

**Present:****Panel Members:**

E. Kearns, Chair  
R. Amies  
M. Cheung  
N. Couttie  
S. MacRae  
M. Patterson  
Y. Popovska

**Guests:**

Brent Hanson, South Street Developer Group  
Jamie Ogden, Beech Westgard Developments  
Karla Castellanos, Architect AIBC, KCC Architecture  
Rod Maruyama, Maruyama & Associates

**Staff Present:**

A. McLean, City Architect  
N. Chow, Urban Design Planner  
S. Lee, Administrative Assistant

**A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES**

It was Moved by N. Couttie  
Seconded by M. Cheung  
That the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel  
meeting of October 20, 2022 and November 3, 2022 be received.  
Carried

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

File No.:	7921-0082-00
New or Resubmit:	New
Last Submission Date:	N/A
Description:	Proposed OCP Amendment to increase the permitted density within the Mixed Employment land use designation, Rezoning to Comprehensive Development Zone (CD) based on IB-3 Zone, and Development Permit for Form and Character to permit the development of a six storey business park building with two commercial retail units.
Address:	15513 – 28 Avenue and 2828 Croydon Drive
Developer:	Brent Hanson, South Street Developer Group and Jamie Ogden, Beech Westgard Developments
Architect:	Karla Castellanos, Architect AIBC, KCC Architecture
Landscape Architect:	Rod Maruyama, Maruyama & Associates
Planner:	Kevin Shackles
Urban Design Planner:	Nathan Chow

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff have some concerns about the project but are supportive of the use and density. Staff support the six storeys and the height of 23 metres with some stepping and curtailment of the massing. The staff also support joint access conditions to minimize sidewalk interruptions onto Croydon Drive and redundant vehicular access and logistics.

Since the building is over 90 metres long, the Panel was asked to comment if the scale will work in this area where there is a blend of residential and some business park designated areas. There is also some lack of clarity with BC Hydro corridor. In terms of the massing being forced towards the street, it appears the supporting documents and references towards BC Hydro's jurisdiction on electromagnetic field setbacks to derive the building envelope are difficult to track how it is exactly applied to the east side or northeast interface.

In terms of public realm, the staff is concerned about the program towards the south and 28 Avenue which has commercial programming. There is a large buffer towards the plaza area on 28 Avenue leading to the commercial space, but Staff prefer to see a direct connection to the commercial premise by cutting through rather than circulating around the plaza area. Furthermore, though there are limited types of tree species that will meet the height requirements due to the overhead wires, the staff encourages the landscape design to incorporate as much greenery as possible.

The Panel was also asked to comment on all aspects of project massing, public realm interface, the overall site planning, and the architectural qualities of the project.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site planning, design rationale and concept, and building isometric 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 N. Couttie  
Seconded by M. Cheung  
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)  
is not in support of the project and recommends that the applicant address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department and resubmit the project to the ADP for review.

Before the question was put:

The Panel noted that the outstanding issues to be addressed are not major concerns for non support and that the project be resubmitted.

It was Moved by N. Couttie  
Seconded by S. MacRae  
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 RESUBMIT the project to the ADP for review.  
Carried with M. Cheung opposed

The Panel considered this project to be early in the design stage and much design development has yet to be done. The Panel does not know how the final design will turn out as there is not enough information on the building itself. The Panel has placed a condition that the project be resubmitted to the ADP for review at a future date.

#### Key Points

- Recommend pursuing additional design development to break up length and massing of building, and to enhance the pedestrian experience.
- Recommend implementing further design detail to reduce the impact of the building from neighbours to the east.
- Further consider the public realm strategy and the south plaza as an important stopping point or feature in this strategy.
- Consider softening the proposed retaining and site grading, and to implement more site permeability.

#### Site

- Consider areas to reduce surplus surface parking and add more public amenity or green space, and further consider the pedestrian experience.
- The parallel parking spaces next to the current entrance are not practical.
- Reconsider the parkade entry location. If the parkade entry is moved to the northern part of the building, the building area (with regards to interior realm) will not be wasted with four to five metres of ramp from parkade entrance to P1 level.

#### Form and Character

- The project has a very complex building program, largely due to constraints caused by the power lines. Hence the project design involves many compromises. Suggest that the City recognize this in regard to site planning, neighbourhood screening, consideration of variances, etc. On the other hand, recommend that the City insist on the highest quality of design for the parts not impacted by these constraints, in particular, the design and quality of the building, and the design and quality of the landscaping and semi-public spaces.
- Consider further breaking up the massing of the building from the Crydon Drive side, 28 Avenue side and where it faces the neighbours to

the east.

- The building massing is considered acceptable but recommend additional design development to elevate the design to a high level. Consider not creating a “striking” design, but rather to strive for something harmonious and timeless.
- Height is an issue for the neighbours; worried about the over-height. Consider reducing the total length of the top floor and develop design to reduce overlook to the North. Recommend that introduction of screening or planting could help here.
- Consider the pedestrian experience along Croydon Drive and study the massing along that side again to make the building massing less dominant. Pedestrian walking experience on Croydon Drive could be improved greatly by setting back the ground floor level and taking space from the setback from the parking at the rear. Consider studying further the introduction of overhang along the front elevation continuing around the corner leading to the 28 Avenue side.
- More focus is recommended on designing the building and public realm to justify the variance on the height and massing being asked.
- Reconsider building facade materials and color palette choices. The massing and materials precedents are simple with just two colour tones, but there are more than six colours in the elevation which may not be the right approach when taking reference from the precedent images or buildings.
- Consider the soffit material on both ends of the building. Perhaps tie in with the wood material of the entrance and if there is a step back along Croydon Drive, a soffit with lighting along this side would also enhance the building form and pedestrian experience.
- Consider coordinating traffic, electrical, and mechanical input.

#### Landscape

- Reconsider plaza design as the current layout and configuration is very far from a plaza rationale.
- The plaza appears to be more of a circulation space with the north edge of the plaza pushed up against the retaining walls and presumably a guard rail. Consider design development to create some planted separation between the parking lot, provide a more direct connection to commercial space, and provide a plaza that is more focused on areas for social interaction.
- The sloping site and the nature of the ‘sunken’ parking lot create a need for significant retaining walls that will be visually very prominent with little available topsoil to support plants for screening. Design development is recommended with the project engineer to confirm design and materiality and coordination with the architect and landscape architect to adjust the parking as required to ensure there is adequate width of topsoil to support plants that can screen or buffer views of the retaining wall.
- Consider softening the grade transition and reducing the retaining walls.
- Consider introducing as much planting as possible and softening of the retaining walls.

- Consider adding additional trees along the north residential edge to create an overlapping canopy to help buffer views.
- The trees in the parking lot are very important in providing shade for the large expanses of asphalt. Consider design development to ensure that structural soil or tree cells are provided to ensure adequate soil volumes for trees to reach maturity.
- Consider permeable or concrete grass for entire parking area.

#### CPTED

- Consider adjustment to the fencing layout shown on L4 to eliminate the pinch point at the park pathway and any potential safety concerns.

#### Sustainability

- Provide sustainability strategy and rationale.
- Consider energy modeling with future climate data to account for shock events (hot and cold), and to inform fenestration layouts, natural ventilation, and passive cooling strategies on different facades.
- Consider inclusion of renewable energy on roof surfaces.
- Consider integrating permeable surfaces, and rain garden or biofiltration as first flush for storm water and beautification in surface parking.
- Consider operational sustainability certification (ie. WELL, Fitwel, BOMA BEST).

#### Accessibility

- Reconsider barrier-free parking spots. Please check with a traffic consultant as the proposed design is on slope over 5%.

### C. OTHER BUSINESS

#### 1. 2023 Advisory Design Panel Meeting Schedule

It was

Moved by S. MacRae

Seconded by R. Amies

That the proposed 2023 Advisory Design Panel meeting schedule be adopted as presented.

Carried

### D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, December 15, 2022.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

---

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

---

E. Kearns, Chairperson