

## PROPOSAL:

- Rezoning from RF to CD (based on RM-7o)
- Development Permit
to permit the development of a 6-storey apartment building consisting of approximately 129 dwelling units in City Centre.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { LOCATION: } & \begin{array}{l}13454-95 \text { Avenue } \\ (13452-95 \text { Avenue })\end{array} \\ & \begin{array}{l}13460-95 \text { Avenue } \\ \\ \\ \text { ZONING: }\end{array} \\ & \text { RF }\end{array}$
OCP DESIGNATION: Multiple Residential
CCP DESIGNATION: Residential Low to Mid Rise up to 2.5 FAR



## 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

- None.


## RATIONALE OF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal complies with the General Urban designation in the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy (RGS).
- The proposal complies with the Multiple Residential designation in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the 'Residential Low to Mid Rise up to 2.5 FAR' designation in the Surrey City Centre Plan.
- The proposed setbacks achieve a more urban, pedestrian streetscape in compliance with the guidelines in the City Centre Plan, and the proposed density and 6-storey building form are appropriate for this area of City Centre.
- 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 achieve a positive urban experience between the proposed building and the public realm.
 line, in order to provide vehicle access to the underground ramp at the southeast corner of the site. The 6 .o-metre wide lane may be converted into a pedestrian walkway in the future, once the full 12 -metre wide east/west lane is constructed just south of the site, in compliance with the City Centre Plan.


## RECOMMENDATION

The Planning \& Development Department recommends that:

1. A By-law be introduced to rezone the subject site from "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" and a date be set for Public Hearing.
2. Council authorize staff to draft Development Permit No. 7920-0206-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) submission of a subdivision layout 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) 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
(g) demolition of existing buildings and structures to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(h) registration of a right-of-way for public rights-of-passage for the area between the building face and the street edges;
(i) 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
(j) 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 Services.

## SITE CONTEXT \& BACKGROUND

| Direction | Existing Use | City Centre Plan <br> Designation | Existing Zone |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Subject Site | Single family dwellings on <br> two of the lots. Vacant lot <br> at 13460 - 95 Avenue, with <br> unauthorized structures on <br> the lot. | Residential Low to Mid <br> Rise up to 2.5 FAR | RF |
| North <br> (Across 95 Avenue): | Single family dwellings. | Residential Low to Mid <br> Rise up to 2.5 FAR | RF |
| East: | Single family dwellings. | Residential Low to Mid <br> Rise up to 2.5 FAR | RF |
| South: | Single family dwellings. | Residential Low to Mid <br> Rise up to 2.5 FAR | RF |
| West: | Single family dwellings. | Residential Low to Mid <br> Rise up to 2.5 FAR | RF |

## Context \& Background

- The 3,964 -square metre subject site consists of three (3) properties and is located west of Queen Elizabeth Secondary School. The site is located within the Medical District of City Centre.
- The three properties are designated "Multiple Residential" in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and "Low to Mid-Rise up to 2.5 FAR" in the City Centre Plan. All of the lots are zoned "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)". Currently, there are single family dwellings located on two (2) of the lots (13452/54 and 13474-95 Avenue). The house at 13460-95 Avenue has been demolished, but the occupants of 13474-95 Avenue have been utilizing the property for parking and storage.


## DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

## Planning Considerations

- The applicant is proposing the following, in order to allow the construction of four 6-storey apartment buildings on the subject site:
o a Rezoning of the site from "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" based on the RM-7o Zone;
o a Development Permit for Form and Character; and
o a Subdivision (lot consolidation).
- The proposal includes 129 apartment units. No micro units (defined as units with a floor area between 30 and 35 square metres in size) and no rental units are proposed.
- The gross floor area ratio (FAR) proposed for this development is 2.3 (2.9 net), which complies with the "Residential Low to Mid Rise up to 2.5 FAR" Surrey City Centre Plan designation.
- There are a few other development applications in this block that is bounded by 134 and 135 Streets on the west and east, and 95 and 94A Avenues on the north and south:
o Development Application No. 7919-0370-oo (9442 and 9456-134 Street and 13439 94A Avenue) to the southwest of the subject site was approved by Council on July 26, 2021 for two 6 -storey apartment buildings. The Building Permit is currently in process;
o Development Application No. 7917-0205-00 (9445/47, 9459/61-135 Street and 13491/93 - 135 Street) to the southeast of the subject site proposes a 6 -storey apartment building and the Rezoning Bylaw was granted Third Reading by Council on May 7, 2018. The applicant is currently working on the remaining outstanding items and expects to proceed to Council for consideration of final adoption in the near future.
o Development Application No. 7920-0286-oo (9470, 9482, 9492 - 134 Street and 13428-95 Avenue) to the west of the subject site proposes a 6-storey apartment building. The project is still under review and is Pre-Council.
- The following table provides development specifics on the proposed project.

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Lot Area |  |  |
| Gross Site Area: | 3,964 square metres |  |
| Lane Dedication: | 765 square metres |  |
| Net Site Area: | 3,199 square metres |  |
| Number of Lots: | 1 proposed lot (3 parent parcels) |  |
| Building Height: | 20.3 metres |  |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR): | 2.3 gross FAR (2.9 net FAR) |  |
| Floor Area |  |  |
| Residential: | 9,243 sq.m. |  |
| Commercial: | N/A |  |
| Total: | 9,243 sq.m. |  |
| Residential Units: | 83 |  |
| 1-Bedroom: | 11 |  |
| 1-Bedroom + Den: | 6 |  |
| 1-Bedroom + Den Loft: | 6 |  |
| 2-Bedroom: | 15 |  |
| 2-Bedroom (adaptable unit): | 4 |  |
| 2-Bedroom + Den: | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |  |
| Total: | $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ |  |

## 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: No concerns.
Advisory Design Panel: The proposal was considered at the ADP meeting on December 2, 2021 and was granted conditional support. The applicant has agreed to resolve the outstanding items from the ADP review as outlined in the Development Permit section of this report, prior to Council's consideration of Final Adoption of the rezoning bylaw, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department.

## Transportation Considerations

- As part of the Rezoning application, the applicant is required to dedicate 6 metres along the south property line for the new east/west green lane, which will eventually connect 134 and 135 Street. This new lane will be 12 metres wide when fully constructed, as the remaining 6 metres will be constructed as part of a future development application for the abutting site to the south ( $13453 / 61 / 73-94$ A Avenue).
- Vehicle access to the underground parking is via this east/west lane along the south property line.
- The applicant has also agreed to dedicate 6.0 metres along the west property line for an interim lane, in order to provide a connection to the new east/west lane along the south property line. There is a chance that the properties to the east (including Development Application No. 7917-0205-oo to the southeast) may not be developed prior to the completion of the development on the subject site, and therefore, the intended lane access to 135 Street to the east may not be in place. The interim north/south lane will provide alternative vehicle access if this is the case.
- In the future when the east/west lane is connected to 134 Street or 135 Street (and provides vehicle access to the subject site), the 6.o-metre north/south lane may be converted into a pedestrian walkway.
- No road dedication is required along the north property line (95 Avenue).
- The proposed development will comply with the parking requirements as per the Zoning Bylaw (see CD Bylaw Section).


## 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 Multiple Residential in the Official Community Plan (OCP). The proposed development complies with the OCP.
- In accordance with the OCP (Urban Centre), the density for the subject site may be expressed as floor area ratio (FAR) calculated on the basis of the gross site area.


## Themes/Policies

- The proposed development is consistent with the following guiding policies and objectives in the OCP:
o Support compact and efficient land development that is consistent with the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy (OCP Policy A1);
o Encourage development in urban neighbourhoods to utilize existing infrastructure and amenities and to enhance existing neighbourhood character and viability ( $\mathrm{A}_{3}$ );
o Require redevelopment and infill development to contribute to neighbourhood connectivity and walkability and to enhance public open spaces and greenspaces within existing neighbourhoods ( $\mathrm{A}_{3}$ ); and
o Encourage development that supports increased transit, pedestrian walkability, and bicycle access (B3).


## Secondary Plans

Land Use Designation

- In accordance with the City Centre Plan (CCP), the subject site is designated "Residential Low to Mid Rise up to 2.5 FAR". The proposed development, which proposes a gross FAR of 2.3 (2.9 net FAR), complies with the CCP land designation.


## Themes/Objectives

- The proposed development is consistent with the following guiding principles:
o Encourage Housing Diversity, with a variety of unit types and sizes;
o Create Vibrant Urban Space, with high quality architectural aesthetics and amenities such as public plazas to encourage people to interact with the public realm; and
o Promoting identity and a sense of place.


## CD By-law

- The applicant proposes to rezone the subject site from "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" to Comprehensive Development (CD based on the RM-7o Zone)" to accommodate a 6-storey apartment building. The proposed CD Bylaw for the proposed development site identifies the uses, densities and setbacks proposed.
- The following table provides a comparison of the density, lot coverage, setbacks, building height and permitted uses in the RM-7o Zone and the proposed CD Bylaw:

| RM-7o Zone (Part 24) | Permitted and/or Required | Proposed CD Zone |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | 1.5 FAR (net) | 2.9 FAR (net) |
| Lot Coverage: | 33\% | 55\% |
| Yards and Setbacks |  |  |
| North (front): <br> East (side): <br> South (rear): <br> West (side): | 7.5 metres from all lot lines | 4.5 metres <br> 3.0 metres <br> 4.5 metres <br> 4.5 metres |
| Height of Buildings |  |  |
| Principal buildings: Accessory buildings: | 50 metres <br> 4.5 metres | 21 metres 4.5 metres |
| Amenity Space |  |  |
| Indoor Amenity: <br> Outdoor Amenity: | 387 square metres <br> 387 square metres | 275 square metres <br> 414 square metres |
| Parking (Part 5) | Required | Proposed |
| Number of Stalls |  |  |
| Residential: <br> Residential Visitor: <br> Total: | 116 to 142 <br> 13 to 26 <br> 129 to 168 | $\begin{aligned} & 129 \\ & 13 \\ & 142 \end{aligned}$ |
| Bicycle Spaces |  |  |
| Residential Secure Parking: <br> Residential Visitor: | $155$ | $\begin{aligned} & 158 \\ & 6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

- The proposed net floor area ratio (FAR) of the overall development is 2.9 FAR and the proposed lot coverage is $55 \%$, which will exceed the maximum 1.5 FAR and $33 \%$ lot coverage permitted under the RM-7o Zone. The proposed density is consistent with the City Centre Plan designation of "Residential Low to Mid Rise up to 2.5 FAR", while the proposed lot coverage is consistent with similar 6 -storey apartment developments.
- The RM-7o Zone requires the setbacks to be 7.5 metres. The applicant is proposing reductions for all setbacks in the CD By-law. The reduction in building setbacks is supportable as they allow for more active engagement of the streets, which is desirable for the City Centre area and consistent with the City Centre Plan design guidelines.
- Staff will continue to work with the applicant to improve upon the indoor and outdoor amenity spaces. See Development Permit Section of this report for more information.
- The proposed vehicle and bicycle parking meets the minimum requirement in Part 5 of the Zoning Bylaw.


## 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 CACs and will provide $\$ 2,000 /$ unit as of January 1, 2022. The contribution will be payable at the rate applicable at the time of Rezoning Final Adoption and required to be paid prior to the issuance of the Building Permit.
- The proposed development is not subject to the Tier 2 Capital Plan Project CACs since the proposed development complies with the permitted density in the Secondary Plan designation ('Residential Low to Mid Rise up to 2.5 FAR' in the City Centre Plan).


## 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.
- The applicant will be required to register a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to address the City's needs with respect to the City's Affordable Housing Strategy.


## 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 March 29, 2021, and the Development Proposal Signs were also installed on March 12, 2021. Staff received two (2) responses requesting additional information and clarification. The information was provided, and no follow-up was required.


## DEVELOPMENT PERMITS

## Form and Character Development Permit Requirement

- The proposed development is subject to a Development Permit for Form and Character and is also subject to the urban design guidelines in the Surrey City Centre Plan.
- The proposed development generally complies with the Form and Character Development Permit guidelines in the OCP and the design guidelines in the Surrey City Centre Plan.
- The proposed 6-storey apartment development incorporates a design and building massing that is generally in accordance with the vision for this part of City Centre. This area is envisioned as a medium density residential neighbourhood of apartments, connected to neighbourhood parks and schools with a finer grained street network with green lanes and pathway systems.
- The proposed apartment building is situated along the public frontages of the site with the indoor and outdoor amenity spaces centrally located at the southeast portion of the site, creating a central courtyard.
- The applicant proposes an urban contemporary design and incorporates two-storey loft units along the north street frontage ( 95 Avenue), which provides strong urban edge.
- All ground-oriented units will have their own useable, semi-private outdoor patio space with direct access to the street / sidewalk.
- Building materials include cement panels, aluminum cladding and ceramic coated panels, and brick façades that will define the lower two floors.
- The proposed indoor and outdoor amenity spaces have been integrated for site functionality and efficiency. For more details, see the Indoor and Outdoor Amenity Space sections in this report.
- The proposed development received 'conditional support' from the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) at the December 2, 2021, ADP meeting, and the applicant has agreed to work with City staff to address the comments, including comments with respect to the landscaping, to the satisfaction of the City Architect, prior to Final Adoption of the subject rezoning. The ADP Minutes are attached as Appendix VIII.


## Landscaping

- The new trees on the site will consist of a variety of trees including maple, spruce, and dogwood.
- A significant number of shrubs and ground cover species are proposed throughout the subject site including yew, laurel, hydrangea, viburnum, and silver grass.


## Indoor Amenity

- Based upon the City's Zoning Bylaw requirement, the applicant is required to provide 387 square metres of indoor amenity space to serve the residents of the proposed 129 dwelling units. The applicant is currently providing 275 square metres of indoor amenity space within the two buildings, which does not meet the minimum on-site requirement.
- The proposed indoor amenity space, however, does meet the minimum indoor amenity space required before a cash-in-lieu contribution may be considered, in accordance with the General Provisions Section of the Zoning Bylaw. Therefore, the applicant may provide a cash-in-lieu contribution to satisfy the shortfall in the indoor amenity space requirement of the RM-7o Zone, at the rate in effect at the time of Final Adoption.
- The applicant has provided the following justification for a reduced indoor amenity space:
o The amount of indoor amenity is about $70 \%$ of the requirement; and
o More outdoor amenity space has been provided to account for a reduced indoor amenity space, and the indoor and outdoor spaces have been designed to complement each other. Staff will continue to work with the applicant to improve upon the amenity space, however.
- The applicant proposes three (3) indoor amenity spaces for the proposed apartment building. A meeting space and gym is proposed adjacent to the outdoor amenity space (central courtyard).
- A yoga room is proposed at the southeast corner of Building B, which also has direct access to the outdoor courtyard.


## Outdoor Amenity

- Based upon the City's Zoning Bylaw requirement, the applicant is required to provide 387 square metres of outdoor amenity space to serve the residents of the proposed 129 dwelling units.
- The applicant proposes 414 square metres of outdoor amenity space, which exceeds the minimum requirement.
- The proposed outdoor amenity space located on the ground floor as a central courtyard. The outdoor space consists of a children's play area, a BBQ area with seating and a veggie garden.


## Outstanding Items

- The applicant is required and has agreed to resolve all outstanding urban design and landscaping issues and the Advisory Design Panel comments, prior to Final Approval of the Development Permit, should the application be supported by Council.
- Some remaining outstanding items, which do not affect the overall character or quality of the project, generally include:
o Refinement of property interfaces;
o Development of the landscape treatment of outdoor common spaces; and the
o Refinement to the proposed building finish materials.


## TREES

- Eryn Buzza, ISA Certified Arborist of M2 Landscape Architecture 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 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Cottonwood | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Deciduous Trees <br> (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) |  |  |  |
| Mountain Ash | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Horse-chestnut | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Cherry | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Holly | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Honey Locust | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Norway Maple | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Coniferous Trees | 0 |  |
| Western Red Cedar | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| Douglas Fir | 3 | 3 | 0 |


| Tree Species | Existing | Remove | Retain |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total (excluding Alder and <br> Cottonwood Trees) | 22 | 22 | $\mathbf{o}$ |
| Total Replacement Trees Proposed <br> (excluding Boulevard Street Trees) | 51 |  |  |
| Total Retained and Replacement Trees | 51 |  |  |
| Contribution to the Green City Program | No contribution required |  |  |

- The Arborist Assessment states that there are a total of 22 mature trees on the site, excluding Alder and Cottonwood trees. Two existing trees, approximately $9 \%$ 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 building footprints including the underground parking structure, as well as road and lane dedications.
- 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 46 replacement trees on the site. The applicant is proposing 51 replacement trees, exceeding City requirements.
- In summary, a total of 51 trees are proposed to be replaced on the site. No contribution is required to the Green City Program.


## CITY ENERGY

- The subject site is located within Service Area A, as defined in the "City Centre District Energy System By-law" (see Appendix VII for location). The District Energy System consists of three primary components:
o community energy centres, City-operated facilities that generate thermal energy for distribution through a piped hot water network;
o distribution piping that links the community energy centres with buildings connected to the system; and
o City-owned energy transfer stations (ETS) located within the building connected to the system. The ETS transfers heat energy from the distribution system to the building's mechanical system and is used to meter the amount of energy used.
- All new developments within Service Area A with a build-out density equal to or greater than a floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.0 will be required to provide hydronic thermal energy systems in support of the City's District Energy (DE) system including domestic hot water, make-up air units and in-suite hydronic space heating. The City is committed to having the DE system operational within the timeframe of this project. Therefore, the subject application will be required to connect to the City's DE system prior to occupancy.
- In order to avoid conflicts between the District Energy System and other utilities, the location of the ETS and related service connections are confirmed by Engineering and the applicant at the servicing agreement stage. The Engineering Department also requires the applicant to register a statutory right-of-way and Section 219 Restrictive Covenant over the subject site for the following purposes:
o City access to, and maintenance and operation of, the ETS within the building and any infrastructure between the building and the property line; and
0 to prevent conflicts with other utilities.
- Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Engineering Department will confirm that the applicant has met the requirements of the "City Centre District Energy System By-law".


## 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. City Centre Plan
Appendix VI. Aerial Photo
Appendix VII. District Energy Service Area Map
Appendix VIII. ADP Minutes
approved by Ron Gill

Ron Gill
Acting General Manager
Planning and Development
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95TH AVE. RES. DEV. / MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

| 0.4.0 unit floor area summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UNIT | UnIT TYPE | count | UNIT AREA SF (1SF) | $\underset{\substack{\text { UNTAREA } \\\left(\mathrm{Im}^{2}\right)}}{\text { U }}$ | totalunit AREA SF | $\underset{\text { AREA } m^{2}}{\text { TOTAL UTIT }}$ |
| Unit Al-1st floor | 1 bed + den loft | 2 | $566.2 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $52.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 1132.35F | $105.2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTTA-2ND Floor | Loft 2nd floor | 1 | 199.0tt ${ }^{2}$ | $18.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 199.0SF | $18.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNIT A A-2No floor | Loft 2no floor | 1 | 199.0.tt ${ }^{2}$ | $18.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 199.0 SF | $18.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UnIt A2-1st floor | 1 BED + den loft | 2 | 566.2 tt ${ }^{2}$ | $52.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 1132.35F | $105.2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNIT A2-1st floor | 1 Bed + den loft | 1 | $580.8 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $54.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 580.88 F | $54.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNIT A2-2ND Floor | Loft 2nd floor | 2 | 199.0tt ${ }^{2}$ | $18.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 397.9 SF | $37.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTTA2-2ND Floor | Loft 2nd floor | 1 | $204.1 \mathrm{ta}^{2}$ | $19.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 204.1. SF | $19.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNIT A3-1St floor | 1 bed + den loft | 1 | $573.1 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $53.2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 573.15F | $53.2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTTA3-2ND Floor | Loft 2nd Floor | 1 | $267.4 \mathrm{tr}^{2}$ | $24.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 267.4SF | 24.8 m |
| UNTT 81 | 1 BED | 3 | $474.1 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $44.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 1422.25 F | $132.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTT B1 | 1 BED | 2 | $474.8 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $44.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 949.75 F | 88.2 m |
| UnTt B2 | 1 Bed | 1 | $512.4 \mathrm{tr}^{2}$ | $47.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 512.4 5 F | $47.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTT B2 | 1 BED | 5 | 512.5 tr $^{2}$ | $47.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 2562.75 F | $238.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTt в3 | 1 Bed | 3 | $52.0 .0 \mathrm{ta}^{2}$ | $48.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 1566.05F | $145.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTT B3 | 1 BED | 1 | $522.6 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $48.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 522.6 SF | 48.6 m ${ }^{2}$ |
| UnTt ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 1 BED | 5 | $529.1 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $49.2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 2645.5 SF | $245.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTT 84 | 1 BED | 1 | $529.4 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $49.2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 529.4 SF | 49.2 m |
| UNT 85 | 1 BED | 8 | 548.0 tr $^{2}$ | $50.9 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 4384.1 SF | $407.3 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNIT 85 | 1 BED | 4 | $548.9 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $51.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 2195.6 SFF | $204.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNIT B6 | 1 BED | 1 | ${ }_{5}^{56.00 .0 t^{2}}$ | $51.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 556.0SF | $51.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UnTt b7 | 1 BED | 8 | 560.6 tr $^{2}$ | $52.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 4484.85 F | $416.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTT 87 | 1 BED | 4 | $560.9 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $52.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 2243.5 SF | $208.4 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTT B7 | 1 BED | 1 | $565.1 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $52.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 565.1 SF | $52.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTT B7 | 1 BED | 1 | 568.3 tt ${ }^{2}$ | $52.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 568.3 SF | $52.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTT B8 | 1 BED | 12 | $562.2 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $52.2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 6746.2 SF | 62.7 m ${ }^{2}$ |
| UnTt b9 | 1 BED | 6 | $563.0 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $52.3 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 3378.0 SF | $313.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTT 810 | 1 BED | 11 | $547.7 \mathrm{ft}{ }^{2}$ | ${ }^{50.9 \mathrm{~m}^{2}}$ | ${ }^{\text {60224.45F }}$ | $559.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNIT B11 | 1 BED | 4 | 613.2 tt ${ }^{2}$ | $57.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 2453.0SF | $227.9 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UnIt B12 | 1 BED (ADAPTABLE DWELIMG UNTT) | 2 | $613.2 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $57.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | ${ }^{1226.555}$ | $113.9 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UnTt C1 | 1 BED + DEN | 5 | $682.5 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $63.4 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 3412.3 SF | $317.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Unit C1 | 1 BED + DEN | 1 | $682.7 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $63.4 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 682.75 F | $63.4 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTT C2 | 1 BED + DEN | 5 | 705.5tt ${ }^{2}$ | $65.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 3527.7 SF | $327.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Unit di | 2 8ED | 2 | $679.1 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $63.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | ${ }^{1358.15 F}$ | $126.2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNIT D1 | 2 BED | 2 | $679.8 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | ${ }^{63.2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}}$ | 13559.75 SF | $126.3 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNIT D2 | 2 BED (ADAPTABLE DWELIMG UNT) | 3 | $818.6 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $76.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 2455.75 FF | $228.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Unit d2 | 2 bed (ADAPTABLE DWELIMS UNIT) | 1 | $819.1 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $76.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 819.15 F | $76.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Unit d3 | 2 BED | 4 | $83.8 .8 \mathrm{tr}^{2}$ | $77.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 3335.45F | $309.9 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Unit d3 | 2 BED | 1 | 837.6tt ${ }^{2}$ | $77.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 837.6 SF | $77.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTT D4 | 2 BED | 1 | 825.3.tt ${ }^{2}$ | $76.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 825.3SF | $76.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Unit d4 | 2 8ED | 5 | $825.6 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $76.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 4128.05 F | $383.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNITE1 | $2 \mathrm{CED}+\mathrm{DEN}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | $893.4 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $83.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 5360.45 FF | $498.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNTE E2 | $2 \mathrm{CED}+\mathrm{DEN}$ | 1 | $915.8 \mathrm{tf}^{2}$ | ${ }^{85.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}}$ | 915.85 F | $85.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| UNITE2 UNIT TOTALS | $2 \mathrm{BED}+\mathrm{DEN}$ | 3 | $916.4 \mathrm{tt}^{2}$ | $85.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $2749.2 \mathrm{SF}$ $81988.8 \mathrm{SF}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 255.4 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \\ 7617 . \mathrm{m}^{2} \end{array}{ }^{2} \end{aligned}$ |

### 0.5.0 parking requirements

| REQuIRED (RM-135) | UnTts/S.F. $\begin{aligned} & \text { APARTMENT } \\ & \text { FACTOR }\end{aligned}$ |  |  | total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RESIIENTS (MIN 0.9 STALISDU-MAX. 1.6 STALIS/OU) | 129 |  | 12 | 129 |
| VISITORS <br> (MIN. 0.1 STALLS/DU - MAX. 0.2 STALLS/DU) <br> TOTAL STALLS |  | * 0.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 142 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| SMALL CAR MAXIMUM $=35 \%$ <br> RESIDENTS - 35\% of 129 |  |  |  | 45 |
| ACCESSIBLE STALLS MINIMUM REQUIRED <br> RESIDENTS - 2\% OF 129 <br> VISITORS - $2 \%$ OF 13 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | (2 VAN accessible) |
| EV CHARGE INFRASTRUCTURE <br> ALL RESIDENTIAL PARKING SPACES \& 50\% OF VISITOR PARKING SPACES TO HAVE AN ENERGIZED ELECTRICAL OUTLET CAPABLE OF PROVIDING LEVEL 2 OR; THE OWNER MUST INSTALL AN ELECTRIC VEHICLE ENERGY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY STANDARDS |  |  |  |  |
| BICYCLE PARKING REQUIRED (RM-135) BIKE STALLS (RESIDENT) <br> BIKE STALLS ( VISITOR / BLDG) <br> total stalls | UN |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ 155 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 155 \\ 6 \\ 161 \end{gathered}$ |
| *Bicrcle farking is excluded from far to a maximum of 170 Sm (1830 SF) |  |  |  |  |
| 0.5.1 parking summary |  |  |  |  |
| PARKING STALLS PROVIDED <br> TENANT <br> VISITOR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMALL CAR } \\ & 55(42.6 \%) \end{aligned}$$\begin{gathered} 55(42.6 \% \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | ACCESSIBLE 5 (I VAN) <br> 1 (VAN) <br> 1 (Van |  |  |
| total stals |  |  | 142 | 142 |
| BIKE PARKING PROVIDED <br> BIKE STALLS (RESIDENT / PARKADE) NOTE LOCKER SIZE. |  |  | 158 | 81 STALLS ON P1, 77 STALLS ON P2 SURFACE MOUNT- WITHIN 30 METERS FROM MAIN ENTRANCE |
| NOTE: $100 \%$ OF RESIDENTIAL PARKING SPACES AND 50\% OF VIIITOR PARKING SPACE TO HAVE AN INSTALLED ENERGIZED ELECTRICAL OUTLET CAPABLE OF PROVIDING LEVEL 2 CHARGING FOR AN ELECTRIC VEHICLE. EACH BIKE STORAGE ROOM TO PROVIDE ONE STALL WITH AN ELECTRICAL OUTLET CAPABLE OF PROVIDING CHARGING FOR an ELECTRIC BIIE. EACH PARKADE LEVEL TO Provide a bike maintenance area, As per floor plan. |  |  |  |  |
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|  | 95TH AVE. RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT | $\underset{\substack{\text { EACAE: NTS. }}}{\text { ELEVATION - RENDER }}$ | REISSUED FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 21-01-25 REVISION \#: 3 CITY UF SURREY FILE \#20-0206 |  | SD4.09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



FROM: Development Services Manager, Engineering Department
DATE: January 25, $2022 \quad$ PROJECT FILE: $\mathbf{7 8 2 0 - 0 2 0 6 - 0 0}$

RE: Engineering Requirements
Location: 13454/60/74-95 Avenue

## REZONE/SUBDIVISION

## Property and Right-of-Way Requirements

- Dedicate 6.0 m wide east-west lane
- Dedicate 6.0 m wide north-south lane.
- Dedicate required corner cuts.
- Provide 0.5 m wide statutory right-of-way along 95 Avenue and the lanes.
- Provide off-site statutory right-of-way for drainage, as applicable.


## Works and Services

- Construct south side of 95 Avenue and the lanes.
- Implement the recommendations of the geotechnical report.
- Construct minimum 250 mm water main along 95 Avenue. Complete fire flow analysis to determine the ultimate water main size, extent and velocity and construct as applicable.
- Construct minimum 250mm sanitary main along 95 Avenue.
- Construct storm mains to service the development.
- Complete drainage catchment analysis to determine capacities. Resolve downstream constraints, as identified.
- Provide water, storm, and sanitary service connections to the lot.
- Register applicable on-site and off-site legal documents as determined through detailed design.
- Pay amenity charge for undergrounding the existing overhead electrical and telecommunication infrastructure.
- Pay water latecomer charges, as applicable.

A Servicing Agreement is required prior to Rezone/Subdivision.

## DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

There are no engineering requirements relative to issuance of the Development Permit beyond those noted above.


Jeff Pang, P.Eng.
Development Services Manager
$\mathrm{HB}_{4}$

LEADERSHIP IN LEARNING
January 3, 2022
Planning

THE IMPACT ON SCHOOLS
APPLICATION \#: 20020600 (Updated Jan 2022)

## SUMMARY

The proposed 129 lowrise units
are estimated to have the following impact
on the following schools:

Projected enrolment at Surrey School District for this development:

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


| September 2021 Enrolment/School Capacity |
| :--- |
| Cindrich Elementary  <br> Enrolment (K/1-7): $44 \mathrm{~K}+370$ <br> Operating Capacity (K/1-7) $38 \mathrm{~K}+443$ <br>   <br> Queen Elizabeth Secondary 1474 <br> Enrolment (8-12): 1600 <br> Capacity (8-12):  |


| Projected population of school-age children for this development: | 33 |
| :--- | :--- |

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.

Cindrich Elementary serves established neighbourhoods. The 10-year projection shows that the school continues to maintain existing enrolment levels. This projection is conservative and will likely change as higher density projects are approved and constructed at the intersection of 96th Ave and King George. There are no current plans to expand this existing school; and based on this projection, any future growth can be accommodated with 4 portables or less.

Queen Elizabeth Secondary operates below existing school capacity. Over the next 10 years, the enrolment growth trend will take on a stronger upwards trend line post 2023. Like the elementary school, the proposed new higher density development anticipated around King George Boulevard and 96th Avenue will also fuel secondary growth in the catchment. There are no current plans to expand the existing secondary school, but enrolment will be monitored over the next several years.

## Cindrich Elementary



## Queen Elizabeth 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.



Table 1: Summary of Tree Preservation by Tree Species:

| Tree Species | Existing | Remove | Retain |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alder and Cottonwood Trees |  |  |  |
| Alder | 1 | 1 |  |
| Cottonwood | 1 | 1 |  |
| Deciduous Trees (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Mountain Ash | 1 | 1 |  |
| Horse-chestnut | 2 | 2 |  |
| Cherry | 5 | 5 |  |
| Holly | 1 | 1 |  |
| Honey Locust | 1 | 1 |  |
| Norway Maple | 2 | 2 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Coniferous Trees |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Western Redcedar | 7 | 7 |  |
| Douglas-fir | 3 | 3 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) | 22 | 22 | 0 |
| Additional Trees in the proposed Open Space / Riparian Area |  |  |  |
| Total Replacement Trees Proposed (excluding Boulevard Street Trees) |  |  |  |
| Total Retained and Replacement Trees |  |  |  |

## Tree Preservation Summary

Surrey Project No: 20-034
Address: 13452, 13460, 1347495 Avenue, Surrey, BC.
Registered Arborist: Xudong Bao ISA PN-7671A TRAQ

| On-Site Trees | Number of Trees |
| :---: | :---: |
| Protected Trees Identified (on-site and shared trees, including trees within boulevards and proposed streets and lanes, but excluding trees in proposed open space or riparian areas) | 24 |
| Protected Trees to be Removed | 24 |
| Protected Trees to be Retained (excluding trees within proposed open space or riparian areas) | 0 |
| Total Replacement Trees Required: <br> - Alder \& Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ratio $\qquad$ 2 $X$ one (1) $=2$ <br> - All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio $\qquad$ 22 X two (2) $=44$ | 46 |
| Replacement Trees Proposed | 51 |
| 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: <br> - Alder \& Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ratio $\qquad$ 0 $X$ one (1) $=0$ <br> - All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio $\qquad$ <br> 0 $X$ two (2) $=0$ | 0 |
| Replacement Trees Proposed | 0 |
| Replacement Trees in Deficit | 0 |

Summary, report and plan prepared and submitted by:

(Signature of Arborist)
$\frac{24-J a n-22}{\text { Date }}$

## ᄃ] City Centre Plan (File No. 7920-0206-00)




## FIGURE 1



Produced by GIS Section: May 31, 2012, CS/AW8

## DISTRICT ENERGY SERVICE AREA (SERVICE AREA A \& SERVICE AREA B)

## Advisory Design Panel Minutes

Panel Members:<br>Present:<br>R. Drew, Chair<br>T. Bunting<br>W. Chong<br>N. Couttie<br>M. Heeney<br>J. Packer<br>M. Pasqua<br>R. Dhall

## Guests:

Luc Gosselin, Whitetail Homes Ltd.
Andressa Linhares, Keystone Architecture
Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape
Architecture

## Staff Present:

A. McLean, City Architect
S. Maleknia, Urban Design Planner
W. Lee, Recording Secretary

## A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was
Moved by Ruchir Dhall
Seconded by Marco Pasqua
That the minutes of the Advisory Design
Panel meeting of November 18, 2021, be received.

## Carried

## B. NEW SUBMISSIONS

1. 4:00 p.m.

| File No.: | 20-0206 |
| :--- | :--- |
| New or Resubmit: | New |
| Last Submission Date: | N/A |
| Description: | The site is designated 'Multiple Residential' in the OCP <br> and 'Residential Low to Mid Rise up to 2.5 FAR' in the |
|  | City Centre Plan. The applicant proposes a 6-storey <br> apartment building with 131 units and underground |
|  | parking. The proposed FAR is 2.47 gross. <br> The proposal requires a Rezoning (from RF to CD based <br> on RM-70), a detailed Development Permit and a <br> subdivision (lot consolidation) |
|  | 13452/54, 13460, 13475 - 95 Avenue |
| Luc Gosselin (Whitetail Homes Ltd.) |  |
| Address: | Eric Poxleitner (Keystone Architecture) <br> Developer: <br> Architect: |
| Landscape Architect: | Meredith Mitchell (M2 Landscape Architecture) |
| Planner: | Donald Nip |
| Urban Design Planner: | Sam Maleknia |

The Urban Design Planner advised that the city staff worked closely with the applicant to advance the concept and the staff generally support the project.

The Panel was asked to comment on overall site planning, the architectural expression of the building and materials, landscape concept, Accessibility issues, and public realm interfaces.

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

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

## ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW


#### Abstract

It was Moved by Jason Packer Seconded by Norm Couttie That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) is in CONDITIONAL SUPPORT of the project and recommends that the applicant address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning \& Development Department and, at the discretion of Planning staff, resubmit the project to the ADP for review.


## Carried

Several Panel members expressed that Conditional Support was marginal, and that they would like to see the project again after revisions had been made.

Key Points

- Consider more direct connectivity between interior circulation/spaces to the outdoor amenities.
- Consider further design development of the exterior elevations including the refining the material palette, especially the use of colour and developing a clearer vocabulary of vertical and horizontal alignment.
- Consider exploring introducing a clerestory window at $6^{\text {th }}$ storey eyebrow features.
- Consider reconfiguring the NW corner, reconsider the use of the chamfer geometry; consider a configuration that is more consistent with the remainder of the project.
- Consider minimizing the number of mullions not only for sustainability reasons but also for composition.
- Consider removing the cornice on the west elevation.
- Consider dropping the height of the lid (top roof) over the northeast corner.
- Consider specifying a darker anodized colour for the curtainwall system.
- Further refinement of the arrangement or zoning of uses in the courtyard and entry plaza.
- Consider decreasing the amount of hardscaping in the courtyard particularly in the SW corner.
- Consider providing $5 \%$ of the suites as adaptable and providing an adaptable suite on the first level.
- Consider enhanced features for cyclists like push buttons, maintenance facility and consider consolidating bikes on the Pı parking level.
- Consider means to enhance the use of stairs, for example daylighting, attractive lighting.
- Consider utilizing the energy and thermal comfort models to inform your design process - use future climate files to best understand the resiliency of the project.
- Consider avoiding the use of IPE wood.

Site

- $\quad$ Plaza at the corner entry is awkward. Recommend further design development to better indicate a sense of entry and create a viable and thriving piece of public realm.
- Consider relocating the PMT away from exit path.


## Form and Character

- Encourage mixing the unit types on the ground floor level instead of keeping the north as only lofts and the west being a variety; possibly bring some lofts to the west. The north townhome elevation is more resolved.
- Recommend further design development to maximize glazing on the upper floor 'pop' ups for double-height space or clerestory space; may need to replan for the living space for the use (Interior- Exterior relationship).
- Recommend further design development to the building entry chamfer language in planning and the double height space usage, more glazing into building vs the heavy brick entry.
- Recommend further design development to lobby; it has a very confusing sequence of spaces leading to the elevator.
- $\quad$ Recommend further design development to the indoor amenity space and its relationship internally and with the outdoor amenity; with this building deficient in indoor amenity, it is key for the layout to fully work to understand if the shortfall is satisfactory.
- $\quad$ Consider moving all the bicycle parking to the Pı level to make it more accessible and easier to use (having to ride a bicycle up two levels of ramps are not optimal).


## Landscape

- Patios do not have good separation with the pathway on the west, consider having larger shrubs for separation from path going to units.
- Consider further design development to the plaza
- $\quad$ Consider reducing the hardscape in the plaza and the courtyard
- Review the courtyard landscape design and arrangement of the spaces to better benefit and use the space.


## CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Engage with a good energy modeler to inform design development and consider using future climate files to analyze resilience and performance.
- Think about future climate with ventilation design: maximize the potential for passive ventilation while making spaces work without any passive ventilation at all. Consider the experience of occupants in a heat wave with wildfire smoke.
- $\quad$ Consider means to encourage the use of stairs to support active lifestyles: transparency in or adjacent to doors, thermal comfort, painting, lighting, signage/art. Bicyclists might benefit from these measures.
- Considers enhancements to bike infrastructure:
o Electric bike charging.
o Push button door operators anywhere a bicyclist will go.
o Bike maintenance room.
Accessibility
- Appreciate that there are 4 adaptable units. Consider adding one to the first floor in case of elevator outage.
- Consider the installation of visual fire alarms for Deaf or hard of hearing residents.
- Appreciate flush thresholds to access the deck/balcony.
- Appreciate that accessible parking has been provided on both the P-ı and $\mathrm{P}-2$ levels.
- Recommend increasing the number of Accessible stalls for residents to at least 4 residential stalls ( 2 per 50) and changing location to accommodate van accessibility.
- Recommend that residential Accessible stalls are assigned to accessible/adaptable unit owners.
- Recommend increasing Accessible stalls for 2 for every 50.
- Appreciate that the main doors to the residential lobby and the amenity areas will be provided with power operated buttons. Consider wave / motion activated sensors to avoid the need to touch buttons.
- Recommend audible floor callouts and other Accessibility considerations (circular handrails, braille/tactile buttons etc.).
- Appreciate that interior walkways have adequate space and utilizing the 2 m wide broom finish sidewalk on the exterior.
- Recommend opting for Accessible Maglin picnic tables and benches, or seating with back support for outdoor amenity
- Consider benches with back support in the plaza.


## C. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Motion to amend agenda to add one more item to adopt the 2022 ADP schedule

| It was | Moved by Tom Bunting <br> Seconded by Ruchir Dhall <br> That the agenda be revised to adopt the $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Advisory Design Panel schedule. |  |

## 2. 2022 Advisory Design Panel Meeting Schedule

| It was | Moved by Jason Packer <br> Seconded by Ruchir Dhall <br> That the proposed 2022 Advisory Design |
| :--- | :--- |
| Panel meeting schedule be adopted as presented. |  |

## Carried

## D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for December 16, 2021

## E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 5:53 p.m.
Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk
R. Drew, Chairperson

