

Present:**Panel Members:**

R. Drew, Chair
B. Howard
G. Borowski
I. MacFadyen
L. Mickelson
M. Patterson
M. Tashakor
R. Dhall
R. Jenkins
T. Bunting

Guests:

Christa Min
David Stoyko, Connect Landscape Architecture
Gwyn Vose, IBI Group
Johnathan Yang
Lu Tang, Thind Properties
Peter Huggins and Dave Cromp, BHA Architecture
Stephen Vincent, Durante Kreuk Ltd.
Tom Miller, Wanson Group
Tony Wai, Haena Choi, and Salim Narayana, IBI Group

Staff Present:

A. McLean, City Architect
N. Chow, Urban Design Planner
P. Djamzad, Community Services
Coordinator
S. Maleknia, Urban Design Planner
C. Eagles, Administrative Assistant

A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was Moved by R. Dhall
Seconded by L. Mickelson
That the minutes of the Advisory Design
Panel meeting of June 25, 2020 be received.
Carried

B. STAFF PRESENTATION**1. Co-Creating an Urban Heat Ready Surrey City Centre**
Pegah Djamzad, Sustainability Engagement Specialist

Staff provided a Power-Point presentation on The Urban Heat Ready Project, which brings together City staff, community partners and development professionals to co-create a vision for a urban heat ready Surrey City Centre and aims to increase awareness about urban heat across all three audiences. As Surrey City Centre rapidly densifies and urbanizes, there is opportunity to anticipate, plan and collaborate on ways to mitigate the impacts of urban heat.

C. NEW SUBMISSIONS

1. Time: 3:20 p.m.

File No.: 19-0223
Address: 13416-13430 – 105A Ave; 10492-10536 University Drive;
13437 – 105 Avenue; 10501-10537 – 134A Street
New or Resubmit: New
Last Submission Date: N/A

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Description: | OCP and City Centre Plan Amendment, Rezoning and General Development Permit for the development of 2 high rise towers and 1 mid-rise building with ground level childcare. |
| Developer: | Lu Tang, Thind Properties |
| Architect: | Gwyn Vose, IBI Group |
| Landscape Architect: | Stephen Vincent, Durante Kreuk Ltd. |
| Planner: | Christopher Atkins |
| Urban Design Planner: | Ann McLean |

The City Architect advised that the heights and density will be more than anticipated by the City Centre Plan. Staff are generally supportive of the uses and siting proposed, however there is concern with the tower heights due to the increase in shadow on Whalley Athletic and Tom Binnie Parks.

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 R. Jenkins
Seconded by R. Dhall
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 redistributing the density to reduce the shadowing of the play fields.
- Consider further developing the architecture and massing of the podium and the tower top.
- Consider delineating expression of rental 'building' and tower.
- Consider reducing length of balconies to help accentuate the vertical moves in the tower.
- Consider impact of balconies on thermal bridging and energy model.
- Consider a bringing more dynamism to the building forms or façade articulation.
- Consider further development of public plazas such as giving them a different character or public art.
- Consider increasing the size of the public plazas.
- Consider a more rigorous approach to the design of the outdoor amenity space.
- Consider a stronger connection between indoor and outdoor amenity spaces.

- Consider increasing the amount of softscaping across the site.
- Consider further development of the private/public interface.
- Consider a stronger connection between the two towers.
- Consider the developing the acoustic mitigation measure early on.
- Consider measures which reduce the shadowing of the public play fields to the north.
- Consider reducing the monochromatic nature of the colour palette.

Site

- Consider extending the southeast plaza and making more welcoming.
- Consider adding more softscaping to the hard areas.
- Consider engaging early with TransLink.
- Consider further design refinement of the corner plazas to provide a sense of place and purpose to engage the public while they interact with these areas.
- Reconsider location of courtyard fencing.
- Provide further detail with respect to expected construction sequencing as it relates to the construction of the parkade, the interaction with the existing structure of the SkyTrain guideway, and whether or not both towers will be constructed at the same time, or if the project will be phased as this may impact the design direction moving forward.
- Provide further detail on the acoustical measures being considered and implemented to mitigate sound transmission from the SkyTrain guideway to the neighboring residential and market rental units that will face its direction.

Form and Character

- Recommend review of public realm to courtyard relationship.
- Consider modulation between heights to help with the shadows.
- Consider making northern lower building lower and transferring some density to the south tower.
- Consider further development on taller tower to mitigate shadows.
- Consider reducing length of balconies to better suit overall expression.
- Consider design development of outdoor amenity space.
- Consider further development of massing and development of design.
- Consider further articulation for the rental podium to break up the mass of the podium for the South Tower.
- Consider stronger tower bases.
- Consider better flow for the space planning at the ground and second level.
- Consider strengthening the concept of podium to add visual interest to the lower pedestrian realm.
- Recommend that an elevator study is conducted early on.

Landscape

- Review the organization of the spaces and landscape treatment in the central courtyard to clarify their relationships and concept.
- Consider further design detail for fencing and gates on outdoor amenity.

- Consider utilizing public art program as a part of the landscape design.
- Consider private outdoor spaces to differentiate from central public outdoor area.

CPTED

- Consider further detail on amount of lighting for safety.

Sustainability

- Consider design requirements to meet BC Energy Step Code 2 requirements.
- Consider implementing passive solar shading elements to the south face of the towers.
- Consider electric bicycle charging infrastructure to the storage areas.
- Consider mechanical engineer/energy modeler review as early as possible.

Accessibility

- Recommend reviewing accessibility.
- Review paving choices in courtyard to ensure they are Accessible.

2. Time: 4:50 p.m.

File No.: 17-0507
 Address: 13760 & 13777 – 75A Avenue; 13778 – 76 Avenue
 New or Resubmit: New
 Last Submission Date: N/A
 Description: Rezoning and Development Permit for three four-storey residential apartment buildings.
 Developer: Tom Miller, Wanson Group
 Architect: Peter Huggins and Dave Cromp, BHA Architecture
 Landscape Architect: David Stoyko, Connect Landscape Architecture
 Planner: Melissa Johnson
 Urban Design Planner: Nathan Chow

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff have concerns on the narrow buffer in between the driveway and rear yards of neighbouring units, and the shared parking ramp and outdoor amenity space. Staff would like to see 75A Avenue widened but it is not a requirement.

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 B. Howard
Seconded by T. Bunting
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

Key Points:

- Consider a more consistent architectural character across Mirra 4.
- Consider reducing amount of hardscaping, simplify the geometry.
- Reduce amount of repetition of façade elements.
- Consider mitigating the impact of auto-court on Mirra, Mirra 4 and the neighbouring building.
- Consider improving daylight access to living spaces at Mirra 3 ground level 2-bedroom suites.
- Consider a stronger connection between indoor and outdoor amenity spaces.
- Consider a stronger connection between Mirra 1 and the shared outdoor amenity.
- Consider incorporating a stronger pedestrian connection between Mirra 3 and Mirra 4.
- Consider a stronger residential access and visual connection from Mirra 3 to the courtyard.
- Consider performing energy modeling as early as possible into the design process.
- Consider accessibility requirements.
- Consider providing adaptable suites.
- Consider parcel delivery requirements.

Site

- Consider further design development.
- Consider further buffering between the auto-court leading to Mirra 3 & 4 and the existing strata building to the West to reduce the impact of vehicle traffic, noise and pollution.
- Consider Mirra 1 and how it connects to Mirra 2.
- Concern with indoor and outdoor amenity spaces.
- Consider usability of courtyard.
- Recommend increasing the amount of indoor amenity space above grade.
- Relocate the below grade amenity to grade.

- Consider revisiting typical layout to avoid excessive articulation on the facade.
- Provide further detail with respect to the parking access and management strategy for the buildings which share a single parkade access point.

Form and Character

- Recommend the materiality and expression of the podium level be carefully thought out.
- Consider using same brick detail for all portal elements.
- Reconsider the small size of balconies.
- Consider removing pitched roofs at top as they seem out of character with the more modern esthetic.
- Consider giving Mirra 4 its own character while relating to the rest of site.
- Consider further animation to lobby entry area.
- Recommend the lobbies in buildings are well designed and laid out.
- Reconsider indoor amenity space below grade.
- Recommend parcel delivery box.

Landscape

- Recommend reducing hardscape for more greenspace in auto court.
- Suggest reducing auto court to a few parking spaces off the access to underground parking.
- Consider further refinement of the outdoor amenity areas.
- Consider better integrating the indoor and outdoor amenity areas.
- Consider opportunities for seating and social engagement to walkway and plaza.
- Consider incorporating spaces for people to sit in the larger nodal areas.
- Reconsider the connection of widened pavement.
- Consider providing protection canopies for more seasonal use of outdoor amenity spaces.
- Reconsider slopes.
- Consider built-in sanitation and/or odor mitigation for the dog run area.
- Provide further detail on the screening of the BC Hydro transformers.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider the BC Energy Step Code.
- Consider mechanical engineer/energy modeler review as early as possible.
- Verify thermal comfort requirements.
- Consider providing electric charging facilities for electric vehicles (cars and bikes).
- Consider implementing electric bicycle charging infrastructure.

Accessibility

- Consider 5% of units be wheel chair accessible with accessible balconies.
- Recommend that the amenity restrooms be accessible.
- Recommend required number of disabled parking stalls.
- Recommend that the entrance door be power operated.
- Consider emergency call buttons in the parking lobbies.
- Consider the elevator and entrance call button panel to be placed horizontally.

D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, July 23, 2020.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

R. Drew, Chair