



ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, June 15, 2010 5:30 p.m.
Committee Room No. 2

MINUTES

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bruce Clark	- Chair
Mark Elliott	- Community Member
Maria Marcu	- Community Member
Clay Nelson	- Community Member
Terry Owen	- Community Member
Baj Puri	- Community Member
Alex Sweezey	- Community Member
Ken Williams	- Community Member

VOTING MEMBER REGRETS:

Helen Bodner	- Community Member
--------------	--------------------

STAFF:

Lisa Spitale	- Director of Development Services
Dave Guiney	- Planning Analyst
Jim Hurst	- Senior Planning Analyst
Mike Watson	- Planning Assistant
Donna Martin	- Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

There were no additions to the agenda.

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of May 18, 2010

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission meeting held on May 18, 2010 be received and adopted.

CARRIED.

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

3.0 LAND USE PRESENTATIONS

3.1 42 South Dyke Road

File: REZ018

Jim Hurst, Planning Analyst, reviewed an application to rezone the property at 42 South Dyke Road from Queensborough Neighbourhood Residential Dwelling Districts (RQ-1) to Multiple Dwelling Districts (Low Rise) (RM-2A). The project proposed is a 36 unit townhouse development.

The issues this proposal faces are as follows:

- What to do with the property outside the dyke? Walking and bicycling paths will be developed at or near the perimeter of the Queensborough neighbourhood
- How to utilize the unusual configuration of land inside the dyke? This area will contain medium density multi-family residential uses. With development of townhouses the applicant will need to dedicate and construct a portion of Dyke Road with a smaller dedication and construction on Wood Street.
- Building in the floodplain design considerations. The amount of floor space allowed at grade is limited for an entry and car parking. In order to provide a workable footprint for the townhouses, tandem parking has been supported by the City for projects in Queensborough.

Architect: Don Andrew, Creekside Architects representing South Surrey Development Corporation came forward to answer questions from the Commission relating to the proposed development.

Questions from Commission *(Response in italics):*

- Is there a buffer between the developments? *There is a 15 ft. setback.*
- What is the frontage? *It will be approximately 422.5 feet.*
- Is Wood Street being extended? *Wood Street will be extended to allow access to the parking lot for the townhouses.*
- Where is the pumping station located? *The pump station is located by Ryall Park.*
- Will the flat roof be a green roof? *The applicant is not currently considering a green roof.*
- Will the trail face the back of the townhouses? *The townhouse fronts will face the trail. The upper living level will be about two feet above the sidewalk along Dyke Road*
- What does it cost to build a green roof? *Green roofs are just not typically built on townhouse as insurance companies are reluctant to insure green roofs.*

3.2 309, 311 and 315 Ward Street

File: REZ012

Jim Hurst reviewed the application received to rezone the property at 309, 311 and 315 Ward Street from Single Detached Dwelling Districts (RS-2) to a Comprehensive Development District zoning based on the Multiple Dwelling Districts (RM-5A) zoning schedule. The project proposed is a four storey, 25 unit residential building.

Don Andrew, Creekside Architects, representing West Fraser Ward Street Developments was available to answer questions from Commission members. He noted there have been meetings with the Design Panel and two meetings in Sapperton. All seem to be supportive of this development.

Questions from the Commission (*Responses in italics*):

- Are the current houses occupied? *The house next to the lane is boarded up. The other two houses are currently rentals.*
- Is there a different zoning for the extra unit? *It will be zoned Commercial District.*
- Is there an opportunity for a green roof? *Architect Don Andrews said it is difficult to get insurance for a green roof on wood frame buildings.*

Recess at 6:28 p.m. Reconvene at 6:39 p.m.

4.0 REZONING

4.1 713 Fourteenth Street

File: REZ030

David Guiney, Planning Analyst, reviewed the application to rezone the property at 713 Fourteenth Street from Neighbourhood Residential Dwelling Districts (NR-1) to Neighbourhood Residential Dwelling Districts (Small Lots) (NR-5) in order to allow a subdivision to create two lots. The existing house will be retained and slightly upgraded and a new house would be built on the newly created lot.

Notification was sent to:

- the surrounding neighbourhood within 100 metres, 118 notices in total;
- all Residents' Associations;
- the New Westminster Heritage Preservation Society
- the Board of School Trustees; and
- Superintendent of Schools.

Six letters were received in response to this rezoning application. The residents expressed the following concerns:

- the height of the new building will compromise existing property views;
- increasing the density will challenge the already overworked infrastructure with traffic;
- the proposed setbacks do not appear to be sufficient;
- concern for the proposed rear access of Hamilton Street will compromise and already congested and narrow street, and
- removal of existing vegetation and groundcover will result in decreased natural drainage.

Mr. Guiney addressed the height of new house noting were the existing lot to be redeveloped with a single house, approximately twice the size of the house proposed, the lot datum, from where the house height is measured, would be only 1.95 feet lower than it would be for the new house being proposed with this application. Therefore, a house

built on the existing lot would likely be approximately 1.95 feet lower than what is proposed for the corner property. In other words, the view that many of the neighbours from across the street now have will be significantly affected even without the rezoning. Because the proposed house is actually less than 24 feet high and a single large house could be built up to 25 feet high, the difference might even be less than 1.95 ft. It might be closer to just 1 foot.

The setback from Hamilton Street is also not significantly affected by the proposed rezoning as Hamilton Street is the side property line and the minimum setback requirement is just 4 feet, regardless of whether there is one house or two houses. It's likely that a single house would be set back further than 4 feet, but only slightly, perhaps to 6 or 8 feet. This differs from the setbacks of all the other properties in the 1300 and 1400 blocks of Hamilton that face Hamilton St and thus have Front setback requirements of 25 feet. The rezoning will not significantly impact the setback of a new house on the corner of Hamilton.

Regarding the proposed off-street parking access off Hamilton Street, the rezoning will not affect this at all, as the Zoning Bylaw would require that a single new house on the existing lot obtain access from Hamilton Street. The existing Fourteenth Street driveway crossing would have to be removed.

With respect to the issue raised about drainage, Mr. Guiney assured Commission members that City staff does not believe drainage in that area to be an issue.

Graham Farstad, Arlington Group, reviewed the site context, floor plan, design elements and parking plan.

Questions from the Commission: *(Response in italics)*

- Would first floor of new house be the same as the existing house? *The first floor of the new house will be about the same as the existing house.*
- Will the new house be below the sidewalk? *The new house will be a very small amount below the sidewalk.*
- Can the height be reduced further? *The pitch is currently 5:12, a 4:12 pitch could be considered.*
- What is square footage of existing house? *The existing house is approximately 1400 sq. ft. above grade.*
- Can the house be moved farther back? *Given the current design of the house, it can only be moved a couple of inches.*

The Chair invited comments from the floor.

Alfons Merk, 713 Fourteenth Street, distributed On-Table pictures to show how the proposed new construction will block his view.

Warren Foster, 1315 Hamilton Street, expressed concern that several properties have been subdivided in this area and therefore there are more families in the area creating more noise and parking issues.

Douglas McCallum, 709 Fourteenth Street voiced his concern about the increased traffic in the area. Mr. McCallum advised that he lives within 33 ft of the property and did not receive a notice.

Paula-Marie Manual, 1317 Hamilton Street, shares the same concerns regarding the loss of view. The garage access off Hamilton Street is also a concern. Suggests the new house be moved back from the sidewalk.

Comments from the Commission:

- Confident issues have been addressed;
- Height is the main objection and that is not going to change, and therefore support the subdivision;
- Have reservations about the visual impact and would like a motion to that effect;
- Massing of house incompatible with houses in the area;
- Reconsider roof pitch;
- The fact that this is a corner lot creates the problem, does not seem to be a solution, therefore will support the application;
- See no factual basis to oppose the application, will support the application;
- Not the ideal site to rezone due to the issues raised regarding height and access, do not support the application;
- Awkward site.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the application to rezone the property at 713 Fourteenth Street from Neighbourhood Residential Dwelling Districts (Small lots) (NR-1) to Neighbourhood Residential Dwelling Districts (NR-5) to allow a subdivision to create two lots be supported with respect to the land use view but the Commission has serious reservations regarding the vertical visual impact of the house design.

CARRIED.

Mark Elliott opposed the motion stating the site does not allow the applicant to mitigate the concerns of the residents i.e., sloping lot, resident views, high impact on Hamilton Street and no lane.

The meeting was recessed at 8:25 p.m. and reconvened at 8:31 p.m.

4.2 333 Keary Street

File: REZ032

David Guiney, Planning Analyst, reviewed the application to rezone the property at 333 Keary Street from Single Detached Dwelling Districts (RS-1) to Single Detached Dwelling Districts (Small Lots) (RS-5) in order to allow a subdivision to create two lots and build two new houses each with a secondary suite. A development variance permit is required to vary the minimum lot frontage requirement from 10% to 9.96% of the lot perimeter.

Notification was sent to:

- the surrounding neighbourhood within 100 metres, 386 notices in total;
- all Residents' Associations;
- the Board of School Trustees; and
- Superintendent of Schools.

One letter was received in response to this rezoning application.

Questions from the Commission: *(Response in italics)*

- How does this application vary from the proposal previously sent to Council? *The application proposes separate attached garages at the front of the house, whereas the previous application proposed a shared central driveway to detached garages in the rear yards. Were basement garages considered? The applicant responded that he had not considered basement garages as he wanted to create something new in the area and he is somewhat limited by the small lot size.*
- *Is the applicant being innovative with drainage? It has not been considered but it is a possibility.*
- *If single car garages were used would it allow more living space? Because the houses will contain secondary suites, two off-street parking spaces are required.*
- *If the rezoning is denied, would the applicant build a larger house? The applicant indicated a house would be built but not necessarily a large house.*

Walt Weaver, father of the applicant, pointed out that he is trying to significantly upgrade the type of housing in the area.

Comments from the Commission:

- Can support as presented;
- Consistent with area, will support;
- Don't like narrow lots but will support the application.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the application to rezone the property at 333 Keary Street from Single Detached Dwelling Districts (RS-1) to Single Detached Dwelling Districts (Small lots) (RS-5) to allow a subdivision to create two lots and build two new houses be supported as presented.

CARRIED.

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

4.3 21 - 27 Eighth Avenue

File: REZ033

Michael Watson, Planning Assistant, reviewed the application to rezone 21 and 27 Eighth Avenue to a Comprehensive Development District based on Community Commercial Districts (Medium Rise) (C-2A). The applicant proposes to construct two four storey mixed use buildings totalling about 135,000 sq. ft. The proposal consists of 152 residential units (townhouse and apartment) and about 9,100 sq ft. of commercial space. **(Tom Bell, GBL Architects)**

Notification was sent to:

- the surrounding neighbourhood within 100 metres, 148 notices in total;
- all Residents' Associations;
- the Board of School Trustees; and
- Superintendent of Schools.

One letter was received in response to this rezoning application.

Questions from the Commission: *(Response in italics)*

- Has this proposal been before the Design Panel? *Yes, the Design Panel was supportive of the application.*
- Is parking still more than required? *Yes.*
- How do you distinguish parking for residents vs. commercial? *Residential parking is gated.*
- Will the two legal lots be strata units? *The two lots are separate applications.*
- Are there any other changes beyond design? *The commercial space has been maximized by limiting the size of the units.*
- Is there any innovative treatment of the roof water? *The challenge is addressing rain water discharge on top of the parkade. Rain water can be discharged into sidewalk boulevards.*

Gary Pooni, Brooke and Associates, highlighted the proposed changes with respect to the area context, neighbourhood context and policy context. Public consultation has been done from which a more detailed site plan was created.

Tom Bell, GBL Architects, reviewed the site plan, elevations, and renderings. Senga Lindsay reviewed the preliminary landscape plan.

Gary Pooni advised that most of the windows on the lane side have been removed to eliminate privacy issues with adjacent units facing the lane. He related the benefits of the plan as presented.

The Chair invited those interested in this application to speak.

John Vect, 122 Queens Avenue, expressed concern about the site lines for the units in the Cheshwalk Building. Mr. Vect suggested the applicant consider moving the second row of condominiums over and realigning the windows to lessen impact on residents in the Cheshwalk Building who wish to use their patios.

Robin Serkorokoff, 106 College Court, spoke in support of this development.

CJ Emmerson, 815 First Street, presented an On-Table letter expressing concern regarding the height of the building at First Street; windows directly across from the Cheshwalk Building; traffic in laneway; and the increased parking issues generated by the new development. Ms. Emmerson also pointed out the proposed buildings do not fit the heritage look of the area.

April Morrison, 119 Durham Street, spoke in support of the project. She commented that the access for Eighth Avenue will be more attractive-. Ms. Morrison asked if there was a way to have the postal employees park in the post office lot.

In response, Jim Hurst offered that the problem is the post office lot is full of trucks early in the morning when post office staff arrives so they park on the street. Neighbourhood parking could be enforced but time limited parking requires neighbourhood approval.

Rob Bobison, owner of the post office building, suggested he talk to postal workers about the problem. He is in support of the proposal and feels it will be a good addition to the neighbourhood.

Question from Commission members:

- Can the green space be moved to the edge of the project? *From a design perspective a green space does not present a strong edge for a project and moving the green space will create problems of how units relate to each other.*

Comments from the Commission:

- Fully support development;
- Like the detailed design improvements, but find it disappointing the developer is not exploring a green roof;
- Project will be an asset in this area;
- Impressed with overall quality of proposal and presentation, will support;
- Like it better now but sympathize with those who are losing their view;
- Like how applicant has responded to concerns.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the application to rezone 21 and 27 Eighth Avenue to a Comprehensive Development District based on Community Commercial Districts (Medium Rise) (C-2A) to allow construction of two four storey mixed use buildings be supported.

CARRIED.

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

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

6.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION

6.1 Advisory Planning Commission – Terms of Reference
--

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

7.0 CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

8.0 NEXT MEETING

July 20, 2010 (in Committee Room No. 2)

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting adjourned 10:22 at p.m.



Bruce Clark
Chair



Donna Martin
Committee Clerk