

City of Surrey PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT REPORT Application No.: 7917-0507-00 Planning Report Date: November 9, 2020

## PROPOSAL:

- Rezoning from RA, CD (Bylaw No. 11223) and CD (Bylaw No. 16724) to CD
- Development Permit
to permit the development of three four-storey apartment buildings containing 261 units.

LOCATION: 13778-76 Avenue 13777-75A Avenue 1376o-75A Avenue

ZONING: RA and CD

OCP DESIGNATION: Multiple Residential
NCP DESIGNATION: High-Density Residential

| RM=15 |  | F- 76 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C-8 |  | RA |  |
|  |  | RM-15 |  |
|  |  | RM-30 |  |
|  |  | $\underset{\text { B/L } 15703}{C D}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CD } \\ \text { B/L } 16724 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | RM-45 |  |
|  | CD |  |  |

## RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

- By-law Introduction and set date for Public Hearing for rezoning
- Approval to draft Development Permit for Form and Character.


## DEVIATION FROM PLANS, POLICIES OR REGULATIONS

- The following deviations from typical Zoning By-law requirements will be addressed through the proposed Comprehensive Development (CD) Zone:
- Proposing to reduce the parking requirements of the Zoning By-law from 423 to 384 parking spaces.
- Proposing to reduce the required setbacks for underground parking.
- Proposing to eliminate the balcony requirement for corner units.


## RATIONALE OF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal complies with the Multiple Residential designation in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the High-Rise Residential designation in the Newton Town Centre Plan (1990).
- The proposed density and building form are appropriate for this part of Newton.
- The proposal complies with the Development Permit requirements in the OCP for Form and Character.
- The proposed building achieves an attractive architectural built form, which utilizes high quality, natural materials, and contemporary lines. The street interface has been designed to a high quality to achieve a positive urban experience between the proposed building and the public realm.
- The proposed 261 units will facilitate densification in the Newton Town Centre and are in close proximity to transit and amenities. On this basis, the proposed parking reduction is supportable.
- Setback relaxations for underground parking allow for an efficient layout of the parking facility.
- Proposed solariums with retractable glass panels provide a functional alternative to balconies on some corner units.


## RECOMMENDATION

The Planning \& Development Department recommends that:

1. A By-law be introduced to rezone the subject site from "One-Acre Residential Zone (RA)", "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD) No. 11223," and "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD) No. 16724 " to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" and a date be set for Public Hearing.
2. Council authorize staff to draft Development Permit No. 7917-0507-oo generally in accordance with the attached drawings (Appendix I).
3. Council instruct staff to resolve the following issues prior to final adoption:
(a) ensure that all engineering requirements and issues including restrictive covenants, dedications, and rights-of-way where necessary, are addressed to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Engineering;
(b) resolution of all urban design issues to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(c) submission of a finalized landscaping plan and landscaping cost estimate to the specifications and satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(d) submission of a finalized tree survey and a statement regarding tree preservation to the satisfaction of the City Landscape Architect;
(e) provision of cash-in-lieu contribution to satisfy the indoor amenity space requirement of the RM-7o Zone, at the rate in effect at the time of Final Adoption;
(f) registration of access easements to ensure access to and maintenance of the proposed shared parking and amenity facilities within the development;
(g) submission of an acoustical report for the units adjacent to 76 Avenue and 138 Street and registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to ensure implementation of any recommended noise mitigation measures;
(h) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to adequately address the City's needs with respect to public art, to the satisfaction of the General Manager Parks, Recreation and Culture;
(i) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to adequately address the City's needs with respect to the City's Affordable Housing Strategy, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Planning \& Development Department; and
(j) discharge of an existing no-build covenant BB1201238 from the property at 13777 75A Avenue.

## SITE CONTEXT \& BACKGROUND

| Direction | Existing Use | OCP/NCP <br> Designation | Existing Zone |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Subject Site | vacant | Multiple <br> Residential | RA <br> CD (Bylaws No. <br> 11223 and 16724) |
| North (Across 76 Avenue): | Townhouse <br> development | Urban | RM-15 |
| East (Across 138 Street): | Frank Hurt Park, <br> Townhouse <br> developments, <br> Four-storey <br> apartment building | Multiple <br> Residential/High <br> Rise Residential | RA, RM-15, RM- <br> 30, and CD <br> (Bylaw No. 11223) |
| South: | Four-storey <br> apartment building | Multiple <br> Residential/High <br> Rise Residential | CD (Bylaw No. <br> 16724 ) |
| West: | Kings Cross <br> shopping centre <br> and an existing <br> four-storey <br> apartment building | Commercial and <br> Multiple <br> Residential/High <br> Rise Residential | C-8 and CD <br> (Bylaw No. 11223) |

## Context \& Background

- The subject site consists of three properties located south of 76 Avenue and immediately east of the Kings Cross shopping centre, at the north end of the Newton Town Centre.
- The three properties together total 1.4 hectares and are all designated Multiple Residential in the Official Community Plan (OCP). The site is within the Newton Town Centre plan area but outside of the area that recently underwent a plan update. The Newton Town Centre Plan Update was approved in July 2020 and extends only as far north as 72 Avenue.
- The subject site is within the older portion of the Newton Town Centre Plan that was approved in 1990. Under that plan, these properties are designated "High-Rise Residential." The 1990 Newton Town Center Plan, however, does not reflect current land-use expectations and is not compatible with the Official Community Plan for this area. It is anticipated that the plan area north of 72 Avenue will be updated in the future to bring the plan in line with the 2014 Official Community Plan (OCP).
- Both the Plan Update Area south of 72 Avenue and the older Newton Town Centre Plan area are identified in the Official Community plan as an Urban Centre for the purpose of concentrating higher density development near transit and amenities.
- The proposed development is compatible with the Official Community Plan and with existing four-storey buildings on surrounding lots.
- The three properties are currently zoned as follows:
- 13778-76 Avenue (northern lot): Comprehensive Development Zone (CD) (Bylaw No. 11223);
- 13777-75A Avenue (middle lot): Comprehensive Development Zone (CD) (Bylaw No. 11223) and One-Acre Residential Zone RA;
- 13760 - 75A Avenue (southern lot): Comprehensive Development Zone (CD) (Bylaw No. 16724).
- These are the last three undeveloped properties in this block between 74 and 76 Avenues, where a number of low-rise apartment buildings have been constructed over the past several decades. The most recent of these neighbouring buildings was approved in 2009 under Development Application No. 7909-0142-00.
- The applicant does not propose to consolidate the properties: each building will be constructed on a separate lot.


## DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

## Planning Considerations

- The applicant is proposing to rezone the three properties to a new Comprehensive Development (CD) Zone and construct three separate four-storey residential apartment buildings with a total of 261 units.
- The buildings are referred to by the applicant as Mirra 2 (southern-most lot, at 13760 75A Avenue), Mirra 3 (centre lot, at 13777 - 75A Avenue), and Mirra 4 (northern-most lot, at 13778-76 Avenue). The Mirra 1 building was built approximately ten years ago (Development Application No. 7909-0142-00, at 13740-75A Avenue), immediately to the south of the southern-most subject property.

|  | Proposed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Area |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Site Area: <br> Road Dedication: <br> Undevelopable <br> Area: <br> Net Site Area: | 1.4 hectares <br> No road dedication required $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ <br> 1.4 hectares |  |  |  |
| Number of Lots: | 3 existing (no consolidation proposed) |  |  |  |
|  | Mirra 2 | Mirra 3 | Mirra 4 | Average/Total |
| Building Height: | 4 storeys | 4 storeys | 4 storeys | 4 storeys |
| Unit Density: | 174 uph | 217 uph | 168 uph | 186 uph |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR): | 1.38 | 1.72 | 1.37 | 1.50 |
| Floor Area |  |  |  |  |
| Residential: Commercial: Total: | $\begin{aligned} & 6,524 \text { sq.m. } \\ & \text { o } \\ & 6,524 \text { sq.m. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6,273 \text { sq.m. } \\ & o \\ & 6,273 \text { sq.m. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8,164 \text { sq.m. } \\ & \text { o } \\ & 8,164 \text { sq.m. } \end{aligned}$ | 20,961 <br> 20,961 |
| Residential Units: |  |  |  |  |


|  | Proposed |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Studio: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1-Bedroom: | 35 | 28 | 51 | 104 |
| 2-Bedroom: | 47 | 51 | 157 |  |
| 3-Bedroom: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total: | 82 | 79 | 100 | 261 |

## Referrals

## Engineering:

School District:

Parks, Recreation \& Culture:

Surrey Fire Department: The Fire Department has no objection to the proposal.

Advisory Design Panel: The proposal was considered at the ADP meeting on July 9, 2020 and was supported. The applicant has resolved all of the outstanding items from the ADP review as outlined in the Development Permit section of this report.

## Transportation Considerations

- The proposed development is located approximately 250 metres from King George Boulevard, which is part of the Frequent Transit Network (FTN) in this area. Transit is also available on adjacent 76 Avenue and 138 Street and the Newton bus exchange is less than one kilometre's walking distance from the subject site.
- Pedestrian access to the main lobby of Mirra 4 (13778-76 Avenue) will be from 76 Avenue. The main pedestrian entrances for Mirra 3 ( 13777 - 75A Avenue) and Mirra 2 ( 13760 75A Avenue) will be from 75A Avenue.
- Both 76 Avenue and 138 Street are arterial roads so direct vehicle access is not permitted. The Mirra 3 and Mirra 4 buildings share an internal private lane access from 75A Avenue. The private lane terminates in an "auto court" that allows a vehicle turn-around, visitor pick-up and drop-off, and delivery access for both buildings.
- Shared ramp access to the Mirra 3 and Mirra 4 underground parking areas is directly from the auto-court. Easements will be required to secure sharing of the private lane, auto-court, and parking ramp in perpetuity.
- The Mirra 2 building ( $13760-75$ A Avenue) will share the existing vehicle access that is already in place for Mirra 1 to the south. As part of the earlier development, an easement was registered that will allow the Mirra 2 residents to share the parking ramp on the Mirra 1 property. Access to this ramp is already established via an easement that runs north/south over the west side of the Mirra 2 property.
- In the northwest corner of 13778-76 Avenue there is an existing private lane that provides access to the Earl's Court building, a four-storey residential building that was constructed in the 1990's. Half of the lane is on the subject property, but the applicant does not intend to use this lane for access to the proposed development.
- In this corner of the property there is also an access easement for the Earl's Court parking ramp, which is located on the subject site. Appropriate building setbacks to the parking ramp are provided.


## Sustainability Considerations

- The applicant has met all of the typical sustainable development criteria, as indicated in the Sustainable Development Checklist. No additional sustainability considerations are proposed.


## POLICY \& BY-LAW CONSIDERATIONS

## Regional Growth Strategy

- The properties lie within the "General Urban" designation in Metro Vancouver's Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) and are compatible with that designation.


## Official Community Plan

## Land Use Designation

- The site is within the "Multiple Residential" designation in the City's Official Community Plan (OCP) and is compatible with that designation. In most parts of the City, the Multiple Residential designation allows a maximum density of 1.5 FAR but the maximum density in this context is 2.0 FAR because the properties are within an Urban Centre area as denoted in the OCP, where higher densities are desirable because of access to transit and services.
- The proposed densities for the three subject properties range from 1.37 to 1.72 FAR.


## Themes/Policies

- Theme A: Growth Management, including policies for Growth Priorities (A1.1, A1.2, A1.3, and A1.5a), and Accommodating Higher Density (A2.1, A2.6, and A2.6a). These policies encourage development in existing urban areas such as town centres and along transit corridors, in compliance with the Official Community Plan land-use designations and Metro Vancouver's Regional Growth Strategy. Development is encouraged at densities sufficient to support transit.
- The three proposed four-storey buildings, with 261 units in total, are appropriate in terms of density and form for this location in the King George Boulevard corridor near the Newton Town Centre.
- Theme B: Centres, Corridors, and Neighbourhoods, including policies for Distinctive Town Centres (B2.1), Land Uses (B2.4), Transportation (B2.12, and B2.14), Transit Corridors (B3.1, B3.5, B3.7, B3.8, and B3.9), Healthy Neighbourhoods (B4.2, B4.6, B4.7, and B4.31), and Urban Design (B6.4 and B6.6).
- The proposed development is designed with an active street interface that will encourage pedestrian access to transit stops on King George Boulevard, 76 Avenue, 138 Street, and 72 Avenue, as well as Frank Hurt Park and local amenities within the Newton Town Centre.


## CD By-law

- The applicant is proposing a "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" to accommodate the three four-storey residential buildings. The proposed CD By-law for the proposed development site identifies the uses, densities and setbacks proposed. The CD By-law will have provisions based on the "Multiple Residential 7o Zone (RM-70)".
- A comparison of the density, lot coverage, setbacks, building height and permitted uses in the RM-7o Zone and the proposed CD By-law is illustrated in the following table:

| Zoning | RM-7o Zone <br> (Part 24) | Proposed CD Zone |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Density: | n/a | n/a |
| Floor Area Ratio: | Maximum 1.50 FAR | Maximum 1.8 FAR |
| Lot Coverage: | $33 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| Yards and Setbacks | Minimum $7 \cdot 5$ metres from <br> all lot lines for buildings. | Minimum 4.5 metres for street- <br> fronting setbacks, with some <br> encroachments for roof overhangs. <br> Setbacks reduced to up to 2.2 <br> metres at certain points on <br> interior lot lines. |
| Principal Building <br> Height: | 16 metres |  |
| Permitted Uses: | -Multiple-unit residential <br> buildings and ground- <br> oriented multiple-unit <br> residential buildings <br> -Child care centres | No change proposed |



- The RM-70 Zone allows a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1.50, which is consistent in most parts of the City with the maximum density permitted under the Multiple Residential designation in the Official Community Plan (OCP). In urban centres, however, the OCP allows up to 2.0 FAR under the Multiple Residential designation. The applicant proposes densities of $1.38,1.72$, and 1.37 FAR on the three separate properties, with an average density of 1.50. The CD Zone will allow the higher density at $13777-75 \mathrm{~A}$ to be accommodated.
- While the RM-7o Zone restricts lot coverage to 33\%, the CD Bylaw will allow a maximum of $44 \%$ coverage. Lower lot coverage is associated with the tower form of development that was originally envisioned with the RM-7o Zone. The greater lot coverage is reflective of a more modern and pedestrian-friendly building form and reflects the fact that all parking is located underground.
- The CD Bylaw will allow for setbacks that are generally less than those permitted in the RM-70 Zone, reflecting an urban style of development. Setbacks along street frontages will be a minimum of 4.5 metres, with encroachments permitted for roof overhangs. Setback measurements are less in some locations on interior lot lines between the proposed Mirra 3 and Mirra 4 buildings.
- The Zoning Bylaw requires that underground parking structures be set back a minimum of 2.0 metres from any lot frontage or flanking street. The applicant proposes to reduce the setback at a few locations, to a minimum of 0.15 metres, in order to facilitate an efficient layout for the underground parking. The parking will be fully underground and will not protrude into the public realm, so the reduced setback is supportable.
- The maximum building height in the RM-70 Zone is 50 metres. The proposed four-storey buildings are proposed to be less than 16 metres at the tallest point, which will be reflected in the CD Bylaw.
- The City's Zoning Bylaw requires that indoor and outdoor amenity spaces be provided at 3.0 square metres each per dwelling unit. For this proposal, a total of 783 square metres is required for each. The applicant proposes a total of 914 square metres of indoor amenity and 2,076 square metres of outdoor amenity total over the three lots. The breakdown for each individual lot is as follows:

| Building | INDOOR AMENITY |  | OUTDOOR AMENITY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Required | Proposed | Required | Proposed |
| Mirra 2 (13760-75A Ave) | 246 sq.m. | 271 sq.m. | 246 sq.m. | 1,095 sq.m. |
| Mirra 3 (13777-75A Ave) | 237 sq.m. | 214 sq.m. | 237 sq.m. | 308 sq.m. |
| Mirra 4 (13778-76 Ave) | 300 sq.m. | 429 sq.m. | 300 sq.m. | 673 sq.m. |
| TOTAL | 783 sq.m. | 914 sq.m. | 783 sq.m. | 2,076 sq.m. |

- Outdoor amenity requirements are exceeded for each building. Indoor amenity requirements are exceeded for Mirra 2 and Mirra 4, but cash-in-lieu in the amount of $\$ 12,000$ will be required to offset the deficiency of 23 square metres in indoor amenity space for Mirra 3.
- In the RM-7o Zone, balconies are required for all dwelling units above the ground floor, and the Zoning Bylaw requires that all balconies be unenclosed. For corner units on the second, third, and fourth floors in all three buildings, the applicant proposes to install retractable glass panels above the balcony railings, allowing the balconies to be enclosed when the panels are closed. This system improves livability by giving residents the flexibility to use their outdoor spaces for a greater part of the year. With the retractable panels, the spaces are not, however, considered to be balconies according to the Zoning Bylaw definition. The balconies must also be considered floor area for the purpose of calculating density. Staff support the use of this system and the consideration of these spaces as functional alternatives to typical balconies.
- The applicant proposes a parking reduction on the basis that the development site is in the Newton Town Centre and close to transit and amenities. Transportation Engineering staff support the proposed relaxation of parking requirements for residential parking spaces only. Visitor parking will be provided in excess of the standard rate of o.2 spaces per unit for all buildings. Residential parking will be provided at a rate of 1.2 stalls per unit for all buildings.
- A comparison of Zoning Bylaw parking requirements and proposed parking is provided in the table below:

| BUILDING | ZONING BYLAW PARKING REQUIREMENT | PROPOSED PARKING SPACES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mirra 2 (13760-75A Ave) | Resident: 116 <br> Visitor: 16 | Resident: 98 <br> Visitor: 20 |
| Mirra 3 (13777-75A Ave) | Resident: 113 Visitor: 16 | Resident: 98 <br> Visitor: 19 |
| Mirra 4 (13778-76 Ave) | Resident: 142 <br> Visitor: 20 | Resident: 125 <br> Visitor: 24 |

## Capital Projects Community Amenity Contributions (CACs)

- On December 16, 2019, Council approved the City's Community Amenity Contribution and Density Bonus Program Update (Corporate Report No. R224; 2019). The intent of that report was to introduce a new City-wide Community Amenity Contribution (CAC) and updated Density Bonus Policy to offset the impacts of growth from development and to provide additional funding for community capital projects identified in the City's Annual Five-Year Capital Financial Plan.
- The proposed development will be subject to the Tier 1 Capital Plan Project CAC's. The contribution rates will be introduced based on a three-phase schedule, with rates increasing as of January 1, 2021. The contribution will be payable at the time of and rate applicable prior to the issuance of the Building Permit.


## Affordable Housing Strategy

- On April 9, 2018, Council approved the City's Affordable Housing Strategy (Corporate Report No. Ro66; 2018) requiring that all new rezoning applications for residential development contribute $\$ 1$, ooo per unit to support the development of new affordable housing. The funds collected through the Affordable Housing Contribution will be used to purchase land for new affordable rental housing projects.
- The subject application was in-stream on April 10, 2018, meaning that the contribution would not apply. However, because the scope of the application changed significantly after this date and more density was consequently proposed, the applicant has agreed to pay the affordable housing contribution of $\$ 1,000$ per unit for all 261 proposed units. The applicant will register a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to address the payment of this contribution.


## Public Art Policy

- The applicant will be required to provide public art, or register a Restrictive Covenant agreeing to provide cash-in-lieu, at a rate of $0.5 \%$ of construction value, to adequately address the City's needs with respect to public art, in accordance with the City's Public Art Policy requirements. The applicant will be required to resolve this requirement prior to consideration of Final Adoption.


## PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

- Pre-notification letters were sent on January 29, 2020, and the Development Proposal Signs were installed on March 6, 2020. Staff received five responses from neighbouring residents (staff comments in italics):
- Some nearby residents are concerned that parking for visitors is already difficult to find in this area and that adding additional residents could exacerbate this problem.
(Although the applicant proposes a reduction in the number of resident parking spaces, visitor parking for all three buildings will be provided in excess of the required 0.2 stalls per dwelling unit. On this basis, visitors to the new buildings would not be expected to place additional pressure on visitor parking facilities for existing buildings.)
- Comments were submitted about the potential loss of privacy and sunlight to residents of neighbouring buildings.
(Shadow studies submitted by the applicant show that the only existing building expected to experience any loss of sunlight is the Earl's Court building to the west of the proposed Mirra 3 building, and this would only be for a short period of the year. There is sufficient distance between existing and proposed buildings and the proposed buildings are oriented in such a way that potential shadows and overlook are minimized.)
- Two neighbours indicated that they would prefer to see townhouses constructed here rather than low-rise residential buildings.
(Higher density development is encouraged in Town Centre areas. The proposed 1.5 average Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of this development is less than the maximum density of 2.o FAR permitted in the Official Community Plan. Staff feel that the fourstorey building form is appropriate because it is compatible with neighbouring residential developments and provides a density that is appropriate for the Newton Town Centre.)
- One neighbour expressed concern about the wildlife habitat that will be lost to development if the application is approved.
(The three subject properties are currently vacant and have been fenced and unused for a number of years. An environmental report that was submitted in support of the application suggests that the properties were cleared of vegetation and re-graded in 2008 with additional clearing and soil disturbance since then. The report also identifies invasive species of vegetation such as Himalayan blackberry and Scotch broom. The arborist report identifies 25 trees, the majority of which are in declining health or dead. These properties are not included in the City's Green Infrastructure network.

While some urban animals and insects may currently use the site as habitat, other lands in the City have been identified for preservation through the Green Infrastructure Network due to their higher habitat values. Frank Hurt Park is located across 138 Street from the subject site and would provide more suitable habitat. These three properties are desirable for development due to their urban setting and are designated as such in the OCP and Town Centre Plan.)

## DEVELOPMENT PERMITS

## Form and Character Development Permit Requirement

- The proposed development is subject to a Development Permit for Form and Character.
- The proposed development generally complies with the Form and Character Development Permit guidelines in the OCP.
- The site is prominently located on the curve where 76 Avenue transitions to 138 Street. The buildings are designed with attractive and pedestrian-oriented street interfaces. Ground-level units have individual accesses directly to the public sidewalks on all street frontages. Main building lobbies are oriented towards the streets rather than internally.


## Existing Easements

- The applicant has worked with staff to design these three buildings on lots that are subject to multiple existing easements resulting from earlier developments on neighbouring lands. When the adjacent properties were developed in the 1990's, an overall concept was advanced that included interior walkways between the various buildings and shared vehicle access points. Walkways were constructed on the developed lots and easements were registered to secure the walkway alignments through undeveloped lands, including the subject properties.
- An existing north/south pedestrian corridor is located on the east side of $13760-75$ A Avenue (Mirra 2) and is connected to a network of walkways farther south. Ground-level units on the east façade of Mirra 2 will have access directly to the walkway, with gates to differentiate the public and private realms. This direct access will provide a vibrant interface and comply with CPTED principles.
- Landscape planting and public realm enhancements such as benches and specialty paving will be provided within the shared pedestrian area.
- An easement for a partial future walkway was registered on the Mirra 4 property (1377876 Avenue) as part of a previous application. Through review of the current proposal, staff determined that the walkway alignment through the centre of the property was no longer desirable. The applicant is pursuing a discharge of the easement, as well as discharge of a no-build covenant that requires this walkway to be formalized and constructed.
- A small pedestrian plaza is provided at the corner of 138 Street and 75A Avenue in order to enhance the public realm along the street frontages.


## Building Design

- All three proposed buildings are four-storey wood-frame construction. The design of the proposed buildings draws upon the massing and design of the existing Mirra 1 building to the south without directly replicating the architectural character.
- Two-storey entry-porch elements for ground-level units create a strong individual identity for each unit and break up the vertical massing of the building. For street-facing facades, brick is used as an accent material around the unit entries.
- A combination of lapped cementitious siding, panels, and board and batten has been used for exterior cladding. The use of colour in a dark red and blue palette with white elements provides interest while also unifying the three proposed Mirra buildings.
- The horizontal massing of Mirra 4 (13778-76 Avenue) has been broken up by removing units on the fourth floor at the two locations where the building bends along 76 Avenue/138 Street. The intention is for this longer building to read visually as three smaller buildings with linking elements. The alternating use of colour further helps to express these as separate building masses.
- Corner units with retractable glass solarium panels have been designed as strong vertical elements to allow the glass to integrate with the building architecture when the panels are closed.
- Exit stairs have been located at building ends and elbows to avoid the most public elevations.


## Landscaping

- Landscaping of the three properties consists primarily of outdoor amenity space and the plantings in and around the private gardens of ground-floor units.
- Ground-floor units will have direct access to public sidewalks or interior walkways. The units will have small private patios and gardens. Plantings within these gardens will include trees (such as maple, snowbell, and cherry), shrubs (such as yew, mockorange, and spirea), and groundcovers (such as blue fescue and dune grass).
- Outdoor amenity spaces include a variety of programming, from paved walkways to open lawns, communal patios, planted garden areas with bench seating, and natural playground elements for children.
- Small, hardscaped corner plazas are proposed at the northwest corner of the site adjacent to the private lane, at the intersection of 75 A Avenue and 138 Street, and at the northeast corner of the Mirra 2 building. These plazas contain bench seating, specialty paving, and tree planting within private property. Some specialty paving, in the form of saw-cut concrete, is proposed on City property. Engineering has approved the use of this material in select locations.
- The auto-court between the Mirra 3 and Mirra 4 buildings is designed to be pedestrianfriendly. It will have a central island planted with feature trees and a pedestrian crossing demarcated with specialty paving.
- A row of evergreen trees will be planted along the west side of the private lane for Mirra 3 and Mirra 4. The trees will provide buffering and privacy to the residents of the existing Earl's Court building.


## Indoor Amenity

- Each building has a typical amenity room with a shared kitchen and multi-purpose space on the ground floor near the lobby. All of the multi-purpose rooms have direct outdoor access.
- Each building also contains a below-ground fitness facility, located on the Pı level for Mirra 2 and Mirra 4 and the $P_{2}$ level for Mirra 3. Light wells are provided where possible for natural illumination in these below-grade areas.
- In addition to the event room and fitness centre, Mirra 4 also includes a co-working space as part of the indoor amenity area. This room is adjacent to the lobby and will contain desks and other office amenities for residents who work from home.
- The applicant proposes to exceed the minimum indoor amenity requirement in both the Mirra 2 and Mirra 4 buildings. The Mirra 3 building has a shortfall of 23 square metres. Because the indoor amenity requirement is 3.0 square metres per unit, there is an eight-unit shortfall. Cash-in-lieu in the amount of $\$ 12,000$ will therefore be required.


## Outdoor Amenity

- Outdoor amenity space surpasses the minimum requirement for all three proposed buildings.
- The Mirra 2 outdoor amenity area consists of a large courtyard space in the southwest quadrant of the site and a walkway and plaza on the east side of the building.
- A previous easement in favour of the existing Mirra 1 strata allows residents of Mirra 1 to use the courtyard space that will be constructed as part of Mirra 2. When Mirra 1 was developed, sufficient outdoor amenity was provided on that site, but a shared use arrangement was envisioned and was formalized through an access easement at that time.
- The courtyard is designed with a large lawn area, a "modern tea house" featuring an undercover seating area, a natural play area for children, and a firepit and patio seating adjacent to the building's multi-purpose amenity room. This area is planted with trees and shrubs around the perimeter.
- The Mirra 3 outdoor amenity area consists of a linear courtyard space on the north side of the building, which forms part of a larger contiguous courtyard between the Mirra 3 and Mirra 4 buildings. There is also a smaller patio area with seating on the south side of the property, adjoining the multi-purpose amenity room and providing animation at the front of the building.
- The Mirra 4 outdoor area forms the larger part of the central courtyard between the Mirra 3 and Mirra 4 buildings. This area is programmed with a fire pit and patio seating, a covered seating area, benches, natural play areas for children, and a large lawn. It is planted throughout with trees and shrubs.


## Outstanding Items

- There are a limited number of Urban Design items that remain outstanding, and which do not affect the overall character or quality of the project. These generally include co-ordination of details between drawings, and some revision to outdoor patio stairs.
- The applicant has been provided a detailed list identifying these requirements and has agreed to resolve these prior to Final Approval of the Development Permit, should the subject application be supported by Council.


## TREES

- Stuart G. Goode, ISA Certified Arborist of Good Arboriculture Consulting prepared an Arborist Assessment for the subject property. The table below provides a summary of the tree retention and removal by tree species:

Table 1: Summary of Tree Preservation by Tree Species:

| Tree Species | Existing | Remove | Retain |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alder and Cottonwood Trees |  |  |  |
| Alder | 13 | 13 | O |
| Cottonwood | 5 | 5 | O |
| Deciduous Trees <br> (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) |  |  |  |
| Weeping Willow | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Coniferous Trees |  |  |  |
| Western Red Cedar | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Total (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| Total Replacement Trees Proposed (excluding Boulevard Street Trees) |  | 216 |  |
| Total Retained and Replacement Trees |  | 216 |  |
| Contribution to the Green City Program | 0 |  |  |

- The Arborist Assessment states that there is a total of seven mature trees on the site, excluding Alder and Cottonwood trees. Eighteen existing trees, approximately $72 \%$ of the total trees on the site, are Alder and Cottonwood trees. It was determined that no trees can be retained as part of this development proposal. The proposed tree retention was assessed taking into consideration the location of services, building footprints, parkades, road dedication and proposed lot grading.
- For those trees that cannot be retained, the applicant will be required to plant trees on a 1 to 1 replacement ratio for Alder and Cottonwood trees, and a 2 to 1 replacement ratio for all other trees. This will require a total of 32 replacement trees on the site. The applicant is proposing 216 replacement trees, exceeding City requirements.
- In addition to the replacement trees, boulevard street trees will be planted on 76 Avenue/138 Street and on 75A Avenue. This will be determined by the Engineering Department during the servicing design review process.
- The new trees on the site will consist of a variety of trees including shore pine, Serbian spruce, double weeping cherry, Japanese snowbell, Japanese maple, Chinese magnolia, and tulip trees.
- In summary, a total of 216 trees are proposed to be replaced on the site with no required contribution to the Green City Program.


## INFORMATION ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT

The following information is attached to this Report:
Appendix I. Site Plan, Building Elevations, Landscape Plans and Perspective
Appendix II. Engineering Summary
Appendix III. School District Comments
Appendix IV. Summary of Tree Survey and Tree Preservation
Appendix V. ADP Comments and Response

# approved by Shawn Low 

Jean Lamontagne
General Manager
Planning and Development
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Mirra 2 - Exterior Materials \& Colours


General materal notes:
Materal Molcators
Trichal locations.



$\qquad$ 3 $\square$ Scale. 1200





MIRRA 3: SOUTHEAST CORNER FROM EAST SIDE OF 138TH STREET
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MIRRA 2,3,4


(1) Entry plaza of different concrete texture

(2) MODERN TEA HOUSE

(3) tumbled paved patio

(4) natural kid play

(5) open lawn

(6) feature tree at vehicle entry
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## MATERIAL LEGEND

$\qquad$
$\square$
$\qquad$
CIP CONCRETE PAVING 3: GRAY, POLISHED, SAWCUT JOINT @ © O.C.

CONCRETE PAVERS 1: CHARCOAL, SANOBLASTED, $2 \times 2{ }^{\prime}$

CONCRETE PAVERS 2: NATURAL, SANBBLASTED 2XZ

## TUMBLED PaVERS: Charcoal blend

pea gravels: dark gray mix


L2.0

TO: Manager, Area Planning \& Development

- South Surrey Division

Planning and Development Department
FROM: Development Services Manager, Engineering Department

DATE: November 2, $\mathbf{2 0 2 0} \quad$ PROJECT FILE: $\quad \mathbf{7 8 1 7} \mathbf{- 0 5 0 7} \mathbf{- 0 0}$

RE: Engineering Requirements
Location: 1377876 Avenue

## REZONE/SUBDIVISION

## Property and Right-of-Way Requirements

- Dedicate 5.0 mx 5.0 m corner cut at 75 A Avenue and 138 Street.
- No additional road dedications are required on 138 Street and/or 75A Avenue.
- Register 0.5m Statutory Right of Way on 138 Street.


## Works and Services

- Confirm downstream storm system capacity; upgrade the system if required.
- Dedicate additional Statutory Right of Way to achieve minimum 5.om Width for the existing 6oomm storm sewer to meet the current Design Criteria requirements.
- Construct onsite sustainable drainage works to meet the Bear Creek Integrate Stormwater Management Plan requirements.
- Construct new 300 mm water mains on 138 Street and 75A Avenue fronting/flanking the site to support the fire flow requirement for the proposed RM7o lots. The existing watermains along 138 Street and 75A Avenue are to be retained.
- Construct 250 mm sanitary sewer on 75 A Avenue.
- Construct 7.3 m wide driveway letdown on 75A Avenue.
- Construct adequately sized storm, water, and sanitary service connection for each proposed lot.

A Servicing Agreement is required prior to Rezone/Subdivision. A processing fee of $\$ 45,822.00$ is required. The above fee is subject to change in January 2021.

## DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

There are no engineering requirements relative to issuance of the Development Permit except for the requirements listed above.


Tommy Buchmann, P.Eng.
Development Services Manager
IKı
NOTE: Detailed Land Development Engineering Review available on file

November 3, 2020

## Planning

## THE IMPACT ON SCHOOLS

APPLICATION \#: 17050700 (Updated Nov 2020)

## SUMMARY

The proposed 261 lowrise units
are estimated to have the following impact
on the following schools:

Projected \# of students for this development:

| Elementary Students: | 7 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Secondary Students: | 13 |

September 2020 Enrolment/School Capacity

|  |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Bear Creek Elementary |  |
| Enrolment (K/1-7): | $55 \mathrm{~K}+458$ |
| Operating Capacity (K/1-7) | $38 \mathrm{~K}+559$ |
|  |  |
| Frank Hurt Secondary | 1397 |
| Enrolment (8-12): | 1250 |
| Capacity (8-12): |  |

School Enrolment Projections and Planning Update:
The following tables illustrate the enrolment projections (with current/approved ministry
capacity) for the elementary and secondary schools serving the proposed development.

Bear Creek Elementary is currently operating just below capacity and enrolment is projected to grow over time by one classroom on average. Bear Creek also accommodated many new immigrant children in our community this year. Up until this September it was felt that enrolment growth could be accommodated with 4 portables or less. However, looking at the 2019 enrolment data, it appears the trend is even stronger than was thought last year. Though no capital projects have been requested for this school, this catchment will be monitored over the next year to further understand the developing growth trend.

Frank Hurt Secondary continues to accept overflow from Sullivan Heights Secondary that currently has capped in-catchment enrollment to the school. Currently, Frank Hurt is operating at 112\% capacity and it is projected to grow to $129 \%$ over the next 10 years. As a result, as part of the District's 2020/21 Five Year Capital Plan submission to the Ministry of Education, there is a capital request to construct a 400 capacity addition targeted to open September 2022. The Ministry has yet to approve capital funding for this project.

## Bear Creek Elementary



Frank Hurt Secondary


* Nominal Capacity is estimated by multiplying the number of enrolling spaces by 25 students.

Table 3-On-site Tree Protection and Replacement Summary

| On-Site Trees | Number of Trees |
| :--- | :---: |
| Protected Trees Identified - on-site and shared trees, including trees within <br> boulevards and proposed streets and lanes, but excluding trees in proposed open <br> space or riparian areas. Including Cottonwood and Alder trees | 25 |
| Protected Trees to be Removed | 25 |
| Protected Trees to be Retained - excluding trees within proposed open space or <br> riparian areas. | 0 |
| Total Replacement Trees Required: <br> $\bullet \quad$ Alder \& Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1:1 Replacement Ratio = 18 <br> $\bullet \quad$ All other Trees Requiring 2 to Replacement Ratio = 14 | 32 |
| Replacement Trees Proposed |  |
| Replacement Trees in Deficit | 32 |
| Protected Trees to be retained in proposed open space /riparian areas | 0 |

Table 3 - Off-site Tree Protection and Replacement Summary

| Off-Site Trees | Number of Trees |
| :--- | :---: |
| Protected Off-site Trees to be removed |  |
| Total Replacement Trees Required: <br> $\bullet \quad$ Alder \& Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1:1 Replacement Ratio = <br> $\bullet \quad$ All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio = |  |
| Replacement Trees Proposed |  |
| Replacement Trees in Deficit |  |

## Summary and Plan Prepared by Goode Arboriculture Consulting



July 30, 2019
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## Advisory Design Panel Minutes

Thursday, July 9, 2020
Time: 3:00 pm

## Present:

Panel Members:
R. Drew, Chair
B. Howard
G. Borowski
I. MacFadyen
L. Mickelson
M. Patterson
M. Tashakor
R. Dhall
R. Jenkins
T. Bunting

## Guests:

Christa Min
David Stoyko, Connect Landscape Architecture
Gwyn Vose, IBI Group Johnathan Yang
Lu Tang, Thind Properties
Peter Huggins and Dave Cromp, BHA Architecture Stephen Vincent, Durante Kreuk Ltd.
Tom Miller, Wanson Group
Tony Wai, Haena Choi, and Salim Narayana, IBI
Group

## A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was<br>Moved by R. Dhall<br>Seconded by L. Mickelson<br>That the minutes of the Advisory Design<br>Panel meeting of June 25, 2020 be received.<br>Carried

## B. STAFF PRESENTATION

1. Co-Creating an Urban Heat Ready Surrey City Centre

Pegah Djamzad, Sustainability Engagement Specialist

Staff provided a Power-Point presentation on The Urban Heat Ready Project, which brings together City staff, community partners and development professionals to co-create a vision for a urban heat ready Surrey City Centre and aims to increase awareness about urban heat across all three audiences. As Surrey City Centre rapidly densifies and urbanizes, there is opportunity to anticipate, plan and collaborate on ways to mitigate the impacts of urban heat.

## C. NEW SUBMISSIONS

2. Time:

File No.:
Address:
New or Resubmit:
Last Submission Date:
Description:

Developer:
Architect:

4:50 p.m.

17-0507
1376o \& 13777 - 75A Avenue; 13778 - 76 Avenue
New
N/A
Rezoning and Development Permit for three four-storey residential apartment buildings.
Tom Miller, Wanson Group
Peter Huggins and Dave Cromp, BHA Architecture

| Landscape Architect: | David Stoyko, Connect Landscape Architecture |
| :--- | :--- |
| Planner: | Melissa Johnson |
| Urban Design Planner: | Nathan Chow |

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff have concerns on the narrow buffer in between the driveway and rear yards of neighbouring units, and the shared parking ramp and outdoor amenity space. Staff would like to see 75A Avenue widened but it is not a requirement.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site and building plans, streetscapes and elevations.

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

## ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

It was
Moved by B. Howard
Seconded by T. Bunting
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)

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

## Carried

## Key Points:

1. Consider a more consistent architectural character across Mirra 4.

Design Team Response: Colour change corresponding with break in building massing help define the massing and helps tie the project to Mirra 2 and 3. BHA has revised single pitched roof form (also on Mirra 3) to simplify building forms and provide consistency across Mirra 1,2,3,4.
2. Consider reducing amount of hardscaping, simplify the geometry.

Design Team Response: (Landscape) Paving at Mirra 2 NE corner, Mirra 3(75A ave and 76 ave), Mirra 4 (both entry plazas) have be substantially reduced. Geometry is a key component to the dynamism of the landscape design which was appreciated by the panel elsewhere.
3. Reduce amount of repetition of façade elements.

Design Team Response: BHA has explored if further massing simplification (less articulation) is possible. The Lobby of Mirra 4 has been simplified (recess removed). Corner wrapping portal elements have also been redesigned to better incorporate enclosed balcony systems and simplify articulation.
4. Consider mitigating the impact of auto-court on Mirra, Mirra 4 and the neighbouring building.

Design Team Response: (Landscape) Additional D.Fir trees of 2.5 m Ht @ 4.5 m spacing have been added to buffer autocourt impact to Earls Court building. Paved plaza at lobby to Mirra 4 has been reduced to allow for more trees planting to screen autocourt from Mirra 4. A visual distinct paved crosswalk has been added through treed island to make autocourt more pedestrian friendly and connect to Mirra 3. Entry to autocourt has been shifted south by pulling change in surface and introducing speedbump (tabletop) to slow traffic earlier. Drive Entry has been raised and speed bump has been added. Bollards has been introduced to define auto court edge with additional planting to soften entrance to Parking Ramp.
5. Consider improving daylight access to living spaces at Mirra 3 ground level 2-bedroom suites.

Design Team Response: BHA has added large openings to the sides of portal elements and moved the exterior wall out $1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ to increase daylight and views for living spaces.
6. Consider a stronger connection between indoor and outdoor amenity spaces.

Design Team Response: BHA has evaluated the Mirra 4 Lobby and adjacent amenity space for opportunities to strengthen connection to exterior space. Connection overall is direct and strong.
7. Consider a stronger connection between Mirra 1 and the shared outdoor amenity.

Design Team Response: (Landscape) Connection between Mirra 1 and 2 courtyard has been redesigned. Larger more rectilinear space provides a stronger, more inviting connection.
8. Consider incorporating a stronger pedestrian connection between Mirra 3 and Mirra 4.

Design Team Response: A pedestrian crosswalk was added bisecting the auto-court.
9. Consider a stronger residential access and visual connection from Mirra 3 to the courtyard.

Design Team Response: The connection to the courtyard from Mirra 3 amenity is as direct as we can make it (across corridor). This has been explored in the past and would require either a loss of units or the redesign of regular unit module. Not desirable or feasible from an overall project perspective. We have eliminated the dog run that was formerly immediately adjacent to Mirra 3 and replaced it with a multi-functional amenity area which strengthens the connection to the courtyard by making it more open and inviting to all residents (not just dog owners).
10. Consider performing energy modeling as early as possible into the design process.

Design Team Response: Energy modelling will inform design development with input from Mechanical engineer and building envelope consultant.
11. Consider accessibility requirements.

Design Team Response: All common and amenity spaces are connected by an accessible path of travel. Automatic door openers to be provided. Handicapped parking requirements have been followed.
12. Consider providing adaptable suites.

Design Team Response: 5\% of C-type units will be converted to adaptable spread throughout the plan on all levels. In Mirra 4 these units are \#101, 122, 217, 307, 418.
13. Consider parcel delivery requirements.

Design Team Response: Parcel delivery boxes to be provided in all lobby mail areas. We have coordinated with the 'Luxer' parcel system to determine space requirements in Lobbies.

Site
14. Consider further design development.

Design Team Response: The design has developed on a number of fronts since the ADP comments were made including improvements to form and character and amenity spaces noted within this document.
15. Consider further buffering between the auto-court leading to Mirra 3 \& 4 and the existing strata building to the West to reduce the impact of vehicle traffic, noise and pollution.

Design Team Response: (Landscape) Additional D.Fir trees of 2.5 m Ht @ 4.5 m spacing have been added to buffer auto-court impact to Earls Court building.
16. Consider Mirra 1 and how it connects to Mirra 2.

Design Team Response: (Landscape) Connection between Mirra 1 and 2 courtyard has been redesigned. Larger more rectilinear space provides a stronger, more inviting connection.
17. Concern with indoor and outdoor amenity spaces.

Design Team Response: Indoor amenity spaces have been reconfigured to include fitness spaces below grade (as opposed to workshop space as formerly planned) with lightwells for access to natural light in Mirra 2 and Mirra 4. The Mirra 4 amenity space adjacent the main lobby has been reconceived as a co-work space. The outdoor amenity areas have undergone a number of revisions to improve quality of space and functionality.
18. Consider usability of courtyard.

Design Team Response: (Landscape) Design revisions made to connect M1 and M2 (see above) Dog run has been deleted to provide for more open flexible space to be used by all residents. Noise/odour from dog run could negatively impact ground level units of M3. Nearby park is more appropriate for this function. Open, flexible space added.
19. Recommend increasing the amount of indoor amenity space above grade.

Design Team Response: Wanson undertaking market research to investigate best function of underground amenity space. Talked to Mirra 1 Strata (on Monday night July 27th. Mirra 1 workshops are now junk rooms. Rennie Marketing team and Wanson agree that a workshop is too specific to an older male buyer and won't appeal to the majority of young first-time buyers. Instead these spaces have been reprogrammed to include a Co-work space at grade adjacent the main Lobby and the below grade Amenities have been combined into a larger Fitness Centre on P1 which appeals to a much broader demographic. Natural light can be brought into this space via light wells at the north end. Light wells have also been added to the Mirra 2 below grade amenity fitness space.
20. Relocate the below grade amenity to grade.

Design Team Response: Very difficult to accommodate. Large overages in area of outdoor amenity has been provided and the Mirra 4 below grade amenities have been combined into one larger fitness centre on P1 with access to natural daylight via light wells. Mirra 2 below grade fitness space has also been updated to include 3 lightwells.
21. Consider revisiting typical layout to avoid excessive articulation on the facade.

Design Team Response: Corners have been redesigned to include a better, more consistent expression of the enclosed balconies.
22. Provide further detail with respect to the parking access and management strategy for the buildings which share a single parkade access point.

Design Team Response: Shared ramp with Mirra 1 has been pre-negotiated and accepted by Mirra 1 strata council (refer to letter proved with DP submission). Security to be controlled through fob access.

## Form and Character

23. Recommend the materiality and expression of the podium level be carefully thought out.

Design Team Response: 2-storey brick elements at street level define 'podium'. And provide textured/durable material to street elevation. These have been well-considered to enrich the public realm.
24. Consider using same brick detail for all portal elements.

Design Team Response: This was considered but for budget reasons the brick was kept only on the public facing elevations.
25. Reconsider the small size of balconies.

Design Team Response: North facing balconies (Mirra 4) to be enlarged to be consistent with $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ deep balconies elsewhere. $1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ will be gained on the exterior (setback unaffected) and $1^{\prime}-0$ " will be taken from unit layout.
26. Consider removing pitched roofs at top as they seem out of character with the more modern esthetic.

Design Team Response: Pitched roofs with pop-up elements at living spaces are consistent with the design of Mirra 1. Pitched roof has drainage and cost advantages and is largely invisible from the adjacent sidewalk due to angle of view - pitched roofs to be retained.
27. Consider giving Mirra 4 its own character while relating to the rest of site.

Design Team Response: All Mirra projects have been designed to share a common architectural language while responding to the conditions unique to each building's site.
28. Consider further animation to lobby entry area.

Design Team Response: Importance of lobby design has been acknowledged and will be further explored with the introduction of an interior designer to the project team. The addition of the Co-work amenity to the main Lobby of Mirra 4 is an improvement (over the fitness room). The space (directly adjacent Lobby) can be designed to be more visually and functionally appealing.
29. Recommend the lobbies in buildings are well designed and laid out.

Design Team Response: see above to item \#28.
30. Reconsider indoor amenity space below grade.

Design Team Response: Mirra 4 below grade amenities have been combined into one larger fitness centre on P1 with access to natural daylight via light wells. Mirra 2 below grade fitness space has also been updated to include 3 lightwells. Mirra 3 amenity room on P2 will also be a fitness space.
31. Recommend parcel delivery box.

Design Team Response: Parcel delivery boxes have been accommodated in all 3 buildings.

## Landscape

32. Recommend reducing hardscape for more greenspace in auto court.

Design Team Response: (Landscape) Additional D.Fir trees of 2.5m Ht @ 4.5m spacing have been added to buffer autocourt impact to Earls Court building. Paved plaza at lobby to Mirra 4 has been reduced to allow for more trees planting to screen autocourt from Mirra 4. A visual distinct paved crosswalk has been added through treed island to make autocourt more pedestrian friendly and connect to Mirra 3. Entry to autocourt has been shifted south by pulling change in surface and introducing speedbump (tabletop) to slow traffic earlier. Drive Entry has been raised and speed bump has been added. Bollards has been introduced to define auto court edge with additional planting to soften entrance to Parking Ramp.
33. Suggest reducing auto court to a few parking spaces off the access to underground parking.

Design Team Response: Auto-court turn-around configuration is required to ensure flow of traffic for move-ins/pick-ups. Auto-court has been reduced as much as possible to minimize impact of hardscape and increase greenspace see above.
34. Consider further refinement of the outdoor amenity areas.

Design Team Response: The outdoor amenity spaces have undergone a number of refinements more specifically described elsewhere in this document. These include improved pedestrian connections between Mirra 1 and 2 and Mirra 3 and 4, increased greenspace (reduction of hardscaping), better buffering to neighbouring property (Earls Court), elimination of fenced-in dog run in favour of more flexible, open space to be used by all.
35. Consider better integrating the indoor and outdoor amenity areas.

Design Team Response: The outdoor amenity spaces connect as directly as possible to indoor amenity spaces. Where a direct connection is not achievable in below grade amenity space we have added lightwells where possible (Mirra 2 and 4) to provide connection to natural light.
36. Consider opportunities for seating and social engagement to walkway and plaza.

Design Team Response: (Landscape) Additional seating have been proposed at pocket plazas of M2(connection to M1), M2 NE corner, M3 (75A and 76 Ave) and M4 (entry lobby).
37. Consider incorporating spaces for people to sit in the larger nodal areas.

Design Team Response: see above.
38. Reconsider the connection of widened pavement.

Design Team Response: The comment was made in reference to the paved pedestrian node adjacent the Mirra 3 entry.

## Refer to drawings L1.1 and L1.5A for revisions.

39. Consider providing protection canopies for more seasonal use of outdoor amenity spaces.

Design Team Response: Covered pavilions (tea houses) have been provided for shading and rain protection.
40. Reconsider slopes.

Design Team Response: Sloped/stepped pedestrian plaza area to NW of Mirra 2 has been redesigned to accommodate more seating and more planting to better respond to the change of elevation here to improve pedestrian experience.
41. Consider built-in sanitation and/or odor mitigation for the dog run area.

Design Team Response: see above. (dog run removed)
42. Provide further detail on the screening of the BC Hydro transformers.

Design Team Response: (Landscape) Unit entry path has been change from lane to 75A Ave to allow more planting buffer to PMT.

## CPTED

43. No specific issues were identified.

## Sustainability

44. Consider the BC Energy Step Code.

Design Team Response: BCBC Step 3 required. Energy model to be provided during design development.
45. Consider mechanical engineer/energy modeler review as early as possible.

Design Team Response: see above.
46. Verify thermal comfort requirements.

## Design Team Response: see above.

47. Consider providing electric charging facilities for electric vehicles (cars and bikes).

Design Team Response: EV stations not covered In Urban Analytics New Home Source Data Base. Wanson to provide car repair hub in parkades. No EV stations for bikes. They will never be used. People take their batteries up to their units. Electrical rough-ins for car chargers to be provided at all parking spaces.
48. Consider implementing electric bicycle charging infrastructure.

Design Team Response: see above.

## Accessibility

49. Consider $5 \%$ of units be wheel chair accessible with accessible balconies.

Design Team Response: see above. Accessible balconies not feasible due to waterproofing requirement (min. 4" membrane upturn) Strata could purchase
small portable ramps to be provided upon request. $5 \%$ of units will be made adaptable, see above response.
50. Recommend that the amenity restrooms be accessible.

Design Team Response: Confirmed. This is required by the building code.
51. Recommend required number of disabled parking stalls.

Design Team Response: Confirmed
52. Recommend that the entrance door be power operated.

## Design Team Response: Confirmed

53. Consider emergency call buttons in the parking lobbies.

## Design Team Response: Confirmed

54. Consider the elevator and entrance call button panel to be placed horizontally.

Design Team Response: OK

## C. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, July 23, 2020.

## D. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

R. Drew, Chair

