
Present:

Panel Members:

R. Drew, Chair
N. Couttie
W. Chong
M. Derksen
M. Heeney
I. MacFadyen
L. Mickelson
M. Patterson

Guests:

Shane Chen, Westland Living
Nadia Said, Chris Dikeakos Architects
Micole Wu, Van Der Zalm Associates
Gurdev Sandhu, Northwest Development
Matthew Cheng, Matthew Cheng Architect Inc.
Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture

Staff Present:

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

A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was

Moved by W. Chong

Seconded by M. Heeney

That the minutes of the Advisory Design

Panel meeting of September 9, 2021, be received.

Carried

B. NEW SUBMISSIONS

1. Time: 3:00 p.m.

File No.: 7921-0006-00

New or Resubmit: New

Last Submission Date: N/A

Description: Proposed 52-storey mixed use building, including a 10-storey commercial/office podium in Surrey City Centre. The proposed development application includes an OCP amendment, City Centre Plan amendment, Rezoning and Detailed Development Permit.

Address: 10302 & 10294 City Parkway

Developer: Westland Corp.

Architect: Nadia Said, Chris Dikeakos Architects

Landscape Architect: Micole Wu, Van Der Zalm Associates

Planner: Ingrid Matthews

Urban Design Planner: Sam Maleknia

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff is supporting of the proposed commercial and office floor spaces, and generally supports the project.

The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, architectural expression of the tower and podium, 3-bedroom unit shortfall/ unit typology, landscape concept, and public realm interfaces.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site planning, streetscapes, building concept, floor plans, 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 M. Heeney
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

- The Panel appreciates the push for density.
- The Panel noted that the applicant has submitted a comprehensive package and provided a thorough presentation on what appears to be an interesting project.

Key Points

- Consider bringing tower expression down to grade at the residential lobby.
- Consider lowering the height of the podium or providing a setback at the upper podium floors.
- Consider deleting the gentle curve expression at the podium. The curve will be executed as a series of segments that will detract from the otherwise smooth massing. Consider using a material at the CRU to office transition band that provides a more continuous, or smooth expression (i.e., no panel divisions).
- Consider rotating Stair 7 and provide daylight into the stairs from the lane.
- Consider providing a continuous canopy for at grade CRUs.
- Further functional design development of L1 is required. Consider separating the residential and office lobbies (potentially office lobby from City Parkway), making the office lobby more generous.
- Consider providing direct access to rooftop outdoor amenity space from the core.
- Consider providing operable windows at the office uses.
- Consider providing 3-bedroom suites.
- Considering working with the City to delete the disconnected townhouses at the lane.

- Consider maintenance strategies for the 'hanging' landscape at the private balconies and podium roof.
- Consider developing a more modern ground plane paving treatment.
- Consider reconfiguring/relocating parkade vent at NE corner.
- Consider locating the underground Accessible stalls closer to residential lobby and certainly of the elevator side of the ramp so users of the stall do not need to cross the base of the ramp.
- Consider utilizing the energy and thermal comfort models to inform your design process – use future climate files to best understand the resiliency of the project. Consider reducing the window to wall ratio.
- Consider providing end of trip facility and dedicated bike access point that is independent of the vehicle access.
- Consider providing a bike maintenance facility.

Site

- Consider a larger gesture for the public realm in the northwest corner.
- The mechanical vent at the NE corner takes up a considerable amount of available exterior ground area. If there is going to be some adjustment to the ground floor layout, consider opportunities to try to reduce the amount of venting.

Form and Character

- Strongly recommend further design development to City Parkway pedestrian public realm; review the ground plane enlarged section showing how the SkyTrain structure relates to the building, how the retail on the opposite side relate to the retail of the building, how does the office view relate to the SkyTrain, how does it feel to have a 10-storey straight face building meet the street, reflection & shading concerns.
- Consider refining the fenestration and massing of the podium so that it makes reference to the 6-storey datum established by other buildings in the City Centre (Central City, SFU Engineering, City Hall and 3 Civic Plaza).
- 10-storey podium is okay but could consider setback at 6th floor level. Confirm actual height of SkyTrain.
- Strongly recommend further design development to the NE corner space named “coffee shop” ensuring its functional use making it vibrant and useable, and how this corner relates to the townhome units directly to the south.
- Consider splitting the lobbies so that the office lobby faces City Parkway.
- Consider enlarging the office lobby to give it more public presence appropriate for the City’s CBD (Central Business District) ambitions. Retail can be located inside the office lobby if necessary (e.g. newsstand, café...) while giving the office use a greater presence.
- Consider using a material at the retail to office transition band that provides a more continuous, or smooth expression (no panel divisions).
- Consider deepening the vertical recess on the north façade of the podium so it aligns with the tower above and gives the tower some presence at grade.
- Encourage a continuous canopy instead of ‘broken’ canopies. Encourage extending canopies out to meet the street to allow for more pedestrian use.

- Encourage any retail space in the NE corner to have an internal connection to the garbage/recycling room.
- The three townhouse units provide a very poor living experience. No internal access to building amenities, parking stalls, or garbage/recycling. Consider deleting them.
- Consider aligning the entry to the middle townhouse unit with the front door.
- Encourage the NE and NW podium curves to be at the corners only (not in and out effect); too subtle to make an effect on the elevations.
- Recommend further design development to inserting a 3-bedroom unit for unit mix satisfaction as this may affect the elevations, i.e., balcony locations.
- Encourage to continue develop the use of colour, particularly the white.

Landscape

- A number of the precedent images for the project illustrated the exterior ground floor with a much more dynamic paving treatment. The current design expression appears to be more about defining the semi public from the public realm. Design development to consider a ground plane treatment that engages more strongly with the public realm and has a more contemporary expression to relate to the contemporary nature of the building.
- The podium roof appears to be well articulated with a range of exterior spaces and ample planting/soil volumes.
- Encourage drafting a landscape plan of the tower top roof.
- Exterior lighting is an important design element to help create and accent exterior spaces. Design development to provide an exterior lighting plan.
- Ensure to maximize soil depths for trees at grade.
- Appreciate the hanging landscape around the lower podium. It is an interesting way to extend verticality of the south landscape.
- Consider the maintenance strategy for hanging landscapes and landscapes at level 36.
- Consider not using the same paver and paver colour used in the public realm along City Parkway. The corner landscape treatment is somewhat unrelated to the building and needs some more landscape form to provide a stronger ground plane.
- From the architectural plans there appears to be levels where there is exterior landscape that is not reflected in the landscape package. Design development to ensure that planted areas that might be under cover above are provided irrigation and maintenance through the winter months.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Encourage energy modelling unit to use future climate files.
- Encourage to look at passive survivability; really understand what will happen when mechanical cooling system is turned off, and how that will impact the project.

- Consider certification to differentiate the office space:
 - LEED – general sustainability.
 - fitwel / WELL - Occupant wellbeing / usability
- Recommend making stairwells useable for office users and open up the office lobby to focus on health and well being of the office space.
- Recommend further design development to the podium glazing, ie. window to wall ratio to be further investigated therefore an exploration of a more robust solid wall assembly, suggest operable windows where appropriate.

Accessibility

- Recommend emergency call buttons in parking lobbies.
- Recommend power doors at all entrances.
- Recommend power doors to amenity areas.
- Recommend ensuring washrooms are disabled Accessible.
- Recommend access to all patios in amenities.
- Recommend elevator button panels are placed horizontally to provide accessibility.
- Provide 5% of unit be disabled Accessible including access to balconies.
- Ensure adequate spaces is provide for wheelchair access in pathways and hallways.

RESUBMISSIONS

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

File No.:	7919-0371-00
New or Resubmit:	Resubmit
Last Submission Date:	June 10, 2021
Description:	Rezoning from CTA to CD (based on RM-70 & C-5); OCP amendment from "Urban" to "Multiple Residential", Subdivision from two (2) into two (2) lots, and a DP to allow the construction of four (4) six (6) storey buildings containing a total of 410 residential units and 327 sq. m. of commercial space.
Address:	8293 King George Boulevard and 8345 135A Street
Developer:	Gurdev Sandhu
Architect:	Matthew Cheng
Landscape Architect:	Meredith Mitchell
Planner:	Luci Moraes
Urban Design Planner:	Nathan Chow

The Urban Design Planner advised that this is a return item and the staff worked with the applicant regarding the comments that were made in the past ADP meeting.

The Panel was asked to only comment on the proposed changes and the previous ADP comments and concerns.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site planning, streetscapes, building concept, floor plans, 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 N. Couttie
Seconded by M. Derksen
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)
SUPPORT the project and recommends that the applicant address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department.

Recommend that the landscaping submission return to staff for further development.

Carried

- The Panel commends the applicant on a much-improved submission.
- The Panel also commends the excellent presentation of “before and after,” with very good responses to all previous Panel comments.

Key Points

- Consider standardizing the scale of the panel divisions at the residential facades.
- Consider further development of the colour palette – especially the vertical feature adjacent to the building entries.
- Consider reintroducing the lobby-like accesses from Buildings 1 and 2 to the interior courtyard.
- Consider consolidating the lawn areas to improve hierarchy of space in the courtyard.
- Provide weather protection at the outdoor amenity spaces.
- Consider increasing the canopy, number of trees.
- Consider utilizing the energy and thermal comfort models to inform your design process – use future climate files to best understand the resiliency of the project.

Site

- Suggest that accesses to courtyards are resolved well.
- Consider reintroducing lobby-like accesses from Buildings 1 and 2 to the interior courtyard.
- Recommend consulting a Code consultant regarding the relationship of stairs and gates.

Form and Character

- Encourage limiting the ground level colours, leave only at entrance locations. Suggest that the coloured verticals are not necessary; may differentiate the entry with a thicker coloured canopy.

- Encourage eliminating vertical colour band at NE corner; colour horizontal band canopy is stronger without the colour vertical band.
- Consider standardizing the scale of the panel divisions at the residential facades.

Landscape

- Consider a covered exterior amenity area for year-round enjoyment.
- The last round of ADP commented on several trees that did not appear to have adequate soil volume. This version has increased soil volumes, but appear to lose some trees. Consider adding trees where soil volumes permit.
- Suggest that the spaces within the main courtyard and a couple rooftop landscapes still seem to lack focus. The main courtyard has a fair amount of circulation space, but recommend that in the courtyard, the lawn area be a bit more robust.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Commend applicant for including energy modelling.
- Consider using future weather files in the energy modelling process.

Accessibility

- No specific issues were identified.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

This section had no items to consider.

D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, October 14, 2021.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m..

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

R. Drew, Chairperson

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