

**Present:****Panel Members:**

R. Drew, Chair  
A. Kenyon  
J. Packer  
L. Mickelson  
M. Derksen  
M. Heeney  
R. Dhall  
S. Slot  
W. Chong

**Guests:**

David Dove, Perkins+Will  
Adrien Pratlong, Perkins+Will  
Daryl Tyacke and Kristin Defer, eta Landscape  
Architecture  
Dylan Chernoff, Durante Kreuk Ltd.  
Katya Yushmanova, PWL Partnership Landscape  
Architects  
Marco Pasqua, Inspirational Speaker and Accessibility  
Consultant  
Nathaniel Funk - BOSA-Bluesky Properties  
Raghbir Gurm, Waterstock Properties Inc  
Richard Bernstein, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc.  
Ryan Jenkins, Tien Sher  
Shelley Craig, Urban Arts Architecture Inc.

**Staff Present:**

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

**A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES**

It was Moved by R. Dhall  
Seconded by W. Chong  
That the minutes of the Advisory Design  
Panel meeting of December 10, 2020 be received.  
Carried

**B. NEW SUBMISSIONS****1. Time: 3:00 p.m.**

File No.: 7919-0367-00  
Address: 10761 King George Boulevard  
New or Resubmit: New  
Last Submission Date: N/A  
Description: Proposed OCP Amendment from "3.5 FAR" to "7.5 FAR",  
City Centre Plan Amendment from "Mixed Use 3.5 FAR" to  
"Mixed Use 7.5 FAR", Rezoning from CD Bylaw No. 9608 to  
CD (based on RM-135 & C-35) and a General Development  
Permit to allow for the development of a 54-storey  
mixed-use tower consisting of 479 residential units and a  
7-storey podium with retail CRUs, office and restaurant.  
Developer: Ryan Jenkins, Tien Sher  
Architect: Richard Bernstein, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc.  
Landscape Architect: Dylan Chernoff, Durante Kreuk Ltd.  
Planner: Jennifer McLean  
Urban Design Planner: Sam Maleknia

The Urban Design Planner advised that the proposal generally complies with the intent of the city centre plan, and staff support the overall approach to site planning, form, expression and public realm. The Panel was asked to comment on the big picture aspects of the project such as the overall context at 108 Avenue and King George intersection, site planning and siting concept, heritage church proximity, interface conditions, pedestrian vs vehicular movements, the central indoor/outdoor mews, amenity allocations, lobby locations, uses, setbacks, overall form and massing, and the overall landscape concept.

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 W. Chong

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 increasing the building setback along 135A Street.
- Consider sculpting the east end of the atrium to create an outdoor space that terminates to gesture.
- Recommend emphasizing the flatiron form even further on the podium and tower.
- Recommend further design development to address the hierarchy of features on the tower.
- Consider rationalizing the overall material palette.
- Consider adjusting location of balcony railing on flatiron suite, to maximize the usable balcony space.
- Consider incorporating bold mid-century inspired signage.
- Recommend further design development of the outdoor amenity to intensify uses.
- Recommend reducing the size of dynamic spaces and increase the static outdoor plaza area at grade.
- Recommend further design development of areas outside the atrium.
- Recommend further design development of the garbage room location. Consider addressing potential congestion/traffic issues caused by one parking access.
- Consider increasing the amount of outdoor space available to the office users.
- Reconsider the depth of soils at the rooftop outdoor amenity.

- Recommend energy modelling and thermal comfort modeling and utilizing it as a design tool.
- Consider engaging an envelop consultant.
- Consider minimizing waste heat, passive heating and cooling of the atrium.
- Consider thermal break at balcony connections.
- Consider reducing amount of glazing where feasible.

#### Site

- Recommend further design development on garbage staging area.
- Consider review and relocation of porte cochere.
- Review the traffic at the port cochere pinch point.
- Reconsider the location of the port cochere to diminish the long lobby corridors.
- Consider increasing the setback on 135A Street to effectively set the tone for the street. This may provide additional space for café seating that can take advantage of sunlight and animate that street making it more pedestrian friendly.
- Consider a 50-foot high freestanding sign.
- Consider a bolder concept at the plaza level as it is underwhelming in comparison, public art, signage, etc.
- Further develop the public realm to emphasize the public space and courtyard.
- Clarify the likelihood of mid-block crosswalk at the existing church.

#### Form and Character

- The application package is well done.
- The project is an opportunity to rehabilitate the immediate area. The mixed-use development is appreciated.
- The key aspects have been incorporated into the design.
- The one-story building is appreciated to recall the history of that site. Consider preserving the single storey pavilion.
- Consider ways to simplify expression.
- Consider emphasising the flat iron form, such as scaling the tower back.
- Consider ways to simplify expression, streamlining and simplifying fenestration, particularly on tower so that “flatiron” form becomes more apparent as gateway to City centre.
- The private indoor and outdoor amenity space is at a premium, consider reviewing the railing location at the private outdoor space.
- The placement of tower is supported.
- Consider the pedestrian experience through the atrium to offices.
- Recommend further design development on the tower design and to minimize material palette.
- Consider envelope consultant to review glazing percentage.
- Reconsider/study the major urban gesture of flow through diagonal atrium aligned with Grosvenor and framing the Heritage church. Reduce the competing devices/ideas with more discipline.

### Landscape

- There is less activity areas than green and planted areas. Consider developing the program to make intensive and available areas for additional users.
- The entry plaza has more dynamism, which is not necessary. Consider more static areas.
- The nodes of the project in front of the lobby and residential lobby could use a welcoming landscape, such as larger open area and surfacing finishes to highlight access points and nodes better.
- Give more importance to the office component such as podium top roof level and open spaces.
- Provide further development to courtyard design, relationship between courtyard and plaza. Consider paving material at courtyard and plaza; plank pavers in complex grading conditions at plaza can be challenging.
- Review planting strategy beneath the boldly cantilevered roof forms of podium level canopy

### CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

### Sustainability

- The variety of uses are well suited for heat recovery and reuse.
- Consider minimizing wasted heat.
- Consider passive ventilation and cooling in the atrium space to the office spaces.
- Consider opportunity for ventilation on the South façade's undulating form on the face of the suites relative to the grid pattern.
- Consider places to reduce glazing without having a significant impact on the window to wall ratio.
- Consider rainwater retention with significant vegetation on rooftops.
- Consider bicycle friendly options for cyclists for opening and closing doors.

### Accessibility

- Consider all aspects of the disabled accessibility such as parking, elevators and ramps.

**2. Time: 4:35 p.m.**

File No.: 7919-0183-00  
 Address: 15719/29 – 16 Avenue & 1634/42/52/62/72 - 157 Street  
 New or Resubmit: New  
 Last Submission Date: N/A  
 Description: OCP Amendment from Urban to Multiple Residential. Rezoning from RF to CD (based on RM-70). Development Permit to allow 2 apartment buildings and 1 stacked townhouse building containing a total of 115 units.  
 Developer: Raghbir Gurm, Waterstock Properties Inc.  
 Architect: Shelley Craig, Urban Arts Architecture Inc.  
 Landscape Architect: Daryl Tyacke and Kristin Defer, ETA Landscape Architecture  
 Planner: Keith Broersma  
 Urban Design Planner: Nathan Chow

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff support the use, form and density, without specific issues other than that the ground floor unit grading does not comply with the OCP and that there is concern about accessible access on site. Staff asked the panel to provide comments on the overall site planning, architectural expression of the building, and public realm interfaces.

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 M. Heeney  
 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

**Key Points:**

- Recommend further development of the landscape buffer between the project and the school.
- Consider a wall courtyard strategy, adding a wall along the east edge of the site to further buffer the project from the school.

- Recommend engaging an acoustic consultant to assess any potential acoustic issues with the neighbouring school.
- Provide stroller and wheelchair access between Building 3 and the playground adjacent to Building 2 without leaving the site.
- Consider providing seating grouping in the plaza areas.
- Consider increasing the amount of glazing in the building lobby.
- Consider measures that promote active use of the stairs, like daylighting.
- Recommend further design development of the shading devices.
- Consider recessing the top of Building 3 to make it more consistent with Buildings 1 and 2.
- Consider soils depths through the site to accommodate large trees.
- Revisit the stormwater management strategy at grade. The channel could be difficult to maintain.
- Consider making the channel a year-round feature and provide an educational opportunity.
- Consider daylighting the parkade.
- Recommend consulting with a waste management consultant to confirm waste strategy.
- Consider designing 5% of suites to be adaptable, including balconies.
- Consider providing accessible stalls adjacent to elevator lobbies.

#### Site

- There is lots of pedestrian movement between Building 1 and 2, encourage simplifying.
- Recommend that the pedestrian movement be complete at the east edge.
- Consider modifying the access to the play area.
- Recommend an accessible connection between Building 2 and 3.
- At the pedestrian crosswalk location between Buildings 2 and 3, consider moving it east past the ramp. Consider bringing the path back up to the 157 St. sidewalk.
- Recommend acoustic consultant to verify noise levels at key times.
- Recommend the applicant connect with the waste solid management consultant.

#### Form and Character

- The ground floor units and public space is concerning.
- The hidden and concealed fasteners for the cladding are appreciated.
- Recommend ways to make the stairwells more inviting, such as windows, skylights or glazing, so residents are encouraged to use the stairs.
- Consider reconfiguring window placement to improve privacy & flow on Building 2, Level 5, north and south bedroom.
- Consider further design expression on Building 3.
- Consider recessing the upper level on Building 3 to keep consistency of the upper level architecture.
- Consider further design exploration of the Building 3, Level 4 roof and wall expression which feels much more formally expressive than the overall scheme which is more restrained and consistent with the concept of carving away a mass.

### Landscape

- Consider reviewing the east property line border treatment with the neighbouring school.
- Consider introducing more robust screening on the east side of the site to visually separate and secure the complex from neighbouring school.
- Suggest that additional landscaping features throughout the eastern areas would be helpful.
- Recommend improving the screening on the side of the school such as a wall.
- The yards facing 16 Avenue have a space that is heavily shrubbed and planted; consider smaller grass areas within this space.
- Recommend suitable furnishing for the plaza area.
- Consider ergonomics and the sitting comfort in design of concrete seating elements.
- Consider that the water channel resources are concerning because it is on top of a slab.

### CPTED

- Consider additional glazing on the long wall in the elevator vestibule of the center building in P1.

### Sustainability

- Consider that the stormwater management will be challenging.
- Consider public education opportunity around stormwater management, such as signage by the water features.
- Consider tuning the glazing to increase thermal resistance to the north and solar gain to the south.
- Consider adding daylight into parkade.

### Accessibility

- Consider accessible units on the ground floor.
- Recommend ramping wherever possible for accessibility.
- Recommend that 5% of units be wheel-chair accessible, including its balconies.
- Recommend a minimum of three designated disabled parking stalls be located by the elevators.
- Recommend that the amenity restrooms be accessible.
- Suggest that the entrance door be power operated.
- Consider the elevator and entrance call button panel to be placed horizontally.
- Consider emergency call buttons in the parking lobbies.

3. **Time:** 6:05 p.m.
- File No.: 7918-0350-00  
 Address: 10460 City Parkway, 13583 – 104 Avenue, 13526 and 13550 - 105 Avenue
- New or Resubmit: Resubmit  
 Last Submission Date: November 28, 2019  
 Description: Partial OCP Amendment and City Centre Plan Amendments to permit higher density, Rezoning (currently at 3<sup>rd</sup> reading, to be rescinded and amended to add Phase 4), General Development Permit for Phase 1-4 (previously reviewed as Phases 1-3), and Detailed Development Permit for Phase 1 to permit the development of a phased multiple residential development consisting of four high-rise buildings and two low-rise buildings. Phase 1 consists of a 38-storey residential rental tower with ground floor commercial.
- Developer: Nathaniel Funk - BOSA-Bluesky Properties  
 Architect: David Dove with Adrien Pratlong, Perkins+Will  
 Landscape Architect: Katya Yushmanova, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects  
 Planner: Jennifer McLean  
 Urban Design Planner: Ann McLean

The City Architect advised that this project is returning for review because additional sites have been added to the consolidation. Staff support the project but are concerned with the limited number of three-bedroom units for the entire site. Staff asked the panel to provide comments on the overall development, tower placement, height, open mews concept, the interfaces with the public realm and neighbouring sites, proportions of the podiums as they relate to each other and the towers for the detailed DP. Staff also asked the Panel for comments on the detailed DP for Tower 1 on the proposed form, ground plane interface, and material expression of the residential tower, and the public plaza design at the SW corner.

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 W. Chong  
Seconded by R. Dhall  
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 developing a temporary or interim landscaping where feasible during site construction.
- Recommend adding definition to the southwest plaza with furniture and other defining features.
- Consider increasing weather protection effectiveness of canopies and overhangs.
- Recommend bringing hierarchy to the canopies at Tower 1.
- Consider alleviating two pinch points: T1 pinch at the commercial building and the path below T3 overhang.
- Recommend a wayfinding strategy.
- The podium heights at T4 are tall and dwarf the adjacent amenity building.
- Consider using skylights to animate the fifth facades (roof) of the barn building.
- Consider providing more soft landscaping on the south portions of the overall site.
- Recommend increasing the transparency and openness between the two barn buildings.
- Consider a fiberglass window system to assist with energy performance.
- Consider adopting different thermal performance criteria for each building façade.
- Recommend not using tropical wood for landscape elements.
- Refer to previous Panel comments for the project.

**Site**

- Recommend a clear definition of static and movement systems.
- The south west plaza feels bare, consider additional furnishings and meaningful anchor given it will be the project's first impression to the public realm.
- Consider further definition where the steps are in the plaza.
- There are two significant pinch points visually in the renderings. There is interest in expansion and compression spaces but Tower 1 pinch at east and Tower 3 over-hang feels uncomfortable and unwelcoming. Consider altering these.

- The outdoor amenity space seems excessive, compared to the public space. Consider reallocating it some way.
- Consider internal wayfinding system for public realm to encourage public use as a connection to other sites.

#### Form and Character

- Consider differentiating the residential and commercial canopies on Tower 1.
- Consider placing the art within each outdoor “room” to draw people into the spaces.
- Review the cross circulation between the amenity and commercial building.
- Consider increasing the transparency and openness between the south end of amenity building and the commercial building.
- Consider the barn roof expression from above as this will be a primary perspective for hundreds of residents.
- Consider reducing height on Tower 4 podium adjacent to the amenity building.
- Consider softening Tower 1 pinch point at commercial building and Tower 3 overhang over mews and providing 3d views of those compression spaces.

#### Landscape

- Consider incorporating programming in the amenity floor plan.
- Recommend additional greenery area towards the southern portion of the site to improve the environment scheme.
- The terrace amenity areas are supported.
- Building 2 seating areas work well.
- Given the scale of project, consider temporary landscaping during construction.

#### CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

#### Sustainability

- Solar shading is appreciated.
- Recommend fibre glass fenestration system as an alternative to thermally breaking the balconies.
- Consider increasing thermal gain on the south side and thermal resistance on the north.
- Consider introducing special construction methods to address the thermal bridging that will occur due to the extensive use of balconies.

Accessibility

- Recommend that all pathways are accessible.
- Recommend that entrance doors be power operated.
- Consider the elevator call button panel to be placed horizontally.
- Recommend that the amenity restrooms be accessible.
- Consider emergency call buttons in the parking lobbies.
- Consider 5% of units be wheelchair accessible including the balconies.

**C. NEXT MEETING**

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, January 28, 2021.

**D. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

---

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

---

R. Drew, Chair

Due to COVID-19 pandemic, these minutes were adopted but not physically signed.