



## **Advisory Design Panel Report**

**For the Meeting of August 22, 2018**

---

**To:** Advisory Design Panel **Date:** August 10, 2018  
**From:** Leanne Taylor, Senior Planner  
**Subject:** Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00078 for 945 Pembroke Street

---

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Advisory Design Panel (ADP) is requested to review a Development Permit with Variances Application for 945 Pembroke Street and provide advice to Council.

The proposal is for two multiple dwellings and requires Rezoning, Development Permit with Variances and Subdivision Applications. Staff are looking for commentary from the Advisory Design Panel with regard to:

- on-site hard and soft landscaping
- residential entryways
- east facing windows of Building A.

The Options section of this report provides guidance on possible recommendations the Panel may make, or use as a basis to modify, in providing advice on this Application.

### **BACKGROUND**

**Applicant:** Mr. Todd Doherty

**Architect:** Ms. Christine Lintott, MAIBC  
Christine Lintott Architects

**Development Permit Area:** Development Permit Area 3(HC): Core Mixed-Use Residential

**Heritage Status:** N/A

### **Description of Proposal**

The proposal is for two multiple dwellings facilitated by concurrent Rezoning and Subdivision Applications. The proposed floor space ratio (FSR) is 0.88:1 for Lot A and 0.89:1 for Lot B. The proposal contains the following major design components:

- two, three-storey buildings consisting of traditional architectural features, including pitched and gabled rooflines, dormers and traditional-style bay windows and materials

- exterior building materials of Building A consisting of lap siding, hardi-panels, asphalt shingles, Tudor batons and painted wood casing
- exterior building materials of Building B consisting of horizontal hardi siding, hardi shingle cladding and asphalt shingles
- individual private patio spaces
- upper storey residential entryways facing the street and rear yard
- side entryways for the basement level residential units
- permeable pavers in the parking area and permeable surface treatment for the driveway
- planting beds to break up the hard surface treatment
- twelve long-term (Class 1) bicycle parking spaces for each building to be located in a bicycle storage area in the basement level, and six short-term (Class 2) bicycle parking spaces to be located in the front yard of each lot.

The following data table compares the proposal with the existing R-2 Zone, Two Family Dwelling District and the R3-A1 Zone, Low Profile Multiple Dwelling District. An asterisk is used to identify where the proposal is less stringent than the existing Zone. Additionally, the key City policy that pertains to the area has been included in this table.

Zoning Criteria	Proposal Lot A	Proposal Lot B	Existing Zone R-2	Zone Standard R3-A1	OCP Policy	Local Neighbourhood Policy (DCAP)
Site area (m <sup>2</sup> ) – minimum	533.29 *	528.41 *	555	920		
Density (Floor Space Ratio) – maximum	0.88:1	0.89:1	0.50:1	1:1	Refer to DCAP	2:1
Height (m) – maximum	9.72	9.48	7.60	10.70		
Storeys – maximum	3	3	2	3		Up to 5 storeys
Site coverage (%) – maximum	35.20 *	35.50 *	40.00	33.33		
Open site space (%) – minimum	31.70	31.00	30.00	30.00		
Setbacks (m) – minimum						
Front (Pembroke Street)	5.53 * / 4.26* (entry steps)	5.72 * / 4.07 * (entry steps)	7.50 / 3.00 (projections)	7.50 / 3.00 (projections)		

Zoning Criteria	Proposal Lot A	Proposal Lot B	Existing Zone R-2	Zone Standard R3-A1	OCP Policy	Local Neighbourhood Policy (DCAP)
Rear (S)	12.98	12.38	13.63	10.50		
Side (E)	2.21 *	1.56 *	3.00	4.86 (Lot A) 4.74 (Lot B)		
Side (W)	1.56 *	2.17 *	1.50	4.86 (Lot A) 4.74 (Lot B)		
Vehicle parking – minimum	5 *	5 *	6	6		
Visitor vehicle parking included in the overall units – minimum	0 *	0 *	1	1		
Surface parking landscape screen	0.60 *	0.60 *	n/a	1.00		
<b>Bicycle parking stalls – minimum</b>						
Class 1	12	12	n/a	6		
Class 2	6	6	n/a	8		

### Sustainability Features

The applicant is proposing to install efficient appliances, plumbing and electrical fixtures as well as parking stall outlets for charging electric vehicles. The roof trusses will be designed to support solar hot water or photovoltaic panel assemblies. The attic would be large enough to store hot water tanks.

### Consistency with Policies and Design Guidelines

#### Official Community Plan and Downtown Core Area Plan

The *Official Community Plan* (OCP) Urban Place Designation for the subject property is Core Residential, which supports multi-unit residential; however the OCP defers to the *Downtown Core Area Plan* (DCAP) for land use policies related to height and densities. The DCAP supports multi-unit residential with a density of 2:1 floor space ratio (FSR) and a maximum height of up to approximately five storeys. The OCP also identifies this property in Development Permit Area 3 (HC): Core Mixed-Use Residential. This DPA identifies the Core Residential area

as a major residential district on the edge of a regional commercial and employment district, and anticipates residential growth in the form of intensified multi-unit residential development. The applicant is proposing a lower density residential infill development that fits in with the existing neighbourhood context and built form, which is predominantly single family dwellings that contain traditional-style architectural features.

#### Design Guidelines for Development Permit Area 3 (HC): Core Mixed-Use Residential

- *Downtown Core Area Plan* (2011)
- *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (2005)
- *Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters* (2010)
- *Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings* (2006).

### **ISSUES AND ANALYSIS**

The following sections identify and provide a brief analysis of the areas where the Panel is requested to provide commentary.

#### **On-Site Hard and Soft Landscaping**

The *Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings* (2006) contain a design guideline pertaining to circulation patterns and pedestrian access, and *Appendix 7: Building Design Guidelines* in the DCAP contains a design guideline ensuring on-site open spaces that are well-designed, safe, active, visible and illuminated to encourage their use. Each lot has identical hard and soft landscaping features to create a seamless streetscape. The front yards contain private patios, fencing, lawn and planting beds. The rear yards are predominantly surface parking with a landscaping strip along the rear property lines as well as planting beds located on the south east and south west corners of the property. Private patios and some soft landscaping are being proposed along the side property lines. The ADP's input on the overall hard and soft landscaping as well as pedestrian circulation patterns on-site would be welcomed.

#### **Residential Entryways**

*Appendix 7: Building Design Guidelines* in the DCAP encourages ground floor residential dwellings that are located adjacent to a street to provide at-grade individual entrances with direct connections to the public sidewalk, and the use of building elements such as landscaping, fencing and gates to enhance residential entrances as well as ensure that building entrances are clearly identifiable from the street. Each proposed building would have two residential entryways facing the street, the basement level residential units would have side entrances accessed from the driveway through a corridor, and the south (rear) facing units have entrances facing the rear parking lot. The ADP's comments on the residential entryways from a design and CPTED perspective are welcomed.

#### **East-Facing Windows of Building A**

The *Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings* contain a design guideline pertaining to fenestration and the arrangement, proportion and pattern of windows. On the east elevation of Building A, there are two windows that align with the neighbouring windows and may pose concerns of privacy and overlook in the future. The ADP's comments on window placement are welcomed.

## **OPTIONS**

The following are three potential options that the Panel may consider using or modifying in formulating a recommendation to Council:

### **Option One**

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00078 for 945 Pembroke Street be approved as presented.

### **Option Two**

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00078 for 945 Pembroke Street be approved with the following changes:

- as listed by the ADP.

### **Option Three**

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 00078 for 945 Pembroke Street does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined (and that the key areas that should be revised include):

- as listed by the ADP, if there is further advice they would like to provide on how the Application could be improved.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- Subject Map
- Aerial Map
- Plans date stamped July 30, 2018
- Applicant's letter dated July 30, 2018.

cc: Mr. Todd Doherty; Ms. Christine Lintott, Christine Lintott Architects.