
Present:

Panel Members:

R. Drew, Chair
T. Bunting
W. Chong
R. Dhall
I. MacFadyen
S. Slot
M. Patterson

Guests:

Richard Bernstein, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc.
Martin Peter
Mani Mahmoudian
Stephen Vincent, Durante Kruek Ltd.
Alexander Wright, Anthem Properties Group Ltd.
Gwyn Vose, IBI Group
Dave Jerke, van der Zalm + associates inc.

Staff Present:

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

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 2, 2021, be received.

Carried

B. NEW SUBMISSIONS

1. 3:05 p.m.

File No.:	7920-0284-00
New or Resubmit:	New
Last Submission Date:	N/A
Description:	OCP and City Centre Plan Amendments, Rezoning and Detailed Development Permit to allow for a 48-storey mixed-use tower. The building consists of a 7-storey podium, containing 4 floors of commercial/office, and 40-storey market residential tower and amenity areas.
Address:	10744-52 City Parkway
Developer:	Berkeley Enterprises LTD.
Architect:	Richard Bernstein, Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Stephen Vincent, Durante Kruek Ltd.
Planner:	Ingrid Matthews
Urban Design Planner:	Sam Maleknia

The Urban Design Planner advised that the city staff worked very closely with the applicant regarding the overall site planning, siting of the tower, allocation of different uses, podiums and street interface resolution for the interim and future condition, and potential open spaces and public spaces. Staff is supporting the overall concept.

The Panel was asked to comment on overall site planning, the architectural expression of the building and materials, landscape concept, Accessibility issues, 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 **Tom Bunting**

Seconded by **Iain MacFadyen**

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

Key Points

- Consider more direct connectivity between interior circulation/spaces to the Level 8 outdoor amenities.
- Consider the possibility of adding a small retail (coffee) kiosk in the commercial lobby
- Consider future climate files in the further development of the window wall system
- Consider privacy measures for the commercial units at grade
- Further design development of the exterior elevations – vertical elements need to be more subdued compared to the horizontals
- Consider increasing the amount of indoor and outdoor commercial amenity
- Consider adding operable windows to office curtainwall system
- Consider daylighting centre stair and the top of the west stair
- Consider extending lightwell to the west façade.
- Consider extending Level 4 private balconies to east and west parapets
- Consider further design development to remove any possible movement hazards to pedestrian movement at grade, e.g. boulders
- Consider providing more active outdoor amenity program
- Consider means to enhance the use of stairs, such as daylighting.
- 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 aiming for Step 3, and sustainable certification for the commercial office space.

Site

- Consider better utilization of the opportunities of public realm outside the building footprint, especially in SE side on the ground level.
- Recommend providing access to the amenity space without passing through fitness area in the central level
- The ground plane and interaction with the public realm appears to be well resolved. The strong pattern of the concrete surfacing provides an interesting and dynamic ground place for the building.

Form and Character

- Recommend adding an extra layer of screening between the office and the exterior of the edges. There is a good base and canopy system and there could be some additions to it that may add warmth to the building.
- Commend applicant on urbanity and commercial feel of base.
- Review exiting on mid level deck.
- Encourage further design development to the vertical elements on the elevations; the horizontals are strong and supported, yet the vertical 'zipper' elements make the elevations busy and conflicts with the horizontals.
- Encourage allowance for natural borrowed light into the middle of the residential floor from L4 to L8, where long corridors are located; use the middle stair as a lightwell by eliminating the den to allow the stair to reach the north perimeter with glazing.
- Recommend further design development to L2 Office Amenity size; with the amount of the office area, provide more amenity by balancing out the floor plate with provisions of amenity.
- Recommend further design development to the L2 Office Outdoor Amenity by expanding the lightwell space west to open up to City Parkway; bring more natural light to the space.
- Recommend further design development to the Office floors window treatments; Provide operable windows to the space.
- If possible, avoid all the offices opening directly outside as most of them are conditioned spaces. Provide better utilization of outdoor spaces and better mediation of traffic. Possibly provide separation from residential areas as well.
- Strongly suggest that the applicant explore to provide office amenity, attracting a certain level of tenants/owners for commercial office space these days requires more than just outdoor amenity. Would not suggest sharing amenity due to different ownerships. Under BOMA measurement standards amenity square footages can be added to the leasable square foot calculations and therefore some revenue could be captured back by the developer which should more than cover the costs for construction of it.
- Consider providing some amenity space geared to more active use, such as adjacent the level 8 gym, where a space given over to outdoor stretching, exercise, would be appropriate.

Landscape

- Recommend separation in the northeast area to distinguish the office and

- residential uses, providing space for residents to gather outside.
- Recommend provision of water at the Landscape Level 4 outdoor area near barbeques.
- The exterior amenity spaces are well articulated. However, they also appear to be generally designed as passive spaces with lots of seating provided. Further design development is recommended to consider the addition of weather protected areas to extend the enjoyment of these outdoor spaces through the year.
- The feature tree at the ground floor plaza/address node is noted as being poisonous. Recommend an alternative tree. Encourage to move on to witch hazel or dogwood which has yellow flowers also.
- Consider a taller more vertical tree at the ground plan in place of styrax japonica to help provide shading for upper floors.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- If the office will be owner operated, consider looking at higher energy codes – can attain payback within a relatively short timeline, depending on the owner’s operating schedule (approximately 10-year payback).
- Consideration to sustainable certification for office.

Accessibility

- The roof decks have a nice variety of surfaces; however, this may prove problematic for the visually impaired or those in wheelchairs. Design development to ensure that the ground place provides a consistent firm and fixed finish for pedestrian stability and ensure that minimum widths for accessible connections are provided.

2. 4:40 p.m.

File No.:	7919-0258-00
New or Resubmit:	New
Last Submission Date:	N/A
Description:	Rezoning from C-8 to CD, site-wide General DP and a Detailed DP for Phase 1 to permit a three-phase, mixed-use project consisting of three mixed-use high-rise towers (31, 33 and 37 storeys), one stand-alone retail building and two 6-storey apartment buildings with a total of 1295 residential units and an overall gross FAR of 4.6.
Address:	10232 Whalley Boulevard
Developer:	Anthem Properties Group Ltd.
Architect:	Gwyn Vose, IBI Group
Landscape Architect:	Dave Jerke, van der Zalm + associates inc.

Planner: Jennifer McLean

Urban Design Planner: Sam Maleknia

The Urban Design Planner advised that the city staff worked very closely with the applicant regarding overall site planning and siting of the buildings, allocation of different uses, podiums and street walls, potential open spaces and plazas, and public realm interfaces. The proposal generally complies with the City Centre Plan, and staff supports the project.

The Panel was asked to provide detailed comments on Architectural expression, landscaping, edges, setbacks for the detailed DP (Phase 1), and to provide general comments for the General DP including the overall context, open spaces setbacks, form and the general lobby location, i.e. general aspects of Phase 2 and phase 3. Phase 2 and 3 buildings will return to the ADP for their Detailed DPs.

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

GENERAL DP (PHASE 2&3)

It was Moved by R. Dhall
Seconded by T. Bunting
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

DETAIL DP (PHASE 1)

It was Moved by R. Dhall
Seconded by M. Patterson
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)

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

One Panel member disagreed with the motion, noting that it should not warrant another review by the Panel.

PHASE 2 & 3 COMMENTS

Key Points

- Consider further development of the strip of land at the SE edge of the site.
- Consider placing trees in the hardscape area in PH 2 driveway / loading area.
- Consider developing pedestrian feel to the lane connecting Whalley Boulevard to 102A. Extend elements of the character between PH 3 buildings into lane
- Consider further development of the indoor amenity program and PH 3 pedestrian realm between buildings
- Consider further development of the pedestrian connection across 102A Avenue between PH 3 and PH 2
- Consider realigning the exit path from between CRU 2 and 3 to between CRU 3 and 4
- Consider developing more permeability through the restaurant building

Site

- Recommend further design development to Phase 3 tower podium L3 to L4, dead end corridor resolution at the west; this factor needs to be resolved as it will affect the location of the stair and/ or planning of the units Midrise.
- Recommend further design development to Phase 3 outdoor amenity space; be clear if this space is programmed or a corridor space between buildings; the 25' wide is very minimal with the 4 to 6 storey walls to the sides.
- Recommend further design development to the end elevations (east & west) of the mid-rise buildings; clarify the location of openings and clarify how they are treated regarding a 'wrapped' elevation and/ or material usage in an extruded way.
- Recommend the central spine (north-south pedestrian route) be connected well responding towards southern edge; any articulation of building form, consolidation of open space gives an opportunity of connectivity.
- Careful consideration is needed in detailed design development to ensure that the internal mews is a shared pedestrian-vehicular environment and consideration needs to be given to type of curb, use of bollards and streetlights to create separation, paving materials to subtly indicate pedestrian vs vehicular vs shared.

Form and Character

- Recommend further design development to the planning of the deficient area of indoor amenity. The drawings should lay out the functions to justify the deficient amount of indoor amenity Phase 3 tower podium.
- Encourage the midrise buildings to be formulated slightly more sensitively for pedestrian movement.

Landscape

- Amenity lawns need more work to be useable.
- Recommend re-assessing the grading transition at the south PL.
- Dead space on east side of new road on Phase 3 – consider further design development on how space could be used.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- No specific issues were identified.

Accessibility

- No specific issues were identified.

PHASE 1 COMMENTS

Key Points

- Pedestrianize the internal lane.
- Consider narrowing the width of the lane accessing the restaurant parking.
- Consider further development of the south facing program and façade treatment.
- Consider exploring the further integration between the podium and tower expression.
- Consider exploring a mass timber structure for the restaurant.
- Recommend further design development to Retail Pavilion building to be as transparent all around with a different planning configuration; this allows the visual permeability from Whalley to the inner courtyard.
- Provide more planting at grade, especially along internal driveway.
- Consider utilizing future climate files. This helps understand impact of climate resiliency.

Site

- Consider further design development at south side of bldg. 1 / phase 1. It has the best southern exposure and faces the main outdoor amenity space.
- Consider further design development to the NE plaza.

Form and Character

- Recommend further design development to the planning of exit stair from the core to Whalley Blvd. Move exit corridor to the south end of CRU 4; this allows the CRU 4 to be continuous with CRU 3 for flexibility and this allows CRU 4 not to be isolated.
- Consider integrating more activities in the open lawn area.
- Careful consideration is needed in design development to ensure that the internal mews is a shared pedestrian vehicular environment and consideration needs to be given to type of curb, use of bollards and streetlights to create separation, paving materials to subtly indicate pedestrian vs vehicular vs shared.
- Consider tall glass partitions for the exterior amenity spaces to help buffer the noise and reduce the noise impacts on residents when in the outside environment.

Landscape

- Recommend adding more greenspace. Overlay should be done on all exit points, pedestrian movement, and residual spaces where there is an opportunity to drop the slab and add more trees and shrubs.
- There appears to be an excess of hardscape and a lack of planting for both the areas along King George Boulevard and the internal roadway. Additional trees along the internal roadway will help to create more of a pedestrianized streetscape. Consider more shrub and tree plantings, noting that the tree plantings may require some dropped slabs to achieve required soil volumes
- Relocate the tree planters that are located in the triangular ph 1,2 lawn, on the phase 2 side, against the internal road to allow a larger lawn area.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Refer to Key Points.

Accessibility

- No specific issues were identified.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

The City Architect thanked the Panel for their excellent work this year, offering special thanks to Winston Chong, Ruchir Dhall and Alexandra Kenyon, who completed their 2-year terms.

D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for January 13, 2022.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

R. Drew, Chairperson