



Advisory Planning Commission MINUTES OF

Friday, December 15, 2017
Council Chambers, 12:00pm
Municipal Hall, 474 South Fletcher Road, Gibsons, BC

PRESENT: Pam Robertson, Chair
Deborah Greaves
Scott Davis
Aleria Ladwig
Michael Mills

REGRETS: Matthew Cavers
Richard Watt

STAFF: Katie Thomas, Planning Assistant
Emanuel Machado, Chief Administrative Officer
Selina Williams, Corporate Officer (12:52pm)
Laurie Mosimann, Administrative Assistant II

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 12:01pm.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda of the Advisory Planning Commission meeting held Friday, December 15th, 2017, was approved with the following amendments:

- Item 4.2 The Official Community Plan Amendment application for 464 Eaglecrest Drive has been withdrawn; and,
- addition of Item 6.1 – Correspondence from Bill Campbell representing the O’Shea/Oceanmount Community Association Land Use Committee, dated December 12th, 2017, regarding 464 Eaglecrest Drive and response from Katie Thomas, December 14th, 2017.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission Meeting - November 24th, 2017

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission meeting held Friday, November 24th, 2017, be adopted.

CARRIED

4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1 623 Gower Point Road – DP-2017-27 and DVP-2017-10

Chair Robertson welcomed property owner Ian Trickett and provided an outline of the Commissions role in regards to the application.

Katie Thomas, Planning Assistant, introduced the Development Permit and Development Variance Permit applications for 623 Gower Point Road and provided a slide presentation indicating location, proposed site plan, setback requirements, elevations, proposed floorplan, landscape options, and current site conditions.

Ms. Thomas stated that the main house on the site is on Gower Point Road and the proposed garage and Garden Suite would be accessed from Beachcomber Lane. The proposed layout adheres to all required setbacks but the request to build the Garden Suite above a garage requires variance. Lot coverage is 22% well under the 45% bylaw requirement. The proposed 18% Building Floor Area requires variance to the 14% bylaw requirement. The Second Storey Floor Area bylaw requirement is 75% of the first storey and the applicants would like to maximize the living space on the second storey to 100%. The subject property is in the View Protection Area with a height restriction of 4 metres, the property is on a steep lot with a grade difference of 1.8 metres from the rear to the front of the Garden Suite. There would be three extra parking spaces provided in the garage.

The east elevation depicts two storeys on Beachcomber Lane with access to the garage and the proposed suite. The west elevation would be one storey as seen from the main house. The north and south elevations depict a dramatic grade change which places partial massing of the garage underground. The south elevation has four windows and the north elevation, which is 5 feet from the property line, has one window which conforms to BC Building Code requirements.

The proposed floor plan indicates that the bedrooms will be on the north side and the living space on the south side of the suite. The existing lot is well vegetated but the proponents were asked to soften the elevation along Beachcomber Lane with additional landscaping. The proponents offered an option of a vine covered trellis or the planting of columnar plants. The existing house is white with blue trim. Ms. Thomas provided a sample of the proposed materials for the suite. There is currently an Army truck that is stored on the site which the applicant would like to store in the garage hence the variation of height in comparison to a typical garage. The neighbouring lot is a pie shaped lot with several mature trees.

Chair Robertson asked Ms. Thomas for clarification of the proposed materials. Ms. Thomas replied that the applicants have proposed hardy board siding in the colour of Heather Moss with white trim, and 12 inch Prolok metal roofing in Buckskin colour.

Chair Robertson offered Mr. Trickett an opportunity to address the Commission. Mr. Trickett stated that if the Garden Suite was built with the second storey at 75% of the first floor area as required by bylaw it would make the living area too small and would not be worth his while. The Army truck that he would like to park in the garage is tall and would require a 10 foot clearance.

Chair Robertson asked the Commission to consider the application for variance and the following was discussed:

- is there any precedence for this type of variance in previous applications? Ms. Thomas replied that there have not been any applications for a garage with a Garden Suite. The definition of the Building Floor Area was added when Garden Suites were added to the Zoning Bylaw and speaks to the entire building, if you were considering the principle building the Gross Floor Area considers only inhabitable space and would ensure that the Garden Suite is smaller than the main house;
- is there a need to make modifications to the bylaw in the future? Ms. Thomas replied yes in terms of the View Protection Area this property is in a steep area and there are no buildings overlooking these properties so it could be changed in the future to have garages with Garden Suites included;
- Ms. Thomas stated that the intent of the 75% Second Storey Floor Area is to have the massing decrease as it gets higher and create a cottage feel;
- would the 75% requirement take into consideration that this is only a half basement as half is buried into the slope? Ms. Thomas replied that it was discussed when the bylaw was amended but was not a scenario that they anticipated and will need further review;
- would it be possible to make the building lower with a side extension for the vehicle storage? Mr. Trickett replied that extending the garage would use up too much space in the yard and make it look larger;
- does the extra height in the garage change the required height of the building? Ms. Thomas replied that the extra height at 5.7 metres requires variance because the site is in the View Protection Area with a maximum 4 metre height requirement;
- the grading is a 7 metre drop in 55 metres which is approximately a 12.7% grade the proposed 30% does not calculate. Will they require grading to create the upper door? There is either a retaining wall or grading to back fill the upper area missing from the proposed site plan. Ms. Thomas replied that the survey does show the elevations which is a 1.8 metre difference in average from top to bottom, there is no grading plan but that would be required with a landscape plan at the time of the Building Permit application;
- Mr. Trickett stated that they will be adjusting the grading to match the existing foundation. The existing foundation will retain the soil behind it and it will slope down the sides to match the drawing and nestle the building into the hillside. It could be moved further back into the property but that would make the turn radius into the garage tighter;

- when converting feet to metres the house deck is at 23.55, the upper floor calculation to the suite is not shown, if you do the math based on 19 and add 10 feet you will be filling in a large bench;
- are the two trees at the bottom of the property going to be retained? Mr. Trickett replied that they will be removed. The cedar is under stress and the alder is directly in the way of the garage and suite;
- concern was expressed that with improper grading it will affect the neighbouring trees roots and compromise their health;
- in evaluating the demonstrated need to permit reasonable use of the property, and the concern of not establishing precedence for other properties, could you please clarify the criteria for the variance? Mr. Trickett replied that they plan to live in the Garden Suite and rent out the main house so it would provide a rental need in the town. In terms of size it is the living space that they need to exist;
- should a more detailed landscape plan be provided to properly evaluate the site?
- a house draft and a survey plan have been provided, what is missing is the 4 foot difference between the existing land and the entry to the suite, this could change the character of the building upon completion;
- given that the site is in the View Protection Area but views do not seem to be affected by the height of the building, it leads to favor of the project as it exists;
- the increase to the 75% Second Storey Floor Area should be looked at as site specific in the fact that 50% of the first storey is buried which makes it look like 60% of the building is sticking out of the ground;
- do we need to know more about the backfill landscape implications of the design? Not sure where it goes into the variance as opposed to form and character. Ms. Thomas replied that the property owner is trying to retain as much of the existing landscaping as possible. A grading plan has not been received but the elevations on the survey plan indicate that there is approximately a 2.5 metre difference between the main house and the suite. We could suggest that a grading plan be provided before the application goes to Council;
- it appears that the garage and suite is buried 4 feet so 6 feet of the 10 foot garage is exposed, the building is not represented well and will look taller than the proposed plans;
- in regards to the 75% Second Storey Floor Area, if the first storey is 50% in the ground there is leeway;
- concerned that if the trees are removed and the neighbouring trees die there would be a visual impact on the lane; and,
- likes that the design ties into the new homes across the road.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission supports the Development Variance Permit application for 623 Gower Point Road subject to Councils approval of the variance to the height and the 100% Second Storey Floor Area; Council should receive a satisfactory grading plan that addresses how the slope of the land will be delivered, and that there be consideration given to the impact of the grade change on the neighbours trees.

CARRIED

Chair Robertson asked the Commission to consider the form and character of the proposed Garden Suite and the following was discussed:

- should the pyramid cedars be replaced with a species that is less inviting to deer;
- suggest an eyebrow roof over the garage doors to break up the massing;
- would like to see more windows or skylights, why is the window on the north side so small? Ms. Thomas replied that BC Building Code requirements for fire separation will only allow a 7% opening when you are within 5 feet of the property line. The current design is under the 7% so there is room to add more openings;
- if the site is losing two large trees the planting of one significant tree would be nice;
- are the gable shingles wood? Hardy board is represented in the drawings and is within the design guidelines;
- concerned with the size as it looks like a very large building;
- likes the building from the form and character standpoint and finds that it is in keeping with the seaside character. Character details could be added by combining the columnar trees and the vined cedar trellis over the garage doors, adding cedar gables, and possibly a roof over the side entry door;
- in favor of the colour scheme;
- a roof over the side door would break up the massing;
- because the property is long, if you adjust the building into the back of the property you are increasing how much of the building is buried due to the natural grade and increasing more of an apron off the lane for a vehicle to park full length;
- looking at the side elevations it is conceptually a set of stairs and not a ramp, if leveling and terracing were done it would look like 75% above something larger;
- the side facing the neighbour could have larger benches added instead of one slope exposing less of the walls and providing planting spaces;
- likes the idea of adding more character over the garage doors or changing the style of the doors by adding windows or adding carriage style doors;
- clustering plants in pots could look nice against the walls and a gate or a trellis that is not attached to the building would use up the 6.4 metres on the side. Mr. Trickett responded that he has looked at multiple designs and has many ideas that are not on the drawings and he is willing to make changes; and,

- if an extra parking spot is added in the lane, a parallel screen to the lane would be suggested.

Emanuel Macho excused himself from the meeting at 12:48pm.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission supports the Development Permit application for 623 Gower Point Road with the following suggestions to break up east façade:

- Addition of a gable;
- Addition of cedar treatments; and,
- Addition of carriage style garage doors for example.

CARRIED

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission recommends to increase the natural light into the building on the north side by adding an additional window.

CARRIED

Chair Robertson thanked Mr. Trickett for his attendance.

4.2 464 Eaglecrest Drive – DP-2017-09

Chair Robertson stated that there is a Zoning Amendment application for 464 Eaglecrest Drive but the Commission will not be commenting on that application and will focus on the form and character.

Ms. Thomas provided a brief introduction to the application. The lot is a 5 acre parcel on Eaglecrest Drive. The proposal that the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) reviewed in May 2017 included 100 units over three benches with the lower bench accessed from Winn / Stewart Road. The APC comments from May asked for a warmer/softer aesthetic through use of colour, better integration with the Eaglecrest Drive townhomes, and a better visual representation of the lower bench.

Ms. Thomas provided the July 2017 Council motions that relate to form and character. Since the July Council presentation the applicants have withdrawn the Official Community Planning (OCP) amendment application. Council requested that the applicants provide a 3-D model, provide a revision of the design with a more gradual transition in number of storeys and setbacks to the north and east sides of the site, and change the architectural style.

The proponents have revised the application so that it fits with the OCP designation of Low Density Residential 1, withdrawing the OCP amendment which changes the Development Permit Area (DPA) to number 8. The Zoning Amendment for the application remains the same as it will be changing from R-1 to a Comprehensive Development Zone at a later stage.

Ms. Thomas provided a summary of the changes made to the application. The previous submission proposed 100 residential units, the revision proposes 87 units in total. Instead of three sections of housing they are now proposing four sections of housing. They are no longer requesting any land on the Stewart Road frontage. The Stewart Road access was not previously defined; the revision proposes access to underground parking with a car elevator to the different levels.

Ms. Thomas provided an image of the revised four bench design which indicated four duplexes on Eaglecrest Drive, with an option for a secondary suite. The second bench consists of a 55 unit condominium complex accessed from Eaglecrest Drive. The lower bench consists of a 24 unit condominium complex accessed from Winn/Stewart Road. The revised site plan indicates an open space in the middle to break up the buildings. The elevations of the duplexes along Eaglecrest Drive (west) are two storeys and three storeys on the east elevation. The cross-sections of the upper bench depict that the townhomes are partially buried. A middle bench visual depicts an amenity space. A lower bench visual illustrates the access from Stewart Road which due to the natural grade creates a large elevation change from the road to the buildings. The Commission will be focusing discussions using the guidelines for DPA No. 8.

Ms. Thomas introduced Tim Ankenman, of Ankenman Marchand Architect. Stanley Yasin of Sutton Group-West Coast Realty was also in attendance on behalf of the applicants.

Mr. Ankenman stated that the proposal is a work in progress and not necessarily a final design. The OCP amendment request has been withdrawn as directed by Council. The current proposal falls within the guidelines of the existing OCP. The middle buildings in the original proposal were too large for the community to accept. The middle buildings have been redefined as cluster housing which falls within low density residential.

Mr. Ankenman provided the Commission with slides of the proposed architectural styles and a site plan indicating the extension of greenspace onto the site. Mr. Ankenman stated that because it is such a steeply sloped site it is responsible to define the bulk of the mass on the upper and lower benches of the site to retain existing soil and vegetation. The original design of the larger condominium buildings has been redesigned with clusters including large gaps between accesses and 10 feet between various buildings. The footprint of the clusters is similar, if not smaller than the areas single family homes. The architectural style has been changed to a West Coast modern style with low sloped roofs. The lower bench has been redesigned with flat green roofs reducing the appearance of scale and massing and creating storm water retention. The buildings have patios at grade and are terraced back with three storeys maximum on the downhill side and two storeys maximum on the uphill side. The amenity building is on a flat access. The children's playground and vegetable gardens were relocated closer to the amenity building. Ponds, trails and interesting points will be retained throughout the proposed parkland area. Each pod of duplex housing has elevator access. Redesigning the condo buildings to duplex buildings has created all corner units with natural light on three sides of each unit. A road was created for front door

access to the lower pods. Sloped and gull wing roofs have been incorporated into the designs on Eaglecrest Drive. The proposed design treats each cluster unit as a single family home using different materials so it does not feel like repetitive housing. The West Coast modern theme will be achieved using stone, cedar, black windows, and white paneling creating a crisp clean look. The entrance to the parkade in the lower bench is accessed from Winn / Stewart Road and consists of car elevators which go up almost two storeys. There are visitor parking stalls available at the entrance. Mr. Ankenman summarized his presentation stating that there are a lot economic benefits to the project, including an abundance of open space at 69%, increases to the current tax base and use of green initiatives.

Mr. Ankenman provided the Commission with 3-D images of the project.

Chair Robertson provided an opportunity for the Commission members to address the applicants and the following was discussed:

- is there still a playground in proposed plan? Mr. Ankenman replied yes the playground has been set back from the property line as there were concerns of noise levels for the neighbouring properties;
- how does the lower bench underground parking tie into the two upper benches? Mr. Ankenman replied that the parkade is basically an entrance portico that is backfilled with landscaping. The parkade level is one storey below grade and each cluster above is accessed by a single elevator;
- Mr. Yasin commented that there have been several improvements to the landscape designs along Eaglecrest Drive. Mr. Ankenman commented that the streetscape has been improved with the addition of trees, sidewalks, front door entries, low level lighting and a tree covered berm;
- Chair Robertson reviewed the concerns raised by the former Director of Planning: the 5-6 storey building has been replaced with a three storey maximum for all sites, do the roof designs have too much urban character, and the impact on Oceanmount Lane residences;
- parking tunnels and elevators are a very urban solution, the tunnel experience is not part of the form and character of Gibsons. Mr. Ankenman replied that the parkade tunnel is a vehicular entry only, there is a walkway that takes you to the front door of the individual townhomes;
- appreciation show for the parking solution as it minimizes the footprint and is a creative idea that provides a good form of housing with minimal impact on the site;
- are the roofs flat or slightly sloped? Mr. Ankenman replied that in compliance with the OCP the roofs along Eaglecrest Drive are sloped and the rest are flat and green;
- will the green roofs have major plantings or small plantings?
- the modern design is well done and a significant improvement from last design. Appreciates the use of dark windows, stonework, natural wood, terraces and outdoor spaces;
- referencing the first bullet in the DPA No. 8 form and character guidelines it is difficult to determine if the design fits the small town character and the surrounding context, it is very different than anything else in Gibsons;
- this design has maintained significant greenspace;

- appreciates the smaller clusters of buildings. Not a fan of gull wing roofs, would rather see more traditional roofs. Likes the openness of the viewscape from Eaglecrest Drive. Driving into a tunnel for the parkade is unusual but an interesting solution to save the surface land and greenery;
- this is a good attempt at addressing the concerns of the first design submitted. There is nothing about this site that fits easily into the design guidelines. There is a need in the community for this type of housing and the design has addressed that. Has concerns that the greenspace between the upper and lower bench will be hard to maintain during construction. Likes the green roofs;
- appreciates the use of space in the centre clusters but has concerns with the lower bench off of Stewart / Winn Road. Likes the fact that the upper bench has been changed to address the neighbours' concerns. Some choices of the architectural embellishment like large vertical pieces of wood may not survive in the West Coast environment and should be limited to certain areas where they will not be exposed to weather. Pockets of colour changing is a good use on a large project;
- Mr. Ankenman stated that the parkade is not unlike other parkades in Gibsons except that you go up into the parking. A Commission member replied that the concern is that there is no room at the entrance of the parkade tunnel. Mr. Ankenman stated that there is a massive area at the throat of the tunnel for lay by parking;
- there could be confusion as to where the entry into the units is located as they are not obvious. Mr. Ankenman replied that the duplex units have a covered ground level entrance located near the elevators;
- will you be using brick and pavement for the decorative driveways and turn around areas? Mr. Ankenman replied that it will be either stamped concrete or pavers. It is important to make it permeable where it is not over the parkade. The concern with pavers is the steep slope of the site which can readjust pavers;
- Mr. Ankenman stated that a portion of the green space will be left in its natural state, all improvements such as trails and stormwater retention ponds will have interpretive signage. The introduction of the green roofs and the retention ponds will deal with the surface run off from the site. An arborist will be retained to evaluate the trees that are health and supplement with smaller trees with root systems that will retain the existing soil;
- are there any requirements for the maintenance of the greenspace on the site? Ms. Thomas replied that will be considered during the rezoning application; and,
- reality is that there will be machinery involved in the development of the pathways and retention ponds, suggest that a qualified professional be retained to identify all the high value elements in the area and the design should reflect where they are.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission believes the new design addresses the direction from Council and most of the concerns raised in Andre Boel's report to Council, and better fits the Development Permit Area No. 8 Design guidelines and maximizes the greenspace on the site.

CARRIED

Chair Robertson thanked Mr. Ankenman and Mr. Yaris for their attendance.

5. UPDATES

- The Building Permit for the Glassford Road Garden Suite has been issued and construction should start in the new year.
- Lesley-Ann Staats, the new Director of Planning, will start in January.

6. CORRESPONDENCE

6.1 Correspondence from Bill Campbell representing the O'Shea/Oceanmount Community Association Land Use Committee, dated December 12th, 2017, regarding 464 Eaglecrest Drive

RECOMMENDATION

THAT correspondence submitted by Bill Campbell representing the O'Shea/Oceanmount Community Association Land Use Committee, dated December 12th, 2017, regarding 464 Eaglecrest Drive be received.

CARRIED

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

8. INQUIRIES

Chair Robertson offered the gallery an opportunity for comments.

9. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Planning Commission meeting is to be held on Friday, January 19th, 2018, in the Town Hall Council Chambers at 12:00pm.

Deborah Greaves excused herself from the meeting at 2:14pm.

Chair Robertson stated that there are three Commission member terms ending at the end of 2017 and the new Director of Planning will be considering membership in the new year.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:16pm.

Pam Robertson, Chair

Selina Williams, Corporate Officer

DRAFT