

---

**Present:**

**Panel Members:**

E. Kearns, Chair  
J. Azizi  
N. Couttie  
M. Heeney  
S. MacRae  
J. Packer  
M. Patterson

**Guests:**

Kunwar Bir Singh, Alvair Development Ltd.  
Jessie Arora, Architect AIBC, DF Architecture  
Dave Jerke, van der Zalm and Associates Landscape Architecture  
Luc Gosselin, Whitetail Homes  
Steve Bartok, Architect AIBC, Keystone Architecture & Planning Ltd.  
Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture  
Zubin Billimoria, Architect AIBC, DF Architecture  
Qing Li, M2 Landscape Architecture  
Andressa Linhares, Architect AIBC, Keystone Architecture & Planning Ltd.

**Staff Present:**

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

---

**A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES**

It was Moved by N. Couttie  
Seconded by M. Heeney  
That the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel  
meeting of December 1, 2022 be received.  
Carried

**B. NEW SUBMISSIONS**

**1. 3:05 p.m.**

File No.: 7921-0223-00  
New or Resubmit: New  
Last Submission Date: N/A  
Description: Rezoning from "Duplex Residential Zone (RM-D)" and "Single Family Residential Zone (RF) to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD based on RM-70 and C-5)", consolidation into one development lot and a Development Permit for Form and Character to permit the development of a six-storey mixed use building with 109 residential units and 1,103 square metres of commercial floor area at grade. The proposal includes the closure and purchase of the existing lane and consolidation with the development site.  
Address: 2301, 2313, 2315, and 2337 - 152 Street  
Developer: Kunwar Bir Singh, Alvair Development Ltd.  
Architect: Jessie Arora, Architect AIBC, DF Architecture  
Landscape Architect: Dave Jerke, van der Zalm and Associates Landscape Architecture  
Planner: Kevin Shackles  
Urban Design Planner: Nathan Chow

The Urban Design Planner noted that the applicant proposed to close and purchase the north-south proportion of the existing lane that is not over a watermain, and consolidate it with the subject site. Furthermore, the applicant is working with staff to retain five Douglas Fir trees on the subject site to provide a buffering scale transition to the school.

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff generally do not have concerns with the density, use, or form; however, staff question the scale of stepping back at the west side interface of single-family homes, as that is designated as a sensitive interface in the Semiahmoo Town Centre Plan.

The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, pedestrian and vehicular movement, lane system being used, and portion being purchased and remain north end, architectural expression of building, building form, overall massing concept, the density proposed setbacks, proposed amenity concept, overall landscape concept, wayfinding and public realm interfaces.

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

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

**J. Packer joined the meeting at 3:15pm.**

#### **ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW**

It was

Moved by M. Heeney

Seconded by N. Couttie

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 with S. MacRae absent

#### Key Points

- Consider simplifying material palette.
- Consider solar shading techniques on west side of the south elevation.
- Consider removing or reducing large overhangs at the top of level 6 to allow building to fully step back from lower levels.
- Encourage more shade elements at the outdoor amenity on the rooftop to allow larger age range of users.
- Reconsider access from underground parking to commercial CRUs.
- Further consider unit design for liveability.

### Site

- Reconsider the current streetscape, in particular the public realm design, to support the ground floor commercial usage of this building. The main sidewalk pressed against the curb is separated from the commercial by a lawn boulevard with a very narrow strip of sidewalk against the property line which is again further separated from the CRUs by the rhythm of planters and benches.
- Reconsider the access to the commercial CRUs from the parkade and the north elevator as it is not very convenient or practical. The double-sided CRUs with equal value given to both sides seem unreasonable. Reconsider the animation of the west side facing the driveway as it does not need to be the same as the east side.
- Consider adding a separate designated elevator for the commercial users that could be shared with the bicycle room access.
- Consider consolidating the residential core to a single pair of elevators located at the midpoint of the building. This will provide more clarity to the residential entrance and will more easily service the amenity level. It will also help break down the scale of the massing while still providing two substantial blocks of retail space on either side.
- Consider increasing the rooftop outdoor space and increasing the programming and quality of this space.
- 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.
- Consider addition of elements to the roof deck in order to provide shade over the play area for summertime use.

### Form and Character

- Consider simplifying and reducing the number of materials to two or three principal materials. This will make it easier to detail, build and maintain as well.
- Consider lighter coloured materials and ensure adequate lighting on soffits over surface parking at the rear (west) of the building to lighten up potentially dark spaces.
- The black window frames are a key element of the attractive exterior elevations. However, these are sometimes dropped later due to cost issues, and this would drastically change the look of the building. It is important that the City obtain some form of firm commitment that they will be retained. Otherwise, the applicant should provide alternative elevations to the ADP, so the actual design can be assessed.
- Consider removing the round columns on the corners holding the roof overhang. The columns diminish the energy of the feature frames and do not add value to the overall building form. It can be reviewed with a structural engineer.
- Consider removing the large roof overhangs to reduce the bulk of the upper floor.
- Consider further setting back the building on the upper floors. The overhang "L-bands" at the roof level contradict these setbacks and consideration should be given to eliminating them.

Landscape

- Consider using taller evergreen plant material at the frontage of the building. The planting palette selected appears to favour lots of groundcover planting.
- Consider a more native palette and one that provides for bird friendly design and pollinators.
- Consider providing a variety of heights of evergreen trees along the west edge and to consider Douglas Fir in place of the specified Deodar Cedar.
- Consider designing the roof deck amenity space to include a wider range of users ages 5-12 as currently the play area appears to be limited to toddlers.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider adding overhangs and horizontal projections on the west side of the south elevation in order to reduce unwanted heat gain and overheating of suites on the southwest corner.

Accessibility

- Consider alternative layouts as a number of the unit layouts are very tight.
- Consider implementing adaptable units per the City's requirements.

**S. MacRae joined the meeting at 4:25 p.m.**

## 2. 4:15 p.m.

File No.:	7922-0168-00
New or Resubmit:	New
Last Submission Date:	N/A
Description:	Rezoning from RF to CD (based on RM-70) and a Development Permit (Form & Character) to allow construction of a 6-storey apartment building with a total of 125 units, and an overall gross FAR of 2.5.
Address:	13453, 13462, and 13473 – 94A Avenue
Developer:	Luc Gosselin, Whitetail Homes
Architect:	Steve Bartok, Architect AIBC, Keystone Architecture and Planning Ltd.
Landscape Architect:	Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture
Planner:	Sarah Robertson
Urban Design Planner:	Sam Maleknia

The Urban Design Planner noted that the westerly setback facing the MUP is 5.0m to achieve an overall 18 metres building separation the between subject site and the adjacent site to the west to allow enough light and views. In addition, the proposal exceeds the City of Surrey's outdoor amenity requirements but is about 25% short on indoor amenity requirements.

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff generally support the project's use, form and density.

The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, architectural expression, massing, design language, material use, overall landscape concept, and public realm interfaces. In addition, the Panel was also asked to comment on the retaining walls on the east PL as the site is challenged by a major grade change from east to west.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site planning, streetscapes, building concept, design rationale, massing diagram, amenity areas, material board and 3D perspective 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 S. MacRae  
 That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) is in  
 SUPPORT of the project and recommends that the applicant address the following  
 issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department.  
Carried with J. Azizi and M. Heeney opposed

The Panel supported the project in general in terms of the overall form, use, and architectural expression. The Panel found the roof top trellis a great addition and balconies well designed. As well, the indoor and outdoor amenities are managed well, and the overall concept is quite dynamic. However, the Panel recommends further design development to the building entry and stepping of the building, to reduce the material palette and consider bike storage location and usability.

#### Key Points

- Reduce the material palette and consider simplifying the treatment of the building façade.
- Simplify and rationalize the big frame element next to the lobby.
- Consider additional design development at main building entry with pedestrian scale approach.
- Consider design strategies and potential stepping of building to increase daylight into the central courtyard.
- Consider softening the treatment and reduction of hardscapes in outdoor amenity at level 1.
- Consider more usable covered outdoor amenity spaces.
- Further consider bike storage location and usability.
- Review the unit layout usability.
- Consider using future climate files to inform design as it progresses.

#### Site

- Consider reducing the amount of hardscape of the central courtyard design to increase the amount of softscape to better screen building overlook of the courtyard and the two unit patio's that are at the same level.

#### Form and Character

- Consider reviewing the massing concept, which has a horseshoe shape that creates shadowing within the courtyard; consider peeling back the rooftop overhang and reduce the 6th floor decks to get more light in there.
- Further consider the whole top floor to have a parapet rather than heavy roof overhang, which will help with the perceived height.
- Consider adding more seating space or waiting space in the lobby so it can be used as more than a corridor for more functionality.
- Consider a pedestrian scale to your residential entry.
- Consider further design development to reduce heavy columns or omit and reduce extension of decks at the side setbacks as they make the building mass overly large. Consider a consistent and robust approach to frame elements around the building facades.
- Further consider reducing the material palette, omit one of the materials, potentially the wood, and leave the brick and blue material.

- The black window frames are a key element of the attractive exterior elevations. However, these are sometimes dropped later due to cost issues, and this would drastically change the look of the building. It is important that the City obtain some form of firm commitment that they will be retained. Otherwise, the applicant should provide alternative elevations to the ADP, so the actual design can be assessed.
- Consider improving the living space layouts as in most units they look quite tight and not very operational.
- Consider having some units such as C6 and C3 to have some design development to open up the living rooms and adjust the wall to allow a more generous layout, as units in the armpit behind the elevators are always compromised.
- Consider the livability of the unit design, especially in corner units. Further consider deleting study rooms and giving more window wall length.
- Consider providing good-sized balcony doors and ensure door clearance when changing the building envelope.
- Consider having the north wing of the building double-loaded and the south one single-loaded to take better advantage of the daylight.
- Consider glazing in the stairwells to make them more welcoming and encourage use.
- Consider indoor amenity on the roof
- For the main residential entry, consider pushing the exterior door of the lobby in and cut off part of the vestibule to open up more space at the entry.
- Consider providing some indoor amenity space on the 6th floor with a direct access stair up to the sunny outdoor rooftop amenity.

#### Landscape

- 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
- The rooftop trellis for shade over the seating node is a great addition, ensure, through design development, that furniture is can fit underneath.
- Consider removing the abrupt paving transition at the front lobby area between the curving plaza space and the area under the balcony above. Further consider a more uniform treatment from the plaza to lobby doors.
- Consider rearranging the intermediate planters or, ideally resize them on the front patios of the west side of the building to make them more functional.
- Consider enlarging some of the unit patios along the west side as they appear to be constrained by planters that could be reduced without affecting soil volumes for trees in lower planters.
- The retaining walls along the building perimeter appear to be well articulated and planters well designed for soil depths.
- Given how shady the courtyard amenity appears to be, consider providing more variety of programming, possibly reduce the amount of urban gardening or change plot sizes.

## CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

## Sustainability

- Consider consolidating all the bicycle storage onto P1 and provide easier access to the outdoors, such as a dedicated elevator for bicycles.
- Consider bike amenities, including good wayfinding for bicyclists, and automatic door operators to ease entry and exit.
- Carefully consider how bicyclists interact with pedestrians and drivers both on the ground plane and within buildings.
- Consider energy modelling to inform the design process and consider using future climate files for thermal comfort modelling to test resiliency and ensure livability in the future.

## Accessibility

- Consider additional design development of the building entry so it can be wrapped around the corner.

**RESUBMISSIONS****3. 5:25 p.m.**

File No.:	7918-0092-00
New or Resubmit:	Resubmit
Last Submission Date:	October 18, 2018
Description:	NCP amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit for a 5-storey, 57-unit apartment building with 2 levels of underground parking and a 6th storey amenity area.
Address:	18503 and 18523 Fraser Highway
Developer:	Lion Estate Construction Ltd.
Architect:	Jessie Arora, Architect AIBC, DF Architecture
Landscape Architect:	Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture
Planner:	Leita Martin
Urban Design Planner:	Nathan Chow

The Urban Design Planner advised that the project is a returning item due to significant changes in the site's buildable area, and the resulting building design. He advised that staff generally support the project's use, form and density.

The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, overall landscape concept, and public realm interfaces. Comment was also requested on the interfaces to the Park trail that runs along the site's south and east, and the proposed SkyTrain on Fraser Highway.



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

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. Heeney  
Seconded by J. Packer  
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)

SUPPORT of the project and recommends that the applicant address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department and recommend that the landscaping submission return to staff for further development.

#### Carried

The Panel supported the project in general in terms of overall site, orientation, unit planning, and parking. In addition, the Panel also found the rear patios provide comfortable space to residents and the roof top amenity to be a great addition. However, the Panel recommends further design development in colour and material palette. They also expressed concerns related to CPTED issues for unit patios on the south side of the pathway.

#### Key Points

- Consider simplifying colours, window patterns and material palette and softening the colours.
- Further consider material compositions and verticality and horizontality around the building.
- Reconsider material of stair element on front (east) elevation.
- Consider using future climate files to inform design, for building resiliency.
- Reconsider programming on the roof deck.
- Carefully consider south path as currently it seems isolated and a possible CPTED concern.

#### Site

- Reconsider the location of the entry lobby and vestibule of the building.
- Reconsider the location of unit #101 Type A at the side of the entry. It is surrounded by the gas meter on the east side.
- Consider the possibility for connected indoor and outdoor amenity spaces for more useability of both.
- Carefully consider how bicyclists interact with pedestrians and drivers both on the ground plane and within buildings.
- Consider opportunities to emulate the P2 bike access on P1 if possible.

### Form and Character

- Consider softening the part of building mass facing the entry plaza to benefit the form of the building.
- Reconsider the location of the stairwell as it is not a space to be highlighted in the overall mass of the building and crowds the entrance.
- Reconsider the design development of the stair material and windows as they do not match with the rest of the building to make it less congruous.
- Consider adding glazing to stairwells on the ground floor to encourage their use.
- Consider similar window treatment at front (east) elevation next to entry for Levels 1-4.
- Consider lining up the windows as the window sizes do not match.
- The coloured window frames are a key element of the attractive exterior elevations. However, these are sometimes dropped later due to cost issues, and this would drastically change the look of the building. It is important that the City obtain some form of firm commitment that they will be retained. Otherwise, the applicant should provide alternative elevations to the ADP, so the actual design can be assessed.
- Reconsider the colour palette of the building as it is not easy to relate the bluish/grayish colour of the features to the rest. It also does not create a strong contrast. The expression is confused at the front façade, main entrance.

### Landscape

- Consider a more rectilinear paving approach for the entry plaza.
- Consider providing planted separation between paved entry area and unit windows to the south.
- Consider enlarging patios where possible as there are a few units around the project where the patios are a bit constrained.
- Consider making some of the small lawn areas paving or planting areas.
- Consider extending the small patio of unit 109 to the west. Also consider defining their yard to acknowledge ownership of the small patch of lawn.
- Reconsider programming organization for the design development of the roof top amenity.

### CPTED

- Consider adjusting patios of units on south side to extend the pathway connection to the MUP and the large area of planting along the south edge to provide some overlook or consider corridor connection to the south to use this space as exterior amenity.

Sustainability

- Consider an acoustic treatment in place to mitigate the future Skytrain noise. This may include providing air conditioning to allow windows to stay closed in the summer.
- Consider energy modelling to inform design process and consider using future climate files for thermal comfort modelling to test resiliency and ensure livability in future.
- Consider high quality bike amenities including good wayfinding for bicyclists, automatic door operators to ease entry and exit, ample room for cargo bikes and trailers, and electric bike charging.
- Consider how to encourage waste management with three stream systems in suites, central recycling rooms that are well lit, include sorting tables, and pictograms to address language barriers.

Accessibility

- No specific issues were identified.

**C. OTHER BUSINESS**

This section had no items to consider.

**D. NEXT MEETING**

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, January 12, 2023.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

---

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

---

E. Kearns, Chairperson