

Present:**Panel Members:**

E. Kearns, Chair
J. Azizi
N. Couttie
R. Amies
S. Macrae
Y. Popovska
R. Salcido
M. Mitchell
K. Deol

Guests:

Tom Gill, Tangerine Developments
David Eaton, David Eaton Architect Inc.
Dylan Chernoff, Durante Kreuk Ltd.
Maciej Dembek, Barnett Dembek Architects Inc. |
Group 161
Andrew Danielson, Van Der Zalm + Associates

Staff Present:

A. McLean, City Architect
N. Chow, Urban Design Planner
S. Maleknia, Urban Design Planner
S. Gill, Recording Secretary

A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was

Moved by N. Couttie

Seconded by E. Kearns

That the minutes of the Advisory Design

Panel meeting of December 15, 2022 be received.

Carried

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

File No.: 7922-0223-00

New or Resubmit: New

Last Submission Date: N/A

Description: Rezoning from RF to CD (based on RM-70), consolidation of four lots into one lot and DP for a 6-storey apartment building consisting of 152 dwelling units with underground parking.

Address: 14518, 14528, 14538, and 14548 – 104A Avenue

Developer: Tom Gill, Tangerine Developments

Architect: David Eaton, David Eaton Architect Inc.

Landscape Architect: Dylan Chernoff, Durante Kreuk Ltd.

Planner: Misty Jorgensen

Urban Design Planner: Nathan Chow

The Urban Design Planner described the emerging area policy and site context, noting the curved road alignment which generated a request for a reduced setback at the west property line. He 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 K. Deol

Seconded by N. Couttie

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 with J. Azizi, S. Macrae, R. Amies,
M. Mitchell opposed.

The Panel supported the project in general the building is generally well oriented, and it responds to the context well.

Key Points

- Consider simplifying facades & building planes to strengthen the architectural character.
- Recommend increasing the townhouse feel of the lower two floors to create a hierarchy of massing.
- Consider further design strategies to create a more identifiable entry.
- Carefully consider a wider courtyard space for more privacy and livability between units.
- Within this courtyard, consider incorporating circulation into programmed space.

Site

- Site planning is restricted with the large road dedication which has a knock-on effect to the courtyard and restricted by the setbacks from the new northwest corner property lines. These converge on the space available for the courtyard and reduce the light and livability.
- The courtyard is quite narrow and the units on two wings are quite close to each other. The same issue typically exists at the corners where the windows of adjacent units are too close to each other, and their privacy is impacted.

- The indoor and outdoor amenities are well oriented on level 1. Their area proportion seems reasonable.
- Consider the entry access to parkade; road must be completed. Reconsider the parallel parking on P1 as it seems to have operational issues, especially the one labeled as V13.

Form and Character

- Consider increasing the townhouse massing at the lower two levels. Consider improving the building entry experience.
- Consider increasing the size and utility of the entry lobby.
- Consider simplifying the façades; there seem to be a lot of different materials, colours, and depths of bump outs and now the balconies as shown in the images read most prominent. Consider pairing down the materials and looking at the depth of the balconies in relation to the two lower floors will help create a hierarchy in the massing.
- Consider that the massing is not helped by large “tabletop” roof terraces at the 5th level on the north Elevation (104A Ave) & to a lesser extend on the east. The east is more successful, but consider, per the precedents, a parapet or real setback rather than extended decks. The Architects drawings A-0.10 suggest the reason was to “minimize appearance” but these monolithic extended decks do the exact opposite in the current proposal.
- The elevations are nicely balanced with materials and colours. It may be a little busy at the upper levels but if the extended decks are reconsidered, it might look even more elegant.
- Consider having a complimentary combination of colours with the brick and upper-level materials.
- 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.

Landscape

- Recommend looking at the public plaza and underground parking elevation to increase soil depth from 0.8 m to 1 m.
- Consider reviewing the maximum height of retaining walls on street frontages to confirm heights are under 1 m.
- Cross Section 1 and 4 – drawing L101; shows retaining wall between patio planting and street front planting. Recommend reviewing requirements for walls; deletion of wall will allow better availability of soil for yard trees.
- Cross Section C-C on drawing A-4.1, on 104A Ave, shows very shallow planting areas with trees. Recommend confirming that all trees on slab have a minimum of 1 m depth soil and 10 m³ per tree. Mounds showing for trees on sheet L202 do not seem to allow for required soil depths.
- Recommend reviewing east side of building to provide trees for yards on

- east side either on top of storm water detention tank or at edge if possible.
- Amenity area circulation has reduced amount of usable space in both rooftop and courtyard. Circulation disconnects children's play area to interior and steppingstone area does not provide a lot of programming. Recommend reviewing layout to incorporate the circulation into usable space more. Suggest reviewing the layout of the courtyard amenity area to connect the exterior kids play amenity to interior and not confirming to a rigid separated pathway layout.
- Reconsider having a BBQ or kitchen area. The rooftop has lots of seating.
- The project meets 100% of the indoor amenity space requirements and 129% of the outdoor requirements (good), however 55% of the required outdoor space is at grade. Consequently, the rooftop outdoor space needs to be exceptional. Consider increasing the programming and quality of this space. Some covered outdoor space is provided (good).
- Reconsider the fire path design as it is very linear, tunnel like and does not provide privacy to units and is not gated. Recommend reviewing path to provide privacy for units adjacent to path. Review the requirements for centre of path and providing an ability to add planting at the amenity courtyard to reduce the tunnel effect.
- Review the access to the PMT. It does not appear to have vehicular access;
- Recommend reviewing proposed trees list to add conifers for multi season green.

CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider energy modeling to 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.
- Stormwater management strategy identifies that proposed onsite landscape planters will absorb water; recommend directing some surface water to planters to allow some infiltration.
- Consider reduction of hardscape in/around the courtyard for more softscape/permeable surfaces.

Accessibility

- Recommend providing adaptable units in the development.
- Recommend providing double-door accessibility for the kids play area.
- Consider installing benches/furniture for resting in the main entrance lobby area.
- Consider having wider stalls/accessible parking near the west elevator (which is located closer to the entrance lobby).

K. Deol left the meeting at 5:30pm.**2. 5:45 p.m.**

File No.:	7919-0177-00
New or Resubmit:	New
Last Submission Date:	N/A
Description:	Rezoning from RM-D and RF to CD (based on RM-70) and Development Permit to allow for three residential buildings at 6-storeys in height, with a gross FAR of 2.63. A total of 319 residential units are proposed.
Address:	11049 to 11069 Ravine Road and 11054 to 11080 – 132 Street
Developer:	Quadra Holdings Ltd.
Architect:	Maciej Dembek, Barnett Dembek Architects Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Andrew Danielson, Van Der Zalm + Associates
Planner:	Ingrid Matthews
Urban Design Planner:	Sam Maleknia

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff generally support the project. However, staff have concerns about the apartment depth and scale, with deeper units. Staff had requested that the northerly apartment be recessed on the upper floors or reduced to 5-storeys to allow for more light into the courtyard to the north site.

The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, pedestrian and vehicular movement, architectural expression (massing and overall design language), 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 M. Mitchell
	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.	
	<u>Carried</u>

Key Points

- Consider a more centralized Indoor Amenity to the courtyard, and/or an Indoor Amenity for each building so residents can access within their individual building.
- Consider more covered outdoor space that in addition to being very useful in our climate, can help offset the deficiency in Indoor Amenity space.
- Consider stepping back “wings” of Building 3 to reduce overlook to the existing building to the north..
- Consider some additional relief, corner windows and/or opening up between buildings at entries to courtyard.
- Consider landscape elements to increase privacy from units to street frontages.
- Roof form at vaulted areas seems foreign; consider a form that better complements the building’s architecture.
- Consider a more robust base material.
- Consider more identifiable entries w/both landscape and architectural elements. The entry lobbies could be more generous and add to the value of the buildings.

Site

- Site planning is generally good, with generous space between the buildings and lots of soft landscaping to reduce noise and echoing. Single parking access is acceptable given the likely amount of traffic.
- Consider the outdoor amenity at grade as it will be in shadow most of the year. Reconsider the upper floor stepping back strategy to provide some additional natural light into the courtyard and potential for a sunny outdoor amenity at upper levels.
- Consider stepping back Building 3, especially at the north-east (unit D8) to reduce overlook to the existing building to the north.
-
- Consider the maximum height of retaining walls on street frontage to create a pleasant public realm.
- 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 relocating the phase line to increase the amount of outdoor amenity space in Phase 1.

Form and Character

- Overall buildings form and configuration seem to be reasonable, and the buildings generally work well together. Reconsider building articulation, especially at the interface of the exterior walls and roofs, as they are not well connected. Their forms are not responsive to each other well. The roof appears as an after thought element. A sloped roof cannot easily fit on complicated building mass, and it requires a lot of work and details to make it practical and visually attractive.
- Consider simplifying the design development of the vaulted roof elements to make the double height / vaults more symmetrical, with posts at the centre and this would help with the steep form that looks incongruous with the overall low slope roof form.
- Consider adding glazing at the vaulted spaces to also add life up there from the street.
- Make sure downspouts from the vaulted roof elements are carefully located on the elevations.
- Consider an additional or complementary colour scheme to help differentiate the buildings and provide more variety & visual interest to the development.
- Review the buildings at entries to courtyard as they are tight; although there is a good approach of limiting the overlook between units in this location, as a pedestrian these interstitial spaces could use some softening/relief.
- Consider the robust base with brick more prominent from the Hardie panels above or create a reveal between the two materials at the transition between the base and the floors above.
- 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 defining the lines between green and white claddings.
- The indoor amenity in Building 2 (west) does not have a good relation or connection to the central outdoor amenity. Recommend relocating this amenity to Building 1 (east) on the opposite side of the current amenity.
- Consider an indoor amenity space for Building 3 (north) which currently doesn't have one, so residents don't have to go outside to access the amenity spaces in Buildings 1 and 2.
- Consider having more individual smaller amenity rooms situated off the entrance lobby, so that people have less far to go, and it would allow for more local neighborly interaction.
- The project meets 80% of the indoor amenity space requirements and 173% of the outdoor requirements (good), and all the required and excess outdoor space is at grade (very good).

Landscape

- Reconsider unit yards on all street frontages for locations of retaining walls, to allow for trees per unit with adequate soil volume. Majority of yards for street frontages have no trees and very little privacy between units or to street. Review of sections show that there is an ability to have trees on grade in yards.
- Recommend ensuring enough sunlight for community garden areas to be functional. A minimum of 6 hrs sunlight is needed in growing seasons.
- Consider the locations where small strips of sod lawn are shown in unit yards. Narrow strips aren't easily maintained and are not a high traffic material. Recommend review areas where small strips of sod are to alternative material. Some sod strips appear to be under overhang of roof and behind hedges with poor access to sunlight. Building 3 shows narrow strip of sod to fence then granular path with steppingstones, continue the steppingstones to the patio.
- Sheet L04D section 2 shows narrow strip of sod on a slope with a planting area that appears to be less than 300mm width. Recommend increasing planting bed and soil depth to allow for adequate separation and privacy of private patios at playground.
- Consider artificial turf or alternative material in dog run area. Recommend providing doggy poop bags in dog run. Consider adding tree buffer planting at the dog run to separate from neighbouring property.
- Reconsider providing soil volume sheet for calculating appropriate soil per tree.
- Interface with neighbour's courtyard seems to have a lot of overlook, and the trees are provided primarily deciduous.
- Reconsider the amenity areas; the interior amenity does not relate to the programming space (would be useful to have the room programming labelled in landscape plans). If there is a gym area, or other kitchen area, recommend programming exterior space to relate to this. Building 2 (west) amenity appears to be quite isolated from the central courtyard amenity.
- Consider high efficiency irrigation system to ensure areas on slab in common areas are watered.
- All lobby entries don't appear to be prominent from streets; recommend some landscape intervention greater than decorative paving to provide recognition to lobby.
- Recommend providing decorative material for the concrete pad at the underground ramp to separate it from the ramp and provide a letdown at the boulevard.

CPTED

- Concrete pathway on north property line connects to all north units with walkways and to street frontages, recommend gating this and making less prominent if this is to be used for maintenance only.

Sustainability

- Recommend providing robust stormwater management on site.
- Consider energy modeling to 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 integrating rain garden/biofiltration as first flush for storm water and beautification as biophilic design elements.
- Consider inclusion of renewable energy on roof surfaces.

Accessibility

- Recommend adding bench / seating areas to very long ramp structures into courtyards.
- Building 3 (north) lobby entry pedestrian flow is impeded by bike racks and layout does not match Building 1 (east) entry with bench.
- Consider adaptable or accessible units to create a more inclusive development.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

This section had no items to consider.

D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, February 23, 2023.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

E. Kearns, Chairperson