

**MINUTES
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL**

Via MS Teams

Wednesday June 6, 2024, 1:01 pm.

Chair: Greg Gillespie

Present: Stephen Deglow, Brad Forth, Chris Glenn Gower (1:04 p.m.), Matthew Jarvis, Will Kryzmowski, Jacy Lee (1:09 p.m.), Kareem Negm and James Partlow (1:06 p.m.)

Regrets: Carl-Jan Rupp and Kimberly Simpson

Guests: Tim Ankenmen (1:07 p.m.) and Daniel Martins, Ankenman Marchand Architects; Jim Lombard, North Landscape Architects; Ron McNeil, McNeil Building Designs; Jeffrey and Anita Sengara, Applicants (1:04 p.m.); Rattandeep Sidhu, Applicant

Staff: Alison Whyte, Senior Planning Technician (1:09 p.m.); Caitlin Yancoff, Senior Planning Technician; Chuck Bell, Planner (1:06 p.m.) and Angela Hawkshaw and Colton Whittaker, Committee Clerks

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOVED by K. Negm and Seconded by W. Kryzmowski: "That the Minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting held on April 3, 2024, be adopted."

CARRIED

3976 Helen Road

Application by Rattandeep Sidhu

The Application is for a new garden suite. Variances are requested.

Legal Description: Lot 3, Section 5, Lake District Plan VIP62815

Planning File: GDN00017

Planning Staff: Alison Whyte, Senior Planning Technician

Comments from the Planner:

- The property is zoned RS-8 and has a lot area of 1,058 square meters.
- The lot size accommodates a garden suite with a maximum height of 6.5 meters and a maximum floor area of 93 square meters.
- For a proposed two-story garden suite, the minimum interior and rear setbacks increase from 1.5 meters to 3.0 meters.
- It should be noted that the property has a covenant area spanning the entire width of the rear yard and a circular tree covenant in the southwest corner.
- The application requests two variances: an interior side lot line set back, with the required setback being 3.0 meters and the proposed setback being 2.64 meters; and a variance for separation space between roofs, with the required separation space being 4.0 meters and the

proposed separation being 2.04 meters.

Comments from the applicant:

- This site has numerous constraints, leading to a limited building envelope.
- Attempts to design a single-level structure were unsuccessful due to space constraints.
- The front entrance of the suite is low because of branches from the circular tree covenant on the southwest corner of the property. The roof slope accommodates these branches and their overhang.
- The roof is restricted by the rear covenant, requiring the foundation to be placed 2 feet away from it, which has brought the suite closer to the main house.
- There is no intrusion on the suite since the main house has no windows facing that side.
- This design ensures a clear view of the main entrance from the road.
- The materials and finishes have been chosen to match the existing house.

In response to questions and comments from the Panel, the applicant noted:

- A fence is not required in the covenant area, but the space can be used for anything that is not considered a structure.
- A weatherproof and secure area has been designated for bike parking.
- The landscaping design is simple and primarily intended to screen the amenity space.
- Building separation is minimal, prioritizing space considerations. Constructing two stories provides more breathing room, as managing expansion was difficult.
- A concrete outdoor amenity space is a more effective long-term solution. Pavers can cause uneven ground, potentially creating issues if future service is needed for the garden suite.

Panel discussion for the garden suite ensued with the following comments:

- Concerns were raised about the variance for building separation.
- The covenant areas are an amenity to this project.
- Landscape guidelines could be considered.
- The unique two-story design, with its different scale entrance and complimentary interior, makes for an efficiently designed project.
- Consideration could be given to equal spacing between windows for visual aesthetics.
- Consideration should be given to providing covered bike parking.

MOVED by W. Krzymowski and Seconded by C. Gower: "That it be recommended that the application to construct a garden suite at 3976 Helen Road be approved as presented."

Panel discussion ensued with the following comments:

- This suite is visible from Helmcken Road.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

****R. McNeil and R. Sidhu exited the meeting at 1:43 p.m.****

3861 and 3861A Cadboro Bay Road

Application by Jeffery Sengara

The application is to rezone the site from the RS-10 to RM-5 to construct 12 town homes. Variances are requested.

Legal Description: Lots 1 and 2, Section 44, Victoria District, Plan 31151

Planning File: DPR01052

Planning Staff: Chuck Bell, Planner

Comments from the Planner:

- The application seeks to rezone the site from the RS-10 to RM-5 to construct 12 town homes.
- The Cadboro Bay Local Area Plan has recently been updated.
- The variances requested are for height, building separation, and exterior and interior setbacks.
- The front of this development is pedestrian-friendly.
- The Small-Scale, Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) implementation proposes allowing a townhouse design up to 11 meters to mid-point of a peaked roof. The request for these height variances is acceptable and supported by staff.
- No variances are requested for car or bike parking.

Comments from the applicant:

- This site consists of two lots that have been combined to accommodate 12 townhomes.
- This location has direct connectivity to an open park area and the waterfront.
- Every unit has a roof top garden.
- Every unit will have a front door on one side and a double garage on the opposite side.
- The north side front doors will face the road.
- The courtyard is located between the second and third rows.
- The front units are 2,100 square feet, while the back units are 1,900 square feet, providing a more affordable option due to the location and size difference.
- Visitor parking is available.
- The target demographic is young families.
- Each unit has 3 bedrooms and 2 ½ bathrooms.
- The staircases are situated inside the building for aesthetic purposes.

In response to questions and comments from the Panel, the applicant noted:

- Each double garage can accommodate 2 cars, bike parking, and a garbage facility.
- Bicycle parking for visitors could be centralized at the muse or installed along the walkway connecting to the back units.
- Civil engineers have managed the stormwater system. No retaining walls are necessary due to the gradual and mostly flat grade.
- Catch basins are accessible along the street.
- Efforts have been made to preserve the vegetation between the two driveway accesses.
- An arborist has implemented a tree management plan.
- The driveway is placed on the east side to avoid future service interruptions that would occur if it were on the west side.
- A linear approach was considered but produced privacy issues.
- Accessibility consideration could be given to the placement of the bathrooms.
- The size of the living space was considered to accommodate a two-door garage.
- Window placement could be adjusted to allow for more privacy.
- The accessible parking spot complies with code standards.
- Living space on the ground floor is restricted due to the water table. The building would need to be raised by 1.4 meters to eliminate these restrictions.
- Spatial consideration and consistency are essential to the design.

- Reviewing access to the outdoor green spaces could be considered.
- Under the SSMUH regulations, each single family lot is permitted up to 4 units in a maximum of 2 buildings. This lot would not qualify for 6 units.
- The open and airy design aims to connect the neighborhood by minimizing or eliminating fences and staircases to enhance connectivity.

Panel discussion ensued with the following comments:

- The project has been carefully considered.
- There is more drive aisle space than required for this small area.
- Placing the homes in a single row facing the panhandle could provide a larger and more private livable green space.
- The walkability to the front doors is appreciated.
- The walkway to the waterfront is a strong aspect.
- Consideration could be given to the application of window glazing.
- The roof top garden design is commendable.
- Choosing the right paving, landscaping, and bench placement could enhance sociability and create a plaza-like appearance, potentially concealing the size of the drive aisle.
- Multiple parking stalls allows for flexibility and a multi-use area.
- The architecture and beautiful details contribute to a refined, desirable high-density space.
- The ground-level space is limited.
- The front mews is better suited for individual front yards rather than a shared space.
- The separation between buildings is a concern. Rotating the buildings slightly could increase space and privacy.
- The option of a two-car garage holds value for families.
- A strata could be a solution to maintain the rooftop gardens and landscaping.
- Concerns were raised about shaded areas potentially limiting vegetation growth.
- It was noted that arranging homes in a single row is not an optimal way to achieve additional private outdoor space.

MOVED by S. Deglow and Seconded by C. Gower: “That it be recommended that the design to construct a 12 town homes at 3861 and 3861A Cadboro Bay Road, be approved subject to consideration of:

- **Adjusting the glazing to maximize the privacy between the units.”**

**CARRIED
with K. Negm OPPOSED**

On a motion from S. Deglow, the meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

CHAIR, Greg Gillespie

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY