

TOWN OF SIDNEY

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

February 19, 2019

PRESENT:

- Chairperson: Kelly Bull-Tomer
- Members: Bernardine van der Meer, Clarence Bolt, Denny Gelinis, Don Carscadden, Donald Macnamara, Douglas Watt, Graden Sol, Jason Rodd, John Crowhurst, Patrick Killeen
Peter Treuheit, Project Architect (Applicant's representative)
- Council Liaison: Councillor Peter Wainwright
- Staff: Corey Newcomb, Senior Manager of Planning
Yazmin Hernandez Banuelas, Municipal Planner
Kelly Albuca, Development and Administrative Coordinator
- Absent: Alissa McCrea, Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:59 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA:

Moved by: D. Watt

Seconded: D. Carscadden

That the Agenda be adopted as circulated.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES:

Moved by: G. Sol

Seconded: J. Crowhurst

That the Minutes of January 15, 2019 be adopted as circulated.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION NO. DP100782 AND DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT APPLICATION NO. DV100279

2319/2325 Brethour Avenue & 9927 Seventh Street

PROPOSAL

- The proposal is for a 4-storey multi-family residential development containing a total of 34 multi-family dwelling units.

PROPOSAL cont.

- Four variances are requested:
 - 1) to allow a reduction of the front yard setback from 4.5m to 3.4m to accommodate the supporting columns of the entrance canopy;
 - 2) to allow the entrance canopy to project 1.7m into the reduced 3.4m front yard setback;
 - 3) to reduce the setback for the rooftop access structure from 25% (6.8m) to 13% (3.65m) of the building face, and;
 - 4) to increase the height of a rooftop patio railing from 1.1m to 1.5m.

Y. Hernandez Banuelas gave an overview of the proposed development. She also advised the Commission of an incorrect reference in her report under Zoning Bylaw No. 2015, Table 2: Zoning Comparison, Section: Density, Proposed Development: 1.47 FAR should read 1.54 FAR as indicated in the paragraph following Table 2.

Presenter: Peter Treuheit – Project Architect

P. Treuheit gave a PowerPoint presentation outlining the development concept, including a discussion regarding the concept of cohousing and the applicant group. Mr. Treuheit specifically spoke to the following design features:

- Common area unique to cohousing design.
- Living units typically smaller due to common spaces incorporated in design.
- Focus on environmental stewardship.
- Façade very animated with visible outside walkways, staircase is visible from the street and is weather protected with glass panels to allow intentional interaction between residents.
- Multiple exterior finishes incorporated to add visual interest. Exterior finish sample boards circulated to Commission members to view.
- Corner balconies utilized as “step back” design feature.
- Landscaping plan retains mature trees as well as adding eleven (11) new tree plantings.
- Shadow analysis done to examine impacts the proposed building would have on adjacent properties with December having the greatest shadow impacts.
- Onsite storm water retention via underground storage tanks.

P. Treuheit also spoke to the rationale underlying the variance requests:

- Reduction of front yard setback to allow for entrance canopy with supporting pillars encroaching into the front yard setback offering a functional safe shelter during rainy season. The canopy will also offer protection to the Class 2 bike parking area.
- Reduction of setback for rooftop access structure to allow for patio and garden space. The narrow and irregular site configuration significantly restricts the permitted location for rooftop access (stairs and elevator).
- Increased height of rooftop guard rails in order to accommodate a clear glass railing that would act as both a safety barrier and a wind screen. Based on 3D modelling, the railing would not be visible from the street.

Commission members noted landscaping plans indicated outdoor features at back of building as “future”. Mr. Treuheit advised that the final landscaping plan will be phased with most of the external landscaping to be installed as indicated in the plans and the “future”/discretionary landscaping to be done in phases.

Commission members made the following observations:

- Accessible units appeared to have small closet area for stacking washer/dryer which is not appropriate for accessible units. P. Treuheit stated accessible laundry facilities are also included in common area.
- Members asked if EV charging stations as well as roof top solar panels be included in plans. P. Treuheit confirmed that EV connections to be roughed in and available to be completed as well as the wiring runs to the roof top for solar panel installations in the future.
- Various parking issues/applications were discussed such as lack of visitor parking and number of street parking pull-ins in front of the building that would be available. It was noted that Town of Sidney requires minimal parking spaces per unit as compared to other municipalities in the region. Staff advise parking bylaw requirements for multi-family developments changed in 2017.
- Access to bicycle storage area was identified as cumbersome. P. Treuheit stated bicycle storage area has since been relocated, so access should no longer be an issue. One member advocated for being able to store bicycles within the typical parking stall length, instead of having to add 2 feet as required by bylaw.
- Concern over the 4m wide boulevard should Town of Sidney wish to widen the road in the future. Staff confirmed the Town has no future plan/need to widen this road.
- Members expressed appreciation for the shadow study that was provided; and agreed December shadowing of adjacent properties could not be mitigated during this time of the year.
- Chair K. Bull-Tomer permitted Cohousing Management Group Member, B. Whittington, to speak to the public consultation process undertaken by the Group, and conveyed some of the feedback given at those consultations. Concerns regarding contractor parking during construction was raised at that time. B. Whittington stated that those concerns have been made known to their contractor along with a request to manage that issue.
- Members generally liked the finishes proposed for the façade. However one member felt that the placement of the stone veneer proposed for the building could be improved, to better reflect stone's traditional use as a structural component for building construction.
- Members considered the variances reasonable due to the limitations an irregular lot shape creates.

Moved by: Don Carscadden

Seconded: Denny Galinas

- 1. That owners and tenants in occupation of property within 75m (246ft) of the property that is the subject of Development Variance Permit Application No. DV100279 (to vary the front yard setback, increase the permitted front yard canopy projection, reduce setbacks for the rooftop access structure, and install an over height rooftop patio railing) be notified regarding the proposed variances and that any written correspondence received be forwarded to Council at the time of consideration of approval of the variances;**
- 2. That as a condition of approval of Development Variance Permit Application No. DV100279, the property owner shall, prior to the issuance of Building Permit, register a restrictive covenant on the title of the property with the Town as a signatory, prohibiting the future strata council from passing any bylaws that may restrict occupancy of the building based on age;**
- 3. That Development Permit Application No. DP100782 (for the form and character of a 4 storey residential building) be brought before Council for consideration of approval if Council authorizes the issuance of the Development Variance Permit, provided that:**
 - a. As a condition of approval of Development Permit Application No. DP100782, the property owner shall, prior to the issuance of Building Permit, pay to the Town a deposit in the amount of 115% of the estimated cost to complete the hard and soft landscaping for the development.**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. ITEMS DISPOSITION BY COUNCIL:

Councillor Wainright advised there had not been any development applications to consider following the previous meeting. However, Council did receive the January 15, 2019 APC minutes.

Councillor Wainright reported back on Council's discussion of having an APC representative to be present to speak to the development referrals. Chair K. Bull-Tomer asked if there would be merit to this proposal; Councillor Wainright felt it could be of value to future liaisons who may not feel comfortable speaking to the referrals.

C. Bolt supported the concept of having an APC representative available to speak to Council regarding development applications and raise the issues or concerns discussed at the APC meetings. He felt that this type of reporting can be very helpful to Council when making a decision.

Moved by: C. Bolt

Seconded: G. Sol

That the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) Chair, Vice-Chair, or designate be available to comment on the APC report at Council meetings.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. ADJOURNMENT:

Moved by: G. Sol

Seconded: D. Gelinias

That the meeting be adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON