

**Present:**

**Panel Members:**

R. Drew, Chair  
J. Azizi  
K. Deol  
E. Kearns (left the meeting at 5:11 p.m.)  
J. Packer  
M. Patterson  
S. Slot

**Guests:**

Hirmanshu Chopra, Architect, AIBC, Douglas R. Johnson Architects Ltd.  
Patricia Campbell, MBCSLA, MCSLA, PMG Landscape Architects Ltd.  
Igor Nardin, Architect AIBC, OCA Architecture Inc.  
Meredith Mitchell, BCSLA, M2 Landscape Architecture  
Lance Barnett, Barnett Dembek Architects Inc.  
Rebecca Krebs, PMG Landscape Architects

**Staff Present:**

A. McLean, City Architect  
S. Maleknia, Urban Design Planner  
V. Goldgrub, Planner  
L. Blake, Administrative Assistant

**A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES**

It was Moved by J. Packer  
Seconded by R. Drew  
That the minutes of the Advisory Design  
Panel meeting of April 21, 2022, be received.

Carried

It was Moved by S. Slot  
Seconded by M. Patterson  
That the minutes of the Advisory Design  
Panel meeting of April 28, 2022, be received.

Carried

**B. NEW SUBMISSIONS**

1. 3:05 p.m.

File No.:	7918-0423-00
New or Resubmit:	New
Last Submission Date:	N/A
Description:	Development Permit for Form and Character to permit the construction of a 4-storey residential apartment building (with 24 units) with 2-storeys of underground parking.
Address:	5848 – 175 Street
Developer:	Harvinder S. Waraich, Manjinder K Waraich, and Paramjit S. Nagra
Architect:	Douglas R. Johnson, Architect, AIBC, Douglas R. Johnson Architects Ltd.
Landscape Architect:	Patricia Campbell, MBCSLA, MCSLA, PMG Landscape Architects Ltd.
Planner:	Robert Ordelleide
Urban Design Planner:	Vanessa Goldgrub

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff generally support the project but have concerns regarding the smaller than required amenity space.

The Panel was asked to comment on the general form of the development, interfaces with the public realm and neighbouring sites, and the character of the building in the neighbourhood context.

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. Patterson  
Seconded by J. Azizi  
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.  
Carried

The Panel noted that the project is a good concept and responds well to the neighbourhood context.

#### Key Points

- Consider providing a roof top outdoor amenity to meet the required amenity space.
- Give further consideration to the grading at the north and east property lines.
- Consider relocating the southeast wing northward to provide better daylight access to the outdoor courtyard.
- Consider rationalizing the Hardie panel divisions on the east and north elevations.
- Consider a more robust column on the northwest balcony posts.
- Consider further development of the use or allocation of materials on the east and north elevations to match west and south elevations. Most of Surrey will see building from the east side along the Bypass.
- Consider specifying parapet flashing that matches the color of the adjacent material.
- Consider providing more expression to the main entry.
- Consider meaningful measures to bring more variety of materials to the north and east elevation.
- Consider alternatives to white brick material to allow for possible challenges with supply.
- Consider a furnishing strategy that allows for more flexibility in the outdoor courtyard.
- Consider a trellis element to provide screening between parkade access and adjacent suites.

- Consider providing larger unit patios at grade.
- Match the specified plant types to the available soil depths.
- Consider using energy and thermal comfort modelling to inform design development. Use future climate files to best understand the resiliency of the project.
- Consider implementing best practice design for bike use, including e-bike charging, room for cargo bikes and trailers, bike maintenance facilities, and push button door operators anywhere bicycles need access.
- Locate accessible parking stalls as close to the elevators as possible.

#### Site

- Site comments are noted under Key Points.

#### Form and Character

- The form and character are done well, and it is a thoughtful design.
- The massing, language and material palette are all good, especially on the south and west elevations, but it decreases on the north and east elevations. Suggest wrapping materials around the north and east corners.
- Consider additional articulation of elements on the south elevation to improve the connection between the different segments, specifically the middle portion of the building.
- Consider additional articulation of the main entry with more robust elements. Recommend better wayfinding and more welcoming features.

#### Landscape

- The project may not require additional outdoor amenity space due to the site constraints and small building size.
- Encourage illumination and adequate tactile warning of the boulder street sign to avoid tripping hazards.

#### CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

#### Sustainability

- Encourage bringing an Environmental Advisor onboard as early as possible to inform design.
- Consider opportunities to maximize window opening areas and include operable windows on two sides of corner units to facilitate passive ventilation and cooling.
- Consider designing inset balconies to reduce thermal bridging.

#### Accessibility

- Encourage creating a more welcoming accessible entry.

2. 4:10 p.m.

File No.: 7921-0186-00  
 New or Resubmit: New  
 Last Submission Date: N/A  
 Description: CD Zone Amendment to increase the permitted building height from 18 m to 24 m and adjust the permitted Accessory Uses; Subdivision from three (3) lots into four (4) lots; and Development Permit for Form and Character to permit the development of a 7-storey seniors' housing apartment building containing 62 independent living units with amenities on the ground floor.  
 Address: 9010 – 158 Street, 9080 – 159 Street & 9025 – 160 Street  
 Developer: Sheldon Loepky, Elim Housing Society  
 Architect: Igor Nardin, Architect AIBC, OCA Architecture Inc.  
 Landscape Architect: Meredith Mitchell, BCSLA, M2 Landscape Architecture  
 Planner: Christa Brown  
 Urban Design Planner: Sam Maleknia

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff generally support the project.

The Panel was asked to comment on the site planning, pedestrian and vehicular movements, architectural expression, 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 E. Kearns  
 Seconded by J. Azizi  
 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.

Carried

- The mix of classic and symmetrical architecture with the organic landscape form makes for an interesting design.

#### Key Points

- Consider the scale of the columns at grade, as they appear bulky.
- Consider increasing the use of brick as a base material to reduce the stripy appearance.

- Consider plants that provide better screening and separation between the patios and the drop-off zone.
- Consider further development of the grading of the site to achieve greater accessibility with no steep slopes.
- Consider the transition from the rolled curb to the flush curb at the main entry to better facilitate senior's movement and accessibility.
- Reconsider the form of the interior pedestrian ramp to make it more welcoming and usable.

#### Site

- The siting and building orientation have been done well.
- The building entry is attractive and will provide an enjoyable experience.
- Suggest revisiting the cul-de-sac connection to the parking aisle, as it currently has a sharp corner that could create a problem for turning.

#### Form and Character

- The project responds well to the neighbourhood context and does a good job of stepping back at the fourth and seventh floors.
- The building form is cohesive, and its parts are well connected, and the character of the building façade is well articulated.
- The interior spaces are well-organized
- The living room for type 1A units on either side of the building appear narrow and tight.

#### Landscape

- The proposed park space (amenity) is a wonderful concept and will create a welcoming and interesting space for the residents.
- Consider drainage for the berm landscaping to ensure rainwater and topsoil do not wash onto hardscape surfaces.
- Encourage further design development of the hardscape detailing to consider the transition from the slab to off-slab conditions.

#### CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

#### Sustainability

- Encourage exploring opportunities to increase passive ventilation through operable windows on two sides of corner units.
- Consider heat pump solutions that provide both heating and cooling while reducing GHG emissions.
- Consider implementing a "recycling lounge" and providing adequate space to facilitate waste sorting in the garbage room.

## Accessibility

- Ensure the covered walkways south of the building are universally accessible.
- Recommend realigning the walkways where the parking lot covers to avoid conflicts.

## 3. 5:15 p.m.

File No.:	7918-0081-00
New or Resubmit:	New
Last Submission Date:	N/A
Description:	NCP Amendment to swap the “Mixed Commercial-Residential (Apartments)” and “Apartments (45 upa max)” land use designations, to create “Multiple Residential (1.5 FAR max)” as a new land use designation and redesignate the “Apartments (45 upa max)” to “Multiple Residential (1.5 FAR max), and for changes to the local road network.
	Rezoning from RA to CD (Based on C-5 and RM-70), Development Permit for a 4 Storey Mixed-use Commercial / Residential Building and a 4 Storey Residential Building.
Address:	5937 – 144 Street
Developer:	Amson Group, 1131823 BC Ltd.
Architect:	Lance Barnett, Architect AIBC, Barnett Dembek Architects Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Mary Chan Yip, PMG Landscape Architects
Planner:	Kevin Shackles
Urban Design Planner:	Vanessa Goldgrub

E. Kearns declared a conflict of interest and left the meeting at 5:11 p.m.

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff generally support the project but would recommend that the residential lobby for Building 2 to be relocated to the northwest side of the building on 59A Avenue and 143 Street to alleviate grading concerns and allow for a larger lobby.

The Panel was asked to comment on the general form of the development, including its proposed form, height, and landscape treatment, interfaces with the public realm and neighbouring sites, and the character of the building in the neighbourhood context.

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 J. Azizi  
Seconded by S. Slot  
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)  
SUPPORT the project and recommend that the applicant address the following  
issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department.

Carried

## Key Points

- Consider providing a turn-around stall in the commercial parking lot.
- Consider providing direct access from the corridor to the rooftop outdoor amenity on Building 2 (west).
- Relocate the Building 2 lobby to the northeast corner of the building, as well as increasing its size. Create a dialogue between the two lobbies. The Building 1 lobby is well-sized.
- Give further consideration to how residents access the residential waste management
- Consider limiting the occupancy of the rooftop amenity and removing the second stair.
- Consider removing a portion or the entire area of the walkway to the amenity area and adding that area to the amenity space for Building 1 (east).
- Consider providing larger patios for north facing suites.
- Consider mechanical cooling.
- Locate suite level ERV units as close to the outside wall as possible and allow space for a slightly larger model, as they are more efficient, allow for summer bypass and can accommodate increased filtration for periods of low air quality.

## Site

- Site comments noted under Key Points.

## Form and Character

- The buildings have balanced form and character, and the facades are articulated well.
- The building height and mass is broken down to a good scale for pedestrian friendly expression.

## Landscape

- Further design development to review fence and gate placement. The location of the gates at the top of the stair risers may need to be redesigned due to Building Code requirements.
- Consider if the two trees in front of the green wall on the east elevation or complimentary or an obstruction.
- No concerns were expressed regarding the grade at the lobby.

- Consider a more architectural style of fence and gate, rather than “paddock” style.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider opportunities to reduce thermal bridging for inset balconies and detail the design to minimize penetrations through the envelope.

Accessibility

- Eliminate the number of barriers, such as doors, to general areas.

**C. OTHER BUSINESS**

This section had no items to consider.

**D. NEXT MEETING**

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for May 26, 2022.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 6:26 p.m.

---

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

---

R. Drew, Chairperson