

Present:

Panel Members:
E. Kearns, Chair
J. Azizi
R. Drew
N. Couttie
S. Macrae
M. Cheung
Y. Popovska
M. Patterson
M. Derkson

Guests:

Renante Solivar, Architect AIBC, MCMP Architects
Jason Wegman, PWL Partnership
Harman Dhillon, Genaris Properties
Rajinder Warraich, Architect AIBC, Flat Architecture
Rebecca Krebs, PMG Landscape Architects
Harry Dhillon, Mahindra Group
Ruchir Dhall, Architecture Panel

Staff Present:

S. Maleknia, Urban Design Planner
V. Goldgrub, Urban Design Planner
S. Gill, Recording Secretary

A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was Moved by R. Drew
Seconded by E. Kearns
That the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel
meeting of September 22, 2022 be received.
Carried

B. NEW SUBMISSIONS**1. Time: 3:05 p.m.**

File No.: 7920-0220-00
New or Resubmit: New
Last Submission Date: N/A
Description: OCP and City Centre Plan Amendments, Rezoning and Development Permit to allow for two towers. The west tower is a 50-storey residential tower and 9-storey podium with 754 residential units. The east tower is a 46-storey tower with 114m2 of ground floor commercial and 505 residential units. The overall gross FAR is 8.3.
Address: 13425 and 13455 - 107A Avenue
Developer: Holyside Property Developments
Architect: Renante Solivar, Architect AIBC, MCMP Architects
Landscape Architect: Jason Wegman, PWL Partnership
Planner: Ingrid Matthews
Urban Design Planner: Sam Maleknia

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

The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, pedestrian and vehicular movement, architectural expression, overall landscape concept, and public realm interfaces.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site planning, streetscapes, building concept, and 3D Views.

The Landscape Architect presented an overview of the general concept for the Landscape design.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

It was

Moved by S. Macrae; N. Coultie

Seconded by J. Azizi

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

- Reconsider current underground parking access locations to improve and pedestrianize the north-south driveway.
- Consider alternative to proposed opaque balconies to open up and improve the views to outside on higher levels.
- Consider future sustainable strategies as the design progresses and consider thermally broken balconies.
- Consider simplifying the expression of the building's base.
- Consider celebration of west entry similar to east building entry.
- Carefully consider materials to reinforce the design rationale.
- Consider relocation of the pedestrian ramp within west building's lobby to allow the lobby to be directly connected to the window and the green space beyond it.
- Consider a more consistent overarching design theme to all outdoor plaza spaces, especially the southeast corner plaza, and integration and relationships of design with other landscape areas.
- Provide a construction phasing plan to show how the parking entries and other site features within the private driveway will be coordinated.

Site

- Consider connecting parkades below the private driveway to increase efficiency.

- Consider relocating the parking entries to the new east-west city lane and making the private driveway more pedestrian oriented.
- Reconsider the public realm design rationale of the north-south driveway between podiums.

Form and Character

- Tower elevations are well resolved.
- Review the materiality, colors, and form of different components. In general, the buildings, including the towers and its podiums, are generally cohesive and balanced. However, the arch-form canopy at the convenience entry and straight contemporary entries on the other sides require further study for consistency.
- Review the cladding panel divisions on the building elevations.
- Consider deleting the white cladding at south elevation. Reserve white cladding for frame expression.
- There is further potential to study the exterior cladding colours, tones and textures of the metal panel cladding on the towers. It could be a good idea to study options and keep in mind solar reflectivity as well as the glass colour to develop this further.
- The opaque balcony guardrails negatively impact the suite views. Consider a design option that can mitigate the issue. Consider flipping the curvature form of the balcony outline or arrangement to free the views for upper units.
- Consider studying a perforated metal panel for the solid balconies to allow some porosity. There is a potential to also explore cladding the edges of the balconies in the same material as the metal clad arches at the east entrance to create a coherent elevational treatment.
- Review the balcony depth for functionality.
- Review the unit layouts to improve natural light access and privacy issues. Further review the kitchen size relevant to the size of the units.
- Give further design development of the podium bases. Consider reducing the number of design elements.
- Reconsider the north-south orientation of the towers. Consider an east-west direction to make the towers more energy efficient. In addition to energy efficiency concerns, the west tower has a long exposure to the SkyTrain guideway and the Gateway Station. Noise will be a major issue. For tower separation the project has been quite responsive to the developments around the site, but the towers are not working well together within this development. The towers are quite close to each other.
- Siting and orientation appear well considered, and the lane and access to the two parkades function adequately, however, consider less hardscape to reduce echo and reflective noise. 107A Avenue and the surrounding main and commercial entrances would benefit from less concrete / pavement and more planting.
- Review the entry to the west tower from 107A Avenue to make as strong as the entry on the east building. Consider more improvements to the lobby expression.

- The form of the east convenience entrance canopy and roof trellis structure is quite enchanting and reminiscent of a 60s international style seen in Palm Springs like E Stewart Williams Coachella Valley Savings & Loan, with its fluted curvy form against a backdrop of the more rigorous modernist style, providing interest and relief.
- Some materiality (like the townhouse brick) should be considered at the lower levels to make it more welcoming.
- Above the main entrances there is an opportunity to utilize as a green roof.
- Consider having a traffic engineer onboard at an early stage because the way the parkade entries are located, especially at the proximity of the main street (107 A Avenue), and considering the number of residents using cars, it creates a traffic pinch point there.
- The towers would benefit of having enough space at the sides of the internal driveway between two towers to allow passenger drop-off.
- Consider providing a more direct link between the elevator cores and the storage lockers at the parkade.
- Consider providing a direct connection between the public realm and the bike storage avoiding having to use the steep parkade ramps passing through the loading area.
- Consider providing a lobby access to the mews from the east building lobby, similar to the west building.
- Review the loading - the loading area off the 5% ramp does not appear to have enough space at the back, and does not look operational.

Landscape

- Appreciate the sunshade expression and reuse of form and motif.
- Appreciate weather protection at podium levels
- Consider increased pedestrianization of the lane – through paving materials and access through the boulevard, possibly through ground floor use and outdoor amenity focused on laneway/driveway intersection. Recommend following CSA B651 accessibility guidelines to protect pedestrians.
- Consider additional seating at SE lobby entrance.
- Consider electric firepits.
- Review the location of water features at the guideway. Review the outdoor amenities on Level 2 of the west building - they are fragmented and not well connected to each other. Moreover, there is no direct access to the outdoor amenities from the interior public corridor which creates a limitation for operation and programming of the outdoor amenities. Nevertheless, the indoor and outdoor amenities on Level 10 are fantastic.
- Consider sound attenuation measures for Outdoor Amenity space near SkyTrain.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider using energy and thermal comfort modelling to inform your design development. Use future climate files (2050/2080) to best understand the impact of shock events and overall resiliency of the project.
- Consider using thermally broken balcony connectors.
- Consider solar panel at tower rooftops.
- Consider window design to improve thermal performance

Accessibility

- Consider a target of providing 5% Adaptable suites

2. 5:30 p.m.

File No.:	7921-0341-00
New or Resubmit:	New
Last Submission Date:	N/A
Description:	Proposed rezoning from RF and RM-D to CD (based on RM-70), consolidation of 2 lots into 1, and Development Permit to allow construction of a 6-storey apartment building with 76 dwelling units.
Address:	10984 and 10986 Ravine Road and 10970 – 132 Street (City Centre)
Developer:	Harman Dhillon, Genaris Properties
Architect:	Rajinder Warraich, Architect AIBC, Flat Architecture
Landscape Architect:	Rebecca Krebs, PMG Landscape Architects
Planner:	Leita Martin
Urban Design Planner:	Sam Maleknia

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

The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, pedestrian and vehicular movement, architectural expression, overall landscape concept, and public realm interfaces.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site planning, streetscapes, building concept, and 3D Views.

The Landscape Architect presented an overview of the general concept for the Landscape design.

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

It was Moved by R. Drew
Seconded by J. Azizi
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 supported the project in general but would like the following items to
be addressed.

Key Points

- Consider Accessibility to indoor and outdoor amenity spaces. Reconsider grading and stairs at indoor/outdoor Amenity on L1, to allow universal access to both.
- Resolve overlook/privacy issues between balconies in crux of the plan (units F2/E4 (o1 and o2 stacks))
- Consider the depth of units generally, to allow light and less reliance on mechanical ventilation; especially consider depth of units E5/B2 and the potential overshadowing of units to the north.
- Consider lightening up the entry canopy and creating a more residential entry.
- Consider more robust verticals for your boxed-out frame elements.
- Consider terminating brick at the boxed-out frame elements, for ease of constructability and to strengthen the framed element.
- Consider more consistency with window selection.
- Consider simplifying your material treatment.
- Consider including more native plantings.
- Further coordinate plans and elevations to ensure drawings accurately represent design intent.

Site

- Consider finished elevation of outdoor amenity area (up to elev. 65.30) to allow universal access from lobby through internal doorways.
- Consider relocation of SE corner walkway and replace it with landscaping.
- Consider reducing extent of ground floor outdoor amenity, allowing more patio space in front of 3-bedroom unit, NE corner (near PMT).
- Consider moving the PMT (beside the car ramp) away from the amenity and unit patios.
- There are large patios for 1-bedroom units on level 1 but the 3-bedroom units on the north side have insufficient patios relative to their sizes.

Form and Character

- Form is good but needs further refinement: fewer material changes, further balcony and frame detailed design and development of the front entrance.
- The building has thoughtful form and character. The selected material and color combination are quite balanced.
- The building has a wide, generous, attractive lobby and the entry is inviting.
- The exterior seems more resolved than the interior layouts and common spaces.
- Reconsider the balcony door design; consider glazed doors.
- Unit plans are tight and lack proper lighting and fenestration seems random.
- Resolve privacy issues between balconies, especially o1 and o2 stacks
- Review the problem of dark (windowless) bedrooms.
- Change the entry canopy to a thinner assembly.
- Consider terminating the brick or Hardie at the boxed-out frame element, for ease of constructability and to strengthen the element.
- Access needs further planning and design as the grade levels compromise the ground level and access considerably. The plans need more work and Code advice for accessibility and fire and life safety with present layouts.
- Reconsider the building form, especially on east façade.

Landscape

- Appreciate the landscape detail showing patio gate and concrete column w/ infill (it doesn't show up on renderings or elevations).
- Consider an alternative design for the wood fence screening at street-facing patios, or re-consider materials, upgrading to opaque glass or incorporating materials found elsewhere in the building language.
- Consider revising the layout at the front lobby entrance – bike racks conflict with doorway.
- Consider incorporating more native plant species and communities, particularly in buffer areas to north.
- Consider converting the inaccessible roof to outdoor amenity and or private patios.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider using energy and thermal comfort modelling to inform your design development. Use future climate files (2050/2080) to best understand the impact of shock events and overall resiliency of the project.
- Study the depths of the units to allow more natural light to the back of the units to reduce the need for more energy use and allow for better passive ventilation and natural light.

Accessibility

- Further consider accessibility to indoor and outdoor amenity spaces.
- Consider accessibility to amenity and garage.

3. 6:45 p.m.

File No.: 7920-0100-00
 New or Resubmit: New
 Last Submission Date: N/A
 Description: Proposed OCP amendment from Urban to Multiple Residential, King George Corridor South LAP Amendment from Townhouse (15 upa) to Mixed Use Commercial Residential, Rezoning from RF to CD (based on RM-70 and C-5), Development Permit and Housing Agreement in order to construct a 4-storey mixed-use building consisting of 27 residential rental units and 782 square metres of commercial space.
 Address: 1704 - 160 Street
 Developer: Harry Dhillon, Mahindra Group
 Architect: Rajinder Warraich, Architect AIBC, Flat Architecture
 Landscape Architect: Ruchir Dhall, Architecture Panel
 Planner: Heather Kamitakahara
 Urban Design Planner: Vanessa Goldgrub

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

The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, pedestrian and vehicular movement, architectural expression, overall landscape concept, and public realm interfaces.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site planning, streetscapes, building concept, and 3D Views.

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. Macrea
 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 supported the project in general with the site being challenging and note that the curved balconies and diagonal forms at each end of the building has made the building quite dynamic with a suitable energy.

Key Points

- Effective use of a constrained site
- The north corner is well resolved from an architectural perspective, however resolution to the plaza is needed. Reconsider the landscape design approach to compliment the architecture at this corner.
- Further resolution and design development is needed at the south end at King George Boulevard, both from an architecture and landscape perspective.
- Simplify the form & roofline from the 160th Street side.
- Streamline and coordinate architectural and landscape language in both plan and elevations. Landscape and architecture are to work together.
- Consider CRU loading at grade and as well as provide a corridor at the back of the CRUs to connect the elevator lobby to them from inside.

Site

- Relocate the CRU door from the prow of the flatiron to the King George Boulevard or 160th street frontage.
- The north plaza is currently split between high and low elevations, this dissection of the plaza does not relate to the building's architecture. Consider favouring one side, preferably the low side. Minimizing the spatial requirements of high side and rearranging the vent. Explore providing a big design idea or statement at the corner.
- Consider the social plaza geometry to integrate better with building at the SE corner.
- PMT is in suitable location.

Form and Character

- Triangular sites create limitations in design. The applicant has turned the limitation into an opportunity by providing a vibrant building with a dynamic form and character. However, the applicant is encouraged to have more fun with the triangle geometry.
- Consider moving the elevator closer to the building centre. It may be worth exploring the option of a key card system that could allow the CRU elevator to perform double duty with the residential levels at the North end of a long corridor.
- Reconsider the round balcony shaped and roof edge to further enhance the building's prow.
- Simplify and reduce the number of architectural materials.
- Design development to the lobby entry façade is needed by further articulating the corner. Consider reconciling the geometry alignments of the wall at the lobby with the overall building form.

- Consider a better resolution of the 3D elements at the south corner on King George Boulevard where the massing of the amenity space block, as well as the canopy above, interferes with the purity of the geometry.
- Show programming of indoor amenity spaces.
- Consider lightening up the elevation panels at the roof patio for additional reflective light and distinguishing the south & west elevations from the wall adjacent to the outdoor amenity garden.
- The building articulation at the south side needs improvement. More specifically, the CRU block massing with the residential above are not speaking the same language.
- Design all sides of the building with the same level of detail. Provide further development of the south and west elevations by simplify the massing, as well as borrowing vocabulary from the King George Boulevard elevation.
- Reconsider mechanical grille selection/location on elevations
- The black window frames are a key element of the exterior elevations, applicant is to ensure black frames are noted on drawings and in the material schedule.

Landscape

- Simplify the paving material, including reconsideration of the use and location of stamped concrete as the transition is abrupt and the patches of stained concrete are distracting rather than unifying. Linear pavers are a fine material, but are not used to the best effect here.
- Consider the relationship between the residential entrance and plaza; the two spaces are not working together.
- Consider a larger specimen tree at north plaza to help define the space and move it more into the corner.
- Provide a rhythm of planters in relationship to the CRU doors - do not block doors, provide direct access from sidewalk to CRU door.
- Reconsider the trellis design and materials.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider using energy and thermal comfort modelling to inform your design development. Use future climate files (2050/2080) to best understand the impact of shock events and overall resiliency of the project.

Accessibility

- Consider a target of providing 5% Adaptable suites
- Locate the commercial accessible parking stall closer to the elevator

C. OTHER BUSINESS

This section had no items to consider.

D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, November 3, 2022.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

R. Drew, Chairperson