



Staff Report to Advisory Design Panel

Planning and Development

FILE: 3060-20-2024-03

REPORT DATE: October 29, 2024 **MEETING DATE:** November 13, 2024
TO: Advisory Design Panel
FROM: Colin O’Byrne, Manager of Planning
SUBJECT: Development Permit Application for 19516 Hammond Rd

RECOMMENDATION(S):

THAT Advisory Design Panel:

- A. Recommends that Council issue Development Permit No. 2024-003, subject to the developer revising the application to a single driveway access and addressing the comments and suggestions made by the ADP during the November 13, 2024 meeting, to the reasonable satisfaction of City staff; OR

- B. Other.

PURPOSE

To bring back a development permit application that was revised following consideration and feedback by the Advisory Design Panel.

Information Report Decision Report Direction Report

DISCUSSION

Background:

The proposed development is a four-unit townhouse development with one basement suite at 19516 Hammond Rd.

The application was initially reviewed by this Advisory Design Panel (ADP) at the October 9, 2024 meeting where the following motion was passed:

“It was MOVED and SECONDED THAT The Advisory Design Panel:

- A. Refer the Development Permit Application for 19516 Hammond Rd (PID: 010-486-950) to the developer to revise the application inclusive of the comments and suggestions made by the ADP during the October 9, 2024 meeting; and
- B. Request that Staff present the revised application to the ADP for comments and consideration.”

Relevant Policy, Bylaw or Legislation:

The proposed development is subject to Development Permit Area No. 9, within the City’s Official Community Plan.

The property is zoned R-6 (Urban Residential 6) as defined in Zoning Bylaw No. 2505, 2011.

Analysis:

The applicant has now submitted revised application drawings (Attachment A) with responses to the following ADP comments:

ADP Comment	Applicant Response
The recommendation was made for considerations to be made around ways to increase the tree canopies for this site and development;	In addition to the 3 maple trees in the front of the property, each backyard now has a dogwood tree moved out from the back fence into the middle of the yard.
Questions were raised around the proposed plans showing exterior doors and windows leading into a lower basement which included plumbing in the living room making the assumption these two units could transition into suites in the future; <i>(Suggestion was to remove the basement doors)</i>	The applicant has decided not to change the design because they identified a basement doors are a desirable feature and they would like to retain them.
A suggestion was made regarding the lawn sumps at the rear of the property recommending trench drains to collect run off for suites two and three;	Each unit now has a lawn sump in the backyard, as opposed to the original 2 on the end units only.
The suggestion was made for the addition of a small roof overhang to support the secondary street address signs;	An address sign has been placed on the front of the building for the secondary suite.
Clarification questions were asked regarding the front elevations requesting clarity on cladding materials (Applicant 1 confirmed	Clarification was added to the drawing regarding cladding on the side of the building.

that the front of the home would be cladded in hardy board);	
Comments were made around the deteriorating retaining wall in the rear of the property;	The existing 'rock wall' (9" high) has been removed from the plans for clarity.
The request was made for more details to be provided on the proposed fencing including the type of material, height, and length for the site;	The location and size of fencing has been updated.
A recommendation to expand the window wells in the suites at the rear and provide more patio space for the units further recommending reducing the width of the stairs to the upper unit to provide more natural light into the lower suites;	The steps leading to the upper patios have been reduced in size to allow more natural light into the lower patio area.
The request was made for confirmation of the size of the rear patios as there was a discrepancy in the site plans attached (The Applicant confirmed that the images on page five were correct dimensions of the patio size);	Clarification has been added to the drawings regarding the size of the back patios as they relate to the overall building dimension.
Suggestion for the developer to consider creating two driveway let downs to mitigate any safety concerns relating to blind spots and consider adding landscape down centre of the driveway between the middle units to achieve curb appeal (The Applicant was in support of these revisions and recommendations);	<p>The design was revised to show two driveways with additional landscaping.</p> <p>The driveway design has been revised to incorporate a stamped border trim.</p> <p><i>Staff note: The DPA guidelines and Provincial Active Transportation Design Guidelines do not support multiple driveways because this creates additional points of potential conflict between vehicles and people using sidewalks and bicycle lanes. Additionally, frequent driveway let-downs negatively impact the comfort of people using mobility aids and reduce street parking availability. Lastly, narrower driveway entrances decrease sightlines when taking into account vehicles parked along the curb.</i></p>
A recommendation was made for the Applicant to hire a Landscape Architect to provide a professional landscape plan and an Arborist to provide support on current trees on the site design;	The applicant has been working with a professional landscaper to assist with the site layout. They have added more detail regarding size and spacing of the site landscaping on the drawings.

<p>Other design changes to address design guideline requirements</p>	<p>Each unit now has a dedicated area in the backyard for city recycling/garbage/compost bins.</p> <p>Each unit now has a garden shed added in the back of the property to add extra storage space.</p> <p>Applicant confirmed that adding a fence to the edge of the lower deck to the lower suite access in order to create a more personal space had been considered but removed in order to maintain access to the middle units and the bike storage.</p>
--	---

Please see Attachment B for a full comparison to the previous plans and to review the development permit area guidelines.

The ADP is requested to consider the revised plans and provide any additional comments, along with a recommendation to Council. As noted in the table above, staff recommend a single driveway to align with the DPA guidelines and the Province’s Active Transportation Design Guidelines. The ADP is requested to provide design suggestions for improving the functionality and design of the front landscaping for a single driveway access layout.

KATZIE FIRST NATION CONSIDERATIONS

Referral Yes No

SIGN-OFFS

Written by:

Jaimie Jagpal,
Development Services Technician

Reviewed by:

Colin O’Byrne,
Manager of Planning

ATTACHMENT(S):

- A. Revised Drawings
- B. ADP Report October 9, 2024