider lack of connectivity of King George Boulevard with CRUs.
- Consider landscape treatment and siting – the connection between the building and King George Boulevard, in front of CRUs – more unified with landscape along King George Boulevard.
- Review grading.
- Make design required for landscape – soil volumes, seating, more useable outdoor space.
- Consider flat slabs at commercial.
- Recommend residential entry be expressed differently from commercial.
- Consider demarking/differentiating Hardie expression at 4/5 floor transition.
- Consider private roof deck for top floor units.
- Consider soffit material.
- Inner road lacks identity framed by garage doors and parking.
- Consider townhouse bay expressions A and B proportions.
- Consider parcel delivery mail room functionality.
- Reconsider access between commercial parkade parking and CRUs (for staff).
- Consider handicapped and adaptable units.
- Reconsider location of parkade - handicapped stalls.
- Consider relocating waste area to make convenient locations.
- Reconsider access to commercial garbage room.
- Consider the BC Step Code and triple glazing (managing acoustics and energy).

Site

- No issue with change in massing and siting.
- There are missed opportunity in the way the building parts address the surroundings and are arranged on site.
- Recommend improving visitor and commercial connection to King George Boulevard sidewalk.
- Recommend increasing access to east CRU.
- Recommend main approach from south have sense of arrival to plaza and differentiation from the cul-de-sac – building elevation is not special – could be developed as something more significant to announce commercial/public nature of the access. There is an equivalence of the designs but consider something on the short ends to show the access for commercial (more celebrated) perhaps CRU could be differentiated.
- Much of the site is given over to vehicular movement, such that the interior roadway is neither an outdoor amenity for residential nor a particularly commercial character
- Break in the townhouse block does not align with main residential lobby – recommend more meaningful axial relationship.
- There is a lot of valuable space at grade – suggest optimize use of that. Consider a modicum of additional green space at the amenity level.
- Ground level outdoor amenity is lacking, for such little site coverage – consider deleting a townhouse to swap with upper storey amenity.
- Recommend creating a loop access and presence to King George Boulevard; to have one point of access feels quite disconnected.
- Like the amenity on upper levels of apartment; consider how townhouse residents will access.
- Consider private roof decks for apartments.
- Ensure mail room and parcel delivery are well thought out.
- Consider making CRU garbage closer to CRUs, seems to be quite far away, perhaps at grade if they are a lot closer to as access is quite difficult.

Form and Character

- The material and colours for units appears good.
- Reconsider massing of south east corner.
- Recommend further design development to north/south elevation as primary approaches for the public and 'address' of apartment building.
- Suggest better integration of the CRU ventilation with signage band not discrete – penetration of brick – could be away from the brick.
- Consider rationalizing base detail at brick feature at building base.
- Consider alternative cladding material at orphan brick feature – north elevation and east elevation at grade – six-storey building, for consistency. Some areas are mixed with a couple of places of two colours of Hardie, etc.
- The use of the contiguous Hardie material from bottom to top over emphasises the massing. Consider differentiating the lower part of the building by making a clear demarcation of the top-middle and top.
- Consider lighter in colour to diminish the volume presence of the upper floors.

- With the precast concrete shelf at the brick, consider either distinguish by having extension of flush and deep enough for a clear determination between brick and Hardie; it is a modest dimension now, if it were to float it suggest it to be larger than that.
- With a lot of step in slab for CRUs 3, 4,5, consider making a flat slab in order to drive value for those units.
- Reconsider configuration of CRU 1's entry area with respect to brick expression.
- Recommend further design development of the apartment residential entries to differentiate from CRUs. Suggest that the lobby space should be differentiated to signal entrance to the residential.
- Recommend expression of east elevation at amenity reconcile with floor plans.
- Consider reconciling the use of colour (green and cobble stone) on east and west elevations.
- Recommend differentiating the townhouses more between units.
- Consider differentiation to provide more of an A/B/A/B pattern rather than A/A/A/A pattern.

Landscape

- Commend the applicant for protection of wetlands.
- The environmental area seems to be a lost opportunity that appears completely separated from the development. Consider design development to provide some amenity use of the area to allow for walkway or bench.
- Recommend that tree retention and site grading along north edge be carefully considered.
- Current size of planters does not appear to provide adequate soil volumes. There may also be a potential conflict between the low concrete planter wall and vehicular access to garages.
- Consider depressing parking slab to allow for greater soil volume for trees over slab.
- Recommend landscape separation to hard paving.
- Recommend landscape separation to cul-de-sac tends as there is no definition of arrival, leave, etc. Consider more landscaping on those CRU spaces and the arrival home experience.
- Recommend strengthening relationship of CRUs to King George Boulevard with landscape treatment.
- Currently there is a build up of landscape in front of CRU 3-5 which tapers to nothing for CRU 1-2. Recommend that treatment should be more homogenous and porous along street edge.
- Consider stronger definition of exterior amenities provided in roof top amenity decks.
- Landscape plans are insufficiently developed to fully understand plans. No site grading plan is included and relationship of environmental area to site is hard to understand.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider the allowance for future EV parking, considering current BC EV vehicle goals, eliminating fuel vehicles in the coming decade.
- Complete a thermal comfort study of the suites if cooling is not to be provided, verify Step Code requirements are being met.
- Recommend using low flow fixtures in washrooms to help reduce water consumption.
- Recommend using triple glazed windows for increased energy efficiency as well as reduced noise from KG Blvd.

Accessibility

- Recommend improving pedestrian connection to King George Boulevard and CRUs.
- Suggest providing accessible units in the larger building, ensuring larger accessible washrooms.
- Suggest providing barrier free access to townhouses.
- Consider locating both accessible stalls at grade.
- Relocate accessible parking spot in underground parking to avoid pedestrians from having to cross drive aisles.
- Reconsider functionality of visitor and commercial below-grade area for access and exiting.

C. NEW SUBMISSIONS

2. **Time:** 5:30 p.m.

File No.:	7919-0168-00
Address:	7561 - 140 Street
New or Resubmit:	New
Last Submission Date:	N/A
Description:	Sohkeya Phase 2 by the Kekinow Native Housing Society. Development Permit to permit 2 apartment buildings containing a total of 104 non-market housing units.
Developer:	Kekinow Native Housing Society
Architect:	Michael Toolan, Architect AIBC, Larry Adams, Architect AIBC, NSDA Architects
Landscape Architect:	Chengru Liang, CHP Architects
Planner:	Heather Kamitakahara
Urban Design Planner:	Nathan Chow

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff generally support the site, noting a few concerns for which the applicant has been advised.

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. Politano
Seconded by K. Shea
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP):

1. SUPPORT the project and recommends that the applicant address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department; and
2. Recommend that the landscaping submission return to staff for further development.

Carried
with S. Standfield opposed.

The Panel supported the project in general.

Key Points:

- Consider locating amenity spaces adjacent to courtyards; opportunity to bring activities to underutilized courtyard spaces.
- Consider moving the playground location from 140 Avenue.
- Consider larger patios along the south.
- Consider using alternative material or colours along the north and south elevations to create more visual interest.
- Consider making one or more of the two or three-bedroom units handicap accessible units.
- Consider stormwater strategy.

Site

- Consider the relationship with amenity space and access to light.
- Outdoor amenity spaces are cramped at the north; recommend prioritizing the pockets available at the south (although there isn't a view to the park, there is sunlight).
- Consider relocation of playground and picnic table to south courtyard space with a corresponding change in location of all or part of the interior amenity spaces to provide for a strong indoor/outdoor relationship.
- Consider increasing openness of arts and crafts studio.
- Consider a stronger sense of 'centreness' in the project. The centre space could become something important – maybe an intensity that could happen.
- Consider a stronger relationship between Building C and the zone in between the two buildings.

- Consider design development of the breezeway plaza to better respond to interior layout of adjacent lounge spaces perhaps with a door connection on west side of lounge.
- Consider larger private patios where space allows, such as at the south.
- Suggest that one of the lounge storage areas be a washroom.
- Recommend that the fencing be higher.
- Suggest maintaining the setback from the street as presented.

Form and Character

- Commend use of timber at the entries, solar shading and the integration of light at the corridor internally.
- Building C differentiated ground level on north is successful. Suggest this on Building B and other ground levels.
- Suggest that the Hardie hitting the ground is not as successful.
- Recommend that the very long elevations have some variation in cladding. Consider vertical cladding as opportunity to vary the elevations.
- Consider introducing different material or colour on the long north and south elevations to create more visual interest.
- Reconsider northwest elevation and streamlining/refinement arrangement of the balcony, guardrail, solar shade and parapet integration.
- Reconsider relationship between sloped roof fascia and parapet (gridline D).
- Appreciate the frieze feature and slope roof; however it is black paint on a dark panel on the north side of a dark building and may be lost. Consider relocating so it can be seen and experienced as intended.

Landscape

- Consider connecting walkways from private patios to open space on south side.
- Consider reducing amount of planting separation between patios and commons space to maximize useable common open space.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Good use of shading at the south side of the building.
- Recommend re-use of water storage that will be required for stormwater run-off.
- Recommend ensuring that there is allowance for EV parking stalls – have these included.

Accessibility

- Consider two and three-bedroom accessible units.
- Recommend that the accessible parking orientation not have to cross the drive aisle to the elevator.
- Consider relocating accessible stalls at west end of parkade closer to elevator lobby.

In response to the comments provided by the Panel, the Project Architect advised:

- The Applicant wanted the amenity close to the entry to emphasize/assist in conversation at the entry.
- The picnic table is a device to create a front porch and social space at the entrance.
- The frieze and dark colours are a place holder, also an opportunity for indigenous artists to create something at that location.

3. Time: 6:10 p.m.

File No.: 7917-0544-00
 Address: 13672/84/88/90, 13702/16/26/36/46 Bentley Road, 13782 and 13790 Harper Road and 13753/55/61/75/81 Grosvenor Road
 New or Resubmit: New - Workshop
 Last Submission Date: N/A
 Description: Rezoning, OCP Amendment, CCP (City Centre) Amendment and Development Permit to allow for the construction of five, 5 and 6 storey apartment buildings with 519 dwelling units in Phase 1.
 Developer: Maskeen Development
 Architect: Doug Johnson
 Landscape Architect: Caelan Griffiths, PMG
 Planner: Donald Nip
 Urban Design Planner: Sam Maleknia

The City Architect advised that this is a preliminary review of a large consolidation that will be developed in stages. The northern portion of the consolidation along Bentley Rd is Phase 1 and will be reviewed as a General Development Permit. The southern sites, along Grosvenor Rd will be reviewed as a Master Plan for future rezoning. Staff are open to consider up to six storeys on parts of the site and will engage with the public to discuss an overall City Centre plan update that will include this area. It was further noted there is an existing building that is on the City's Heritage Inventory that is in the Master Plan area that may be considered for retention as part of the overall development.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site and building plans, streetscapes and elevations, and noted a children's daycare in the building as well as space for a potential dog daycare in future.

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

Staff and the applicant team responded to questions from the Panel.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

The Panel supported the project in general and provided comments as follows:

Key Points:

- Consider rooflines using key massing and breaking down into a scale that would fit the project and neighbourhood. In particular, shifting scales in the six-storey block, flat top.
- Consider landscaping that encourages larger moves that stitch all little moves/parts together and connect all three of the courtyards that allows for connectivity between the sites and the variety of scale and events.
- Consider the landscape programming; very programmed and the programs repeat. Create more passive and more flexible uses/programs for outdoor amenities and take advantage of what might already be considered for the City park.
- Consider some commercial space; it may make sense to use the heritage house for that space.
- Consider implications of the Step Code.
- Consider simplifying the courtyards.
- Create connections through the sites and buildings to bring the Park to the people.

Site

- Lots of programming in outdoor amenity space, perhaps too much; a lot of programs squeezed into a space that might be too intensive. Perhaps all the courtyards should be part of a larger whole. Seems if you want to get people moving through, maybe you don't need to program every courtyard.
- Bocci and pickleball are noise-generating activities that are not best suited in courtyards where noise cannot be amplified.
- Review where the light and pedestrian connections occur and use as opportunities to shift scale between the building elements.
- With 519 units in the first phase and another 250 in the next phase, consider a small amount of commercial space (e.g. coffee shop) facing future park as place where broader neighbourhood can congregate/socialize.
- Break up building C- it is quite a leap from single family densities – so it will feel less imposing.
- Create a relationship among the courtyard spaces – more flexible space.
- Wonderful to see a larger children's area than two smaller ones.
- Spaces such as a dog run may not be well-suited to a courtyard.
- Consider locating remaining indoor amenity at grade.
- Consider including five- and six-storey precedent images in the package.

- It would be better if there are four buildings on the 2 westerly quadrants instead of three.
- More public presence for amenities.
- Perhaps leave heritage house where it is; if it has to be shifted then honour its context.
- As the City reviews the Plan area, consider how the green lane could penetrate and provide something like the Arbutus walk through the City Centre and streets; this is a great place for that to start.
- Consider pedestrian connectivity to the future park by allowing a breezeway connection through the building to park, particularly for the NE quadrant.
- Consider courtyards to have differing programming elements to encourage pedestrian movement through each of the courtyards.
- Consider simplifying courtyards to better organize elements to present a more cohesive look.

Form and Character

- Overall strong approach and the starting point with large patios for all units is a good thing.
- There is an opportunity to break up the southern building and provide vision to the park and increase the circulation loops on the west side.
- Most of the right pieces are there; uniformity to everything shown so far.
- Consider varied heights – refine to avoid unification of mass. Pay attention to breaking up the long facades.
- Higher density seems appropriate given proximity to transit.
- Consider logical lobby locations and organization of building functions and their relationship to surrounding urban features.
- Outdoor courtyards are a nice feature. Appear highly segmented and rigid – consider cross-site connections and relationship instead of formal boundaries for a looser approach to ground level vs. the simple geometries of the buildings.
- Careful configuration of indoor amenity spaces and how they relate to/conflict to outdoor amenities. Locations currently appear incidental. Stretch out to areas – enhance relationship.
- There's an equivalence of how ground level units relate to the courtyard vs. the street or lane – consider turning them to their location and adjacencies. Integrate more variety.
- In 3D model, feels as though the large facades are too close together (e.g buildings C and D), even though the minimum spacing is met.

Landscape

- Encourage the notion of bringing the park to the people on Howey Road.
- Look at the programming of courtyard spaces to look at the scale and variety of elements. Maybe a greater parsing of large to smaller elements.

- Consider a more passive approach in view of future park across the street. Simplifying the courtyards would help e.g. a patio and formal garden where the heritage house is (which isn't really connecting well with the proposed pickleball). Maybe there needs to be a walkway or tree way to get there.
- The community gardens seem very small and close together.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- East/west facing apartment, consider thermal comfort.
- Recommend defining the Step Code targets for the development.

Accessibility

- No specific issues were identified.

In response to the comments provided by the Panel, the Project Architect advised:

- With respect to public spaces, the comments make sense; a bit messy right now and needs to come together and be a little more refined.
- Connectivity to the public space with the heritage house possibly turned into a coffee shop, sounds good.
- Like the suggestion of a small commercial aspect, maybe in the corner or opposite the park.
- With the green lane, we are at the mercy of the Engineering.

D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, November 28, 2019 at Surrey City Hall in 2E Community Room B.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 7:14 p.m.

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

Robert Drew, Chair