

## **ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Tuesday, April 16, 2019 at 6:30 p.m.**

**Council Chambers**

### **MINUTES**

#### **VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:**

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| Christa MacArthur    | - Chair, Community Member                  |
| Rebecca Bateman      | - Community Member                         |
| Stephen Beasley      | - Community Member                         |
| Ken Bourdeau         | - Vice-Chair, Community Member             |
| Darlene Carty        | - Community Member                         |
| Margaret Fairweather | - Community Member (Departed at 8:17 p.m.) |
| Andrew Feltham       | - Community Member                         |
| Tobi May             | - Community Member                         |
| Melinda Michael      | - Community Member                         |

#### **GUESTS:**

|                 |                              |
|-----------------|------------------------------|
| Minder Bhullar  | - Builder, 632 Second Street |
| Robert Billard  | - Billard Architecture       |
| Jaspal Randhawa | - Owner, 632 Second Street   |

#### **STAFF:**

|                 |                       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Dilys Huang     | - Planning Technician |
| Britney Quail   | - Heritage Planner    |
| Janet Zazubek   | - Planning Analyst    |
| Heather Corbett | - Committee Clerk     |

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

### **1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**

#### **1.1 There were no additions.**

## **2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

### **2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of Tuesday, March 19, 2019**

#### **MOVED AND SECONDED**

*THAT the minutes of the March 19, 2019 Advisory Planning Commission meeting be adopted.*

**CARRIED.**

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion

### **2.2 Adoption of the Minutes of Tuesday, January 15, 2019**

#### **MOVED AND SECONDED**

*THAT the minutes of the January 15, 2019 Advisory Planning Commission meeting be adopted.*

**CARRIED.**

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion

## **3.0 INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS**

There were no items.

## **4.0 REZONING**

### **4.1 1002 – 1004 and 1006 – 1008 Third Avenue**

**HER00700**

Britney Quail, Heritage Planner, and Janet Zazubek, Planning Analyst, summarized the staff report dated April 16, 2019, regarding a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) to allow the conversion of four unoccupied attic spaces into loft bedrooms at the duplexes located at 1002-1004 and 1006-1008 Third Avenue. In exchange, the owner would undertake small-scale restoration and legally protect both duplexes.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Zazubek provided the following information:

- The City's Building Department reviewed the application as per the standard process, particularly in regards to the Building Code for the stairs and windows;
- The proposed attic spaces meet egress requirements through the use of alternate compliance methods; and,

- Attic spaces are not usually counted in FSR calculations as they are usually less than four feet in height or non-accessible. This project would be rendering the space accessible through the addition of a staircase.

Robert Billard, Billard Architecture, provided the Commission with a PowerPoint presentation covering the following information:

- Details of the design of the attic additions; and,
- Details of the proposed skylights, which would be operable and sufficient for egress.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Billard provided the following information:

- The required fire separation between the duplex units would be included as per the BC Building Code;
- The proposed staircase has been reviewed by the City's Building Department, and would likely be acceptable by BC Building Code; and,
- No sprinklers would be required in the proposed attic spaces.

The Chair called three times for any speakers from the public and none came forward.

The Commission made the following comments in regards to the proposed development:

- Appreciation was shown for retaining the heritage duplexes, particularly in the Brow of the Hill neighbourhood; and,
- The application and use of the proposed renovation is straightforward and will provide protection to the buildings.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Advisory Planning Commission recommend that Council approve the proposed conversion, restoration and HRA at 1002 – 1004 and 1006 – 1008 Third Avenue, as described in the staff report dated April 16, 2019.*

**CARRIED.**

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

**Procedural Note:** The Commission recessed from 6:47pm to 6:54pm.

Britney Quail, Heritage Planner, and Dilys Huang, Planning Technician, summarized the staff report dated April 16, 2019, regarding a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) proposed for subdivision of the property at 632 Second Street into two parcels, as well as the construction of an infill house, and relaxation of zoning provisions, in exchange for restoration and protection of the 1937 Pugh Residence.

Ms. Huang noted details of the site context and current zoning, parking and vehicular access off Seventh Avenue, and public consultation conducted, including an open house and a meeting with the Glenbrooke North Residents' Association.

In response to questions from the Commission, staff provided the following information:

- On direction from Council, the City is not currently supporting small lot rezonings, but rather is focusing on infill programs through the OCP implementation program. Therefore, without the proposed HRA, this application would not normally be considered;
- If an HRA proposal was not being considered, the property owner would be permitted to build a carriage house not exceeding 10% of the lot size under the existing RS-1 zone;
- Due to the inclusion of an accessible parking space, the proposed parking configuration consists of four off-street parking spaces, including three parking pads and one parking space in the heritage house's attached garage. The previously proposed detached garage has been changed to a detached workshop;
- The setback for the new house is proposed as the standard five feet from the side property line. This is the standard setback from a side property line in the RS-1 zone, regardless of where the neighbouring house is located on its adjacent lot;
- A different building configuration on the lot was initially proposed in order to provide more distance from the neighbouring house; however, it would have worked contrary to the Engineering Services Department's requirement of one shared driveway access for the subject site;
- Minimization of access points and curb letdowns is a City priority within the OCP and the Master Transportation Plan, especially in terms of Greenways, and applies to both Second Street and Seventh Avenue;
- The proposed workshop is not included in the 0.66 FSR proposed for the infill house, as detached accessory structures are permitted up to 10% of the lot size and are not counted as part of the primary building's FSR;

- Consideration was given to locating the driveway on Second Street; however, the Seventh Avenue access was deemed more suitable by Engineering Services, due to the location of both a boulevard tree and a utility pole on Second Street;
- If the heritage house was to be demolished rather than retained as part of an HRA, the current zoning would permit a single detached dwelling with a secondary suite, and a carriage house on the property, and two off-street parking spaces would be required;
- Tree permit applications, and any necessary arborist reports, are required when an HRA application is first submitted;
- Tree retention is negotiated in the site planning process in the same way as heritage restoration and Engineering Services requirements;
- Arborist reports are not typically provided to the APC; however, in this case, it was requested by members of the Commission; and,
- The Community Heritage Commission has reviewed this project, and draft minutes from their meeting have been provided in the APC agenda package.

Minder Bhullar, Builder and Jaspal Randhawa, Owner, reviewed the details and reasoning for the project, covering the following information:

- Details of the history of the property;
- Proposed building features, such as colours, materials, and an accessible suite in the basement;
- The importance to the builder of developing an infill house that reflects the streetscape and is consistent with the surrounding neighbourhood;
- The benefits of the project, including site coverage not exceeding 30%, consistency with the surrounding character homes' designs, suitability for the neighbourhood, addition of affordable housing and increase in density; and,
- Community support had been received for the project.

The Chair called for any speakers from the public.

**Fran Davies**, resident, described the proposed setbacks of the project. She noted that if even a garage is built on the property at the minimum setback requirement (2 ft.), this would make access to her house for cleaning very difficult, in addition to causing a reduction in light. Ms. Davies was also concerned about a fire hazard, due to the proximity of the proposed infill house to her house and expressed concern about the alignment of the proposed infill house's windows with her house. Ms. Davies also expressed concerns about the increase in vehicles that would be generated by the proposed residences on the property and the impact these would have on the greenway, where children often ride back and forth to Herbert Spencer Elementary School.

**Robert Park**, resident, expressed concerns about the increase in vehicles and parking demand that this proposal would contribute to the adjacent streets, and noted that these concerns were raised at the Residents' Association (RA) meeting. In addition, Mr. Park was concerned about the size and height of the proposed infill house, and the proposed setbacks, noting that more clearance from the adjacent house should be provided. Lastly, he noted that the existing house does not have a significant amount of redeeming heritage value to justify the HRA.

The Chair noted that all correspondence from the public in regards to the application had been included in the Commission's agenda package.

**Gary Edge**, resident, noted that he had not observed significant support for the project at the RA meeting. He was not appreciative of the perceived threat of the alternative of building a large house, as the zoning would allow, and noted that this proposal provides too much density and building mass on too small a property.

**Pat Chafe**, resident, expressed concern about the proximity of the new house to the neighbouring house, and the subsequent loss of light. He further noted that a carriage house would have been more appropriate, as the proposal would provide too much density for the lot, and an insufficient amount of greenspace. Lastly, Mr. Chafe noted that the proposed density may mean that potentially eight cars could have need to park and pull out into the street, and this would add to the dangerous nature of the intersection for the schoolchildren, who tend to ride their bikes on the sidewalk.

**Michael Flirtell**, resident, discussed the lack of parking on the street and recounted his experience with a shared driveway, noting that two driveways for this proposal would be preferable.

The Chair called a further two times for any comments from the public.

The Commission made the following comments in regards to the proposed development:

- The proposal would provide a good combination of preservation of a character house, with the provision of density, rental housing, and affordability;
- The proposal would provide an increase in density in keeping with the built character of the neighbourhood;
- The proposal makes good use of the lot, while keeping within property lines and setbacks, and it appears to be smaller in height than the neighbouring house;

- In keeping with the City’s policies for density, the alternative to this proposal would be a single detached dwelling with a secondary suite, and a carriage house, which would likely bring as many vehicles;
- While the public’s safety concerns in regards to the greenway may be valid, the greenway use is not the responsibility of the proponent, and the provision of parking as per the City’s requirements has been satisfied;
- With respect to parking and driveways, one crossing provides a good balance for trees, protection of the greenway and maintenance of street parking; and,
- Reservations were noted concerning Engineering Services enforcing a single driveway, resulting in a set site configuration, which does not fully address the neighbours’ concerns.

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Advisory Planning Commission recommend that Council approve the subdivision, infill house, relaxations, restorations and other proposals, as described in staff report dated April 16, 2019 with regard to 632 Second Street.*

**CARRIED.**

Darlene Carty voted in opposition to the motion.

**5.0 NEW BUSINESS**

Commission members discussed the mandate of the Advisory Planning Commission and the topics that the Commission is legally permitted to consider, particularly in reference to trees and heritage issues.

Britney Quail, Heritage Planner, and Heather Corbett, Committee Clerk, suggested that staff could provide clarification of the Commission’s concerns about purview at a future meeting.

**6.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION**

There were no items.

**7.0 CORRESPONDENCE**

**7.1 Correspondence re 632 Second Street**

**MOVED and SECONDED**

*THAT the Advisory Planning Commission receive the on-table correspondence.*

**CARRIED.**

Darlene Carty, Margaret Fairweather, Andrew Feltham and Tobi May voted in opposition of the motion.

**8.0 NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday, April 25, 2019 in Council Chamber, City Hall

**9.0 ADJOURNMENT**

**ON MOTION**, the meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Certified Correct,

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

**Christa MacArthur**  
**Chair**

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

**Heather Corbett**  
**Committee Clerk**