

---

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

R. Drew, Chair  
W. Chong  
N. Couttie  
L. Mickelson  
M. Patterson  
J. Packer

**Guests:**

Fariba Gharaei, Urban Design Group  
Mary Chan-Yip, PMG Landscape Architects

**Staff Present:**

A. McLean, City Architect  
N. Chow, Urban Design Planner  
W. Lee, Recording Secretary

---

**A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES**

It was

Moved by Leroy Mickelson

Seconded by Jason Packer

That the minutes of the Advisory Design

Panel meeting of June 24, 2021, be received.

Carried

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

File No.: 7918-0149-00

Address: 6362 & 6370 – 131A Street 6365 – 132 Street 13174 &  
13190 – 64 Avenue; City lane

New or Resubmit: New

Last Submission Date: N/A

Description: Rezoning and Development Permit to permit two  
single-storey retail buildings containing approximately  
9 CRU's and 2,211 sq.m. of floor area in total. Parking is  
at-grade and a City stormwater detention facility is  
proposed under the parking area.

Developer: 581947 B.C. Ltd, Tony Singh

Architect: Fariba Gharaei, Urban Design Group

Landscape Architect: Mary Chan-Yip, PMG Landscape Architect

Planner: Melissa Johnson

Urban Design Planner: Nathan Chow

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff support the proposed use, form and density and have no specific issues. Staff worked closely with the applicant to advance the concept and support the project. The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, landscape treatment mass and form, 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 Leroy Mickelson  
Seconded by Norm Coultie  
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 developing a second breezeway or relocate to another portion of site where it can have windows.
- Reconsider intent of breezeway to allow more uses like sidewalk sales.
- Consider further refinement to the building expression, alternating grey and cedar.
- Consider utilizing the energy model to inform the design process. Use future climate files to best understand the resiliency of the project.
- Consider operable windows on the south side to enhance passive ventilation.
- Consider further refinement of the sign strategy.
- Suggest to ensure open doors and other displays do not impede on the ability of wheelchair users and shopping carts to use on site sidewalks.
- Consider reconciling landscape along CRU entries.

#### Site

- Suggest that the breezeway pathways are confusing and walkways do not seem to go anywhere.
- Consider further design development on introducing another breezeway and break Building B into two for the movement of pedestrians from the parking to 64 Avenue.
- Suggest that the breezeway is an opportunity to really create a vibrant shared space. Encourage the applicant to create more visibility and access into both the east and west CRU's, allow opportunities for fruit and vegetable space to spill out and work with the landscape to better articulate the landscape pattern of trees and furniture to create usable spaces to complement the internal uses.
- Suggest that the amount of space along the south side seems quite tight with the potential for cars/trucks to overhang. Consider additional curb stops.
- Consider widening the south sidewalk to allow more space for shopping carts, security bollards, outdoor displays, exterior door swings and wheelchair access.
- Recommend that shopping cart storage be identified on the plans.

### Form and Character

- Suggest that the oversize of Building A is OK.
- Consider adding more glazing in the breezeway (for “eyes on the street”).
- Recommend more transparency at east elevation of Building B fronting 132<sup>nd</sup> St. allows for more inviting and visual elevation.
- Consider further refinement to the building expression, alternating grey and cedar.
- Recommend the elevations to maintain vertical language (grey portion, cedar panel portion), the wrap elements at the corner ends are not necessary.
- Consider reducing the amount of allowable opaque glazing at south facing glazing.
- Change note on drawings A.A3.1 and A.B3.1 to allow only 80% of the glazing to be made obscure, not 100%
- Recommend a sign design guideline (size, hierarchy, justification, colour, etc) for the development to unify a stronger rationale.
- Commend applicant for an attractive project.

### Landscape

- Consider making the breezeway a more useful space. If this is not achievable due to fire separation and structure, place the landscape elements at the perimeter to diminish the “blank walls.”
- Consider reconciling the alignment of the landscape features along 64 Avenue and the CRU entries.
- Encourage the applicant to work/adjust the streetscape pattern to better work with the rhythm of the building/CRU and to create clear open path to the front doors. If some of these CRU's are restaurants, look for opportunities to create room for spill out onto the sidewalk.
- Recommend to maximize hard surface on west side of building A.
- Commend shade trees in parking.

### CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

### Sustainability

- Consider utilizing the energy model to inform the design development.
- Recommend using future climate files to best understand the resiliency of the project and thermal comfort modelling.
- Commend the thermally broken, low E double glazing.
- Consider operable clearstory windows for passive cooling and ventilation, particularly on the South side where there is not traffic noise and there is extra solar gain to be mitigated.
- Consider skylights to allow daylight deeper into the CRUs. Operable skylights would allow passive ventilation, complimenting operable clearstory windows.

- Consider larger, exterior insulated concrete upstand instead of glazing to the ground.
- Suggest to design for robust heat recovery taking advantage of the refrigeration.
- Consider if gas is really required. Ask the tenants if they can operate electrically (i.e. with induction cooktops).
- Commend the dark sky compliant lighting design.
- Commend the rainwater strategy.

Accessibility

- Recommend to ensure open doors and other displays do not impede on the ability of wheelchair users to use on site sidewalks.
- Recommend to ensure curb let downs are located to allow wheelchair accessibility from parking to buildings.
- Recommend power doors at all entrances.
- Recommend adequate space for wheelchairs to enter washrooms in CRUs.

**C. NEXT MEETING**

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, July 22, 2021.

**D. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

---

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

---

Robert Drew, Chair