

Present:

Panel Members:

R. Drew, Chair
B. Howard
G. Borowski
L. Mickelson
R. Dhall
I. MacFadyen
T. Bunting
W. Chong

Guests:

Bob Ransford and Stefan Melnyk, Century Group
Gurdev Sandhu, Northwest Developments Ltd.
Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative
Katya Yushmanova BCSLA, CSLA, PWL
Partnership Landscape Architects Inc
Mark Thompson, MCMP Architects
Patrick Cotter, ZGF Architects Inc

Staff Present:

A. McLean, City Architect
S. Maleknia, Urban Design Planner
C. Eagles, Administrative Assistant

A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was Moved by L. Mickelson
Seconded by T. Bunting
That the minutes of the Advisory Design
Panel meeting of October 8, 2020 be received.
Carried

B. NEW SUBMISSIONS

1. Time: 3:00 p.m.

File No.: 7920-0149-00
Address: 13545/55/65/83 – 98A Avenue & 9905 KGB
New or Resubmit: New
Last Submission Date: N/A
Description: The applicant is proposing a Detailed Development Permit for Phase 1 of Holland Parkside. The proposal consists of one 19-storey, 243 unit rental residential tower, one 11-storey office tower (18,751 square metres) with a 304-square metre childcare facility within all located on top of a podium that includes fitness amenity, market hall, restaurant and underground parking.
Developer: Bob Ransford and Stefan Melnyk, Century Group
Architect: Patrick Cotter, ZGF Architects Inc
Landscape Architect: Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative
Planner: Jennifer McLean
Urban Design Planner: Ann McLean

The City Architect advised that the application has third reading for rezoning and a general development permit. Staff generally support the direction for this detailed development permit of Phase 1 and at this Detailed DP stage. Staff asked for comments on the overall architectural and landscape expression; in particular

the architectural material and detailed form, architectural interface at the street edges, and public realm interface, including plazas.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site and building plans, streetscapes and elevations. The project will connect and harmonize Holland Park to King George Boulevard.

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

Iain MacFadyen declared a Conflict of Interest and excused himself from the discussion.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

It was Moved by B. Howard
Seconded by L. Mickelson
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

In general, the Panel supports the project.

The applicant clarified that the corrugated metal is a very fine detailed material with lots of finesse.

Key Points:

- Explore ways to increase legibility of access to the outdoor public amenity area (central courtyard).
- Provide indoor amenity at the rooftops of both the office and rental building.
- Further develop the private-public interface of the central courtyard.
- Simplicity of movement through the central courtyard.
- Increase visible cues to invite public into the courtyard from 98A, consider wider, perhaps grander, stairs.
- Improving connectivity to Holland Park in Phase 1.
- Explore measures to manage privacy issues and views between the rental apartments and the future market building, the office building and the north market tower. Increase sense of separation.
- Further design development of detailing of the corrugated metal panel.
- Further development of the design of the rental tower exterior elevations.
- Review impact of the parkade ventilation on the public realm.
- Ensure early coordination of structural with Engineers.

Site

- The development is thoughtful and present.
- Divert or wayfind the corner to allow entrance to courtyard at the west.
- Continue improvement to connectivity to the Park during Phase 1 as it lacks clarity.
- Recommend further design development to the corrugated metal panel; the detailing would be important.
- The applicants have done a good job designing the project, which is complicated. The courtyard is successful.
- The rental building and south east corner are well done.
- Consider enhancing the experience in the courtyard as the scale is reasonably large. The courtyard steps to 98A could use the orchard to define the movement. The courtyard has many activities taking place. Consider simplifying the movement towards Holland Park to give orientation and strengthen intent of a good connection.
- Recommend making the courtyard entrance more visible from 98A and increasing the open area scale.
- The intention of the market hall glazing allows for a notion of connectivity for those passing by.
- The rental apartment façade facing the future market tower could benefit from a user experience assessment. Consider sliding screens.
- The office building perimeters are optimally set, in coordination with the office plates. Consider sensitivity to façade.
- In the overall material palette, corrugation will not have an industrial quality.
- Good attention to the pedestrian experience at the street level, such as the market hall concept.
- The vibrant scene activity is carried on into the evening. Ensure the restaurant and market hall do not get buried or lost.
- Consider providing indoor space on the top of rental and office buildings.
- The concept of shared parking is supported between uses for day and night. Ensure the office space has adequate parking.
- Consider engaging with Modo or Zip Code car share programs early.
- Consider coordinating early with structural BC building code.
- Ensure the air space parcelling is done early.

Form and Character

- The base of the building is exciting with a dynamic and playful composition.
- The curtain wall is well done.
- Consider continuity of material and surfaces.
- Consider making the entrance to the courtyard more inviting.
- The composition of the facades is supported.
- Encourage further development of resolution of detail to the rental building. Consider other material than corrugated metal. The facades may become too rich.

Landscape

- The resolution of landscape is great.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- No specific issues were identified.

Accessibility

- Consider accommodating a ramp at the south side to enrich project and courtyard.
- Further explore an interim ramp from the courtyard toward the Park.
- Recommend that the amenity rooms and restrooms be accessible.
- Recommend all paths are barrier free.
- Recommend accessible parcel rooms.
- Recommend interspersed designated disabled parking stalls.
- Recommend that entrance doors be power operated.
- Consider the elevator and entrance call button panel to be placed horizontally.
- Consider emergency call buttons in the parking lobbies.
- Consider 5% of units be wheel chair accessible.

Iain MacFadyen returned to participate in the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

2.	Time:	5:05 p.m.
	File No.:	7919-0372-00
	Address:	10662 King George Blvd
	New or Resubmit:	New
	Last Submission Date:	N/A
	Description:	Rezoning, City Centre Plan and OCP Amendments, and Detailed DP (form and character) to permit two high rise residential towers with podiums, a portion of which will consist of ground floor commercial units.
	Developer:	Gurdev Sandhu, Northwest Developments Ltd.
	Architect:	Mark Thompson, MCMP Architects
	Landscape Architect:	Katya Yushmanova BCSLA, CSLA, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Inc.
	Planner:	Christopher Atkins
	Urban Design Planner:	Sam Maleknia

The Urban Design Planner advised that there is a significant shortfall in parking and outdoor amenity spaces. He added that Surrey Fire Service has reviewed the interim road conditions and is in agreement. The final parking requirement will be coordinated with the City. The north and south sides of the site have existing

buildings that create a landlocked road condition in the interim and a major road realignment will take place at this site. The Urban Design Planner advised that staff have no specific issues. Staff worked closely with the applicant to advance the concept and support the project. Staff asked the Panel to provide comments on the overall site planning, architectural expression of the building, amenity spaces, and public realm interfaces.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the project, including site plan and building expression, floor plans, streetscapes and elevations.

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

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

It was

Moved by L. Mickelson

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 further development of the patterning of the balconies. Consider bolder patterns/moves.
- Consider further design development of the residential entries and commercial facades; consider drawing upon the spirit of mid-century modern aesthetic.
- Consider moving the west residential lobby to the northwest corner of the tower to allow for a more contiguous commercial presence.
- Consider further design development of the east and west facades. Consider, for example, borrowing from the mid-century modern aesthetic to help manage potential solar heat gain issues on the facades.
- Consider further development of the podium elevations, the bold horizontal cladding vocabulary of the podium at grade. Consider a more pedestrian-scale (finer grain) patterns.
- Consider programming non-accessible lower rooftop areas into shared amenity uses.
- Consider further design development of the corner plazas.
- Consider increasing the amount of indoor and outdoor amenity.
- Consider placing additional indoor and outdoor amenity at the tower rooftops.
- Consider parcel delivery rooms.
- Consider further development of edge conditions and wayfinding at the rooftop amenities.

Site

- Further design development to the corner plaza such as public art, seating, increased visibility to corners.
- Consider improving the design clarity to the ground plane of the towers. Consider inclusion of the proposed design of the future 136A St plaza into package; this would prove helpful to understanding the spatial use.

Form and Character

- The development massing addresses streets appropriately. Encourage design development to improve the relationship between the podium and massing.
- The CRU's are separated as displayed on L2.01, consider moving the lobby to the north west corner. The opportunity to have continuous CRU spaces would benefit the project. Concerns were expressed on the chopped up nature of the CRU's and the experience pedestrians would encounter. The space is rather flexible.
- Ensure the CRU's are visible with clear signage.
- Encourage to increase the amount of amenity space, such as further indoor or outdoor amenity.
- Consider lower parking rates as the project is well served by transit and is in an urban area. The assumption of co-op cars proposed is viable for the owners.
- Recommend an elevator study.
- Ensure Canada Post requirements and online parcel delivery provisions are included in the residential lobbies.
- The extension of tower language to the podium could use further refinement.
- The bold horizontal pattern at grade is out of scale and overwhelming. Consider bringing the scale back down to the pedestrian level.
- Consider a more dynamic podium elevation composition that engages pedestrians more strongly.
- Recommend further design development to the pattern on the balconies as it is very settle, recommend a bolder presence.
- Consider further design development to the corners and lobby expression where the entries are. The lobby retail on the west building and east building at entries appears not as slick and a "boxy" look.
- The development on the twin towers should be clear in respect to the materials. There appears to be a disjointed material application across the two towers, ie. townhouse, blank wall, CRU interfaces.
- The balconies could stand out more with bolder patterns.
- Consider reinforcing balcony concept and pixilation, as it is limited by the height of the slab.
- The original concept drawings are simplistic/clear and comes through into the design.
- Consider exploring and reinforcing the prominence of the of the east and west facades.
- The townhouse expression is lost in the podium.
- The efficiency of the floor plates is relatively low.

Landscape

- Consider programming the non-accessible areas on roof to be accessible.
- Consider increasing patio space and green area which would enhance the project.
- Consider expanding usable green roofs. Consider making the most use of outdoor roof spaces on the north side.
- The cellular spaces in the roof amenity is supported. Many users can benefit from this.
- Consider working on the corners and refining the landscape at grade.
- Consider making the planters more engaging.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- No specific issues were identified.

Accessibility

- Recommend there is accessibility between the CRU's and parking.
- Recommend that the amenity spaces and restrooms be accessible.
- Consider 5% of units be wheel chair accessible.

C. NEXT MEETING


The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, October 22, 2020.

D. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.



Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk



Robert Drew, Chair

