 PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT REPORT

## Application No.:

7917-0577-00
7917-0577-01
Planning Report Date: May 9, 2022

## PROPOSAL:

- Partial Land Use Contract Discharge
- Rezoning a portion from C-35 to CD
- Detailed Development Permits
- Development Variance Permit
to permit the development of a residential high-rise on the Guildford Sheraton hotel site (15269-104 Avenue) and an office expansion on the abutting Guildford
Corporate Centre commercial site (10470-152 Street).
LOCATION:
15269-104 Avenue
10470-152 Street
( 15230 - 105 Avenue)
ZONING:
OCP DESIGNATION: Town Centre
NCP DESIGNATION: Mid to High Rise Mixed Use



## RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

- By-law Introduction and set date for Public Hearing for:
- Partial Land Use Contract Discharge (for both properties); and
- Rezoning (of 15269-104 Avenue only).
- Approval to draft Detailed Development Permit Nos. 7917-0577-oo and 7917-0577-o1 for Form and Character for the Guildford Sheraton and Guildford Corporate Centre sites, respectively.


## DEVIATION FROM PLANS, POLICIES OR REGULATIONS

- Proposing to reduce the south and east yard setback requirements of the C-35 Zone on the Guildford Corporate Centre site.


## RATIONALE OF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal complies with the Town Centre designation in the Official Community Plan (OCP).
- The proposal complies with the 'Mid to High Rise Mixed Use' designation in the Guildford Town Centre \& 104 Avenue Corridor Stage 1 Plan.
- The proposed density and building form are appropriate for this part of Guildford Town Centre. The proposed development is within a Frequent Transit Development Area (FTDA) and conforms to the goal of achieving higher density development near a transit corridor (104 Avenue).
- The proposal generally complies with the Development Permit requirements in the OCP for Form and Character. The proposed setbacks achieve a more urban, pedestrian streetscape in compliance with the Guildford Town Centre \& 104 Avenue Corridor Stage 1 Plan, and in accordance with the Development Permit (Form and Character) design guidelines in the OCP.
- The proposed architectural design of the residential tower and office expansion will complement and enhance the design character of the Guildford Sheraton and Guildford Corporate Centre sites.
- The applicant will provide a density bonus amenity contribution consistent with the Tier 2 Capital Projects Community Amenity Contributions (CACs), in support of the requested increased density.


## RECOMMENDATION

The Planning \& Development Department recommends that:

1. A By-law be introduced to partially discharge Land Use Contract No. 342 from the subject properties (15269-104 Avenue and 10470-152 Street) and a date be set for Public Hearing.
2. A By-law be introduced to rezone one of the subject properties (15269-104 Avenue only) from "Downtown Commercial Zone (C-35)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" and a date be set for Public Hearing.
3. Council authorize staff to draft Detailed Development Permit No. 7917-0577-oo (15269-104 Avenue) generally in accordance with the attached drawings (Appendix I).
4. Council authorize staff to draft Detailed Development Permit No. 7917-0577-01 (10470-152 Street) generally in accordance with the attached drawings (Appendix I).
5. Council approve Development Variance Permit No. 7917-0577-oo (Appendix VI) varying the following, to proceed to Public Notification:
(a) to reduce the minimum rear yard (south) setback of the C-35 Zone from 7.5 metres to 4.5 metres in order to retain the existing Guildford Corporate Centre building at 10470-152 Street; and
(b) to reduce the minimum rear yard (south) setback from 7.5 metres to 1.0 metre and the side yard (east) setback of the C- 35 Zone from 3.0 metres to 0.0 metre in order to accommodate the proposed multi-level parking structure at 10470-152 Street (Guildford Corporate Centre site).
6. 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) submission of a road dedication plan to the satisfaction of the Approving Officer;
(c) resolution of all urban design issues to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(d) submission of a finalized landscaping plan and landscaping cost estimate to the specifications and satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(e) submission of a finalized tree survey and a statement regarding tree preservation to the satisfaction of the City Landscape Architect;
(f) the applicant provide a density bonus amenity contribution consistent with the Tier 2 Capital Projects CACs in support of the requested increased density, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Planning and Development Department;
(g) registration of a right-of-way for public rights-of-passage for the area between the building face and the street edges;
(h) registration of access easements to ensure shared access to the proposed parking and vehicle drive aisles and accesses between the two properties (15269-104 Avenue and 10470-152 Street);
(i) submission of an acoustical report for the units adjacent to 104 Avenue and registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to ensure implementation of noise mitigation measures;
(j) 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 and with respect to the City's Affordable Housing Strategy and Tier 1 Capital Project CACs, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Planning \& Development Services; and
(k) completion of a Highway Licensing Agreement (HLA) to allow some portions of the existing Sheraton Guildford hotel building and the existing underground parking structure (15269-104 Avenue) to encroach into the road dedication along 104 Avenue and 153 Street.

## SITE CONTEXT \& BACKGROUND

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Direction } & \text { Existing Use } & \text { TCP Designation } & \text { Existing Zone } \\
\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Subject Site } \\
(15269-104 \text { Ave): }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Sheraton Vancouver } \\
\text { Guildford Hotel. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Mid to High Rise } \\
\text { Mixed Use } \\
(10470-152 \text { St): }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Guildford Corporate } \\
\text { Centre office building. }\end{array}\end{array}
$$ \begin{array}{l}LUC No. 342 <br>
(underlying C-35) to High Rise <br>

Mixed Use\end{array}\right]\)| LUC No. 342 |
| :--- |
| (underlying C-35) |$|$| North (of Sheraton hotel): | 4-storey apartment <br> building. | Mid to High Rise <br> Apartment | LUC No. 342 <br> (underlying C-35) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North (across 105 Ave): | Townhouse <br> development. | Mid to High Rise <br> Apartment and <br> Low to Mid Rise <br> Apartment | RM-45 |


| Direction | Existing Use | TCP Designation | Existing Zone |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| East (Across 153 St): | 3 and 4-storey office <br> buildings. | Low to Mid Rise <br> Apartment and Mid <br> to High Rise Mixed <br> Use | C-15 |
| South (Across 104 Ave): | Automobile <br> dealership. | Mid to High Rise <br> Mixed Use | CHI |
| West (of Sheraton hotel): | 4-storey office <br> building. <br> Gas station and bank | Mid to High Rise <br> Mixed Use <br> High Rise Mixed <br> Use | LUC No. 342 <br> (underlying C-35) <br> CG-1 and C-8 |
| West (across 152 St): |  |  |  |

## Context \& Background

- The subject site includes two properties located at 15269-104 Avenue and 10470-152 Street near the 104 Avenue and 152 Street intersection in Guildford. The sites are designated "Town Centre" in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and designated "Mid to High Rise Mixed Use" in the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Stage 1 Plan. Both properties are regulated under Land Use Contract No. 342 (underlying C-35 Zoning).
- The 20-storey Sheraton Vancouver Guildford Hotel is located on the southeast property ( 15269 - 104 Ave) and has operated on the site since 1992. The 6 -storey Guildford Corporate Centre is located on the northwest property (10470-152 Street) and was constructed in 1997. Both sites include surface and underground parking.
- There is an in-process, City-initiated development application (File No. 7920-o184-oo) to terminate Land Use Contract (LUC) No. 342 from the four properties in this block (15258-105 Ave and 15225-104 Avenue), as well as the two subject properties (15269-104 Avenue and 10470-152 Street). File No. 7920-0184-oo is currently pre-Council. Since the applicant for the Guildford Sheraton Hotel and Guildford Corporate Centre (GCC) site would like to forward their project to Council in advance of File No. 7920-0184-oo proceeding to Council, they have included a partial LUC discharge as part of their application. The proposal will only discharge LUC No. 342 from the two subject properties (15269-104 Avenue and 10470-152 Street), while the termination of LUC No. 342 from the remaining two properties will be processed as part of File No. 7920-0184-oo in the near future.


## Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan

- After an extensive public consultation process, Stage 1 of the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan was approved by Council on July 8, 2019. Stage 1 outlines the expected land-use and densities for the Guildford Town Centre area.
- Development applications for properties in the plan area that are consistent with the Stage 1 Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan may proceed to Council for consideration and initial approvals (Third Reading).


## DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

## Planning Considerations

- The proposed development consists of two separate concurrent projects (one on each of the two properties) that will be linked through a shared parking structure (discussed further in the Transportation Section of this report).
- For the purpose of this report, the property at 15269-104 Ave will be referred to as the "Sheraton site" and the property at 10470-152 Street will be referred to as the "GCC site".
- The applicant proposes a 31-storey residential building at the southwest corner of the Sheraton site, with a small amount of commercial space on the ground floor. The existing Sheraton Guildford Hotel will remain in its current location on the eastern portion of the site.
- The applicant also proposes a 3 -storey addition to the existing 6 -storey office building on the GCC site. The existing GCC building consists of a 6 -storey component along the southern half of the building, while the northern half is only three storeys in height. The applicant proposes a 3 -story addition to the north half of the building, which will result in the entire building being a full six storeys when completed.
- A parking structure/garage is also proposed on the east side of the GCC site, above the current surface parking lot. The parking structure will be six storeys, with three levels underground and three above grade. A small 3 -storey office space ( 776 square metres in size) is proposed at the north end of the parking structure, facing 105 Avenue.
- The applicant proposes the following in order to permit the development of the 31-storey residential building on the Sheraton site:
- Partial Land Use Contract Discharge;
- Rezoning from C-35 to CD; and
- Detailed Development Permit for Form and Character (7917-0577-oo).
- The applicant proposes the following in order to permit the 3-storey office addition and parking garage on the GCC site:
- Partial Land Use Contract Discharge;
- Detailed Development Permit for Form and Character (7917-0577-01); and
- Development Variance Permit to reduce the south rear yard and east side yard setbacks of the C-35 Zone to accommodate the existing building and proposed parking structure.
- A Rezoning is not required on the GCC site, as the site can be regulated by the underlying C-35 Zone.
- The development data for the Sheraton site is provided in the following table:

| Sheraton Site | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lot Area |  |
| Gross Site Area: | 9,533 sq.m. |
| Road Dedication: | 687 sq.m. |
| Net Site Area: | 8,844 sq.m. |
| Number of Lots: | 1 |
| Building Height: | 99 metres (XX storeys) |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR): | 4.2 gross FAR |
| Floor Area |  |
| Commercial (existing hotel): | 19,638 sq.m. |
| Residential (new bldg): | 20,143 sq.m. |
| Commercial (new bldg): | 229 sq.m. |
| Total: | 40,013 sq.m. |
| Residential Units: | 35 |
| Studio: | 136 |
| 1-Bedroom: | 1 |
| 1-Bedroom + den: | 5 |
| 1-Bedroom adaptable: | 64 |
| 2-Bedroom: | 6 |
| 2-Bedroom adaptable: | 8 |
| 3-Bedroom: | 31 |
| Total: | 280 (including 25 micro units) |

- The development data for the GCC site is provided in the following table:

| GCC Site | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lot Area |  |
| Gross Site Area: | 6,730 sq.m. |
| Road Dedication: | N/A |
| Net Site Area: | 6,730 sq.m. |
| Number of Lots: | 1 |
| Building Height: | 25 metres (6 storeys) |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR): | 2.6 gross FAR |
| Floor Area |  |
| Residential: | N/A |
| Office: | $17,68 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m}$. |
| Total: | 17,680 sq.m. |
|  |  |

## Referrals

Engineering: The Engineering Department has no objection to the project subject to the completion of Engineering servicing requirements as outlined in Appendix II.

School District:

Parks, Recreation \&
Culture:
Surrey Fire Department:
Advisory Design Panel:

The School District has advised that there will be approximately 37 school-age children generated by this development, of which the School District has provided the following expected student enrollment.

15 Elementary students at Harold Bishop Elementary School 14 Secondary students at Guildford Park Secondary School
(Appendix III)
Note that the number of school-age children is greater than the expected enrollment due to students attending private schools, home school or different school districts.

The applicant has advised that the dwelling units in this project are expected to be constructed and ready for occupancy by Spring or Summer 2026.

No concerns.
No concerns.
The proposal was considered at the ADP meeting on January 13, 2022 and was conditionally supported. The applicant has resolved most of the outstanding items from the ADP review as outlined in the Development Permit section of this report. Any additional revisions will be completed prior to Council's consideration of Final Adoption of the rezoning by-law, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department.

## Transportation Considerations

## Road dedication and SROWs

- The applicant will provide the following road dedication for the Sheraton site, as part of the proposed Rezoning application:
- Approximately 5.5 metres of dedication along the south property line to widen 104 Avenue to an ultimate 42 metres ( 21 metres from centreline);
- 2.0 metres of dedication along the east property line to widen 153 Street to an ultimate 20 metres; and
- A 3-metre x 3-metre corner cut at 104 Avenue and 153 Street.
- Some portions of the existing underground parking structure will be located within the road allowance, after the required road dedication along 104 Avenue. A Highway License Agreement will be required in order to allow the continued operation of the underground parking garage.
- The applicant proposes to remove the existing ramp along 104 Avenue that connects to the underground parking garage. This ramp is located completely within the road dedication.
- Some portions of the existing underground parking structure will also encroach into the road allowance along 153 Street, due to the 2.0 metre road dedication. The road dedication will also result in minor encroachments for the existing single-storey podium along 153 Street. These encroachments are about 0.5 metre.
- Since a rezoning is not proposed for the GCC site, road dedication cannot be required. Therefore, the applicant will provide the following statutory rights-of ways (SROWs) for the GCC site, as part of the proposed Development Permit application.
- Approximately 3.0 metres along the north property line to widen 105 Avenue;
- Approximately 2.0 metres along the west property line to widen 152 Street; and
- A 5-metre x 5-metre corner cut at 105 Avenue and 152 Street.
- The full road right-of-way along 152 Street is approximately 6 metres from the GCC site for an ultimate 42 metre road. As noted above, the applicant is providing an approximate 2.0 -metre SROW along 152 Street. Due to the location of the existing GCC building, an additional 4 metres is not possible. Future demolition and redevelopment of the site could potentially allow for the widening of 152 Street to its ultimate cross-section.


## Vehicle Access and Parking

- Vehicle access to the Sheraton site is via the existing accesses along 104 Avenue (middle of site) and 153 Street (northeast corner). Since the applicant proposes to remove the existing ramp along 104 Avenue, only one on-site ramp will connect to the underground parking on the Sheraton site - located near the northwest corner of the site adjacent to the existing hotel building.
- Vehicle access to the GCC site is via the existing underground parking access along the north property line ( 105 Avenue). There is also an existing access connecting to the surface parking, just east of the underground parking access. However, this access will be shifted slightly westward to accommodate the construction of the proposed parking structure and 3 -storey office space along the east side of the site. Transportation Engineering staff indicated that the separation distance between the two accesses is acceptable.
- The proposed parking garage is a two-level addition above the existing surface parking lot located on the eastern portion of the site (and there is existing underground parking beneath this surface parking lot).
- In order to provide adequate parking for the Sheraton site, the applicant proposes to provide a vehicle connection between the two sites, in order to allow residents in the proposed high-rise building on the Sheraton site to utilize excess parking in the new parking garage on the GCC site. Vehicle access between the sites is via Levels $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}$ and will allow residents and patrons of both sites to ingress/egress via any of the existing/proposed accesses along 104 Avenue, 153 Street and 105 Avenue. The proposal will require a shared access and parking agreement.
- The proposed parking is as follows:
- The Sheraton site requires a total of 714 parking spaces for the existing hotel (406) and the proposed 31-storey residential building (308). The site can only provide a total of 497 parking spaces.
- The GCC site requires a total of 442 parking spaces for the existing GCC building (312) and the proposed addition (130). The site can accommodate a total 667 parking spaces once the proposed parking structure is complete.
- When the parking is combined, a total of $1,156(714+442)$ parking spaces are required for both sites and a total of 1,164 (497+667) parking spaces are proposed - an excess of 8 parking spaces.


## Sustainability Considerations

- The applicant has met all of the typical sustainable development criteria, as indicated in the Sustainable Development Checklist.
- In addition, the applicant has highlighted the following additional sustainable features:
- Energy modelling will show compliance with Step 3 of the BC Energy Step Code;
- Outdoor and some common area lights will be controlled by photocells and/or a time clock. Light-emitting diode (LED) lights will be utilized;
- Water fixtures are to be at least $20 \%$ more efficient than standard fixtures;
- Locally manufactured building materials will be sourced, where possible;
- Efficient mechanical and electrical lighting systems and appliances will be required in the building fit-out;
- Low volatile organic compound (VOC) emitting materials will be chosen, when possible, over conventional materials.


## POLICY \& BY-LAW CONSIDERATIONS

## Regional Growth Strategy

- The subject site is designated General Urban in Metro Vancouver's Regional Growth Strategy (RGS). The proposed development complies with the RGS.


## Official Community Plan

## Land Use Designation

- The subject site is designated Town Centre in the Official Community Plan, with a permitted maximum density of 2.5 FAR, as noted in Figure 13 of the OCP. Densities within Town Centres may exceed the densities prescribed in the OCP where the site is located adjacent to existing or planned rapid transit stations/corridors. The subject site is adjacent to the existing Frequent Transit Network along 104 Avenue.
- In accordance with the OCP, the density for the subject site may be expressed as floor area ratio (FAR) calculated on the basis of the gross site area.
- The proposed density (4.2 gross FAR) is consistent with the "Mid to High Rise Mixed Use" designation in the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Stage 1 Plan, including density bonus. Therefore, an OCP Amendment is not required.


## Themes/Policies

- The proposed development is consistent with the following OCP Themes and Policies:
- Theme A: Growth Management
- Growth Priorities: Support compact and efficient land development that is consistent with the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy.
- Accommodating High Density:
- Direct residential and mixed-use development into Town Centres, along Frequent Transit Corridors and Secondary Plan areas; and
- Ensure redevelopment along Frequent Transit Corridors are required to be sufficient enough to support rapid transit infrastructure investments.
- Theme B: Centres, Corridors and Neighbourhoods:
- Distinctive Town Centres:
- Support each Town Centre as the primary centre for its community, the location of higher intensity urban development and the location of community-serving civic, cultural, social, and recreational facilities; and
- Locate community-serving commercial uses in Town Centres to maximize accessibility.
- Transit Corridors:
- Support higher-density residential, commercial, and mixed-use developments in appropriate locations along existing and planned Frequent Transit Corridors.
- Overall, the development proposal supports transit-oriented development, focusing growth and increased density along frequent transit corridors, along main roads, near transit routes and adjacent to major parks and civic amenities.


## Secondary Plans

## Land Use Designation

- The subject properties are designated 'Mid to High Rise Mixed Use' in the Stage 1 Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan (TCP).
- The proposed development generally complies with the TCP designation, per the Stage 1 Plan.


## Themes/Objectives

- The proposed development (additional residential units and office space) will be beneficial to the growing Guildford community;
- The development encourages a greater diversity of housing options for different family sizes, types, and compositions.


## Zoning Bylaw and CD Bylaw

- The applicant is proposing to discharge the existing Land Use Contract (LUC) No. 342 from both the Sheraton and GCC sites, and rezone the Sheraton site from the underlying "Downtown Commercial Zone (C-35)" to a "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" based on the "Community Commercial Zone (C-8)" and the "Multiple Residential 135 Zone (RM-135)" to accommodate a proposed 31-storey residential building ( 280 units) with about 236 square metres of ground floor commercial space and the existing Sheraton Hotel.
- The GCC site does not require a rezoning and will utilize the underlying C-35 Zone if Council supports the discharge of the existing LUC.
- The table below provides an analysis of the development proposal of the GCC site in relation to the requirements of the Zoning By-law.

| C-35 Zone | Permitted and/or Required | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | 3.5 | 2.6 |
| Lot Coverage: | 85\% | $41 \%$ |
| Yards and Setbacks |  |  |
| North (front): | 2.0 m | 2.0 m |
| East (side yard): | 3.0 m | 0.0 m (parking structure)* |
| South (rear): | 7.5 m | 4.5 m (building)* <br> 1.0 m (parking structure)* |
| West (street side yard): | 2.0 m | 2.0 m |
| Height of Buildings |  |  |
| Principal buildings: | N/A | 25 m |
| Parking (Part 5) | Required | Proposed |
| Number of Stalls |  |  |
| Commercial: | 442 | 442 |
| Additional: |  | 225 |
| Total: |  | 667 |

*Variance Requested

- The following table provides a comparison of the density, lot coverage, setbacks, building height and permitted uses in the RM-135 Zone, C-8 Zone and the proposed CD Bylaw (which will regulate the existing hotel and the proposed 31-storey building) for the Sheraton site:

| Zoning | RM-135 Zone (Part 25) | C-8 Zone <br> (Part 36) | Proposed CD Zone (Sheraton site) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | 2.5 (net) | o.8o (net) | 4.5 (net) |
| Lot Coverage: | 33\% | 50\% | 60\% |
| Yards and Setbacks | 7.5 metres or $50 \%$ of the building height | 7.5 metres | North (rear): 7.5 metres <br> East (side): o.o metre South (front): 3.4 metres West (side): 5.4 metres |
| Principal Building Height: | N/A | 12 metres | 100 metres |
| Permitted Uses: | The RM-135 Zone permits multiple unit residential buildings and ground-oriented multiple residential buildings. <br> The C-8 Zone permits commercial uses including: <br> - Retail stores; <br> - Personal service uses; <br> - General service uses; <br> - Beverage container return centres; <br> - Eating establishments; <br> - Neighbourhood pubs; <br> - Liquor store; <br> - Office uses; <br> - Parking facilities; <br> - Automotive service uses; <br> - Indoor recreational facilities; <br> - Entertainment uses; <br> - Assembly halls; <br> - Community services; <br> - Child care facilities; <br> - Cultural uses; and <br> - One dwelling unit. |  | Residential will comply with the RM-135 Zone, except the ground-oriented multiple residential units. <br> Commercial uses will include the following: <br> - Retail stores; <br> - Personal service uses; <br> - General service uses; <br> - Eating establishments; <br> - Neighbourhood pubs; <br> - Office uses; <br> - Indoor recreational facilities; <br> - Entertainment uses; <br> - Assembly halls; <br> - Community services; <br> - Tourist Accommodation; <br> - Child care facilities; and <br> - Cultural uses. |
| Amenity Space |  |  |  |
| Indoor Amenity: <br> Outdoor Amenity: | 727 square metres ( 25 m <br> 865 square metres |  | 88o square metres 884 square metres |
| Parking (Part 5) <br> Number of Stalls | Required <br> (1.3 spaces/dwelling unit for 1 bed or less, 1.5 spaces/DU for 2 beds or more, o. 2 for visitors) |  | Proposed <br> (1.0 spaces/dwelling unit, o.1 for visitors) |
| Residential: | 385 |  | 280 |
| Residential Visitor: | 56 |  | 28 |
| Total: | 441 |  | 308 |
| Tourist Accommodation | 279 |  | 279 |
| Eating <br>  <br> Banquet Hall | 94 |  | 94 |
| Retail Use | 3 |  | 3 |


| Recreational <br> Facility | 9 | 9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Office Space | 21 | 21 |
| Bicycle Spaces |  |  |
| Residential <br> Secure Parking: | 336 | 350 |
| Residential <br> Visitor: | 6 | 6 |

- The proposed floor area ratio (FAR) for the Sheraton site is 4.5 net FAR (4.2 gross FAR), and the lot coverage is proposed to be $60 \%$, which will exceed the maximum 2.5 FAR and $33 \%$ lot coverage permitted under the RM-135 Zone. Given the site's location in Guildford Town Centre and proximity to public transit options, the proposed density is appropriate, and the proposed lot coverage is consistent with other similar high-rise developments.
- The RM-135 Zone requires the setbacks to be 7.5 metres or a minimum of $50 \%$ of the building height, whichever is greater. The applicant is proposing reductions for all setbacks in the CD By-law. The reduction in building setbacks is supportable as they allow for the retention of the existing Sheraton hotel building and to create a more urban and active engagement of the streets, which is desirable for a Town Centre location. This is consistent with Development Permit (Form and Character) design guidelines in the Official Community Plan.
- The reduced setbacks in the CD Bylaw for the south and east property lines are proposed in order to retain the existing Sheraton Hotel building and also due to road dedication requirements. The proposed 31-storey residential building at the southwest corner of the site will include the following setbacks, which are generally consistent with high-density developments in City Centre or a Town Centre:
- North (rear): more than 7.5 metres
- East (side): more than 7.5 metres
- South (front): 4.5 metres
- West (side): 5.4 metres
- As mentioned earlier in the Transportation Considerations Section, small portions of the existing building and underground parking structure will be located within the road dedication along the south ( 104 Avenue) and east ( 153 Street) property lines. A Highway License Agreement will be required.
- The proposed building height (31 storeys) is generally consistent with the permitted densities in the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Stage 1 Plan.
- The proposed indoor and outdoor amenity spaces comply with the current Zoning By-law.
- The parking for the proposed 31-storey residential building will be based on a rate of 1.0 parking space per dwelling unit and o.1 spaces for visitor parking. The Transportation Engineering Section supports this reduced parking rate for this location in Guildford Town Centre since the site is adjacent to an existing Frequent Transit Network along 104 Avenue.
- The existing Sheraton hotel uses will comply with the parking requirements as per the Zoning Bylaw. No parking relaxations are proposed.
- The proposal also complies with the minimum bicycle parking requirements as per the Zoning Bylaw.


## Building/Structure Setback Variances

- The applicant is requesting the following variances:
(a) to reduce the minimum rear yard (south) setback of the C-35 Zone from 7.5 metres to 4.5 metres in order to retain the existing Guildford Corporate Centre building at 10470-152 Street; and
(b) to reduce the minimum rear yard (south) setback from 7.5 metres to 1.0 metre and the side yard (east) setback of the C-35 Zone from 3.0 metres to 0.0 metre in order to accommodate the proposed multi-level parking structure at 10470-152 Street (Guildford Corporate Centre site).
- The proposed variance to reduce the rear yard (south) setback to 4.5 metres is in order to retain the existing GCC building, which is in good condition and occupied by tenants.
- The proposed variance to reduce the south and east setbacks are to allow a new two-level parking structure above the existing parking lot on the east portion of the site.
- The proposed setback reduction to 1.0 metre along the rear (south) yard is not expected to negatively impact the site to the south ( $15225-104$ Avenue), as a surface parking lot is located to the south. Additionally, mature trees provide a separation between the sites at this location.
- The proposed setback reduction to o.o metre along the side (east) yard is only for the portion at the southeast corner of the site, in order to provide a connection to the parking on the Sheraton site. The remaining two-thirds of the proposed parking structure will be set back 5.0 metres from the east property line, which is greater than the 3.0 metre setback noted in the C-35 Zone. The proposed 5.0-metre setback will provide greater separation between the parking structure and the existing apartment buildings to the east and will also allow for the retention of many mature trees between the sites.
- Staff support the requested variances to proceed for consideration.


## 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 Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Stage 1 Plan designates both the Sheraton and GCC sites as "Mid to High Rise Mixed Use". This represents a density of 3.5 FAR. The proposed gross density for the Sheraton site is 4.2 FAR, while the proposed gross density for the GCC site is 2.6 FAR.
- The proposed development will be subject to the Tier 1 Capital Plan Project CACs. The contribution will be payable at the rate applicable at the time of Building Permit Issuance (\$2,ooo per unit).
- The proposed development is subject to the Tier 2 Capital Plan Project CACs, which will be calculated in accordance with the flat rates under Schedule G of the Zoning Bylaw and payable prior to Final Adoption. The precise amount of floor space subject to Tier 2 CACs will be determined in advance of Final Adoption for the residential floor area that exceeds 3.5 FAR, if any.


## 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 new 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.
- As the subject application was instream on April 10, 2018, the contribution does not apply.


## 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 October 7, 2021, and the Development Proposal Signs were also installed on October 13, 2021. Staff received four responses, with three of the respondents requesting additional information and clarification but did express some concerns. One other respondent expressed support for the proposal. The following comments/concerns were expressed by the respondents:
- Construction impact: noise from the construction of the proposed development will be difficult for residents of the existing apartment building at 15258 - 105 Avenue, particularly those working from home or those with medical conditions.

Staff comments:

- The proposed construction is not expected for an extended period of time, particularly for the GCC site. The proposed building on the Sheraton site is located at the southwest corner of the site, and therefore, further away from existing apartment buildings in the area.
- Fumes and Privacy: the proposed parking structure on the GCC site will result in noise and additional vehicle exhaust fumes dispersing towards the adjacent apartment building units to the east. This infringes upon each resident's privacy.


## Staff comments:

- The applicant has proposed to increase the setback along the east property line to 5.0 metres and to retain all of the existing trees in this area. Additional trees are proposed as part of the landscape plan to further screen and provide separation between the subject site and the existing apartment building to the east.


## DEVELOPMENT PERMITS

## Form and Character Development Permit Requirement

- The proposed development generally complies with the Form and Character Development Permit guidelines in the OCP.
- The proposed developments on both the GCC and Sheraton sites involve the retention of the existing buildings, while also proposing new floor area (additional office space on the existing GCC building and a new 31-storey residential building next to the existing Sheraton hotel).
- The proposed development represented some challenges as a result of the existing building locations and the road dedication requirements. However, the applicant and staff worked diligently together to develop a design that incorporates good urban design guidelines and principles, in order to enhance the existing urban street interfaces.
- The proposed development received 'conditional support' from the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) at the January 13, 2022, ADP meeting. The applicant has generally addressed most of the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) comments (Appendix VIII).


## Sheraton Hotel Site

- The proposed 31-storey building at the southwest corner of the Sheraton site will utilize very similar building materials as the GCC site including:
- anodized aluminum frames with glass spandrel;
- tempered glass balcony guards
- painted concrete (white and grey);
- composite metal panels (white); and
- composite panels (marbled white and dark grey).
- The existing lower façade of the Sheraton Hotel building will be replaced with fritted glass panels, which will provide a distinctive and decorative aspect to the south elevation. This paneling will also act a design bridge between the existing hotel and the proposed residential building.
- The proposed residential building is a contemporary design but has been modified to provide some relation to the existing Sheraton building. This has been done through podium massing and tower fenestration and balcony form.
- The tower separation between the proposed 31-storey residential building and the existing Sheraton tower is about 25 metres from corner-to-corner. Typically for buildings on the same site of similar heights, the corner-to-corner tower separation is 30 metres. However, a minor variance to the tower separation can be considered in this case, since the Sheraton tower is a commercial use (hotel) as opposed to a residential use. The layout of the residential units have been designed to minimize outlook impacts.
- Despite the challenges with road dedication and the retention of the existing building, the applicant has been able to greatly improve the street interface. The proposed removal of the underground vehicle access and the addition of commercial units, specialty paving, trees and landscaping and will significantly enhance the pedestrian experience along a busy 104 Avenue corridor.


## Guildford Corporate Centre (GCC) Site

- The applicant proposes to retain the existing GCC building on the site, which is a total of six storeys along the south half of the building. The southern half of the building, however, is currently only three storeys high. The applicant proposes additional floor area to increase the southern half of the building to six storeys as well (see blue-shaded areas of the building on Pages A3.11 and 3.12 in Appendix I).
- The proposed building materials and glazing will match the existing GCC building.
- A parking structure is also proposed on the east side of the GCC site, above the current surface parking lot. Three levels of the parking structure will be underground and three above grade. A three-storey office space is proposed at the north end of the parking structure, which will provide a more urban, pedestrian interface along 105 Avenue.
- This proposed three-storey office space will include significant façade glazing with anodized aluminum frames and glass spandrel and tempered glass balcony guards.
- The building is constructed of concrete (painted white and grey), which are colours that are consistent with the existing GCC building. Composite metal panels (white) and composite panels (woodgrain) are proposed as building accents.
- An outdoor space is proposed on the rooftop of the three-storey office space and will be utilized by the employees of the Guildford Corporate Centre (see amenity space section, further below).


## Signage

- The applicant proposes some new signage as part of the proposal including:
- Two fascia signs on the ground floor of the proposed 31-storey building identifying the building name and address along 104 Avenue. These signs are comprised of channel letters;
- One fascia sign on the ground floor above the main entrance to the commercial retail unit (CRU) along 104 Avenue; and
- An under-canopy projecting sign for the CRU.
- This will be reviewed as part of the Comprehensive Sign Design Package Development Permit
- The existing 'Sheraton' sign located along 104 Avenue will be retained but relocated further east along the same frontage.
- The existing free-standing sign of the Sheraton Hotel, which is located at the southeast corner of the site ( 104 Avenue and 153 Street), will also be retained, but will be shifted slightly away from the corner in order to ensure that the sign is in compliance with the 2.0 -metre setback requirement in the Sign Bylaw. This existing free-standing sign was previously approved under Development Application No. 7910-0159-00, and no changes are currently proposed other than its slight relocation.


## Landscaping

## Sheraton Hotel Site

- As part of the proposed development, most of the existing landscaping along 104 Avenue and 153 Street will be removed and replaced with new landscaping.
- New specialty paving, raised planters, trees and landscaping are proposed on the subject site along 104 Avenue, which will significantly enhance the street interface. As part of the road dedication and widening of 104 Avenue, a new 2.5-metre wide sidewalk and 2.5-metre wide treed boulevard will also be constructed.
- The applicant is also proposing a small plaza at the southeast corner of site, which will include trees, landscaping and seating.
- Due to the required road dedication and the location of the existing building, minimal landscaping ( 0.5 metre landscape strip) can be provided on the subject site along 153 Street. However, a new 2.0 -metre wide sidewalk and 2.0 -metre wide boulevard will be constructed along 153 Street, which will greatly improve the interface along the east property line. The boulevard will include sod and trees.
- New trees and landscaping are also proposed through the existing surface parking lot as well as the outdoor amenity space areas on Level 7 and the rooftop.
- The new trees on the site will consist of a variety of trees including ironwood, hazel, and a few varieties of maple.
- A significant number of shrubs and ground cover species are proposed throughout the subject site, including boxwood, sedge, astilbe, twig dogwood, willow, honeysuckle sweetbox, and decorative grass.


## GCC Site

- All of the existing landscaping in front of the GCC building along 152 Street and 105 Avenue will largely remain the same. The majority of the existing trees along the east property line will also remain, providing a buffer between the subject site and the existing four-storey apartment buildings to the east.
- As part of the proposed development, new trees and landscaping are mainly proposed above the new parking structure.
- The new trees on the site will consist of a variety of trees including maple, ironwood, and cherry. A number of shrubs and ground cover species are proposed including azalea, sweetbox, juniper, holly, and ferns.


## Indoor Amenity

- Based upon the City's Zoning By-law requirement, the applicant is required to provide 727 square metres of indoor amenity space to serve the residents of the proposed 280 market condo units (including 25 micro units) on the Sheraton site. The applicant is currently providing 88 o square metres of indoor amenity space, which exceeds the minimum requirement.
- The proposed indoor amenity is divided into three (3) areas of the building as follows:
- Level 2: fitness area and gym, as well as study and meeting spaces;
- Level 7: kitchen and dining area, as well as a games room and lounge that connect to the outdoor amenity space; and
- Level 31 (rooftop): small storage room and restroom for the rooftop garden.


## Outdoor Amenity

- Based upon the City's Zoning By-law requirement, the applicant is required to provide 865 square metres of outdoor amenity space to serve the residents of the proposed 280 market condo units (including 25 micro units) on the Sheraton site. The applicant proposes 884 square metres of outdoor amenity space, which exceeds the minimum requirement.
- The proposed outdoor amenity space is as follows:
- Level 7: a seating areas, an outdoor kitchen and dining area, as well as a children's playspace; and
- Level 30 (rooftop): outdoor amenity garden space.


## Outstanding Items

- The applicant is required to resolve all outstanding urban design and landscaping issues and Advisory Design Panel comments, as follows:
- Further design development to the proposed tower on the Sheraton site to pay homage to the Guildford Sheraton hotel, which may include revisions to massing, fenestration, and balcony expression;
- Refine the CRU facades to improve visibility and access;
- Simplify and develop pedestrian access, movements, and weather protection through the site with particular regard to CPTED;
- Improve the quality of finish to the existing hotel podium;
- Clarify and refine the design of the plazas and site edges, in particular the southeast corner plaza;
- Refine the materials, balconies, and architectural elements; and
- Refine the signage design.
- The applicant will be provided a detailed list identifying these requirements and has agreed to resolve these prior to Final Approval of the Development Permit, should the application be supported by Council.


## TREES

- Florian Fisch and Natalie Gibbs, ISA Certified Arborists of Durante Kreuk Ltd. prepared an Arborist Assessment for the subject property. The following table provides a summary of the tree retention and removal by tree species for both sites combined:

Table 1: Summary of Tree Preservation by Tree Species:

| Tree Species | Existing | Remove | Retain |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deciduous Trees <br> (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) |  |  |  |
| Cherry | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| Red Maple | 2 | O | 2 |
| Sweet Gum | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| Coniferous Trees |  |  |  |
| Austrian Pine | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| Western Red Cedar | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Total (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) | 25 | 18 | 7 |
| Total Replacement Trees Proposed (excluding Boulevard Street Trees) |  | 36 |  |
| Total Retained and Replacement Trees |  | 43 |  |
| Contribution to the Green City Program |  | \$0 |  |

- The Arborist Assessment states that there are a total of 25 mature trees on the site. There are no Alder or Cottonwood trees on the site. It was determined that seven 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, road dedication and proposed lot grading.
- For those trees that cannot be retained, the applicant will be required to plant trees on a 2 to 1 replacement ratio. This will require a total of 36 replacement trees on the site. The applicant is proposing at least 36 replacement trees, therefore meeting the City requirement.


## 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. Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Stage 1 Plan
Appendix VI. Development Variance Permit No. 7917-0577-oo
Appendix VII. Aerial Photo
Appendix VIII. ADP Comments and Response
approved by Ron Gill

Jeff Arason
Acting General Manager
Planning and Development
DN/cm
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TO: Manager, Area Planning \& Development

- North Surrey Division

Planning and Development Department
FROM: Development Services Manager, Engineering Department
DATE: May 02, $2022 \quad$ PROJECT FILE: $\quad \mathbf{7 8 1 7} \mathbf{- 0 5 7 7 - 0 0}$

RE:

## Engineering Requirements (Commercial/Industrial) <br> Location: 15269104 Ave

## REZONE/SUBDIVISION

## Property and Right-of-Way Requirements

- Dedicate approximately 5.46 metres along 104 Avenue.
- Dedicate varying widths along 153 Street to accommodate existing on-site building.
- Dedicate required corner cuts.
- Register 3.0 metres SRW along 105 Avenue.
- Register 2.0 metres SRW along 152 Street.
- Provide 0.5 metre wide statutory rights-of-way (SRW) along 104 Avenue and 153 Street.


## Works and Services

- Construct 104 Avenue, 105 Avenue, 152 Street, and 153 Street.
- Implement the recommendations of the Traffic Impact Study and geotechnical report.
- Complete drainage catchment analysis to determine existing capacities. Resolve downstream constraints, as identified.
- Submit fire flow and water meter calculations to confirm system adequacy.
- Provide water, storm and sanitary service connections to service the development, and abandon all existing connections.
- Register applicable legal documents as determined through detailed design.
- Pay amenity charge for undergrounding the existing overhead electrical and telecommunication infrastructure and applicable latecomer charges.

A Servicing Agreement is required prior to Rezone/Subdivision.

## DEVELOPMENT PERMIT/DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT

There are no engineering requirements relative to the Development Permit and Development Variance Permit proposed.



Jeff Pang, P.Eng.
Development Services Manager
HB4
NOTE: Detailed Land Development Engineering Review available on file

## THE IMPACT ON SCHOOLS

APPLICATION \#: 17057700

## SUMMARY

The proposed 280 highrise units
are estimated to have the following impact
on the following schools:

Projected enrolment at Surrey School District for this development:

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Elementary Students: | 15 |
| Secondary Students: | 14 |

September 2021 Enrolment/School Capacity

| Harold Bishop Elementary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Enrolment (K/1-7): |  |
| Operating Capacity (K/1-7) | $38 \mathrm{~K}+376$ |
|  |  |
| Johnston Heights Secondary | 1371 |
| Enrolment (8-12): | 1450 |
| Capacity (8-12): |  |



Population : The projected population of children aged 0-19 Impacted by the development. Enrolment: The number of students projected to attend the Surrey School District ONLY.

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.

Harold Bishop Elementary has been operating just below capacity the past 5 years. With the proposed large scale development proposed along 152nd, it , it change the urban landscape of the area and also fuel growth to counteract the previous flat line enrolment trend that sat below the school capacity. This catchment will be monitored over the next year to further understand the impact that the new larger residential development currently considered by the Surrey Development Services.

Johnston Heights Secondary like Harold Bishop has been operating below the school's capacity for the last 5 years and is projected to continue this trend. Enrolment has been declining as it serves many of the maturing neighbourhoods in North Surrey and Guildford. However, with the pending densification around Guildford Mall and the future Skytrain line, these projections should be considered conservative.

## Harold Bishop Elementary



Johnston Heights Secondary


* Nominal Capacity is estimated by multiplying the number of enrolling spaces by 25 students. Maximum operating capacity is estimated by multipying the number of enrolling spaces by 27 students.



# Tree Preservation Summary 

| Surrey Project No: | $17-0577$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Address: | 15269104 Ave. Surrey, BC |
| Registered Arborist: | Florian Fisch, PN-7921A and Natalie Gibbs, PN-9032A |


| On-Site Trees | Number of Trees |
| :---: | :---: |
| Protected Trees Indentified <br> (on-site and shared trees, including trees within boulevards and proposed streets and lanes, but excluding trees in proposed open space or riparian areas) | 25 |
| Protected Trees to be Removed | 18 |
| Protected Trees to be Retained <br> (excluding trees within proposed open space or riparian areas) | 7 |
| Total Replacement Trees Required: <br> Alder \& Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ration $\qquad$ $0 \times$ one (1) $=0$ <br> All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio $\qquad$ 18 X two $(2)=36$ | 36 |
| Replacement Trees Proposed | 36 |
| Replacement Trees in Deficit | 0 |
| Protected Trees to be Retained in Proposed [Open Space / Riparian Areas] | 0 |


| Off-Site Trees | Number of Trees |
| :--- | :---: |
| Protected Off-Site Trees to be Removed | 0 |
| Total Replacement Trees Required: |  |
| Alder \& Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ration |  |
| $0 \times$ one (1) = 0 | 0 |
| All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio |  |
| $0 \times$ two (2) $=0$ | 0 |
| Replacement Trees Proposed | 0 |
| Replacement Trees in Deficit | 0 |

Summary, report and plan prepared and submitted by:

(Signature of Arborist)

January 4, 2022
Date


Legend

| Single Family or Duplex | Low to Mid Rise Apartment | 7 High Rise Mixed Use | School | Bus Layover Facility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Townhouse or Row House | V2. Low to Mid Rise Mixed Use | Commercial | - Park/School | :**: Riparian Buffer |
| Low Rise Apartment | Mid to High Rise Apartment | Parks and Natural Areas | Civic |  |
| Low Rise Mixed Use | V. Mid to High Rise Mixed Use | Metro Vancouver Reservoir | Daylighted Watercourse |  |



## DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT

NO.: 7917-0577-00
Issued To:
(the "Owner")

Address of Owner:

1. This development variance permit is issued subject to compliance by the Owner with all statutes, by-laws, orders, regulations or agreements, except as specifically varied by this development variance permit.
2. This development variance permit applies to that real property including land with or without improvements located within the City of Surrey, with the legal description and civic address as follows:

Parcel Identifier: 019-001-011
Lot A Section 21 Block 5 North Range 1 West New Westminster District Plan LMP19459

$$
\begin{gathered}
10470-152 \text { Street } \\
(15230-105 \text { Avenue })
\end{gathered}
$$

(the "Land")
3. Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended is varied as follows:
(a) In Section F of Part 38 "Downtown Commercial Zone (C-35)", the minimum rear yard (south) setback is reduced from 7.5 metres to 4.5 metres for the existing Guildford Corporate Centre building at 10470-152 Street; and
(b) In Section F of Part 38 "Downtown Commercial Zone (C-35)", the minimum rear yard (south) setback is reduced from 7.5 metres to 1.0 metre for the proposed parking structure at 10470-152 Street; and
(c) In Section F of Part 38 "Downtown Commercial Zone (C-35)", the minimum side yard (east) setback is reduced from 3.0 metres to 0.0 metre for the proposed parking structure at 10470-152 Street.
4. This development variance permit applies to only the buildings and structures on the Land shown on Schedule A, which is attached hereto and forms part of this development variance permit.
5. The Land shall be developed strictly in accordance with the terms and conditions and provisions of this development variance permit.
6. This development variance permit shall lapse if the Owner does not substantially start any construction with respect to which this development variance permit is issued, within two (2) years after the date this development variance permit is issued.
7. The terms of this development variance permit or any amendment to it, are binding on all persons who acquire an interest in the Land.
8. This development variance permit is not a building permit.
AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE COUNCIL, THE DAY OF , 20 .
ISSUED THIS DAY OF , 20.

Mayor - Doug McCallum

City Clerk - Jennifer Ficocelli


## CIS City of Surrey Mapping Online System


N.B. THIS DOCUMENT IS BASED ON THE ORIGINAL MINUTES OF JANUARY 17, 2022
\& HAS BEEN TRIMMED TO THE CONDITIONAL ITEMS OF 17-0577 ONLY.

Respondents:
IBI Architects
DKL Landscape

## BEGIN:

## Key Points

- Consider providing temporary loading/unloading stalls adjacent to the residential tower parkade lobbies to facilitate grocery unloading activities. Parking stalls adjacent to Tower core have been reassigned as Resident Convenience Loading and stall count adjusted accordingly.
- $\quad$ Consider increasing the number of active uses at grade along 104th Avenue. Given the limited frontage along $104^{\text {th }}$, we have increased the potential number of active uses along the interior frontage (fronting the Hotel Driveway). By including additional entries into this CRU space, it is possible to host multiple smaller tenants with exposure to the Hotel lobby. We have also increased the width of sidewalk along this frontage to $1.5 m$, encouraging pedestrian traffic to these shopfronts. In addition, we are chamfering the storefront to remove the sharp angular plan condition and increase community social outdoor space (see Landscape comments below). Note that the CRU was introduced at the early request of Planning ... its inclusion is a fundamental response to improving the streetscape along $104^{\text {th }}$ and these refinements further improve that.
- Consider providing a step or other measures to recognize and pay homage to the height of the Sheraton tower.
Four architectural devices have been introduced that recognize and pay homage to the height of the Sheraton tower (i.e. L21). These are:

1. A dramatic yet simple 'carving' of the SE corner balconies along an angled facet. The base of this facet is greatest at Lo8 and diminishes progressively to zero at L21, matching the height of the existing Hotel tower. This geometric facetting is reversed above the Hotel tower datum.
2. Two different color treatments of balcony soffits are introduced. The interplay of these two soffits accentuates and refers to the existing Hotel tower.
3. An upstand of 18 " is introduced on select balconies from Lo8 to L21, further acknowledging the existing Hotel tower.
4. Balconies are continuous/discontinuous in response to the existing Hotel tower datum.
See also a similar comment below in Form \& Character section.

- Consider additional sun shading on west façade to help manage solar heating on that façade.
We note that the privacy screens between units will provide additional vertical shading from a late afternoon western sun.
- Consider narrowing the width of the south façade. Work with the City to relocate the density to the top of the tower. Consider a purer rectangular form. We have increased the rectilinearity of the composition by 'squaring' all balconies, resulting in a more rectangular form and impression. We decline seeking additional height as our proposal is already a careful balance of functionality and urban fit discussed at length with Planning. See a similar comment in the Form \& Character section below.
- Consider further landscape or amenity development of the existing Sheraton podium roof top.
The existing Hotel podium rooftop will receive an ornamental raked gravel pattern providing a more appealing aspect to both residents the new residential tower and Hotel users by reducing the amount of roofing membrane now showing. However, the current tenant of the Hotel requires and expects operational exclusivity for its building. It is not possible to provide a residential amenity on the Hotel podium without compromising this contractual obligation. A further factor in this decision is the impracticality of connecting the residential component to the Hotel podium roof given the floor heights do not match and elevators, stairs, and/ramps would be required to achieve accessible access. This applies to a similar comment in the Landscape section below.
- Consider enhancing the experience of moving between the GCC and the residential lobby. Provide over-head protection for path connecting residential parking structure at GCC and the residential tower. Consider a more formal expression at the west tower entry.
Improving this path will be undertaken for the benefit of the general public and hotel users. Note that no residents will park on either the Hotel or the GCC surface parking areas. All resident parking is underground and therefore residents will not likely use this surface path. Given then that the path is primarily for non-residents, it will not be integrated with the residential lobby. However, it will be placed adjacent to the lobby for improved CPTED performance. Also, the path will be weather-protected along the length of the proposed building to enhance the experience of moving between the GCC parking area and $104^{\text {th }}$ Avenue as per a similar condition below.
- Consider providing a pedestrian route through the block.

On close review and inspection, it is not practical to provide a pedestrian route across the GCC site as this involves a vertical difference of 8+m (27'). This would necessitate a dedicated 'public' elevator which is undesirable from both construction and ongoing maintenance aspects. In addition the only feasible location such a route could pass across the GCC site is within the 5 m setback along the east and this route would be difficult to keep safe and secure from a CPTED aspect. See also a similar comment below in Form \& Character section.

- Consider further development of the southeast plaza that addresses potential CPTED concerns.
This comment is well received and through further iteration has a much more open layout. Predominantly by special paver pattern, the exit paths from existing building are maintained, seating will take a
more iconic form with an ultra-high-performance-concrete product
such as the "Tree-Line" from IDCreated. Subtle grading may
introduce a rainwater feature. Two trees to be preserved (per arborist report) will be relocated in-grade tree grates in this new parklette (with placement to consider the visibility of the relocated existing Sheraton signage to remain).

Site

- Commend the proponent for taking a high-density urban infill approach. Thank you.
- Appreciate applicant's attempt to revitalize the area.

Thank you.
Good design solution given all constraints. Elegant solution to parking. Thank you.

Project team to be complimented for a very complete application for whatappears to be a tight and challenging site.
Thank you.

## Form and Character

- The overall form of the building is simple and elegant.

Thank you.

- Appreciate entire presentation. Good form and character, and attractive project.

Thank you.

- There appears to be a considerable amount of very visible membrane hotel roof evident in the renderings and 3 D views. Applicant should consider opportunities to provide softening of this roof when viewed from the new residential tower through application of coloured gravels, low profile green roof or other such interventions.
The existing Hotel podium rooftop will receive an ornamental coloured gravel pattern providing a more appealing aspect to both the new residential tower and the existing Hotel users by reducing the amount of roofing membrane now showing.
- Consider providing an attractive mid-block pedestrian crossing that can be further improved when the neighboring properties are developed. This could also help improve the residents' experience travelling from the parking structure to their units.
On close review and inspection, it is not practical to provide a pedestrian route across the GCC site as this involves a vertical climb/drop of over $8 m$ (27') and this would necessitate a dedicated 'public' elevator which is undesirable from both construction and ongoing maintenance aspects. In addition the only feasible location such a route could pass across the GCC site is within the 5m setback along the east and this route would be difficult to keep safe and secure from a CPTED aspect (as it would be framed on one side by a parking structure wall and a stand of mature screening trees on the other, both of which preclude easy 'eyes on the street' from the easterly neighbour). See also a similar comment above in Key Points section.

Regarding the experience of residents' travel above grade from the parking structure to their units, note that such a route is unlikely as all residential parking is below grade. Residents are thus more likely to go directly below grade to the tower elevators: there is little reason for them to take a more convoluted path involving two elevators and outdoor exposure. See also a similar comment below in the Landscape section.

- Consider modifying the residential tower massing (stepping) and fenestration to more specifically relate to the Sheraton tower height and expression. The overall new tower height could be increased to offset any loss of floor area from the stepping.
(See a similar comment above in the Key Points section) Four architectural devices have been introduced that recognize and pay homage to the height of the Sheraton tower. These are:

1. A dramatic yet simple 'carving' of the SE corner balconies along a single angled facet. The base of this facet, this setback of the balcony, is greatest at Lo8 and diminishes progressively to zero at L22, matching the height of the existing Hotel tower. This embellishing geometry is reversed above the Hotel tower datum.
2. Two different color treatments of balcony soffits are introduced. The interplay of these two soffits accentuates and refers to the existing Hotel tower.
3. An upstand of 18 " is introduced on select balconies from Lo8 to L22, further acknowledging the existing Hotel tower.
4. A pronounced 'brow' on the L22 at the SE, E, and NE slabs to further delineate the existing Hotel tower.

Insofar as seeking increased tower height, we respectfully decline. The tower height we are proposing is a careful \& deliberate balance of urban fit and programme discussed at length with the City.

- The indoor and outdoor amenity allocation on different levels sounds generous. However, the outdoor amenity on Level 7 is broken into many parts, which would be better connected to each other; encourage connectivity with the outdoor amenity.
The outdoor amenity has been revised for better connectivity. See comment below in Landscape section regarding this same subject (to wit: Exterior amenity at level 7 appears well organized relative to the interior amenity.).
- North-south orientation of residential tower of site is challenging for energy efficiency, but given site limitations, other options can't be achieved. A large portion of building is facing west, which has unprotected sunlight and prevents getting advantage of the north mountain view. The balconies work very well for sun shading but because of west-facing windows, some vertical shading as per the City of Surrey's DP guidelines would be advantageous.
We are proposing extensive balconies which inherently provide sun shading. Privacy screens between units contribute to vertically-oriented shading for late afternoon solar angles.
- Proximity of the new residential tower to the existing hotel is a concern as it impacts the character of the residential tower, privacy of residential and
hotel units. Recommend further design development to the podium layout. While the separation between the existing Hotel tower and the proposed residential tower is minimal at one particular condition, the overarching orientation of the buildings is such that this minimal condition immediately increases with every centimeter moved further along the building faces ... this is a compelling factor. Sightlines perpendicular to building faces meet or exceed standard requirements as illustrated below:

- Guildford is an important urban centre and a regional shopping destination. 104 Avenue is the main corridor on Guildford and would encourage making the south side of the tower more vibrant, pedestrian and community friendly. Currently it is not inviting enough. Recommend further articulation at floor level on the south side, which would give more energy to that part.
Given the finite and modest frontage available along $104^{\text {th }}$, there is little room for added articulation since further reduction of the CRU by increasing public outdoor spaces will compromise the economic viability of the CRU itself. See next comment as part of this issue. We note that the inclusion of the CRU now showing is already at the specific request of Planning and already greatly improves the current situation along this frontage by providing a vibrant, pedestrian- and community-friendly amenity relative to the present condition..
- CRU could benefit from increased walkway width along the driveway for better access and visibility.
We have allowed for a demising of the CRU by providing potential separate entries facing the Hotel driveway. A widened sidewalk along this frontage is provided.
- Recommend further design development to exposed concrete balconies. We have altered and reduced the extent of exposed concrete balconies where possible. We note thermal bridging of extended balconies is offset somewhat by increased shading, thus reducing the energy costs of cooling during the summer. We are in discussion with our energy consultant to further mitigate thermal bridging heat losses during working drawings (measures such as thermally-broken balcony connections and/or gapped slab connections are under consideration).
- Design development on the extrusion of the GCC building may be required. A reveal or step may help merge new and old façade materials and reduce the massing facing adjacent residential uses.
The GCC building has been revised accordingly and a reveal at the $4{ }^{\text {th }}$ level has been introduced. This also applies to the comment below.
- Explore an alternate footprint for the new floors of the GCC to achieve sun shading. See preceding comment.
- Improvements to public realm are well handled given the constraints. Thank you.


## Landscape

- The walkway along the west side is long and isolated. The applicant's suggestion of adding weather protection for this walkway is supported, but also consider more visual permeability from the west side of the lobby onto this walkway, there appears to be quite a wide swath of planting isolating the walkway from the building.
See also a similar comment above in the Form \& Character section.
Architecture and landscape have coordinated to resolve both suggestions, a covered walkway for the length of the tower with direct visual adjacency from interior lobby for CPTED and passive seating along the path/West entry. Additional permeability has been added from the Main south entry by reorienting the bike parking.

Ensure that the tree planters in the parking lot are maximized to provide the soil volumes required for the trees to mature and to provide a pleasingvisual relief from the asphalt parking.
At a depth of $1.07 \mathrm{~m} / 42$ " tree planters are approx. $5 \mathrm{cb} . \mathrm{m}$ soil volume. While this is not $10 \mathrm{cb} . \mathrm{m}$ standard applied to other trees on site, we'd suggest that to maintain sightlines for CPTED in the parking lot, we do not want trees to reach full mature sizes. The landscape standards have only changed in the past few years from $5 \mathrm{cb} . \mathrm{m}$ to 10 cb.m and we'd request accommodation on this point to have trees only reaching 50-70\% maturity in favour of providing an improved aesthetic for the surface parking.

Recommend adding more landscaping to the public realm to make that area wider, and to provide a softer and gentler edge especially at the currently sharp corner of CRU to invite people to stop and to encouragesocial interaction.
The sharp corner of the CRU has been chamfered as much as possible (without overly compromising the commercial viability of the CRU) to provide a softer, gentler edge to the public realm at this location. See similar comment in Key Points section above.
The special paving at the raised pedestrian table at tower CRU clearly delineates the active public realm, with spill-out opportunities for the retail vendor. The chamfered corner allows for gathering at between more formal potential tables/chairs layout.

- Exterior amenity at level 7 appears well organized relative to the interior amenity.
Thank you. See also the comment above in Form \& Character section regarding this same subject.
We appreciate this comment, but due to mixed commentary have taken a second look at the $7^{\text {th }}$ floor and $31^{\text {st }}$ floor programs. The $7^{\text {th }}$ floor has received the urban agriculture program from the rooftop, and flipped the outdoor dining to the north to favour the solar aspect for growing conditions.
- Uppermost roof is not the best location for the community garden amenity. Consider an amenity that provides for larger enjoyment for all residents. No doubt there is a commanding view from this location and good solar aspect.
The community garden amenity has been relocated to Lo7 Outdoor Amenity area. Outdoor Amenity on uppermost roof is retained for all residents to enjoy the commanding views/solar aspect of this situation. As noted above, the urban agriculture has been moved down and expanded on Level 7. However, there is no real option to provide same on hotel podium roof (see next).
- Consider relocating the community garden from the 31st floor roof and adding several community garden "pods" on the hotel ballroom roof, connected to the Leveloz amenity space with a bridge over the entry driveway. This would help beautify the large hotel roof area, provide meaningful community garden areas, and add a "Wow" design factor. Relocating community gardens to existing Hotel podium and/or Ballroom rooffundamentally not possible for geometric (access to residential tower would require elevators, stairs/ramps as there is no common datum) and pragmatic (current Hotel Tenant contractually enjoys independent operation) reasons. Community gardens relocated instead to Lo7 Outdoor Amenity area (see preceding comment in Key Points section above).
Instead, a radial visual pattern in coloured gravel is contemplated for visual appeal from the residential and hotel towers. This design is not final and will be considered throughout the development process.


## CPTED

- Recommend carefully considering pedestrian experience when walking from remote residential parking to the residential entry. Weather protection noted by the applicant will help the experience.
Weather protection is provided adjacent to the proposed residential building.
As noted above, changes have been made to the ground level layout at all corners and pedestrian circulation routes to ensure visibility by other users, safety (from vehicular traffic) through raised pedestrian tables and lighting, and through planting decisions

Recommend further design development to the corner plaza at 104 Avenue and 153 Street to increase openness to the street for visibility and to address possibleCPTED issues related to limited visibility and multipoint access. Additional planting may help
soften the existing blank hotel façade in this location.
Related to the issue of visibility, the new parklette design (as
described above) and its seating is fully in view of the streets, with
lighting design that will animate the space and make it a comfortable, safe space to users. Planting near the existing facades
do soften the blank areas (refer to planting plan L2.1)

## Sustainability

Commend applicant for using energy modelling early in the process.
Thank you.

- Consider future weather files for energy modelling, looking at passive survivability.
This suggestion will be incorporated in subsequent energy-related design development.
- Consider future potential uses that the new parkade could be converted to when the demand for parking abates in the future. Consider flat floors and higher floors to floor dimensions that could accommodate other uses. Given the complexity of matching existing slabs while accommodating the pronounced site slopes, it is not practical to future-proof the new parkade in this manner.

Accessibility

- No specific issues were identified.

Thank you.

