

MINUTES
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL
Via MS Teams
Wednesday July 20, 2022

A/Chair: Andy Guiry

Present: Brad Forth; Jacy Lee; Nicholas Standeven

Regrets: Keith Davidoff; Janine Wigmore; Greg Gillespie; Illarion Gallant

Guests: Jamie Gill; Tim Rodier; James Partlow (applicant team)

Staff: Christine Rickards, Planner; Nancy Chaggar, Senior Committee Clerk

No motions were made due to a lack of quorum.

CALL TO ORDER

The Senior Committee Clerk called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

NOMINATION OF ACTING CHAIR

Andy Guiry was nominated as Acting Chair for this meeting.

3907 AND 3909 CEDAR HILL ROAD

Application by Seba Construction

This application is to rezone the sites from RS-6 to RT-5 to permit construction of 12 townhouse units with variances.

Legal Description: Lot 2, Section 41, Victoria District, Plan 7227 (**3907 Cedar Hill Road**)
Lot 1, Section 41, Victoria District, Plan 7227 That Part Lying to the West
of the Production Northerly of the Easterly Boundary of Lot 1 of Said Plan
(**3909 Cedar Hill Road**)

Planning File: DPR00823; REZ00687

Planner: Christine Rickards

Comments from the Planner:

- The subject site consists of two lots located on the east side of Cedar Hill Road. It is south of the McKenzie and Shelbourne intersection, and west of UVic and Shelbourne Street.
- Adjacent lots are predominantly zoned RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) and are low density.
- Cedar Hill Middle School is located across the street from the subject site.
- The proposal is for 12 three-bedroom town homes in four buildings.
- Each unit will have a single car garage with energized spaces and dedicated Class 1 bike space.
- The proposed density is 0.97 FSR or 1 unit/140 m²
- Proposed parking is one parking space per unit, plus four visitor parking spaces (three of the four parking spaces are proposed to be located in the setback).
- While coverage and density meet RT-5 regulations, variances are required for height,

- setbacks, building separation, parking, and location of open space.
- Suggested Community Amenity Contributions of \$60,000 to the affordable housing fund and \$30,000 to public realm improvements meet the interim policies.
- The site is designated “Neighborhood” within the Saanich OCP which permits townhomes.
- The site is located just south of a Major Centre (University Centre).
- The proposed development is in the University Centre Area of the Shelbourne Valley Action Plan where townhouses of two to three storeys in height are permitted.
- Feedback has been received from Environmental Services, Parks, and Engineering. There have not been any insurmountable aspects to the feedback received.
- The project proposes a net gain of seven trees.
- The applicant has conducted resident and community consultations.

Comments from applicant:

The applicant team presented to the Panel and noted the following:

- The proposed site is in close proximity to University Heights shopping district and multiple transit routes.
- The combined lot area is 1683 m².
- The project proposes a central drive aisle.
- The west units feature street facing patios and the east units have private rear yards.
- All units are flexible three-bedroom (or two bedroom plus den/office) layouts with ample living space, a washroom on each level, and large amount of storage in the garage and crawl space.
- The materials selected are mostly cement board products with variation in colour tone.
- The goal of the design is to blend in with the rest of the neighbourhood.
- The current bylaw requires 24 parking spaces, and the proposal provides for 12 (one per unit).
- The proposal provides for 12 Bicycle Type 1 parking spaces, and six Bicycle Type 2 parking spaces.
- The parking study expects that parking demand for this development will meet the proposed supply.
- The proposal aims to add density and create reasonably sized homes; as a result, the property envelope is rather small after setback variances.
- The height variance is a result of the proposal for three-storey units.
- The proposed six columnar trees were supposed to be street trees; however, those will be moved back a metre and not considered as street trees.
- Boulevard trees will be planted under the overhead lines and species will be coordinated accordingly.
- There are no proposed lawn areas, mostly planting beds.
- Medium sized trees will be planted at the rear along the property line.
- Significantly sized patios with permeable paving will allow for storm water integration.
- The storm line along Cedar Hill Road is too shallow for any development to connect to. The project will need to connect via Mortimer Street; this comes at a significant cost.
- The applicant has conducted multiple rounds of community engagement with neighbours in the area. The feedback received has been that residents do not want to see this type of change happening in their neighborhood.

In response to questions from the Panel, it was noted:

- The stormwater management design incorporates bylaw requirements.
- It is difficult to make these three-storey units accessible due to the stairs. The lower level could be modified by adding a lift to make it more accessible.
- A parking study was completed which analyzed the needs of this site given the intended usage.

- Given the location of this development, the need for two vehicles per unit is not as prevalent.
- The need for parking is shifting; developments have been successful with parking variances in locations where transit is readily available.
- This proposal does not include a community space for people to interact and for children to play; however, there is a school across the street.
- There isn't a need for a hydro transformer.
- Each block will have meters; therefore, there is no need for electrical or service rooms.
- The applicant team will look at reorganizing the bike parking space.

Comments from the Panel:

- Overall, this proposal provides great context for missing middle housing and tying into the Shelbourne Valley Action Plan and amenities nearby.
- The differing floor plans will appeal to a range of buyers.
- A community mailbox should be considered and conveniently located.
- Concerns were expressed about the parking variances.
- Concerns about lack of greenery and softening in the centre corridor and driveway entrance were expressed.
- The overall architectural expression is nice.
- This project may be proposing too much density.
- It was suggested that some visitor parking stalls be removed to make way for additional greenery and amenity space.
- The level of density is appropriate given the current need for housing.
- The bike parking should be relocated so it is more easily visible and accessible.
- There is opportunity to improve the spatial quality and green space.
- One bicycle parking space per unit may not be sufficient given that these units are tailored to families, with only one vehicle parking space.
- It was noted that there is a disconnect between the allowed density and the required setbacks as outlined in the bylaw for this zone.

Consensus by Panel members present: "That it be recommended that the application to rezone from RS-6 to RT-5 to permit construction of 12 townhouse units with variances, be approved subject to the consideration of:

- a) additional greening/softening of the interior lane where possible along the sides of the driveway;**
- b) relocation of bicycle parking type II to a central location where it has better overlook by residents with consideration to security and functionality;**
- c) further delineation in paving of the central courtyard;**
- d) greening and softening to inner courtyard and property line (North);**
- e) providing a more defined amenity space for residents;**
- f) defining locations for signage;**
- g) making the handicap parking stall part of the paving as it may act as a courtyard when unoccupied by a vehicle;**
- h) convenient location for a community mailbox."**

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY