

City of Surrey

## PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Application No.:
7921-0079-00
Planning Report Date: October 3, 2022

## PROPOSAL:

- OCP Amendment from Multiple Residential to Town Centre
- Rezoning from C-35 to CD (based on RM-135 and C-8)
- Development Permit
to permit the development of one 18 -storey residential and one 24 -storey mixed-use building consisting of 430 dwelling units with two levels of commercial and office space in Guildford.
LOCATION: 14723-104 Avenue
ZONING:
C-35
OCP DESIGNATION: Multiple Residential
TCP DESIGNATION: Mid to High Rise Apartment, Mid to High Rise Mixed-Use and Road



## RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

- By-law Introduction and set date for Public Hearing for:
- OCP Amendment; and
- Rezoning.
- Approval to vary the Sign By-law through a comprehensive sign design package.
- Approval to draft Development Permit for Form and Character.


## DEVIATION FROM PLANS, POLICIES OR REGULATIONS

- Proposed amendment to the Official Community Plan (OCP) from "Multiple Residential" to "Town Centre" and to Figure 13: Guildford Town Centre Densities to include the subject site within the Town Centre boundary.
- The applicant is proposing to vary the Sign By-law, through a comprehensive sign design package, in order to permit additional signage on the subject site.


## RATIONALE OF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposed amendment to the OCP from "Multiple Residential" to "Town Centre" is required to achieve the proposed high-rise buildings at a density higher than currently allowed in the "Multiple Residential" designation.
- The proposed OCP Amendment is considered to have merit given that the project is located in a Frequent Transit Development Area (FTDA) and within close proximity to rapid bus service along 104 Avenue (a Frequent Transit Network) and aligns with the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan (Stage 1).
- The applicant will provide a density bonus amenity contribution consistent with the Tier 2 Capital Projects Community Amenity Contributions (CACs) in support of the development proposal which requests an increase in density beyond the maximum permitted within the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan (Stage 1).
- The proposal generally complies with the "Mid to High Rise Apartment" and "Mid to High Rise Mixed-Use" designation in the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan (Stage 1).
- The proposed apartment buildings are of high-quality design appropriate for a town centre location and the proposed setbacks help to achieve a more urban, pedestrian streetscape in compliance with the Form and Character Development Permit (DP) guidelines in the OCP.
- The proposed apartment buildings are attractive, well-designed and will utilize high-quality, natural materials as well as contemporary lines. The applicant is proposing reduced building setbacks that benefit the streetscape by providing connectivity to the street. In addition, the applicant will provide appropriate landscaping, along the street frontages, which will help to promote a pedestrian friendly environment as well as positive urban experience between the proposed building and public realm.


## RECOMMENDATION

The Planning \& Development Department recommends that:

1. A By-law be introduced to amend the OCP Figure 3: General Land Use Designations for the subject site from Multiple Residential to Town Centre and OCP Figure 13: Guildford Town Centre Densities to include the subject site within the Town Centre boundary, and a date be set for Public Hearing.
2. Council determine the opportunities for consultation with persons, organizations and authorities that are considered to be affected by the proposed amendment to the Official Community Plan, as described in the Report, to be appropriate to meet the requirement of Section 475 of the Local Government Act.
3. A By-law be introduced to rezone the subject site from "Downtown Commercial Zone (C-35)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" and a date be set for Public Hearing.
4. Council approve the applicant's request to vary the Sign By-law as described in Appendix I.
5. Council authorize staff to draft Development Permit No. 7921-0079-oo, including a comprehensive sign design package, generally in accordance with the attached drawings (Appendix II).
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) the applicant is required to dedicate, as road and without compensation, Bylaw Road for Parcel W of Lot 2 and Parcel X of Parcel A, both of Bylaw number 2534;
(d) submission of a Traffic Impact Assessment, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Engineering;
(e) resolution of all urban design issues to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(f) submission of a finalized landscaping plan and landscaping cost estimate to the specifications and satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(g) submission of a finalized tree survey and a statement regarding tree preservation to the satisfaction of the City Landscape Architect;
(h) the applicant satisfy the deficiency in tree replacement on the site, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(i) provision of cash-in-lieu contribution to satisfy the indoor amenity space requirement of the CD Zone, at the rate in effect at the time of Final Adoption;
(j) 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;
(k) 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; and
(1) 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 Department.

## SITE CONTEXT \& BACKGROUND

| Direction | Existing Use | TCP <br> Designation | Existing Zone |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Subject Site | Vacant parcel | Mid to High Rise <br> Apartment and <br> Mid to High Rise <br> Mixed-Use | C-35 |
| North <br> (Across future 104A Avenue): | Whalley Reservoir <br> Park and existing 3- <br> storey apartment <br> buildings | Low to Mid Rise <br> Apartment | RF \& RM-45 |
| East: | Hjorth Road <br> Elementary School <br> and multi-tenant <br> commercial building | Mid to High Rise <br> Apartment and <br> Mid to High Rise <br> Mixed Use | RF \& C-8 |
| South <br> (Across 104 Avenue): | Supportive housing <br> and Guildford RCMP <br> Sub-station | Civic | CD (Bylaw No. <br> 19893, C-8 \& C-35 |
| West <br> (Across future 147 Street): | Vacant parcel under <br> application for two 6- <br> storey apartment <br> buildings <br> (Development | Low to Mid Rise <br> Apartment | C-35 |

## Context \& Background

- The subject property is located on the north side of 104 Avenue, just east of future 147 Street.
- The property is approximately 0.7 hectare in total area and presently vacant.
- The subject site is designated "Multiple Residential" in the Official Community Plan (OCP), "Mid to High Rise Apartment", "Mid to High Rise Mixed-Use" and "Road" in the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan (Stage 1) as well as zoned "Downtown Commercial Zone (C-35)".


## DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

## Planning Considerations

- In order to permit the development of two high-rise buildings consisting of 430 dwelling units and two floors of commercial/office space with underground parking, the applicant proposes the following:
- OCP Amendment from "Multiple Residential" to "Town Centre";
- Rezoning from "Downtown Commercial Zone (C-35)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" (based upon the "Multiple Residential 135 Zone [RM-135]" and "Community Commercial Zone [C-8]"); and
- Development Permit for Form and Character.
- Building A (18 storeys in height) is located on the northern portion of the site. Building B ( 24 storeys) is located on the southern portion of the site.
- Development details are provided in the following table:

|  | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: |
| Lot Area |  |
| Gross Site Area: <br> Road Dedication: <br> Undevelopable Area: <br> Net Site Area: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7,100.9 sq. m. } \\ & \text { 1,578.7 sq. m. } \\ & \text { N/A } \\ & 5,522.3 \text { sq. m. } \end{aligned}$ |
| Number of Lots: | 1 (existing) |
| Building Height: | Building A: 63 metres Building $\mathrm{B}: 81$ metres |
| Unit Density: | N/A |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR): | 4.2 (Gross)/5.5 (Net) |
| Floor Area |  |
| Residential: Commercial: Total: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28,065 sq. m. } \\ & \text { 2,710 sq. m. } \\ & 30,775 \text { sq. m. } \end{aligned}$ |
| Residential Units: |  |
| Studio: <br> 1-Bedroom: <br> 1-Bedroom plus den: <br> 2-Bedroom: <br> 2-Bedroom, plus den: <br> 3-Bedroom: <br> Total: | 41 dwelling units 189 dwelling units 55 dwelling units 144 dwelling units 1 dwelling unit N/A <br> 430 dwelling units |
| Residential Unit Type |  |
| Micro Unit | 41 dwelling units |


|  | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- |
| Adaptable Unit | 41 dwelling units |

## Referrals

Engineering:

School District:

Parks, Recreation \&
Culture:

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

The School District has advised that there will be approximately 69 school-age children generated by this development, of which the School District has provided the following expected student enrollment.

34 Elementary students at Hjorth Road Elementary School 22 Secondary students at Guildford Park Secondary School

## (Appendix IV)

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, 2026.

No concerns.

The closest active park is Hjorth Road Park and is 150 metres away, and the closest natural area is Green Timbers Urban Forest and is 550 metres away.

Surrey Fire Department: No concerns.
Advisory Design Panel: The proposal was considered at the ADP meeting on July 14, 2022, and was 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

- The subject property is located within the 104 Avenue Frequent Transit Development Area (FTDA) and 60 metres from an existing rapid bus stop ( $\mathrm{R} \mathbf{1}$ - King George to Guildford).
- As such, the proposed development is appropriate for this part of the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor and conforms with the goal of achieving higher density development in locations that benefit from access to frequent transit service.


## Driveway Access and Dedication Requirements

- As part of the subject application, the applicant will be required to dedicate the following:
- The applicant is required to dedicate, as road and without compensation, Bylaw Road for Parcel W of Lot 2 and Parcel X of Parcel A, both of Bylaw number 2534;
- 104 Avenue: approximately 7.808 metres to achieve the ultimate 20.0 metre road allowance from centreline;
- 104A Avenue: various amounts of dedication to achieve the ultimate 26.0 metre collector road (Green Connector) standard;
- 3 metre by 3 metre corner-cut where 147 Street intersects with 104 Avenue and 104A Avenue; and
- 0.5 metre statutory right-of-way (SROW) along 104 Avenue, 104A Avenue and future 147 Street.
- The proposed development will obtain vehicular access to the underground parkade from the future north-south road ( 147 Street). No direct vehicle access will be permitted to 104 Avenue or 104A Avenue.


## 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:
- The proposed high albedo roofing material will have a Solar Reflectance Index (SRI) of 75 or higher; and
- The applicant is proposing electric bicycle charging on-site.


## POLICY \& BY-LAW CONSIDERATIONS

## Regional Growth Strategy

- The subject property is designated General Urban in the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS).
- The proposed development complies with the General Urban RGS designation.

Official Community Plan

## Land Use Designation

- The subject property is designated Multiple Residential in the Official Community Plan (OCP).
- In accordance with the OCP, the Multiple Residential designation is intended to support a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.0 in Frequent Transit Development Areas (FTDAs), Urban Centres, and sites abutting a Frequent Transit Network and, where specifically noted, in approved Secondary Plan Areas In addition, this land-use designation is generally intended for apartment buildings up to a maximum of 6-storeys, as well as higher-density townhouse developments.
- The proposed high-rise apartment buildings (18-storeys and 24 -storeys), located on the subject site, cannot be accommodated under the Multiple Residential designation. Therefore, an OCP Amendment to Figure 3: General Land Use Designations from "Multiple Residential" to "Town Centre" is required to allow the proposal (Appendix VI). Furthermore, this will necessitate that the boundaries of the "Town Centre", as shown on Figure 13: Guildford Town Centre Densities, be amended to include the subject site.
- The Town Centre designation allows additional bonus densities in select areas in exchange for the provision of sufficient community amenities in accordance with approved Council policies. The requested increased density under the Town Centre designation from 2.5 FAR to 4.2 FAR (gross density) can be accommodated in accordance with the City's Density Bonus Program.
- City staff anticipate that, as part of the Stage 2 Plan, several modifications will be made to the land-uses and densities currently permitted in the OCP to better align with the land-uses and densities allowed under the Stage 1 Plan, especially for sites designated for higher densities. In an effort to accommodate the anticipated changes in land-use and density, it will be necessary to amend the boundaries of the "Town Centre", as shown on Figure 13: Guildford Town Centre Densities, to include the affected properties. Staff expect that changes to the OCP designation for these sites, to accommodate the higher-density permitted in the Secondary Land-Use Plan, will be brought forward to Council, at a later date, as part of the broader Stage 2 Plan or OCP Update.


## Amendment Rationale

- The subject property is located within a Frequent Transit Development Area (FTDA), adjacent to an existing Frequent Transit Network (104 Avenue) and within walking distance of existing rapid bus transit service ( $\mathrm{R}_{1}$ - King George to Guildford).
- In the OCP, the "Multiple Residential" designation allows a maximum density of 2.0 FAR for sites located within a FTDA or Urban Centre, that abut a FTN or where specifically permitted in a Secondary Land-Use Plan.
- Under the "Town Centre" designation in the OCP, a maximum permitted density of 2.5 FAR is permitted within Guildford Town Centre. In addition, the Town Centre designation allows for a higher-density built form and, therefore, would be more appropriate for the subject site than the Multiple Residential designation which is intended primarily to accommodate a maximum 6 -storey building.
- The requested increased density under the Town Centre designation from 2.5 FAR to 4.2 FAR can be accommodate through the City's Density Bonus Program.
- The applicant will be required to provide the Tier 2 Capital Plan Project CAC per sq. ft. flat rate for the floor area above the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan (Stage 1) designation, in accordance with the Density Bonus Program. The contribution is payable at the rate applicable at the time of Final Adoption of the Rezoning Bylaw.
- Given that the subject property is located within an FTDA, adjacent to a FTN and within 60 metres of an existing rapid bus stop, a higher-density mixed-use development is supportable on the subject site given it will promote walkability, allow for greater housing choice as well as complies with OCP principles that encourage higher-density development in areas served by FTNs.


## Public Consultation for Proposed OCP Amendment

- Pursuant to Section 475 of the Local Government Act, it was determined that it was not necessary to consult with any persons, organizations, or authorities with respect to the proposed OCP amendment, other than those contacted as part of the pre-notification process.


## Themes/Policies

- The proposal will support various policies, outlined in the OCP, including the following:
- The proposal supports transit-oriented development, focused growth and increased density along frequent transit corridors, which supports transit service expansion as well as rapid transit infrastructure investment;
- The proposal supports directing higher-density residential land-uses to locations within walking distance of neighbourhood centres, along main roads, near transit routes and/or adjacent to major parks or civic amenities; and
- The dwelling units front onto 104 Avenue, 104A Avenue and future 147 street with urban design features (e.g. ground-floor patio space, internal sidewalks, etc.) that promote a welcoming public streetscape and urban public realm.


## Secondary Plans

Land Use Designation

- The subject property is designated "Mid to High Rise Apartment", "Mid to High Rise MixedUse" and "Road" in the Stage 1 Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan (TCP).
- The proposed development complies with the TCP designation, per the Stage 1 Plan.


## Themes/Objectives

- The proposed apartment building supports the gradual transition of heights and densities between higher-density areas (i.e. the "core") and existing single-family areas that will be retained at the periphery of the plan area.
- The development encourages a greater diversity of housing options for different family sizes, types, and compositions.
- The proposal complies with the "Mid to High Rise Apartment" and "Mid to High Rise Mixed-Use" designation in the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan (Stage 1) which is intended for mid- to high-rise developments of up to 24 -storeys for mixed-use and 18-storeys for residential buildings including, at minimum, a two-storey podium.
- As part of the Stage 2 planning process for the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor, staff are exploring several family-oriented and affordable housing policies that could include requiring minimum percentages of family-oriented dwelling units in multi-family proposals (e.g. two or more bedroom and three or more bedroom units). This would provide a broader range of housing choice for a variety of family sizes, types, and compositions.
- Staff note that the proposal partially addresses the possible future family-oriented housing policies in the Stage 2 Plan by providing roughly thirty-four percent (34\%) of dwelling units as two or more bedroom (145 units in total). However, the applicant has declined to provide any three or more bedroom dwelling units, as part of the subject proposal.


## Proposed CD Bylaw

- The applicant proposes to rezone the subject site from "Downtown Commercial Zone (C-35)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" (based upon the "Multiple Residential 135 Zone [RM-135]" and "Community Commercial Zone [C-8]") in order to allow for the proposed high-rise buildings. The proposed CD Bylaw for the subject site identifies the uses, densities as well as setbacks proposed.
- A comparison of the density, lot coverage, setbacks, building height and permitted uses in the RM-135 Zone, C-8 Zone and proposed CD Bylaw are illustrated in the following table:

| Zoning | RM-135 Zone <br> (Part 25) | C-8 Zone (Part 36) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Proposed CD } \\ \text { Zone } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Density: | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Floor Area Ratio: | 2.50 | o.8o | $\begin{gathered} 4.2 \text { (Gross) } \\ 5.5 \text { (Net) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Lot Coverage: | 33\% | 50\% | 63\% |
| Yards and Setbacks <br> North: <br> East: <br> South: <br> West: | 7.5 m . or $50 \%$ of the building height | $\begin{aligned} & 7.5 \mathrm{~m} . \\ & 7.5 \mathrm{~m} . \\ & 7.5 \mathrm{~m} . \\ & 7.5 \mathrm{~m} . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.6 \mathrm{~m} . \\ 9.3 \mathrm{~m} . \& 6 . \mathrm{m} . \\ 4.5 \mathrm{~m} . \\ 4.9 \mathrm{~m} . \& 4.0 \mathrm{~m} . \end{gathered}$ |
| Principal Building Height: | N/A | 12 m . | $63 \mathrm{~m} . \& 81 \mathrm{~m}$. |
| Permitted Uses: | - Multiple unit residential buildings and ground-oriented multiple unit residential buildings <br> - Child care centres | - Retail uses <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 facility <br> - Entertainment uses <br> - Assembly halls <br> - Community services <br> - Child care centres <br> - Cultural uses <br> - One caretaker unit | - Multiple unit residential buildings and ground-oriented multiple unit residential buildings <br> - Retail uses <br> - Personal service uses <br> - General service uses <br> - Office uses <br> - Eating establishments to a maximum combined floor area of 215 sq. m. <br> - Cultural uses <br> - Child care centres |
| Amenity Space |  |  |  |
| Indoor Amenity: | $925 \text { sq. m. }$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | The proposed 934 sq. m. exceeds the Zoning By-law requirement. |
| Outdoor Amenity: | 1,331 sq. m. | N/A | The proposed 1,346 sq. m. exceeds Zoning By-law requirement. |


| Parking (Part 5) | Required | Proposed |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Stalls | 90 parking spaces | 90 parking spaces |  |
| Commercial: | 588 parking spaces | 482 parking spaces |  |
| Residential: | 86 parking spaces | 47 parking spaces |  |
| Residential Visitor: | 606 parking spaces | 619 parking spaces |  |
| Total: |  |  |  |
| Bicycle Spaces | 516 bicycle spaces | 580 bicycle spaces |  |
| Residential Secure Parking: | 16 bicycle spaces | 24 bicycle spaces |  |
| Residential Visitor: |  |  |  |

- The proposed CD Zone is based upon the RM-135 Zone and C-8 Zone with modifications to the maximum permitted density, lot coverage, minimum building setbacks, permitted uses, maximum building height, off-street parking requirements and location of the underground parkade relative to the lot lines.
- The proposed CD Bylaw will incorporate similar uses as the RM-135 Zone for the residential component and the C-8 Zone for the commercial component, with some restrictions. Those commercial land-uses that can be accommodated on-site, based on the parking provided, will be included in the CD Zone (e.g. eating establishments to a maximum combined floor area of 215 sq. m., retail uses, general service uses, personal service uses, office uses, etc., all of which are not parking intensive land-uses and have lower parking rates).
- If calculated based on gross site area, the proposed high-rise buildings on the subject site will have a combined floor area ratio of 4.2 FAR. As the subject property is located within a FTDA, along an existing FTN (104 Avenue), within close proximity to a rapid bus stop and given the required road dedication, the proposal to increase the density from 3.5 FAR to 5.5 FAR (net density) in the CD Zone is supportable.
- The maximum permitted lot coverage has been increased from $33 \%$ under the RM-7o Zone to a maximum of $63 \%$ in the CD Bylaw to accommodate the proposed built form. The proposed lot coverage is typical for high-rise buildings on a site of this size.
- The RM-135 Zone requires the setbacks to be 7.5 metres or a minimum of fifty percent ( $50 \%$ ) of the building height, whichever is greater. The applicant is proposing reduced setbacks in the CD Bylaw which is supportable given that it allows for more active engagement with the street and, therefore, is consistent with the Stage 1 Plan for the Guildford Town Centre 104 Avenue Corridor.


## On-site Parking and Bicycle Storage

- The proposed development includes a total of 619 parking spaces consisting of 482 resident parking spaces, 47 parking spaces for visitors and 90 parking spaces for commercial uses. In addition, the applicant will provide 14 accessible parking spaces.
- All parking spaces on-site will be provided either as surface parking, for the commercial component, or within an enclosed underground parkade that is accessed from 147 Street.
- The applicant is proposing to provide a rate of 1.1 parking space per dwelling unit for residents and o.1 parking space per dwelling unit for visitors (1.2 per unit in total). The proposed parking reduction is supportable given the subject site is located within a Rapid Transit Area (RTA) and complies with the reduced parking rates, previously endorsed by Council, as part of Corporate Report No. Ru15;2021 ("Parking Update: Rapid Transit Corridors and Rental Housing").
- Of the 619 parking spaces provided, 96 small car stalls are proposed or $16 \%$ of the total number of parking spaces. The Surrey Zoning By-law allows for a maximum of $35 \%$ of the total parking spaces on-site to be provided for small cars.
- The Zoning By-law requires that no parking facilities be constructed within 2.0 metres of the front lot line or a lot line along a flanking street. The proposed underground parkade will be located within 0.5 metre of the north, west and south lot lines. As a result, the proposed CD Zone will permit the underground parkade facility to extend to 0.5 metre of these lot lines.
- The development will provide a total of 581 secure bicycle parking spaces in the underground parkade. This will exceed the 516 bicycle parking spaces required under the Zoning By-law. In addition, the applicant will provide 14 bicycle parking spaces, at grade for visitors, for each of the proposed buildings which complies with the Zoning By-law requirement.


## 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 development proposal is subject to Tier 1 Capital Plan Project CACs (CPCAC) and will be required to provide a financial contribution of $\$ 2,000$ per dwelling unit. The contributions are payable at the rate applicable at the time of Building Permit issuance.
- In addition, the applicant is required to provide the per unit Tier 2 CPCAC flat rate for the proposed density that is greater than currently allowed under the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan (Stage 1) designation. This contribution is required at the time of Final Adoption of the Rezoning Bylaw.


## 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 May 26, 2022, and the Development Proposal Signs were installed on May 31, 2022. Staff received one (1) response from an adjacent property owner (staff comments in italics):
- The property owner requested more information about the impact the proposal may have on schools within the local area and Hjorth Road Elementary School, in particular.
(The Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan [Stage 1] has tentatively designated eight (8) lots north of $104 A$ Avenue and east offuture 145 Street as a potential future "School" site. This could help alleviate any pressure on existing schools in the local area while improving child safety by locating the school mid-block, within a residential neighbourhood, away from high traffic areas [e.g. 104 Avenue].)


## 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, as outlined within the Guildford Town Centre - 104 Avenue Corridor Plan.
- The proposal generally complies with the Form and Character Development Permit guidelines in the OCP, and the applicant has worked with staff to ensure an appropriate interface between land-uses as well as further refine the overall building massing in order to ensure an attractive streetscape and reflect and urban public realm.


## Building Design

- The proposed development is comprised of one 18 -storey residential building (Building A, on the northern portion of the site) and one 24 -storey mixed-use building situated on a 4-storey podium (Building B, on the southern portion of the site) consisting of 430 market condo units with $\mathbf{2 , 7 1 0}$ square metres of ground- and second-floor commercial/office space.
- The applicant has worked with staff to develop a design that incorporates the future Guildford Town Centre urban design guidelines and principles through tower and podium refinement as well as public realm and street interface. The applicant has continued to work with staff, on an ongoing basis, to resolve specific design-related issues.
- The proposed building façade reflects a contemporary and dynamic built form with particular attention provided to tower and podium placement as well as building height, solar access and street interfaces.
- The podium is designed to wrap around the frontage and provide a continuous street wall. On Building A, a two-storey street-oriented townhouse expression will be provided at-grade along the northern and western building façades. Each ground-oriented unit will have an individual entry with low-level planting that actively engages with the street and provides a strong urban edge and active street wall. The podium will include a residential lobby, anchored at the northwest corner of the subject site.
- In contrast, the lower podium levels of Building B consist of ground-floor commercial/retail units (CRUs) with first-/second-floor office space. The upper levels, along 147 Street, feature indoor amenity space with extended ceiling heights as well as rooftop outdoor amenity space which provides a physical connection between each proposed high-rise building (i.e. Building A and Building B).
- In addition, the four-storey podium further helps conceal the at-grade outdoor plan space and surface parking area which are both located internal to the site and, as a result, are not visible from the public realm.
- Corner plazas are provided where 147 Street intersects with 104 Avenue and 104A Avenue.
- The third level of the podium includes a large indoor amenity space with direct linkages to the outdoor amenity space. Additional roof top outdoor amenity space is provided on Level 5 . The podium roof top levels (Level 3 and Level 5) also include several apartment units which have a private walkout patio space with additional planting to provide privacy.
- The residential and commercial entrances are easily identifiable with lobbies strategically located along 104 Avenue (commercial component) and 147 Street (residential component).
- The proposed building materials include sheet metal panel cladding, exposed painted concrete, curtain wall and storefront windows, spandrel glazing as well as painted steel canopies located at the podium base. In addition, the applicant proposes white and light gray sheet metal panel cladding that extends from the podium upwards, into the residential towers, thereby providing greater consistency in appearance and reflecting a strong vertical expression.
- The proposed building form adopts a modern architectural vocabulary, consistent with the high-rise typology currently popular in Surrey's town centres. A lively streetscape is further reinforced through the vertical metal panel patterns and ground-level accent materials that create a mirror effect to reflect the vibrancy of the urban public realm.
- The town separation diagram demonstrates acceptable future tower separation, reflective of the minimum building separation requirements in the OCP.


## Commercial Component

- The commercial component is located within Building B and wraps around the corner of 104 Avenue to extend northward along the east side of future 147 Street. The applicant proposes a total of 2,710 square metres of commercial space consisting of 2-storeys of retail and office uses as well as a potential 245 square metre purpose-built child care facility with associated outdoor play space located at-grade.
- The retail units will front onto 104 Avenue to provide maximum exposure to pedestrian and vehicular traffic while the office component is located at-grade along 147 Street and Level 2. The commercial land-uses will have a separate lobby entrance and elevator access from the residential component. The location of the proposed commercial uses, along the north side of 104 Avenue and east side of 147 Street, is consistent with the mixed-use designation, as is shown in the Stage 1 Plan.


## Proposed Signage

- The applicant is proposing the following signage on-site:

104 Avenue

- Two (2) identification signs;
- Three (3) fascia signs;
- One (1) canopy sign; and
- Three (3) under-canopy signs.

147 Street

- Five (5) fascia signs;
- One (1) canopy sign; and
- Four (4) under-canopy signs.

104A Avenue

- One (1) identification sign; and
- One (1) fascia sign.
- The Sign By-law permits one identification sign per multiple residential development provided the sign area does not exceed 2.3 sq . m. The applicant proposes a total of two (2) identification signs on-site for the residential component and each sign exceeds the maximum allowable sign area.
- One (1) identification sign is proposed, for the commercial component, along 104 Avenue.
- The applicant is proposing a total of nine (9) fascia signs, two (2) of which are intended to identify the location of the residential lobby entrance. The Sign By-law does not permit the residential component to install fascia signs. As such, a variance is required. All fascia signs will comply with the Sign By-law in terms of total combined sign area and not project more than 0.5 metre from the building façade.
- In addition, the applicant proposes two (2) canopy signs and seven (7) under-canopy signs. The proposed canopies slightly exceed the maximum distance of 1.8 meters that a canopy is allowed to extend from the exterior building face, per the Sign By-law. Similarly, the undercanopy signs slightly exceed the maximum vertical height and clearance permitted between the top of the under-canopy sign and the canopy to which it is affixed. The signs will comply with all other aspects of the Sign By-law.
- Given that the number of proposed signs and proposed dimensions for the canopies and under-canopy signs exceed the maximum permitted under the Sign By-law, the applicant proposes to vary these provisions through a comprehensive sign design package (Appendix I).


## Indoor Amenity Space

- The proposed indoor amenity space is shared between the proposed residential towers and centrally located on Level 3. The indoor amenity space will front onto future 147 Street and provides for greater connectivity between the indoor and outdoor amenity spaces, which is similarly located on Level 3, with additional rooftop outdoor amenity space provided above the indoor amenity space on Level 4.
- The indoor amenity space consists of a bike maintenance room (Level P3), yoga space, office centre, kitchen/dining area, lounge, games room, music room, fitness space and gymnasium for basketball, pickleball and badminton.
- According to the Zoning By-law, the proposed development on the subject site is required to provide the following minimum indoor amenity space requirement:
- 3 square metres per dwelling unit up to 557 sq. m. (equivalent to 186 dwelling units);
- 1 square metre per dwelling unit for that portion greater than 557 sq. m.; and
- 4 square metres per dwelling unit for micro units.
- Based upon the Zoning Bylaw requirement, the proposed development is required to provide 925 square metres of indoor amenity space. The proposed indoor amenity space is 934 square metres in total area which exceeds the minimum requirement under the Zoning Bylaw.


## Outdoor Amenity Space and Proposed Landscaping

- The outdoor amenity space is centrally located and adjacent to the indoor amenity space.
- The applicant is proposing to provide the following outdoor amenity space:
- Level 1: potential outdoor amenity space for an at-grade child care facility.
- Level 2: an outdoor balcony for the library space.
- Level 3: tables and chairs, outdoor hammocks, fire place and lounge seating, outdoor kitchen, long table with benches as well as cast-in-place concrete seatwalls with stairs.
- Level 5: timber benches, tables and chairs, outdoor barbeque area, fire place and lounge seating as well as a gated dog run space with a concrete mound play area.
- The proposed outdoor amenity space is roughly 1,346 square metres in total area which exceeds the minimum outdoor amenity space requirement, per the Zoning By-law, based upon a total of 3 square metres per dwelling unit and 4 square metres per micro unit.
- The proposed landscaping has been designed to respond to the urban nature of Guildford Town Centre as an active, pedestrian-friendly space. The overall design considers the grade change, pedestrian circulation and provides an inclusive interface between the public and private realm.
- The apartment units located on Level 3 and Level 4, adjacent the outdoor amenity space, will have private walkout patios with additional landscaping to provide privacy.
- Each individual ground-oriented townhouse unit will have a small private patio or front yard enclosed by a 1.2 metre high wood fence and private gate with layered planting that includes a by-law sized tree, small shrubs, and low-lying ground cover.
- Each apartment unit that faces onto the street frontage or outdoor amenity space will provide an "eyes-on-the-street" function with active rooms facing toward the public realm.
- Exterior lighting is designed to reduce light pollution as well as provide adequate lighting to ensure community safety, in keeping with CPTED principles.
- The applicant further proposes to provide two corner plazas on-site that consists of low-level planting, decorative paving, bike racks as well as bench seating where 147 Street intersects with both 104 Avenue and 104A Avenue.


## Advisory Design Panel

ADP date: July 14, 2022
The applicant has agreed to resolve the remaining outstanding items noted below, from the ADP review to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department before Final Adoption (Appendix VII).

## Outstanding Items

- City staff will continue to work with the applicant to resolve the following outstanding designrelated issues and Advisory Design Panel Comments, as follows:
- Resolution of fire fighter access along 104 Avenue;
- Design refinement to the material expression;
- Design development to architectural features including the balconies and roof expression; and
- Design refinement and coordination of landscape to improve resident privacy and public realm interface.
- The applicant has been provided a detailed list identifying these requirements and has agreed to resolve these prior to Final Adoption of the Development Permit, should the application be supported by Council.


## TREES

- Nick McMahon, ISA Certified Arborist of Arbortech Consulting prepared an Arborist Assessment for the subject property. The table below provides a summary of the tree retention and removal by tree species:

Table 1: Summary of Tree Preservation by Tree Species:

| Tree Species | Existing | Remove | Retain |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alder and Cottonwood Trees |  |  |  |
| Alder | 1 | 1 | o |
| Cottonwood | 10 | 10 | o |
| Deciduous Trees (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) |  |  |  |
| Hazelnut | 1 | 1 | O |
| Coniferous Trees |  |  |  |
| Douglas Fir | 15 | 15 | o |
| Western Red Cedar | 1 | 1 | o |
| Total (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) | 17 | 17 | o |
| Total Replacement Trees Proposed (excluding Boulevard Street Trees) |  | 74 |  |
| Total Retained and Replacement Trees |  | 74 |  |
| Contribution to the Green City Program |  | N/A |  |

- The Arborist Assessment states that there are a total of seventeen (17) mature trees on the site, excluding Alder and Cottonwood trees. Eleven (11) existing trees or roughly thirty-nine percent ( $39 \%$ ) 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 onsite was assessed taking into consideration building footprints, location of services, road dedication and proposed lot grading.
- For those trees that cannot be retained, the applicant will be required to plant trees on a 1 to 1 replacement ratio for Alder and Cottonwood trees, and a 2 to 1 replacement ratio for all other trees. This will require a total of forty-five (45) replacement trees on the site. The applicant is proposing 74 replacement trees, thereby exceeding City requirements.
- In addition to the replacement trees, boulevard street trees will be planted along 104 Avenue, 104A Avenue and future 147 Street. This will be determined by the Engineering Department during the servicing design review process.
- The new trees on the site will consist of a variety of trees including Paperbark Maple, Osakazuki Japanese Maple, Autumn Blaze Freeman Maple, Shademaster Honeylocust, Serbian Spruce, Japanese Red Pine, Japanese Stewartia and Japanese Snowbell.
- In summary, a total of 74 replacement trees are proposed with no contribution required to the Green City Program.


## INFORMATION ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT

The following information is attached to this Report:
Appendix I. Proposed Variances to the Sign By-law
Appendix II. Block Plan, Site Plan, Building Elevation Drawings and Landscape Plans
Appendix III. Engineering Summary
Appendix IV. School District Comments
Appendix V. Summary of Tree Survey and Tree Preservation
Appendix VI. OCP Redesignation Map
Appendix VII. ADP Comments and Response
approved by Ron Gill

Jeff Arason
Acting General Manager
Planning and Development
MRJ/cm

PROPOSED SIGN BY-LAW VARIANCES

| \# | Proposed Variances | Sign By-law Requirement | Rationale |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | To allow a total of three (3) <br> identification signs on-site <br> that exceed the maximum <br> sign area in the Sign Bylaw. | A maximum of one (1) <br> identification sign is <br> permitted per residential <br> development, provided that <br> the sign area does not exceed <br> 2.3 square metres. | The applicant proposes one (1) <br> identification sign for each of the <br> residential lobby entrances and <br> one (1) identification sign for the <br> commercial lobby entrance to <br> assist in wayfinding. |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | To allow a total of two <br> (2) fascia signs for the <br> residential component. | The Sign By-law does not <br> permit fascia signs for the <br> residential component. | The proposed fascia signs will <br> help to identify the location of <br> the lobby entrance and assist in <br> wayfinding. |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | To allow the canopies to <br> exceed the maximum <br> horizontal distance from <br> the exterior wall as well as <br> permit the under-canopy <br> signage to exceed the <br> maximum vertical height <br> and maximum clearance to <br> the underside of the <br> canopy, per the Sign By-law. | The Sign By-Law permits a <br> canopy to project from the <br> face of the exterior wall by a <br> maximum of 1.8 metres. | The proposed canopies will <br> extend i.83 metres from the <br> exterior wall. Given this is a <br> slight increase with no visible <br> difference, the canopies can be <br> supported. |
| The Sign By-law permits <br> maximum vertical dimension <br> of o.3 metre and requires the <br> clearance between the top of <br> the sign and underside of the <br> canopy, to which it is affixed, <br> not exceed 5 cm. | The proposed under-canopy <br> signage is o.36 metres tall and <br> exceeds the clearance between <br> the top of the sign and under- <br> side of the canopy. Given the <br> proposed signage dimensions <br> and vertical clearance will not <br> result in a notable difference, <br> the vertical height and clearance <br> can be supported. |  |  |

SCALE 1: 750


| Total Area Block 'A' | $=0.189 \mathrm{Ha}$. |
| ---: | :--- |
| Total Area Block 'B' | $=0.369 \mathrm{Ha}$ |
| Total Area Roads | $=0.152 \mathrm{Ha}$ |
| Total | $=0.710 \mathrm{Ha}$. |

Total Area Block 'B' $=0.369 \mathrm{Ha}$
Total Area Roads $=0.152 \mathrm{Ha}$
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| FLOOR AREAS SUMMARY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BUILDING A | BUILDING B | total |
| Levelı | ${ }^{\text {8,098 }}$ | ${ }_{13,575}$ | 2,5,5654 2006272mm |
| Level2 | ${ }_{7}^{7,7125}$ | ${ }^{19.958}$ | ${ }^{2,5,505 \mathrm{~s} \text { 2 } 2,512.5 \mathrm{smm}}$ |
| Levels | ${ }_{\text {27,018 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {8,035t }}$ | ${ }^{25,1,365 t} 2.335$ |
| Levela | ${ }^{7}$ 7.24s ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 7.968t | ${ }_{15,2225 t} 1.125 .58 \mathrm{sm}$ |
| Levels 518 | ${ }^{765}$ |  | 97,765s 9,083,3smm |
| Level 5 24 |  | ${ }_{13,68098}$ |  |
| Lower wech | 3,000 5 | 3.060 |  |
| РP¢ER MECH. |  | 9375 | 1,98585 122.615 mm |
| Gross floor area | ${ }^{14,92335}$ | ${ }^{193,04555}$ | ${ }_{3}^{34,9,985 t} 31,119.46 \mathrm{sm}$ |
| -mooor amenir | 9,428 5 | ${ }^{629}$ | 10.0575 934303m |
| -Eke storace | 655st | 2265 | ${ }^{202488838303 m}$ |
| = Far area | ${ }_{\text {13, } 218959}$ | 120,270st | 324,0095t 30,010173m |

SITE PLAN
SCALE: $1^{1}=20^{\circ}$
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## 




| (1) SHEET METAL PANEL CLADDING <br> (2) WINDOW WALL RAISED METAL PANEL <br> (3) WINDOW WALL SYSTEM <br> (4) CURTAIN WALL WINDOW SYSTEM <br> 5. STOREFRONT WINDOW SYSTEM <br> 6) EXPOSED PAINTED CONCRETE 7) $42^{\prime \prime}$ HT. ALUMINUM \& GLASS G <br> (8) GLASS \& STEEL CANOPY, SEE 5/DP-3.09 <br> 9) STEEL CANOPY, PAINTED, SEE 6/DP-309 <br> 10 STEEL DOOR, PAINTED <br> 11) OBSCURED GLASS PRIVACY SCREEN <br> 12 PAINTED STEEL <br> 13. PRE-FINISHED LOUVERS 14.$)$ FASCIA SIGN <br> (15) IDENTIFICATION SIGNAGE, SEE <br> 16) PROJECTING SIGN, SEE 2/DP-3.09 <br> ALUMINUM GRILLE ACCESS GATE <br> CANOPY SIGNAGE, SEE 3/DP-3.09 ALUMINUM SLAT GAS METER <br> ENCLOSURE aCM PANEL CLADDING <br> SPANDREL GLASS <br> REFER TO DP-3.10 FOR COLOUR REFERENCE |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |




##  <br> BUILDING A
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A Window Wall System 1
Starline 9000
'White'


Window Wall Raised Metal Panel 1 Starline D2000
'White'

Window Wall Raised Metal Panel 2
C Starline D2000
'Silver'

D Metal Panel 1
Westform Met
'Brite White'

E Metal Panel 2
Westform Metal
'Charcoal Grey'
$\frac{\text { Metal Panel } 3}{\text { Westform Metals }}$ Westform Metals 'Saddle'

G ACM Panels
G Alucobond
'Anodized Clear'Aluminum Curtainwall \& Storefront Aluminur Anodized

J Vision Glass Vitro
'Solarban 70'


K Spandrel Glass 1 CDD Opaci-Coat
SP456 'Santa's SP456 'Santa's Beard'

L
Spandrel Glass 2
Vertical Fritted

M $\frac{\text { Paint } 1}{\text { Beniami }}$ Benjamin Moore 'Snow White' OC-66
(1) Paint 2

N Benjamin Moore 'Kendall Charcoal' HC-166

O Aluminum/Glass Railings \& Privacy Screens
'Clear Anodiz

Balcony Soffit 1 Benjamin Moore Kendall Charcoal' HC-166

R
Metal Panel 4 Westform Meta

```
Pre-finished Louver
    Match Metal Panel 2
```

Balcony Soffit 2 Benjamin Moore 'Warmed Cognac' AF-235
compand now
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(2) $\frac{\text { Coniffrous tree planting on slab (tryical) }}{\text { scale } 125}$
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(4) $\frac{\text { Conifer Tree planting on grade (TYPICAL) }}{\text { SCALE }} 1: 20$

(7) SOD LAWN ON SLAB (TYPICAL)

(5) $\frac{\text { PLANTING ON SLAB (TYPICAL) }}{\text { sCALE }}$ )

6) $\frac{\text { PLANTING ON GRADE (TYPICAL) }}{\text { SCALE }}$

8) sfavelel dran strip on slab

David Stoyko
Landscape Architect
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(1) $\frac{\text { AMENTTY PATIO PAVERS ON SLAB (TYPICAL) }}{\text { SCALE } 1: 10}$

##  <br> 


2) $\frac{\text { PRIVATE PATIO }}{\text { Scale: }: 1: 10}$

(3) PEDESTRIAN UNIT PAVERS ON SLAB (TYPICAL)

(4) $\frac{\text { PEDESTRIAN LINEAR UNIT PAVERS ON SLAB (TYPICAL) }}{\text { Scale: } 1: 10}$
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6) $\frac{\text { TURFSTONE PAVING ON GRADE }}{\text { Scale: } 1: 10}$


(7) $\frac{\text { CIP CONCRETE PAVING ON GRADE (TYPICAL) }}{\text { SCALE } 1: 10}$
(5) CIP CONCRETE PAVING ON SLAB (TYPICAL)

$8 \frac{\text { LEVEL } 3 \text { CIP CONCRETE STAIR AND LAWN AREA }}{\text { SCALE } 1: 10}$

David Stoyko
Landscape Architect
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(4) DAYCARE FENCING WITH WAVE PROFILE
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TO: Manager, Area Planning \& Development

- North Surrey Division

Planning and Development Department

FROM: Development Services Manager, Engineering Department

DATE: August 31, $2022 \quad$ PROJECT FILE: $\quad \mathbf{7 8 2 1 - 0 0 7 9 - 0 0}$

RE: Engineering Requirements (Commercial/Multi-Family)
Location: 14723104 Avenue
CP AMENDMENT
There are no engineering requirements relative to the OCP Amendment.

## REZONE

## Property and Right-of-Way Requirements

- Dedicate 7.808 m along 104 Avenue.
- Dedicate 20.0m for 104A Avenue.
- Dedicate By-law road.
- Dedicate required corner cuts.
- Provide o.5m wide statutory rights-of-way along all site frontages.


## Works and Services

- Construct east side of 147 Street, south side of 104 A Avenue and 104 Avenue road works.
- Implement recommendations of Traffic Impact Assessment and geo-technical reports.
- Construct storm mains along 147 Street and 104A Avenue.
- Construct minimum 250 mm frontage sanitary main along 147 Street and 375 mm frontage and off-site sanitary mains along 104A Avenue.
- Complete sanitary and drainage catchment analysis to determine existing capacities. Resolve downstream constraints, as identified.
- Construct minimum 300 mm water main along 104A Avenue. Complete fire flow analysis to determine the ultimate water main size and extent.
- Provide water storm and sanitary service connections to support the development.
- Register/modify applicable legal documents as determined through detailed design.

A Servicing Agreement is required prior to Rezone.

## 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
HB
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## THE IMPACT ON SCHOOLS

## APPLICATION \#: 21007900

## SUMMARY

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

## Projected enrolment at Surrey School District for this development:

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Elementary Students: | 34 |
| Secondary Students: | 22 |

September 2021 Enrolment/School Capacity

| Hjorth Road Elementary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Enrolment (K/1-7): | $30 \mathrm{~K}+253$ |
| Operating Capacity (K/1-7) | $19 \mathrm{~K}+210$ |
|  |  |
| Guildford Park Secondary | 1364 |
| Enrolment (8-12): | 1050 |
| Capacity (8-12): |  |


| Projected population of school-age children for this development: | 69 |
| :--- | :--- |

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.

Future densification along 104th will affect enrolment growth at both Hjorth Road Elementary and Guildford Park Secondary.

Total enrolment for Hjorth Road elementary has exceeded the school capacity over the last 5 years. Though this school enrolment shrank by 14 students this past September, the school remains operating at $124 \%$. In the District's 2022/2023 Five Year Capital Plan, a new request for a 10classroom addition to Hjorth Road Elementary has been included. The Ministry of Education has not approved funding for this request.

Guildford Park Secondary operates over capacity. With the continued development and densification of the City Center, enrollment for this school is projected to continue to grow, perhaps, quicker than what is shown below. In March 2020, the Ministry of Education supported the District to prepare a feasibility study for a 450-capacity addition at the secondary school. The addition is targeted to open for September 2024.

## Hjorth Road Elementary



Guildford Park 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.


## ACL GROUPARBCRTECHCONSULTING

## APPENDIX F: CITY OF SURREY SUMMARY FORM

Surrey Project No.:
Project Address:
Consulting Arborist:
14723104 Avenue, Surrey, BC

| ON-SITE TREES: | QUANTITY OF TREES |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Bylaw Protected Trees Identified <br> (on-site and shared trees, including trees within boulevards and proposed streets <br> and lanes, excluding Park and ESA dedications) | 28 |
| Bylaw Protected Trees to be Removed | 28 |
| Bylaw Protected Trees to be Retained <br> (excludes trees in Park dedication areas and ESA's) | 0 <br> Replacement Trees Required: <br> Alder and Cottonwood at 1:1 ratio: <br> All Other Bylaw Protected Trees at 2:1 ratio: <br> TOTAL: <br> Replacement Trees Proposed <br> Replacement Trees in Deficit |
| Protected Trees Retained in Proposed Open Space/ Riparian Areas $2=$ | 11 |


| OFF-SITE TREES: |  | QUANTITY OF TREES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bylaw Protected Off-Site Trees to be Removed |  | 0 |
| Replacement Trees Required: <br> Alder and Cottonwood at 1:1 ratio: <br> All Other Bylaw Protected Trees at 2:1 ratio: TOTAL: | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \text { times } 1=0 \\ & 0 \text { times } 2=0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |
| Replacement Trees Proposed |  | 0 |
| Replacement Trees in Deficit |  | 0 |

N/A denotes information "Not Available" at this time.
This summary and the referenced documents are prepared and submitted by:

Nick McMahon, Consulting Arborist

Dated: November 17, 2021

Direct: 6048122986
Email: nick@aclgroup.ca


TREE ASSESSMENT DETAIL



TREE RETENTION AND PROTECTION DETAIL

| - memeramer |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - - |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | $\square \square$ |






# Advisory Design Panel <br> Minutes 

Location: Virtual
ThURSDAY, JULY 14, 2022
Time: 3:00 p.m.

Present:
Panel Members:
R. Drew, Chair
J. Aziz
M. Cheung
N. Couttie
K. Deol
M. Derksen
M. Heeney
J. Packer

Guests:
John Rempel, RDG Guildford West Development Ltd.
Colin Hogan, Architect AIBC, Focus Architecture Inc.
David Stoyko, David Stoyko Landscape Architect
Amrik Purewal, Campbell Crossing 4 Ltd.
Robert Salikan, Architect AIBC, Salikan Architecture Inc.
Mary Chan-Yip, BCSLA, PMG Landscape Architects

## Staff Present:

N. Chow, Urban Design Planner S. Maleknia, Urban Design Planner
V. Goldgrub, Urban Design Planner S. Gill, Recording Secretary

## A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was

Panel meeting of June 23, 2022, be received.

It was

Panel meeting of June 30, 2022, be received.

## B. NEW SUBMISSIONS

1. $3: 05$ p.m.

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

Address:
Developer:
Architect:
Landscape Architect:
Planner:
Urban Design Planner:

## Carried

Moved by M. Heeney
Seconded by J. Packer
That the minutes of the Advisory Design

## Carried <br> Carried

7921-0063-00
Moved by M. Heeney
Seconded by K. Deol
That the minutes of the Advisory Design

New
N/A
Proposed rezoning from C-35 to CD (based on RM-70), DP for two 6-storey apartment buildings consisting of 187 dwelling units with underground parking and DVP to vary the definition of "balcony", under the Zoning By-law, in order to permit enclosed balconies. 14683-104 Avenue
John Rempel, RDG Guildford West Development Ltd.
Colin Hogan, Architect AIBC, Focus Architecture Inc.
David Stoyko, David Stoyko Landscape Architect
Misty Jorgensen
Nathan Chow

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff generally support the project.
The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, pedestrian and vehicular movement, wayfinding, architectural expression, overall landscape concept, and public realm interfaces.

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

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

## ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

It was Moved by N. Couttie<br>Seconded by J. Packer<br>That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)

SUPPORT the project and recommends that the applicant address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning \& Development Department.

Carried
The Panel supported the project in general and the use of the Lumon balcony enclosure system but to ensure that the balconies are not considered interior habitable spaces.

## Key Points

- Consider borrowing design features from the neighbouring tower design. Focus: we have removed the C-shapes from the design and replaced with Lshapes similar to the ones on the tower facades.
- Consider enhancing the visibility of the building entries. Focus: the new Lshapes are located at each building entry and are clad with wood-look siding to enhance the visibility of each entry.
- Reconsider the use of c-shape frame features. Focus: C-shapes have been removed.
- Consider the design and refinement of balcony enclosure system Focus: We reviewed the "frames" and balcony edges surrounding the Lumon system and made them consistent dimensions to help unify the design. The head and sill design of the actual Lumon system is a standard design that cannot be varied. We will share the Lumon standard details with staff.
- Consider refining the design (lighten) of the ground floor canopies. Focus: the canopies located at each ground floor suite entry have been revised to glass and steel.
- Consider further design measures to enhance the level of privacy between suites located at the inside corner of the Building A. Focus: a solid wall has been added to the east side of the balcony at the ' -10 ' units to block the view between units.
- Consider the depth of the roof fascia features Focus: all roof fascias have been made the same depth.
- Consider ensuring that the balconies are considered limited common
property. Focus: we confirm that the balconies will be LCP.
Site
- Consider the privacy issue of the Units ( 10 and 11 ) at the corner of Building A, facing the courtyard. Focus: a solid wall has been added to the east side of the balcony at the ' -10 ' units to block the view between units. Currently, the rendering shows the balcony incorrectly (i.e. with the balcony projecting past the face of the adjacent unit). It will be revised to match the plan.
- Consider the entry doors of the Units 101 and 112 in Building B; concerns for privacy and comfort of these units. Focus: the entry door to suite 112 has been relocated to the mail area. Suite 101 entry is away from the pedestrian traffic flow through the lobby, we feel its entry is acceptable where located.
- Ensure that the enclosed balconies are not considered interior habitable spaces and that residents are encouraged to open and activate the Lumon enclosed balcony system (e.g. ensure it is limited common property). Focus: based on previous projects, Lumon balconies are considered as limited common property (LCP) and therefore cannot be enclosed. The applicant would consider an RC to help enforce this.


## Form and Character

- The form and character are done well, and it is a thoughtful design.
- Consider more design development and refinement on building entrances. Focus: the new L-shapes are located at each building entry and are clad with wood-look siding to enhance the visibility of each entry.
- $\quad$ Consider taking the brick cladding up a level at the corners. Consider setting back or otherwise articulating the top floor to relate to the building across the street and reduce the scale of the building. Focus: The Guildford Neighbourhood Plan requires a 2-storey townhouse base treatment, which is why we terminated the brick at level 2. However, we will raise the brick to 3 levels at prominent corners to address this comment. Regarding the comment to consider stepping back the top floor, this comment was made by an ADP panelist who appeared to be unfamiliar with the Guildford Plan. Per the Guildford Plan, the context includes mid-rise apartment (6 storey) to the north, south, and west, and mid/high rise (18-24 storeys) to the east. Stepping the top floor of this building down would make it inconsistent with the context of the Guildford Plan. As such, we plan to leave the level 6 plan as-is and will consider material refinement before Final Adoption to address this comment.
- Consider the building articulation in both horizontal and vertical directions; needs some improvement. The joint between level 2 and the upper part of the building could be better defined. The white horizontal features wrapping the enclosed balconies where they turn around the corner look loose. Focus: we have added a dark grey cornice to better define the transition from brick to siding. The C-shapes around the balconies have been removed.
- Consider having the same design for both Buildings A and B; the corner balcony on the southeast corner of Building B on level 2 is better designed and connected to the rest of the building compared to Building A at the
northeast corner. Focus: the balconies are now the same on both buildings.
- Consider the black portion of the facades, it takes away the cohesiveness of the building character. Focus: we prefer to keep the dark charcoal colour, we feel it works well with the red brick base.
- Consider maintaining the black window frames as they are a key element for the exterior elevations. Focus: black window frames will be provided.
- Retractable balcony enclosures are a significant benefit for climate zone and consider the appropriate design. Focus: agreed.

Landscape

- Consider the design of the corner plaza; add furniture. Focus: This comment is in reference to the sidewalk corner located in the city ROW, we cannot add furniture without Engineering Dept. approval.
- $\quad$ Consider providing more interesting paving patterns and street furniture on the corners at 147 Street. Focus: This comment is in reference to the sidewalk corner located in the city ROW, we are guided by the Engineering Dept and the future Guildford Neighbourhood Plan.
- Consider adjusting the vent locations at the northwest and northeast to allow circulation routes to be improved. Focus: we have straightened out the pathway as much as possible.
- Consider the paving materials at grade. Stoyko: Additional paving information has been included for clarity.
- Consider providing a separation between the waste bin staging area and the pedestrian walkway. Focus: a planter has been added between the staging area and walkway.
- Consider increasing the amount of native plant species. Stoyko: The quantity of native species has been increased.
- Indoor and outdoor amenities are well oriented; Consider adding covered outdoor amenity space. Stoyko: Trellis has been adjusted to include a partially covered portion over the BBQ and dining area.


## CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.


## Sustainability

- Consider using energy and thermal comfort modelling to inform your design development. Use future climate files $(2050 / 2080)$ to best understand the impact of shock events and overall resiliency of the project. Focus: We will use future climate files for our energy modelling.
- Consider electric bike charging facilities. Focus: We will add outlets in the storage rooms for bicycle charging. Note that many e-bikes have removable batteries to make charging possible from residential suites.
- Consider enhancing the experience of being in the waste/recycling spaces. Focus: We will work with the interior designer to try to enhance the quality of these spaces and make them more user friendly.
- Consider specifying thermally modified ash for the outdoor furniture.

Stoyko: Jarrah furnishing material has been replaced by thermally modified ash.

## Accessibility

- Ensure the balcony thresholds in the adaptable units provide barrier free access. Focus: We will review this request and evaluate options for access with the building envelope consultant when the project moves into the construction drawing phase. We note that balcony access is not a building code requirement for adaptable suites, but that it is desirable if possible.

2. $4: 40$ p.m.

| File No.: | 7921-0079-oo |
| :--- | :--- |
| New or Resubmit: | New |
| Last Submission Date: | N/A |
| Description: | Proposed OCP Amendment from "Multiple Residential" <br> to "Mixed Use", rezoning from C-35 to CD (based on |
|  | RM-135 and C-8) and DP for one 18-storey residential <br> building and one 24-storey mixed-use building <br> consisting of 467 dwelling units with surface and |
|  | underground parking. |
|  | 14723 - 104 Avenue |

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff generally support the project.
The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, pedestrian and vehicular movement, architectural expression, overall setbacks, overall landscape concept, and public realm interfaces.

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

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

## ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

It was
Moved by J. Azizi
Seconded by M. Heeney
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)
SUPPORT the project and recommends that the applicant address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning \& Development Department.

Carried

The Panel supported the project in general and the compact form.
Key Points

- Consider bringing more rigor to the use of the wood coloured and dark grey coloured material in the project. Focus: we have limited the use of wood to entry elements. The dark grey is now only used on the L-shaped features on the south and west facades. We will add wood elements to the residential lobby doors and replace the wood material on the office lobby portal with another material to ensure that the wood is being used consistently to signify residential uses.
- Consider straightening out the vertical grey leg of the frame along 104 Avenue. Focus: the vertical legs have been straightened.
- Consider providing varying depths to the balconies; relate to the size of the unit. Focus: Each balcony size exceeds the minimum zoning requirement. As such, we would prefer to keep the balcony depths as designed for ease/cost of construction. Instead, we have made some balconies longer and joined them together to enhance privacy. We can review this further with staff before Final Adoption.
- Consider the privacy impacts of the staggered balcony pattern. Focus: We have made some balconies longer and joined them together to enhance privacy.
- Consider completing the loop around the residential townhouses entries. Focus: We have 'completed the loop' to make these entries more compatible with the townhouse entries on the low-rise across the street.
- Consider providing electrical bicycle charging facilities. Focus: We will add outlets in the storage rooms for bicycle charging. Note that many e-bikes have removable batteries to make charging possible from residential suites

Site

- The gym is a great indoor amenity space. Consider adjusting the proportions to allow for multiple sports. Focus: we have added lines to the floor plan for a badminton/pickleball court.

Form and Character

- The form and character of the lower portion of the podium, especially the dark grey features, are quite thoughtful.
- Reconsider that the randomly arranged panel on the podium makes it look too busy on the west side amenity façade. Focus: we have revised the panels to be narrower with more regular spacing.
- Consider that the cladding panels might impact the way it is integrated with the windows. Focus: we have revised the panels to be narrower with more regular spacing to maintain views from windows.
- Recommend bring more texture to the elevation. Focus: With the staggered balconies, we feel that the elevations have sufficient texture. However, we will further review the balcony depths with staff.
- Reconsider the balconies on the south and north facades; it makes the building look too busy. The horizontal staggering makes the build look
even more busy. Focus: This comment appears to contradict the previous one. With a rectangular footprint, we feel the movement of the balconies is essential to enliven the facade. As such, we have retained the staggered balconies but have refined the design to appear more consistent.
- The concerns for the east and west facades of the balcony; the small and large rhythms aesthetically look good, but the arrangement can have challenges because of the practicality of the large balcony. They are exposed to more rainwater, snow and privacy is impacted by the short balconies. Focus: We have reviewed the balcony design and limited the amount of overlook/privacy concerns by eliminating gaps between some of the balconies. It is not uncommon for projects with undulating balconies to have some portions that are more exposed to weather than others. We feel that this provides a variety of balcony options to building users (i.e. some like more sun and some prefer more shade) and the movement creates texture on the façade. We believe that we have struck a balance between the project aesthetics and privacy concerns. If staff feels that these revisions are not sufficient, we will review further with staff before Final Adoption.


## Landscape

- Well done on the tree planting on grade. Appreciate the double-row of trees on 147 Avenue.
- Consider adjusting the parkade vent locations in the northeast corner and southwest corner of the site to enhance the quality of the landscape and to allow for better flow of pedestrian circulation. Focus: the pathway has been straightened out as much as possible. We cannot move the vents further without significant impacts to parking.
- $\quad$ Consider the street level landscape treatment in front of the commercial depending on the unit (e.g. provide more separation at daycare and office, make the retail more open and engaging with the sidewalk). Stoyko: The street level landscape has been further articulated to relate to interior programming. Additionally, a secondary entrance has been added to the southwest corner unit to provide a better relationship to the corner plaza.
- Consider relating the paving strategy (the amount of paving) along 104 Avenue. Stoyko: Paving has been reduced as much as possible while providing continuous pedestrian circulation along $104^{\text {th }}$ Avenue frontage.
- Consider providing more prominence to the north-south mid book pedestrian connection. Reconcile the geometry at the southeast corner. Stoyko: The geometry of the mid-block connection has been revised to provide greater prominence. A tree and planting bed have been removed at the southeast corner to create a more direct connection to $104^{\text {th }}$ Avenue.
- Consider the relationship between wood-decked amenity spaces, with possibility of expanding the space (contributing to accessibility). Stoyko: This comment is believed to be regarding the West site as the East side does not contain a wood-decked amenity space. For the West side, the wood deck amenity size has been increased.
- Consider additional / wider connection from main amenity patio to greenspace. Stoyko: This comment is also believed to be regarding the West site. A wider connection has been incorporated as a connection from the wood-deck amenity patio to the greenspace.
- Consider additional access to separate the fireplace lounge, balancing the access with the privacy and consider expanding canopy of the pavilion at Level 5. Stoyko: The L5 pavilion canopy has been increased to provide cover for dining areas.


## CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.


## Sustainability

- Consider using energy and thermal comfort modelling to inform your design development. Use future climate files $(2050 / 2080)$ to best understand the impact of shock events and overall resiliency of the project. Focus: We will use future climate files for our energy modelling.
- Consider suspending, rather than cantilevering, some of the balconies to reduce thermal bridging and provide additional visual interest. Focus: a preliminary energy model has been completed and with standard projecting balconies, we can meet Step Code 2.
- $\quad$ Consider providing electric bicycle charging facilities. Focus: We will add outlets in the storage rooms for bicycle charging. Note that many e-bikes have removable batteries to make charging possible from residential suites
- Consider enhancing the social quality of bicycle facilities and having a waste/recycling lounge. Focus: We will work with the interior designer to try to enhance the quality of these spaces and make them more user friendly.

Accessibility

- Consider an alternative material for the surfacing of the outdoor amenity areas (etc. daycare and hammock area). Stoyko: Artificial Turf has replaced the lawn in the hammock area for improved accessibility.
- Consider more wheelchair friendly, shock absorbent materials and incorporate universal design. Stoyko: Please see above response.

3. $\quad 6: 25$ p.m.

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

Address:
Developer:
Architect:
Landscape Architect:
Planner:

7921-0322-00
New
N/A
NCP amendment, Rezoning, Consolidation, and DP to permit a 4 storey mixed-use building containing 34 residential dwelling units and 1,280 sq. m. of ground floor commercial, including a child care centre, with underground parking.
2213-156 Street and 2249 - King George Boulevard Amrik Purewal, Campbell Crossing 4 Ltd.
Robert Salikan, Architect AIBC, Salikan Architecture Inc. Mary Chan-Yip, BCSLA, PMG Landscape Architects Erin MacGregor

Urban Design Planner: Vanessa Goldgrub
The Urban Design Planner advised that staff generally support the project.
The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, pedestrian and vehicular movement, architectural expression, overall landscape concept, and public realm interfaces.

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

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

## ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { It was } & \text { Moved by K. Deol } \\
& \text { Seconded by N. Couttie } \\
& \text { That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) }
\end{array}
$$

recommend 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

The Panel recommended that the applicant give careful consideration to the operations of the child daycare, particularly congestion associated with the peak drop off and pick up times.

Key Points

- Consider the drop-off and pick-up demand on the parking lot for the childcare uses.
- Consider providing more dedication to allow for parallel parking on lane; or have more parking underground, the current stalls are not feasible.

Site

- Consider relocating the surface parking underground or working with the city to parallel park along the lane; or consider the option of direct access off the parkade driveway.
- $\quad$ Southern (left-hand) stall isn't usable for many vehicles, and there are concerns about safety and visibility for vehicles exiting the surface parking into driveway.


## Form and Character

- $\quad$ Consider applying metal panel cladding to all three volumes along the south elevation. South elevation to be designed to the same level of detail as east and west elevations
- Consider having a curved balcony to the deck detail.
- Consider providing translucent glazing in lieu of opaque at the west-facing balconies.
- Consider reducing the number of window mullions.
- Consider projecting the features binding the balconies on the east side, from the face of the balcony slab/guardrail.

Landscape

- Consider increasing the amount of planted landscaping screening between the childcare and $156^{\text {th }}$ Street.


## CPTED

- No specific issues were identified.

Sustainability

- Consider using energy and thermal comfort modelling to inform your design development. Use future climate files $(2050 / 2080)$ to best understand the impact of shock events and overall resiliency of the project.
- Consider providing cooling to the suites.

Accessibility

- Consider providing more adaptable units.
- $\quad$ Consider placing an elevator on the $2^{\text {nd }}$ level
- Consider incorporating universally accessible washrooms


## C. OTHER BUSINESS

This section had no items to consider.

## D. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, July 28, 2022.

## E. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 8:0o p.m.

