

Present:**Panel Members:**

R. Drew, Chair
J. Azizi
N. Couttie
G. Brumpton
T. Bunting
M. Derksen
M. Heeney
E. Kearns
J. Packer
S. Slot

Guests:

Matt Reid, Dawson & Sawyer
Lance Barnett, Barnett Dembek
Mary Chan-Yip, PMG Landscape Architects

Staff Present:

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

A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was

Moved by M. Derksen

Seconded by J. Packer

That the minutes of the Advisory Design

Panel meeting of January 27, 2022, be received.

Carried

B. NEW SUBMISSIONS**1. 4:05 p.m.**

File No.:	7921-0049-00
New or Resubmit:	New
Last Submission Date:	N/A
Description:	Detailed Development Permit for four 6-storey apartment buildings consisting of 462 dwelling units with underground parking.
Address:	8509 – 158 Street and 15733 – 85 Avenue
Developer:	Estkin Developments Ltd. (Matt Reid, Dawson & Sawyer)
Architect:	Lance Barnett, Barnett Dembek
Landscape Architect:	Mary Chan-Yip, PMG Landscape Architects)
Planner:	Misty Jorgensen
Urban Design Planner:	Sam Maleknia

The Urban Design Planner explained the background of the overall site and advised that the staff worked with the applicant regarding the general site planning, massing, architectural expression, interfaces, and landscape concept. The proposal generally complies with the Fleetwood Town Centre Plan intent and direction, and the staff is supporting the proposal.

The Panel was asked to comment on the detailed building design as part of detailed DP review, and previous relevant key considerations that were brought up in the General DP ADP meeting from May 28th 2020.

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 M. Derksen
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

Key Points

- Consider addressing potential privacy issues between the north interfaces of Buildings 1 and Buildings 2.
- Consider providing 100% of the indoor amenity space.
- Consider further refinement of the elevations for both building types 1 and 2.
- Consider further development of the north and south elevations of Building 2. Consider simplifying the expression and lending the vocabulary or language of Buildings 1 onto Buildings 2.
- Consider further development of the buildings' entries.
- Ensure that black window frames are not value engineered out of the project.
- Consider adding shade tolerant plants to the shady corners and incorporating more native species into the landscape.
- Consider further development of the courtyard and mews. Revisit the "Victorian" landscape theme and allow this to inform their design.
- Consider providing more intimate spaces, greater variety of seating areas and weather protection in the courtyards.
- Consider location of the children play areas to make them more visible to the main courtyards.
- Add play environment for younger children.

- Consider further ways to activate the corner plazas.
- Consider providing adaptable suites in Building 2.
- Consider using energy and thermal comfort modelling to inform the design development. Use future climate files to best understand the resiliency of the project.
- Consider providing air conditioning.
- Consider electric charging stations for electric bike charging, and if possible, a bike maintenance facility.
- Minimize the need for mullions in the windows to minimize thermal bridging.

Site

- Recommend that play experience for younger age groups be added to this phase. Subsequent phases may take a while to be constructed. Families have kids in different age groups, it is nice if they can use one area.
- Consider location of play areas – visibility from street versus visibility within courtyard.

Form and Character

- A good solid scheme that will set the tone well for Fleetwood as it is developed out to support the new SkyTrain extension. Very good-looking project – clean, simple, yet very effective Townhome definition. Stepping the J-shape buildings (Buildings 1) are a great idea. It makes building dynamic and energetic.
- Consider widening the space between north wing of Building 1 and Building 2 (both lots): concerns with the overlook and liveability for the units (BD/AC2/A2/B2) that face each other with a very minimal setback.
- Consider locating brick at the building base of Buildings 1, in lieu of Hardie panels.
- Consider further development of the parapet line, consider perhaps a more robust material.
- The building orientation sounds reasonable.
- Consider additional design development for the façade treatment. In particular on the brick components which should be taken down to the ground and also be capped more substantially than just a metal flashing (e.g. precast or masonry).
- Appreciate restraint and number of materials.
- Colour composition of the building façade managed well. However, the charcoal/beige colour should be revisited.
- The entries are not very welcoming and need some additional work to give more expression.
- For Building type 1 (especially Building 1 on Lot 3): Consider celebrating the corner entry element with a canopy & glazing continuing around the corner or giving this entry more prominence by changing planes-bumping in/out or chamfering-to open it up and activate the street.
- Consider additional weather protection over the entry for Building 2 (both lots).

- Consider further design development to the entry. Entries look good and there is lots of visibility into the lobby, but there is a narrow corridor to the elevator. This can be a challenge with bikes and strollers. Consider further review.
- Buildings 1 (both lots) elevation on 158th/Green Road has a rhythm in its architectural expression, but this language changes/loses steam as you move around the building; Consider some more consistency of façade articulation/fenestration on all elevations, all buildings.
- Consider introducing Indoor Amenity adjacent to the Outdoor Amenity at levels 3 & 5 (Buildings 1, both lots), to make this space more useable, like a washroom and kitchenette.
- The amenity is programmed well especially on level 1 but the corridor separating the amenity rooms weakens the space design, consider a review.
- The top of the J-shape buildings 1 along 158th St. and the Green Lane is too flat. Consider more work to give more energy to the skyline.
- The street elevation for Building type 2 is overwhelming and busy. Consider further review.
- Consider additional design development for the façade treatment. In particular on the brick components which should be taken down to the ground and capped more substantially than a metal flashing (e.g. precast or masonry).
- The black window frames are a key element of the attractive exterior elevations. However, these are often dropped later due to cost issues, and this would drastically change the look of the buildings. It is important that the City obtain some form of firm commitment that they will be retained. Alternatively, the applicant should provide alternative elevations showing white or beige frames, so the actual design can be properly assessed.

Landscape

- Amount of space that the applicant has provided with courtyards that are private is going to be very attractive in the new neighbourhood.
- Commend permeability and access to site.
- Appreciate presentation and commend applicant on green space and open space that the applicant has managed to fit into this project.
- Resolution of landscape at entries seems to be working.
- Appreciate attention to soil volumes, including that they are contiguous, without requiring a lot of walls.
- Recommend design development to increase granularity or intimacy of exterior amenity spaces, especially the BBQ area on the upper deck and L1 patio. Consider structures like arbours.
- Shadow studies show reasonable light access. Suggest that more planting be added to the courtyards in areas with significant shade. Lawn will not do well in these areas and extra planting will add layering, interest, and privacy to the experience of being in the courtyard.
- Recommend further design development to the wood fence detail as it does not seem to relate to the building architecture or the overall design theme.
- Recommend review of pedestrian circulation in the courtyards. There may be dead ends or areas where people will shortcut across soft landscape creating goat paths. Suggest creating complete loops which will allow residents to move efficiently in multiple directions, be positive for people taking short walks or kids on trikes etc.

- Suggest developing the landscape design with a clear overarching narrative to foster unique identity and sense of place for each courtyard and the mews landscape. Softer forms, more variation of size of spaces, vertical elements with weather protection would be good outcomes of the design development process that would add value to the project.
- Consider adding some covered outdoor space that, in addition to being very useful in our climate, can help offset the deficiency in indoor amenity area.
- Indoor amenity programming diversity is not reflected outdoors; Consider diversifying courtyard experiences by providing variety of outdoor spaces, including more intimate seating, or gathering areas. Consider varying experience between lots to enhance sense of place and wayfinding.
- Consider changing some log seating to standard benches with backrest- which is valuable for parents.
- Provide more protected spaces and varied seating opportunities, including accessible options, for play areas. Consider the functionality of the seating areas between play area and village green.
- The mews between the linear buildings is fantastic. However, investigate connecting the two pathways; making them less organic would be more cohesive.
- Consider weather protection in courtyard. This may be an opportunity to enhance indoor-outdoor program relationship.
- Consider identity of corner plazas, and the relationship of their materials, forms, and furnishings to other public realm areas, such as the mews.
- Consider consistent use of materials and expression throughout public realm.
- Consider more extensive native plant palette, or ways to contribute more ecosystem service.
- Consider a minimum 1m growing medium / drainage for trees (not evident in some sections).

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider engaging with your energy modeller. Consider future climate files for energy and thermal comfort modelling to ensure livability in future.
- Consider air conditioning. Heat pumps are good solution for heating and cooling.
- If you use suite level HRV/ ERVs, make sure you are allocating space for them with suite level design. Consider larger HRVs that are going to perform better and provide bypass mode in summertime; locate them as close to outside walls as possible.
- Fenestration – where you feel comfortable to do so, consider minimizing window frames and mullions and maximize openable area.
- Consider push button door operators anywhere a bicyclist will go.
- Consider adding electric bike charging and a bike maintenance room.

Accessibility

- Consider introducing some adaptable units in Buildings 2 to bring you up to 5% of total units.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

This section had no items to consider.

D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, February 25, 2022.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

R. Drew, Chairperson