



Advisory Design Panel Report

For the Meeting of January 25, 2017

To: Advisory Design Panel **Date:** January 6, 2017
From: Charlotte Wain, Senior Planner – Urban Design
Subject: Rezoning Application No. 00531 and Development Permit No. 000484 for 986, 988 and 990 Heywood Avenue

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000484 for 986, 988 and 990 Heywood Avenue be approved with changes recommended by the Advisory Design Panel.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Advisory Design Panel (ADP) is requested to review a Development Permit Application for 986, 988 and 990 Heywood Avenue and provide advice to Council.

The purpose of this report is to present the Advisory Design Panel with information, analysis and recommendations regarding a Development Permit Application for the property located at 986, 988 and 990 Heywood Avenue. The proposal is to construct a four-storey, multi-residential building containing 21 residential units. Variances associated with the Application are related to setbacks, site coverage, open site space and height.

The following policy documents were considered in assessing this Application:

- *Official Community Plan (OCP), 2012*
- *Design Guidelines for Multi-Unit Residential, Commercial and Industrial (2012)*
- *Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings (2006)*
- *Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters (2010)*

COUNCIL DIRECTION

The Application has not yet been presented to the Committee of the Whole. The intent is to present the Application to Committee with the benefit of advice from the panel.

BACKGROUND

Project Details

Applicant: Mr. David Jawl
Jawl Residential Developments Inc.

Architect: Mr. Gregory Damant, MAIBC
Cascadia Architects Inc.

Development Permit Area: Development Permit Area 16, General Form and Character

Heritage Status: N/A

The following data table compares the proposal with the existing R3-AM2, Mid-Rise Multiple Dwelling District Zone. An asterisk is used to identify where the proposal is less stringent than the existing Zone.

Zoning Criteria	Proposal	Zone Standard R3-AM2
Site area (m ²) - minimum	1463.00	920.00
Density (Floor Space Ratio) - maximum	1.6:1*	1.2:1
Total floor area (m ²) - maximum	2334.85	N/A
Height (m) - maximum	14.59*	12.00
Storeys - maximum	4	4
Site coverage % - maximum	71.00*	40.00
Open site space % - minimum	22.00*	30.00
Setbacks (m) – minimum		
Front (Heywood Avenue)	4.51*	10.50
Rear (east)	6.73 (building) 4.73* (balcony)	6.73
Side (north)	3.75*	6.73
Side (south)	4.22*	6.73
Parking - minimum	32	29
Visitor parking (minimum) included in the overall units	3	3
Bicycle parking Class 1 secure storage (minimum)	22	21
Bicycle parking Class 2 publicly accessible (minimum)	6	6

Description of Proposal

The proposal is to construct a four-storey, multi-residential building containing 21 residential units. Variances associated with the Application are related to setbacks, site coverage, open site space and height. The building has a floor space ratio (FSR) of 1.6:1 and a maximum height of 14.59m.

Sustainability Features

The proposal includes the following components:

- multi-unit residential building form with three ground-oriented units facing Heywood Avenue and three units to the rear
- private patios with planting as shown on the landscape plan for each of the six units on the ground level; three facing Heywood Avenue and three to the rear
- one level of underground parking for 32 stalls, including three stalls for residential visitor use
- 22 class 1 bicycle storage spaces located underground
- one publicly accessible class 2 rack for six bikes located adjacent to the main entrance on Heywood Avenue
- removal and replacement of three existing street trees (Cherry) and retention and protection of one existing street tree (Cherry) on Heywood Avenue
- removal and replacement of one Monkey Puzzle tree within the private property.

Exterior building materials include:

- stone ceramic tile for the primary building with accents of metal and stone ceramic screens
- tongue and groove cedar soffits
- vertical board form exposed concrete for the parkade wall that projects above grade on the north and east elevations
- clear glazing with aluminum frames
- clear glass and metal guardrails for balconies
- mechanical penthouse (material unconfirmed).

Sustainability Features

As indicated in the applicant's letter dated October 27, 2016, the proposed sustainability features associated with this Application include the following:

- high efficiency heating
- natural and recyclable building materials, sourced within 800km of the site where possible
- solar-ready conduit from the electrical room to the roof
- EnergyStar® rated windows and appliances
- LED lighting throughout the building
- interior suite layouts designed to optimize natural daylight
- construction waste diverted from all landfill during construction through smart on-site waste management
- low flow and water efficient plumbing fixtures
- secure heated bike storage in the underground parkade
- electric bike charging locations within the bike storage room.

Consistency with Design Guidelines

The *Official Community Plan, 2012* (OCP) Urban Place Designation for the subject property is Urban Residential, which supports low-rise and mid-rise multi-unit buildings up to approximately six storeys. The site is located in a transitional area; and although Urban Residential designations front Beacon Hill Park to the west, lower scale Traditional Residential Urban Place Designations adjoin the rear of the properties to the east. The OCP identifies this property in Development Permit Area (DPA) 16 General Form and Character. The proposed development is generally consistent with the objectives of the DPA which seeks to integrate multi-unit residential buildings in a manner that is complementary to the place character of the neighbourhood including heritage character. Enhancing the character of the streetscape through high quality architecture, landscape and urban design as well as creating human-scaled design are also key objectives of this DPA. Design Guidelines that apply to DPA 16 are *Multi-Unit Residential, Commercial and Industrial Guidelines (2012)*, *Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings (2006)* and *Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters (2010)*.

ISSUES

The issues associated with this project are:

- massing, height and transition in relation to the context
- interface on the north and east elevations as it relates to the projecting parkade.

ANALYSIS

Massing, Height and Transition to Context

The proposed building height is 14.59m which is 2.59m above the maximum height allowance in the R3-AM-2 Zone, Mid-Rise Multiple Dwelling District and 6.9m above the maximum height allowance in the adjacent R1-B Zone, Single Family Dwelling District, to the east of the subject property. Although the OCP envisages buildings up to approximately six storeys in the Urban Residential Place Designation, the Guidelines encourage appropriate form, massing and building articulation in relation to existing context.

The proposed building is adjacent to a three-storey building to the south (the Tweedsmuir), with a four storey condominium building to the south-west fronting Park Boulevard. To the north are two-storey townhouses that front Oliphant Avenue. To the east in rear of the property are predominantly two-storey single family dwellings. In summary, there are no predominant height characteristics within the neighbourhood block and most range from two to four-storeys. Although the policy supports taller buildings fronting Beacon Hill Park, the proposed building height is higher than the maximum allowance in the current zone and adjacent buildings. The applicant has reduced this by 0.2m (8 inches) in response to staff comments and notes that a combination of 9ft and 10ft ceiling heights are desirable for this proposal. The applicant notes that the design team conducted sun studies with a reduced penthouse ceiling height of 9ft, and there would be no appreciable difference in impact on adjacent properties. However, staff can not verify this as the comparable study as it has not been included in the submission drawings. Staff are generally supportive of the proposed height given the OCP policy direction and the minimal impact this additional height will have on the immediate context along Heywood Avenue, which predominantly consists of three and four storey multi-residential buildings. In addition, articulation of the front façade has been incorporated through changes in materials and landscaping. This serves to emphasise the ground-oriented units which help to create a human-scaled design at the street level. However, opportunities exist to improve the transition to the lower scale single family buildings at the rear, through increased setbacks at the fourth

floor. Further analysis through additional cross sections may be warranted to demonstrate this relationship. ADP is invited to comment on the proposed massing and height as it relates to the immediate context.

North and East Elevations and Projecting Parkade

The subject properties are on a sloping site, with the highest point towards the south, and the lowest at the north. The underground parkade projects above grade along the rear (east) and side (north) elevation ranging from approximately 0.3m to 1.8m in height from finished grade (not including the additional 0.6m in height which is setback by approximately 1m from this edge). The applicant has noted that lowering the parkade would result in a reduction in the parking provision due to the requirement for a longer access ramp. This in turn would trigger a variance from the minimum parking requirements under the Zoning Regulation Bylaw, which the applicant wishes to avoid. A lower parkade would also create a sunken patio and entrance for the southern-most unit facing Heywood Avenue, causing a disruption along the pedestrian route, which the Guidelines seek to avoid. An accompanying sheet has been attached to the application package for the Panel's consideration, showing the potential impact of a lower parkade on the access ramp.

Staff have raised concern with this projection and the potentially stark interface this creates with adjoining properties. The projection is setback 1.2m from the property line, which does allow for additional planting to soften this edge as noted on the landscape plan, which would supplement the existing vegetation on the adjacent properties to the east as shown on the architectural elevations. The applicant notes that the intent is to retain the existing fence on the adjacent properties to avoid impacts to existing vegetation, and to allow adjacent property owners the option to remove the fence in the future. However, this could possibly create a "trench" between the projecting parkade and the existing fence on the neighbouring properties which has the potential to create entrapment places which Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) standards seek to avoid. Advice from ADP is being sought on the projecting parkade and opportunities for eliminating or mitigating the impact of this wall on adjacent properties as well as any opportunities to address CPTED concerns.

OPTIONS

1. Recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000484 for 986, 988 and 990 Heywood Avenue be approved as presented.
2. Recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000484 for 986, 988 and 990 Heywood Avenue be approved with changes recommended by the Advisory Design Panel (**recommended**).
3. Recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000484 for 986, 988 and 990 Heywood Avenue does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined.

CONCLUSION

This Application is generally consistent with the applicable design guidelines prescribed within DPA 16. The proposed four storey building does exceed the height of the maximum allowance in the current zoning although the impact on the streetscape is considered to be minimal through the use of building articulation creating a human scale along Heywood Avenue. However, the Application could benefit from further design refinement to improve the transition to the lower scale residential units at the rear (east) and mitigation or elimination of the projecting parkade wall.

ATTACHMENTS

- Aerial Map
- Zoning Map
- Applicants letter date stamped December 12, 2016
- Plans date stamped January 9, 2016
- Perspective illustration of parkade box below grade date stamped Dec 12, 2016
- Tree Management Plan dated January 19, 2017

cc: David Jawl, Rajiv Ghandi, Heywood Avenue Developments Inc.; Gregory Damant, Cascadia Architects Inc.

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY JANUARY 25, 2017 AT 12 P.M.**

1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:08 P.M.

Panel Members Present: Christopher Rowe; Justin Gammon; Cynthia Hildebrand; Patricia Graham; Jesse Garlick

Absent: Ann Katherine Murphy; Erica Sangster; Mike Miller; Renee Lussier

Staff Present: Charlotte Wain - Senior Planner, Urban Design
Quinn Anglin - Secretary, Advisory Design Panel

2. Minutes from the Meeting held December 21, 2016.

Action:

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Jesse Garlick, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held December 21, 2016 be approved with changes.

- Page 6 – Jesse Garlick’s name is misspelt

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Development Permit #000484 and Rezoning #00531 for 986, 988, and 990 Heywood Avenue

The City is considering an application to rezone the property at 986, 988, and 990 Heywood Avenue to allow for the construction of a 4 storey multi residential building containing 21 residential units.

Applicant Meeting attendees:

DAVID JAWL	JAWL RESIDENTIAL LTD.
TRAVIS LEE	TRI-EAGLE
GREGORY DAMANT	CASCADIA ARCHITECTS INC.
PETER JOHANNKNECHT	CASCADIA ARCHITECTS
JAMES HAYTER	CASCADIA ARCHITECTS INC.
BEV WINDJACK	LADR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS INC.
KEVIN SCLULEMYER	LADR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS INC.

Ms. Wain provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the Application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- massing, height and transition in relation to the context
- interface on the north and east elevations as it relates to the projecting parkade.

Ms. Wain also made the Panel aware of some inconsistencies with the technical data on the plans and the data table specifically related to the setbacks to the parkade, open site space and site coverage. Under the zoning regulation bylaw, the landscaping proposed on the roof of the projecting parkade cannot be counted towards open site space. It was noted that the site coverage would likely increase and the open site space would decrease. These items would be corrected prior to the application advancing to Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Peter Johannknecht then provided the panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal

- corrected that there were 29 parking stalls, not 32, as outlined in the plans

Bev Windjack then provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the landscape plan proposal.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following;

- the sloping site in relation to the parkade
- the access along the south side of the proposal; is for maintenance only and would be gated

Panel Members discussed:

- the decisions with respect to the design of parkade are appropriate to the elevations
- project is very neighbourly, no objections to the height or massing in relation to the context
- the level of consultation with neighbours to be a part of the discussion and decisions are commendable
- decisions for height and setback well laid out and highly developed
- development is respectable for both existing and future neighbours
- that the building may be a change from the existing condition but over time will fit with the context and neighbourhood
- building is a very handsome building

Action:

MOVED / SECONDED

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Patricia Graham, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council Development Permit Application No. 000484 for 986, 988, 990 Heywood Avenue be approved as proposed.

3.2 Development Permit #000482 for 456 Chester Avenue

The City is considering a Development Permit application to permit construction of a 3 unit multi residential townhouse.

Applicant Meeting attendees:

MIKE GALLANT	SALSBURY HOLDINGS
PAUL DIMENT	SALSBURY HOLDINGS
MICHAEL MOODY	MJM ARCHITECTS

Ms. Wain provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the Application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on.

Mike Gallant then provided the panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

Renee Lussier entered the meeting at 12:58.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following;

- material of the existing driveway?
 - cement
- reasoning for the several different styles of glazing, railings, and finishing materials?
 - driven by picking up cues from the neighbourhood and applying a contemporary take on traditional style
- do the guard rails have glass behind them?
 - they will have a clear plexi sheet behind them
- are the patio spaces used for owners?
 - yes they are
- is the topography relatively level?
 - yes, but they elected to start the first floor below grade to make height restrictions and avoid variances
- the sunken entrances to the suites at ground level
- are the patio decks considered roof decks by definition?
 - yes, but they are permitted in this zone so are not an issue.

Panel Members discussed:

- modest project that is not asking for much
- the south elevation being rather prominent due to the parking lot and could use some further development. The consideration and approach should be consistent throughout the project
- the material changing within a plane is busy, possibly some simplification or one fewer materials on the south elevation most specifically
- scale wise that the project seems to be consistent with the context

- the general form and character; feels ambiguous as it is only 3 units but it could read as 5
- insufficient outdoor space for all of the units
- that the front entrance reads like a lobby into the building when in actuality it is only 3 units with private entrances
- too many materials being applied throughout the project
- the buildings around are moderately simple, so the project could be more considerate of the adjacent buildings in approach to design
- the pavers to the front decks on the main floor possibly being cut out and additional green space added for more private space
- the open site space and the challenges with meeting zoning requirements
- the path along the south side potentially being removed, as access for the back suite is already provided at the back of the building
- the bike rack potentially being moved

Action:

MOVED / SECONDED

It was moved by Patricia Graham, seconded by Jesse Garlick, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council Development Permit Application No. 000482 for 456 Chester Avenue be approved with recommendations as proposed;

- Alternate treatments to the south elevation
- Additional consideration to the material transitions and number of materials used
- Consideration to remove some of the hardscaping, specifically in relation to the paving and circulation to allow additional greenspace in the private outdoor spaces
- Possible relocation of the bike rack

CARRIED

3. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting of January 25, 2017 adjourned at 1:17 pm.

Christopher Rowe, Chair