EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

● Proposal: To add to and relocate the existing multiple dwelling building (8 units + 4 sleeping units) towards the front property line and, to develop the rear of the site with a new 4 storey multiple dwelling infill building consisting of 17 rental units addressed from Henshaw Lane.

See Appendix A Standard Conditions
Appendix B Standard Notes and Conditions of Development Permit
Appendix C Applicant’s Plans, Elevations, and Design Rationale
Appendix D Processing Centre - Building Comments

● Issues:
  1. Renovation of and Addition to Existing Pre-Date Dwelling
  2. Tree Retention
  3. Laneway Public Realm
  4. Parking

● Urban Design Panel: Support.
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT STAFF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE418115 submitted, the plans and information forming a part thereof, to add to and relocate the existing multiple dwelling building (8 units + 4 sleeping units) towards the front property line and to develop the rear of the site with a new 4 storey multiple dwelling infill building consisting of 17 rental units addressed from the lane.

1.0 Prior to the issuance of the development permit, revised drawings and information shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, clearly indicating:

1.1 design development to improve the retention of the pre-date character of the existing building through the development of a conservation plan;

   **Note to Applicant:** A Conservation Plan should be developed that includes reconsideration of the design of the front facade with greater reference to the preservation of character defining features of the existing dwelling.

1.2 design development to the infill building lane edge car-share parking areas to mitigate CPTED concerns;

   **Note to Applicant:** Enclosure of the parking spaces may be considered to address concerns around the creation of unsafe spaces and of spaces for anti-social behavior. The importance of material quality and expression in any potential enclosure is noted, and the response to this condition should be developed in tandem with the threshold space public realm design as per Condition 1.9.

1.3 design development to improve entrance legibility of the infill building through the provision of weather protection canopy and significant glazing of the stair tower in the south side yard;

   **Note to Applicant:** The common entrance to the infill building should be clearly legible both from the lane from a way finding perspective but also to residents of the existing building to signal the common use of the rooftop amenity space for occupants of either building. See also Condition 1.4 (ii).

1.4 design development to over-height elements of the infill building as follows:

   i. eliminate rooftop storage area and clarify that the design of the rooftop amenity area is in line with applicable policies, bylaws, and guidelines;

   **Note to Applicant:** Discretionary height increases necessary to achieve barrier-free access to this space will be considered as per the City of Vancouver bulletin ‘Roof Mounted Energy Technologies and Green Roofs - Discretionary Height Increases’ and will be limited to elevator and stair overruns and amenity area enclosure. See also Condition A.1.2.

   ii. improve massing and visual expression;

   **Note to Applicant:** The solid volume of the stair towers as over-height elements located in proximity to shared property lines are not supported as currently proposed and should each be substantially glazed to reduce visual mass. Similarly, the external expression of the elevator and associated overrun should be improved in line with condition 1.5.
1.5 design development to provide a higher quality external material finish to the infill building;

**Note to Applicant:** Wood-effect fibre cement siding as proposed is not supported and should be replaced by higher quality external material finish.

1.6 Make arrangements to the satisfaction of the Chief Housing Officer and the Director of Legal Services which secures the provision of:

i. a notarized declaration prior to Occupancy demonstrating that each tenant was given written notice of the intent to redevelop the property; indicating the number of units occupied on the date of the notice; including information on posting of notice regarding the intent to redevelop as per Section 3 of the Rate of Change Guidelines; and including copies of a letter addressed to each tenant summarizing the Tenant Relocation Plan offer and signed as received by each tenant.

ii. a final Tenant Relocation Report prior to Occupancy outlining the names of tenants; indicating the outcome of their search for alternate accommodation; summarizing the total monetary value given to each tenant (moving costs, rent, any other compensation); and including a summary of all communication provided to the tenants

1.7 Make arrangements to the satisfaction of the Chief Housing Officer and the Director of Legal Services which secures all 27 residential units as rental housing for 60 years or the life of the building, whichever is greater and subject to the following additional conditions in respect of those units:

i. That such units may not be subdivided by deposit of a strata plan;

ii. That none of such units may be separately sold;

iii. That none of such units will be rented for less than one month at a time;

iv. That at least 50% of the dwelling units must contain two or more bedrooms and at least 10% of the dwelling units must contain three or more bedrooms

v. On other such terms and conditions as the Managing Director of Social Development and the Director of Legal Services may in their sole discretion require;

**Note to Applicant:** this condition will be secured by a Housing Agreement to be entered into by the City by by-law enactment pursuant to a Section 219 Covenant.

1.8 compliance with section 4.3.6 and 4.8.4 of the Parking Bylaw;

**Note to Applicant:** The site is required to meet the Parking Bylaw to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning in consultation with General Manager of Engineering Services and, if applicable, the Director of Legal Services. The site may elect to use any of the eligible Bylaw provisions to meet the site’s parking requirements. The provision of shared vehicles and/or securement of off-site parking are suitable examples. Any required parking that is provided off-site will be linked to a residential unit such that any cost to renters associated with the parking will be included in the rent and not separate or optional. A separate Development Permit will also be required for a site that is providing off-site parking.
1.9 submission of a separate application to the General Manager of Engineering Services describing public realm improvements to the threshold space to lane immediately adjacent to the infill development;

**Note to Applicant:** In conjunction with the infill development, 6.5 feet of the laneway right of way adjacent to the site shall be improved with a landscaped public realm treatment that will remain public right of way. The adjacent property owner will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the green strip, including replacement of any landscape treatments that may be removed or damaged as a result of accessing underground utilities. The design should be developed in consultation with Planning, Landscape and Engineering Services staff.

1.10 design development to mitigate direct overlook from upper floors to nearby residential neighbours;

**Note to Applicant:** This can be accomplished with the use of translucent glazing to a 36 inch height at the balcony guard rail and windows, or similar measures.

1.11 design development to reconfigure Unit 1535 to facilitate retention of tree #1;

**Note to Applicant:** This can be achieved either by relocating the entry to the shared courtyard or by revising entry arrangements to the sunken entry patio. See also Landscape Condition A.1.17.

1.12 design development to provide a window to the second bedroom Unit 404;

1.13 design development to improve the functionality of amenity space in the existing building;

**Note to Applicant:** Amenity space in the infill building should be more connected to the Lobby area and biased toward use as a programmable meeting space for residents, rather than as rental management office.

1.14 provision of enlarged details, at ½"=1'-0" scale or better, of all significant exterior features.

2.0 That the conditions set out in Appendix A be met prior to the issuance of the Development Permit.

3.0 That the Notes to Applicant and Conditions of the Development Permit set out in Appendix B be approved by the Board.
● Technical Analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PERMITTED</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.10 ft. x 130.90 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,652 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area (Max.)</td>
<td>12,978 sq. ft.</td>
<td>5,740 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Infill MD: 6,218.0 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,069.0 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 16,287.0 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSR (Max.)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Multiple Dwelling: 0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infill MD: 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (Max.)</td>
<td>40 ft. (Infill)</td>
<td>38.52 ft. (Multiple Dwelling)</td>
<td>Top of Parapet Wall (Infill): 37.76 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 ft. (Overall)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Top of Guard (Infill): 39.42 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top of Stair (Infill): 43.80 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top of Elevator (Infill): 45.97 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top of Ridge (Multiple Dwelling): 40.52 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (Min.)</td>
<td>12.14 ft.</td>
<td>39.20 ft.</td>
<td>12.50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yards (Min.)</td>
<td>MD - East 6.89 ft.</td>
<td>MD - East 5.10 ft.</td>
<td>MD - East 7.90 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MD - West 6.89 ft.</td>
<td>MD - West 9.00 ft.</td>
<td>MD - West 6.77 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infill - East 3.00 ft.</td>
<td>Infill - West 3.00 ft.</td>
<td>Infill - East 3.67 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (Min.)</td>
<td>Infill 2.00 ft.</td>
<td>Infill 2.00 ft.</td>
<td>2.00 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>20.00 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.00 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage (Max.)</td>
<td>50% (2,163 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>-% (- sq. ft.)</td>
<td>-% (- sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (Min.)</td>
<td>M.D. 4 Spaces</td>
<td>Car Share 3 Spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infill 7 Spaces</td>
<td>Disability 1 Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 11 Spaces</td>
<td>Total 4 Spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 - Disability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking (Min.)</td>
<td>Class A 30</td>
<td>Class A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class B 6</td>
<td>Class B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Design</td>
<td>Residential windows that open shall be more than 14.76 ft. from rear property line;</td>
<td>- Not compliant with 1st and 2nd floor dwelling units facing lane;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>- Multiple Dwelling with 8 Units and 4 sleeping units;</td>
<td>- Multiple Dwelling with 10 Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Infill Multiple Dwelling with 17 Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Type</td>
<td>Proposed MD Proposed Infill:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Bed 8</td>
<td>Studio 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Bed 1</td>
<td>One Bedroom 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Bed 1</td>
<td>Two-bedroom 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 10</td>
<td>Total: 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 **Note on Floor Area and FSR:** Section 5.3 of the RM-5 District Schedule allows the Development Permit Board to relax the regulation in Section 4.7 allowing a Floor Area/FSR that considers the intent of the RM-5 District Schedule and all applicable policies and guidelines. A total of 478 square feet is being added to the existing multiple dwelling in addition to the proposed infill. The proposal is to comply with Section 5.3 (a), (b), (c) and (d).

2 **Note on Height:** The height of the building is above the maximum suggested in the RM-5 design guidelines for infill buildings. The Development Permit Board may permit an increase in the maximum height of a building with respect to any development as per Section 10.11 of the Zoning and Development By-law. Discretionary height as measured to the top of stairwell/elevator shaft can be considered only if minimum requirements including green roof areas are achieved. For extensive green roofs, at least 50% of the roof should be planted. For intensive green roofs, at least 25% of the roof area should be planted. Note that if the extent of the green roof is not sufficient, additional conditions to reduce building height will be applied. The top of the elevator shaft/stair is considered to be the overall height of the building. Condition 1.4 and Standard condition A.1.2 seeks compliance with height.

3 **Note on Site Coverage:** Standard Condition A.1.3 seeks confirmation with Section 4.8 of the RM-5 District Schedule of the Zoning and Development By-law, does not exceed the maximum permitted;

4 **Note on Parking:** While staff support the use of shared vehicle spaces at this location, the application is deficient one disability stall. Converting one of the shared vehicle spaces to a disability stall should meet the requirements of the Parking By-law. See Standard Condition A.1.4.

5 **Note on Bicycle Parking:** Standard Condition A.1.4 seeks compliance with Section 6 of the Parking bylaw. Stacked bicycle parking is not acceptable. See engineering condition A.2.4 for additional comments on Bicycle parking.

6 **Note on External Design:** Section 5.3 of the RM-5 District Schedule allows the Development Permit Board to relax the regulation in Section 4.17.1 allowing residential units with windows closer than 14.76 ft. to a lane that consider the intent of the RM-5 District Schedule and all applicable policies and guidelines. The proposal is to comply with Section 5.3 (a), (b), (c) and (d).

7 **Note on Unit Mix:** Table below shows compliance on unit mix for this proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Infill Proposal (17 units)</th>
<th>Compliance (17 Units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio - 4</td>
<td>One Bed - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bed - 2</td>
<td>Two Bed - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Bed - 11</td>
<td>Three Bed - 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
● **Legal Description**
  
  Lot: 13  
  Block: 47  
  District Lot: 185  
  Plan: 92

● **History of Application:**
  
  14 06 20 Complete DE submitted  
  14 08 07 Urban Design Panel  
  15 01 28 Urban Design Panel  
  15 03 25 Development Permit Staff Committee

● **Site:** The site is a 66ft x 131ft midblock parcel between Nicola St. and Cardero St. in the West End neighbourhood, located three blocks from both Denman and Robson Streets. The site contains an existing 1907 dwelling (Allan Residence) with later additions containing 8 rental units and 4 sleeping units. The site slopes approx. 7.5ft down from Comox Street to the lane at the rear and approx. 2ft down to the north.

● **Context:** Significant adjacent development includes:

(a) 1100 Bidwell Street - Lord Roberts Elementary  
(b) 1601 Comox Street - Grace Court (1912 8-storey residential building & approved laneway infill)  
(c) 1546 Nelson Street - Urquhart Residence (1905 residential building & approved laneway infill)  
(d) 1044 Cardero Street (1905 residential building)  
(e) 1038 Cardero Street (1905 residential building)  
(f) 1036 Cardero Street (1905 residential building)  
(g) 1547 Comox Street (3 storey residential building)  
(h) 1523 Comox St (1905 residential building)  
(i) 1510 Nelson Street - Ashbury Place (3 storey residential building)
● Background:

A development application was submitted on June 20th, 2014 following ongoing pre-application discussion with staff to determine the acceptable form of a laneway multiple dwelling infill building to the rear of the existing character multiple dwelling under the provisions of the West End Community Plan. A pre-application open house was held by the applicant on February 27th, 2014. The proposal was reviewed by the Urban Design Panel on August 27th, 2014 and again, in a substantially revised form, on February 28th, 2015, at which time it was unanimously supported.

The application does not seek to alter existing zoning, and will result in new family oriented rental units.

● Applicable By-laws and Guidelines:

1. West End Community Plan

The West End Community Plan provides a framework to guide positive change, development and public benefits in the West End. Deepening housing affordability and meeting the needs of a growing community are a stated priority, with the plan identifying new rental housing opportunities, including for families with children. The Plan also identifies the West End’s remaining 124 character houses as a key aspect of the area’s distinct character and seeks to protect these houses by allowing new development to be built behind them, along the laneway, while also preserving the house and streetscape character of the area.

The Plan envisages incremental change and redevelopment occurring in the neighbourhoods as a way to gradually renew the building stock, and develops an overall strategy, referred to as ‘Laneways 2.0’, under which the laneways will become secondary streets that can accommodate ground-oriented infill rental housing. Laneways 2.0 takes advantage of the wider laneways unique to the West End and the opportunity they present to develop new rental housing stock and to enhance the laneways as more walkable public spaces while maintaining their integral parking, servicing, and utility functions. Strata-titled infill housing will only be allowed for the retention and designation of heritage houses.

Approval of the West End Plan included the adoption of By-law amendments for residentially zoned areas to allow for low-rise laneway infill housing, and of supplemental design guidance to the amended zoning regulations in the form of West End RM Design Guidelines for Infill Housing. Following plan approval, staff work is ongoing to develop a ‘Laneways 2.0 Toolkit’ to provide guidance on the process, regulatory requirements, and urban design performance considerations needed to ensure that new laneway infill contributes positively to community character and livability.

2. RM-5, RM-5A, RM-5B, RM5-C and RM-5D Districts Schedule

The intent of this Schedule is to permit a variety of residential developments and some compatible other uses. Emphasis is placed on achieving development which is compatible with neighbouring development with respect to streetscape character, open spaces, view retention, sunlight access and privacy. The RM-5 District also encourages developments suited to families with children. Conditional density of 1.5FSR and multiple conversion dwelling use are permitted.

Infill multiple dwelling use is permitted in accordance with Section 5 of the Schedule which allows the Director of Planning or the Development Permit Board to relax the regulations of the Schedule as they relate to required front yard, side yards, rear yard, floor area and density, site coverage, horizontal angle of daylight, and external design for infill multiple dwelling, if the Director of Planning or the Development Permit Board first considers the intent of the Schedule, and all applicable Council policies and guidelines, except that:
a) the infill multiple dwelling must be used for secured market rental housing;
b) in an infill multiple dwelling with four or more dwelling units, at least 50% of the dwelling units
must contain two or more bedrooms;
c) in an infill multiple dwelling with ten or more dwelling units, at least 50% of the dwelling units
must contain two or more bedrooms and at least 10% of the dwelling units must contain three or
more bedrooms; and

d) existing buildings, landmarks or features on the site which are listed on the Vancouver Heritage
Register or may have heritage value must be conserved, to the satisfaction of the Director of
Planning.

3. West End RM Design Guidelines for Infill Housing

The Guidelines offer detailed design advice to assess applications for discretionary infill development
resulting from the relaxations provided in the District Schedule. As with the West End Community Plan
and the Districts Schedule, emphasis is placed on contextual fit with adjacent development. Given the
relaxation of FSR in the Districts Schedule to enable infill development, the Guidelines are less
concerned with floor area and instead describe an appropriate form of development as it relates to
scale, height and other typical urban design performance criteria across each of the four typical lot
typologies found in the West End. The Guidelines also describe the intent to develop a threshold space
or ‘green strip’ in the 6.5ft of public right of way on the lane immediately adjacent to the infill lot.

The Guidelines note that the process of infilling existing under-utilized frontages to the lane with
additional buildings requires sensitive and creative design, with a focus not only on creating
neighbourly relationships with adjacent development but also on the manner in which lanes are treated
and their resultant public realm character, based on their intended role within the neighbourhoods as
more intimate in scale pedestrian routes with less traffic that still support necessary service functions.

4. High Density Housing Guidelines for Families with Children

The intent of the guidelines is to address the key issues of site, building and unit design which relate to
residential livability for families with children. Although quantitative standards are given in some
cases, these are provided to assist applicants in their design as well as City staff in their evaluation.
They are not necessarily absolute requirements.

● Response to Applicable By-laws and Guidelines:

1. West End Community Plan

The site contains an existing 1907 multiple dwelling on a standard 66ft x 131ft lot of the kind explicitly
referenced by Plan as being an important legacy of the earliest period of development in the area and
being relatively few in number. Retention of the character home as a multiple conversion dwelling
and the securing of family oriented market rental units as per Condition 1.7 in an infill building to the rear
of the property are in line with the policies and principles of the Plan. Condition 1.1 seeks
improvement to the conservation plan to better achieve an appropriate level of character retention of
the dwelling. Relocation of the dwelling as proposed does not conflict with the aims of the Plan as they
relate to the preservation of existing street character due to the proposed tree retention along the
Comox St. frontage outlined in Section 3(iv). The aims of the Plan as they relate to activation of the
laneways as public spaces by way of public realm improvements will be achieved through Condition
1.9.

2. RM-5, RM-5A, RM-5B, RM5-C and RM-5D Districts Schedule

The application meets the relevant regulations of the Districts Schedule by proposing infill multiple
dwelling for secured market rental use on a site with existing pre-1975 rental development. The
The proposal does not presently meet the unit mix described in Section 5.3(c), requiring a minimum of 50% of units in the Infill Multiple Dwelling are to have 2 or more bedrooms and a minimum 10% of units to have 3 or more bedrooms. Condition A.1.1 seeks compliance with the unit mix.

While designation of the existing building is not being sought due to the extent of non-original additions present, the retention of the character home as a multiple conversion dwelling meets the requirement of the District Schedule that retention is to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning. Condition 1.1 seeks improvement to the retention of character defining elements through the development of a Conservation Plan.

3. West End RM Design Guidelines for Infill Housing

The proposal is generally in line with the anticipated form of development described by the Guidelines.

i) Lot Typology, Scale & Height

The subject lot conforms to Lot Typology 02 (66ft - 98ft Lots) and with the identified generally appropriate form of development described: modest infill development in 3.5 to 4 storey form where appropriate to provide additional sites for rental housing and to activate the lane frontage. The 4 storey scale of development is in line with the Guidelines. The 40ft height permitted is exceeded by elevator and stair overruns necessary to achieve universal accessibility to the rooftop common amenity space. Conditions 1.4 and A.1.2 require that over-height elements are designed in accordance with Section 10.11 and the City of Vancouver bulletin ‘Roof Mounted Energy Technologies and Green Roofs-Discretionary Height Increases’. Staff conditions also seek design development to the material expression of those over-height elements to ensure that their visual impact on adjacent development is minimized.

ii) Building Separation, Shared Courtyard & Common Open Space

The minimum 20ft separation between buildings expected by the Guidelines is intended as a clear dimension between buildings, facilitating development of shared amenity courtyard for use by occupants of both the existing and new building as an integral part of the overall site development strategy and landscape plan for all infill development. All new infill development will result in the provision of a shared courtyard between the new and existing buildings, the design of which should be informed by existing landscape and open space features, sun access, privacy and usability.

The minimum 20ft separation provided and exceeded in the northern half of the courtyard which is developed as a play space suitable to families with children. The edges of this space are activated with residential uses at grade level with attached private open spaces directly accessing the common space. Landscape conditions seek design development to the courtyard to reconcile the need for unit entries with the development of a space for the enjoyment of all occupants of the lot.

Further to this, a common rooftop amenity space is developed to serve all occupants on the roof of the infill building. The amenity area is pulled back from the building edges and screened with landscape to avoid direct overlook to adjacent development. Condition 1.3 seeks to improve legibility of entry to the infill to ensure ease of use of this space for all occupants of the lot; while Condition 1.4 seeks to ensure that design of the over-height elements minimizes negative impacts on adjacent development.

A small indoor amenity space is developed in the existing building to complement these external spaces. Condition 1.13 seeks to improve the functionality of this space.

iii) Private Open Space

As new infill development is intended to be family-oriented, all family units are expected to provide private open space and where possible provide grade access to an open space that is suitable for children. All family units in the infill, and the majority of 1-bedroom units, have access to private open
space; while grade-level units in both the existing building and the infill building have direct access to at-grade private space.

iv) Front Yard Setbacks

A key concern of infill development is the preservation of existing street character and the retention of front yards as a visual amenity of the neighbourhood. The Comox Street frontage is characterised at present by six mature trees and a cedar hedge on the property as well as a street tree and a tree on the adjacent property that combine to screen the pre-date dwelling from the street. The proposed application retains and protects the street tree and tree on the adjacent property as well half of the on-site trees to retain the heavily planted character. As a result the relocation of the pre-date dwelling closer to Comox Street does not result in the significant alteration of the existing streetscape. Staff are recommending design development to the street fronting basement unit in the existing building to improve the retention of mature trees to this frontage.

v) Building Setbacks at Upper Levels to the Internal Courtyard

Upper level setbacks to the shared courtyard are encouraged in all developments in the order of 6ft to 8ft to provide useable decks for family units. The guidelines state that subject to urban design performance as it relates to privacy, overlooking and solar access to the shared courtyard, such setbacks will not be required on developments of the scale proposed in the application. Given the cross-gabled form of the existing dwelling, the provision of separation between buildings for much of the shared courtyard in excess of minimum 20ft, and the private open space provision to family units on all levels of the infill dwelling, an upper level setback is not provided and is not being sought.

vi) Building Setbacks to the Lane

A 2ft setback from the rear property line is expected where units have direct grade access off the lane, and to provide for landscaping to protect the privacy amenity of the ground floor unit. A setback of 3.75ft is provided, but staff note that given required parking arrangements, only one unit is directly accessed from the lane.

Upper level setbacks to the lane frontage described by the Guidelines are intended to ensure that where taller development occurs along the lane a smaller scaled continuous street wall height is maintained. A continuous setback is provided at fourth floor level varying in depth from 4ft to 5ft. Condition 1.10 recommends modifications of the glazing details to the laneway elevations to mitigate direct overlook from upper floors to nearby buildings.

vii) Side Yard Setbacks

The proposal provides the minimum side yard setbacks of 3ft to the north side yard. The main common residential entry to the infill building is located along the south side yard, resulting in the provision of a wider side yard of varying depths from approx. 5ft in the area of the entry to 3.75ft. At the lane edge, this widens to 12ft as a shared surface with car-share space facilitating the retention of existing mature cedar tree in this location.

Condition 1.3 seeks design development to improve the legibility of the entrance in this location and provide weather protection, while Condition 1.4 seeks to improve the material expression of over-height elements in both side yards.

viii) Parking

The Parking Bylaw allows for alternate ways to meet the site's parking demands including the car share incentive, whereby an on-site car share vehicle and space can replace 5 required parking spaces, or securing off-site parking for the building. Staff are supportive of parking for this application to be provided partially by shared vehicles located on-site. The current proposal is deficient one disability
parking space which Recommended Condition 1.8 requires. Should the applicant provide an additional
disability space in place of one of the proposed shared vehicle spaces, the Parking By-Law will be
deemed met.

ix) Threshold Spaces

The development of the laneways as secondary public spaces is made possible by the existing 33ft laneways. Retaining a 20ft vehicular corridor for required servicing and access functions leaves 6.5ft of surface at each side of the lane for development of a new public realm. In general, greening along the edge of the drivable surface will contribute to a pleasant laneway walking experience for the public as well as additional separation between dwellings and travelling vehicles. The public realm and landscaping design of new infill development will be expected to visually integrate the provision of such landscaping or utilitarian features required adjacent to the development.

Future applications will have the benefit of the forthcoming Laneways 2.0 toolkit to guide their design. As an interim solution, recommended Condition 1.9 seeks a supplementary application for the threshold space to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Engineering Services, the design of which will be developed in consultation with staff. Condition 1.2 seeks design development to mitigate CPTED concerns along the lane edge related to the development of spaces for anti-social behaviour through the car-share parking solution and recommends that such design development is done in the context of development of the green strip.

x) Orientation and Unit Access

All units will be addressed and entered from the lane as encouraged by the Guidelines to ensure that activation of the laneway results from infill development.

Staff note that given required parking arrangements, only one unit is directly accessed from the lane, as a result most units are accessed via a shared corridor and common residential lobby, which is contrary to the general aspiration of the Laneways 2.0 programme to deliver townhome and stacked townhome forms of development.

xi) Architecture & Form

In line with the eclectic nature of existing development in the West End, there is no stylistic preference set within the Guidelines for new infill proposals. New development is expected to respond to existing on-site character, the surrounding neighbourhood context and the emerging character of the host laneway, with sensitivity to adjacent development demonstrated in roof form, window size and placement.

Staff are generally satisfied that the contemporary expression and simple massing is an appropriate form of development, but are seeking design development through various recommended conditions of approval to improve the external material expression and massing of over-height elements to ensure a better contextual fit.

● Conclusion:

The proposed development application demonstrates general approvability under the prevailing applicable by-laws, policies, and guidelines, and increases the stock of family oriented rental housing in the West End while preserving the existing heritage resource on the site. Staff support the application, subject to the conditions noted.
URBAN DESIGN PANEL

The Urban Design Panel reviewed this application on February 28, 2015, and provided the following comments:

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (6-0)

- **Introduction:** Colin King, Development Planner, introduced a proposal under the Laneway Infill Program for the West End. He described the context for the area noting that across the lane is a 3-storey, 40 unit strata building with decks to the lane and a previously approved 3-storey infill building. Adjacent to the site is a 3-storey walk-up building and 2.5-storey character home. The existing dwelling on the site has non-original alterations to the rear, which will be removed.

  
  Mr. King explained the Guidelines for the project noting that they expect a ground oriented laneway infill dwelling, addressed from the lane with a shared courtyard space and the infill should preserve the existing character to the street with high quality and authentic details and materials that are sensitive to the adjacent dwelling and the host building. As well the courtyard space is an important piece and the family units must have access to the private play space.

  
  Mr. King mentioned that at the previous review by the Panel in August, the proposal got non-support. He described the consensus items for improvement which included better integration of the two buildings on the site including the addition to the dwelling, improvement of the courtyard, provision of an indoor amenity space, improvement to the unit layouts, improvement to the tree retention and that windows should be added to the bike storage.

  
  Mr. King described the proposal noting that the key to the Laneway Infill Program is delivery of at grade activation of the lane and the development of the green strip. The 1907 building predates the Parking Bylaw, so replacement of existing parking plus parking for the new units is required. The site is providing off-site car share parking. He mentioned that the most significant change to the proposal is the addition of parking at grade and the side yard area to the south which has been pulled back to allow for a tree to be retained in that area. As well all the family units in the infill have private balconies and the rooftop has been developed as common open space and is setback from the edge of the building. Mr. King mentioned that 10 units are now proposed instead of the previous 13 with two and three bedroom and an internal amenity room, communal laundry and bike storage.

  
  Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:
  Does the revised application successfully address previous panel concerns around:

- Integration of the two buildings on the site.
- Additions to the existing pre-date dwelling.
- Provision and quality of common and private amenity spaces, including in the addition to the dwelling.
- Livability of proposed units.
- Tree retention.
- Grade activation of street, courtyard and laneway frontages.

  Mr. King took questions from the Panel.

- **Applicant’s Introductory Comments:** Timothy Ankenman, Architect, further described the proposal and mentioned that they have some concerns as well with CPTED issues in the garage area and they are working with the car companies to see if they could add a garage door on a
timer because there will always be one space open for the communal car. He explained that they are trying to stay true to the original character of the existing building in terms of the front façade and its relationship to the street. As a result they aren’t using a lot of historical features and that is why the existing building will not be heritage designated. He described the architecture and noted that they have added a veranda on the front, a porch, a gable roof, front entry stair and celebrated the entry. He added that they have carved out a portion of the building in order to retain the large existing tree which will also signify the entry to the infill.

Daniel Martins, Architect, described the material palette noting the addition of a natural wooden colour and the rest is a white hardie panel. With the colour scheme they are trying to bring the natural colours from the original building into the new building but adding some brighter colours.

The applicant team took questions from the Panel.

- **Panel’s Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:**
  - Consider enhancing the entrance to the infill and adding weather protection;
  - Design development to consider another material rather than using faux wood;
  - Design development to consider the use and function of the proposed amenity space
  - Consider a more open plan for the two bedroom units in the infill;

- **Related Commentary:** The Panel supported the proposal and thought the applicant had improved the design since the last review.

The Panel thought there was a better treatment of the heritage and as well a better integration between the infill and the existing building. As well they liked that the courtyard was larger and that some of the units will now front the space. However, Panel members thought the entrance to the infill was difficult to find and thought it should be more visible to improve security. As well, it was suggested that the area could use some rain protection. One Panel member had some concerns regarding security for the open carport structure and suggested overhead or sliding doors.

The Panel had some concerns with the material palette noting that the use of faux wood reduced the level of contrast and didn’t think it was the best strategy. They wanted to see more contrast in the material expression.

Panel members thought the amenity space was too small and might not be used. One Panel member suggested making it open to the lobby so that it would have more space for community functions.

A couple of Panel members were concerned with the livability of the units in the basement. They noted that the second bedrooms tended to be a bit on the small size but that the units were in keeping with affordable housing. A couple of Panel members suggested reducing the amount of rooms in the two bedroom units and having an open floor plan that would allow the space to be more flexible for the residents.

The Panel supported the landscaping plans but thought there should be more programming on the roof patio. The Panel applauded the applicant for the improvement to the tree retention strategy. They did however still have some CPTED concerns and encouraged the applicant to add more windows on the first floor on the lane or in the stair wells.

- **Applicant’s Response:** Mr. Ankenman thanked the Panel for their comments and said he looked forward to incorporating them in the project.
ENGINEERING SERVICES

The recommendations of Engineering Services are contained in the prior-to conditions noted in Appendix A attached to this report.

CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (CPTED)

Staff recommendations to mitigate CPTED concerns around the surface parking spaces provided along the lane edge are outlined in Condition 1.2 and further described in section 3 ix) Threshold Spaces.

LANDSCAPE

The recommendations of Landscape are contained in the prior-to conditions notes in Appendix A attached to this report.

HERITAGE PLANNING

While designation of the existing building is not being sought due to the extent of non-original additions present, the retention of the character home as a multiple conversion dwelling meets the requirement of the District Schedule that retention is to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning. Condition 1.1 seeks improvement to the retention of character defining elements through the development of a Conservation Plan.

HOUSING POLICY & PROJECTS / SOCIAL POLICY & PROJECTS / CULTURAL SERVICES

11 units of the 17-unit infill building have 2 bedrooms, and are subject to the High Density Housing Guidelines for Families with Children and the Urban Agricultural Guidelines for the Private Realm. Consistent with the guidelines, plans for the site include a common outdoor courtyard with a lawn and bench, as well as an accessible rooftop common outdoor area, which may be used by children for a range of play activity.

The City of Vancouver Food Policy identifies environmental and social benefits associated with urban agriculture and seeks to encourage opportunities to grow food in the city. The “Urban Agriculture Guidelines for the Private Realm” encourage edible landscaping and shared gardening opportunities in private developments. Design development is needed to the rooftop area to provide basic infrastructure that would provide opportunities for residents to engage in gardening / urban agricultural activity. (See condition A.1.33)

PROCESSING CENTRE - BUILDING

This Development Application submission has not been fully reviewed for compliance with the Building By-law. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that the design of the building meets the Building By-law requirements. The options available to assure Building By-law compliance at an early stage of development should be considered by the applicant in consultation with Processing Centre-Building staff.

To ensure that the project does not conflict in any substantial manner with the Building By-law, the designer should know and take into account, at the Development Application stage, the Building By-law requirements which may affect the building design and internal layout. These would generally include:
spatial separation, fire separation, exiting, access for physically disabled persons, type of construction materials used, fire fighting access and energy utilization requirements.

Further comments regarding Building By-law requirements are contained in Appendix D attached to this report.

NOTIFICATION

A site sign was placed at 1529 Comox Street, and installation was verified on August 19, 2014. On August 20, 2014, 1082 notification postcards were sent to neighbouring property owners advising them of the application, and offering additional information on the city’s website. On February 16, 2015 notification postcards were again sent to neighbouring property owners, advising them of the rescheduled DP Board date and revised project submission on the city’s website.

After the first round of notification, a total of 26 written responses were received. Four comments indicated support for the proposal at 1529 Comox Street, with the exception of some concerns outlined below. Four respondents requested additional information. 18 of the respondents either opposed laneway infill proposals in general, or expressed serious concerns with the proposal. During the most recent notification period, one response (both written and phone calls from the same individual) was received. Comments received from the notification are summarized below:

1529 Comox St - Comments About This Proposal:

Tree Removal: Several respondents expressed concern over proposed tree removal to both Comox Street and lane frontages, with one respondent referring specifically to the removal of a mature maple tree to Comox Street.

Staff Response: Tree removal to the Comox Street frontage has been improved through the application process from that originally proposed at the time the comment was received. Removal of the two maple trees is supported by an arborist report noting evidence of fungal decay and recommending removal due to poor condition. The infill building has been significantly redesigned to facilitate the retention of the large Cedar tree to the laneway frontage. Condition 1.11 and landscape conditions also seek to improve tree retention beyond that currently proposed.

Laneway Traffic Calming: Some respondents were concerned additional laneway traffic as a result of the development.

Staff Response: Laneway Public Realm improvements are proposed as a secondary application as per Condition 1.9 however traffic calming measures are not expected as part of this secondary application.

Scale & Massing: Some respondents were concerned about the scale of the development, seeking redesign to 2.5 storeys and elimination of the roof deck.

Staff Response: Refer to Application Response to Guidelines commentary Section 3.i) Lot Typology, Scale and Height regarding the appropriateness of the 4-storey form; Section 3.vi) Building Setbacks to the Lane regarding the provision of upper level setbacks to lessen the apparent scale of the four-storey development; and, Section 3.ii) regarding measures mitigating direct overlook from the rooftop amenity area to adjacent development.
Construction Noise & Other Impacts: Several respondents expressed concern about noise, disruption and traffic impacts of additional developments in their neighbourhood. Several respondents suggested that construction work hours should be limited and that these limits should be better enforced.

Staff Response: Construction on the site would be subject to Vancouver Noise Control By-Law #65555 which limits construction on private property between 7:30 and 8pm on any weekday that is not a holiday and between 10am to 8pm on any Saturday that is not a holiday.

Parking: See general laneway infill comments.

Staff Response: The Parking Bylaw allows for alternate ways to meet the site’s parking demands including car share and off-site parking as a solution. The application is deficient one disability parking space as currently proposed. Recommended Condition 1.8 requires the provision of minimum parking numbers for the building. See also ‘Application Response to Guidelines commentary Section 3.vii Parking’.

Undergrounding of Utilities: One respondent expressed a desire to see all power lines and transformers moved underground.

Staff Response: The proposal includes the provision of a Pad Mounted Transformer to provide underground service to the new development.

Seniors Housing: One respondent noted that the proposal did not address the need for seniors housing.

Staff Response: ‘Laneways 2.0’ does not specifically require provision of housing for seniors, instead focusing more generally on the provision of rental units with unit mix regulations ensuring the provision of family rental units.

Laneway Infill - General Comments:

Parking: The majority of respondents indicated concern about the lack of parking provided on these sites and the potential for increased traffic in the already congested neighbourhoods of the West End. There was also concern about the potential for increased pressure on on-street permit parking. Some respondents asked why there were no underground parking garages in the proposals, or allowance for parking within the inner courtyards between the existing and new buildings. More generally speaking, several respondents commented on the need for improved public transit options for the West End.

Staff Response: The Parking Bylaw allows for alternate ways to meet the site’s parking demands including car share and off-site parking as a solution. The application is deficient one disability parking space as currently proposed. Recommended Condition 1.8 requires the provision of minimum parking numbers for the building. With regard to the provision of parking in the shared courtyards; the shared courtyard is an essential open space amenity required to ensure livability for all occupants as the residential use of these lots is intensified. Parking use would compromise the livability of both infill and existing building.

Densification: One respondent commented on the increased density in the West End and that potential new developments need to be weighed against the ability of a neighbourhood to accommodate construction periods and new residents and vehicles. Other densification concerns mentioned included inadequate access to schools, and that new units in the West End are being built too small.
Staff Response: Laneways 2.0 anticipates infill development on under-utilized areas of existing sites that have potentially exhausted the maximum available FSR. Staff are satisfied that the application demonstrates an intensification of residential use in a form of development expected by the West End Plan. Construction on the site would be subject to Vancouver Noise Control By-Law #65555 which limits construction on private property between 7:30 and 8pm on any weekday that is not a holiday and between 10am to 8pm on any Saturday that is not a holiday.

Impacts on Neighbouring Properties: Two respondents indicated support for infill laneway housing if the design minimizes the impact to neighbouring properties and respects existing access to daylight, privacy, and views.

Condition 1.10 recommends modifications of the glazing details to the laneway elevations to mitigate direct overlook from upper floors to nearby buildings. Refer also to Application Response to Guidelines commentary Section 3.vi Building Setbacks to the Lane; Section 3.vii Side Yard Setbacks; and, Section 3.xi Architecture & Form.

Character: Some respondents were concerned about the loss of character in the proposals and suggested more architectural continuity between the existing building and the infill, in terms of form and massing.

Staff Response: Staff note tree retention measures to the Comox Street and lane frontages as mitigating the loss of character to the neighbourhood, and Condition 1.1 as it relates to an improved retention of the existing significant character features of the pre-date dwelling. Regarding architectural continuity between the infill and host buildings, staff note UDP support for the integration of the two buildings on the lot and the contrasting expression of new and existing buildings, and refer also to Application Response to Guidelines commentary Section 3.xi Architecture & Form.
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT STAFF COMMITTEE COMMENTS:

The Staff Committee has considered the approval sought by this application and concluded that with respect to the Zoning and Development By-law it requires decisions by both the Development Permit Board and the Director of Planning.

With respect to the decision by the Development Permit Board, the application requires the Development Permit Board to exercise discretionary authority as delegated to the Board by Council.

It also requires the Board to consider By-law relaxations, per Section 5.3 of the RM-5 Districts Schedule and Section 4.2 of the Parking By-Law. The Staff Committee supports the relaxations proposed.

The Staff Committee supports this proposal subject to the conditions contained in this report.

J. Greer
Chair, Development Permit Staff Committee

C. King
Development Planner

J. Bosnjak
Project Coordinator

Project Facilitator: W. LeBreton
The following is a list of conditions that must also be met prior to issuance of the Development Permit.

A.1 Standard Conditions

A.1.1 compliance with Section 5.3(b) and (c) of the RM-5 District Schedule of the Zoning and Development Bylaw;

Note to Applicant: A minimum of 50% of Units in the Infill Multiple Dwelling are to have 2 or more bedrooms and a minimum 10% of units to have 3 or more bedrooms.

A.1.2 compliance with Section 4.3.1 of the RM-5 District Schedule of the Zoning and Development Bylaw;

Note to Applicant: The top of Elevator/Stairwell does not comply with Section 10.11 of the Zoning and Development Bylaw. See also Condition 1.4.

A.1.3 confirmation that the Site Coverage (4.8) of the RM-5 District Schedule of the Zoning and Development By-law, does not exceed the maximum permitted;

Note to Applicant: Submission of detailed Site Coverage plan is required to confirm this number. The inclusion of porches and outermost walls are required for this calculation.

A.1.4 compliance with 4.8.1 and 4.8.4 - Disability Spaces of the Parking By-law;

Note to Applicant: A total of two disability parking spaces are required.

A.1.5 provision of bicycle parking in accordance with the Parking By-law;

Note to Applicant: 30 Class A bicycle space are required as noted in Section 6.2.1.2 of the Parking By-law;

A.1.6 provision of details of bicycle rooms, in accordance with Section 6 of the Parking By-law, which demonstrates the following:

- a minimum of 20 percent of the bicycle spaces to be secured via lockers;
- a maximum of 30 percent of the bicycle spaces to be vertical spaces;
- a provision of one electrical receptacle per two bicycle spaces for the charging of electric bicycles; and
- notation on the plans that “construction of the bicycle rooms to be in accordance with Section 6.3 of the Parking By-law”;

A.1.7 an acoustical consultant’s report shall be submitted which assesses noise impacts on the site and recommends noise mitigation measures in order to achieve noise criteria;

A.1.8 written confirmation shall be submitted by the applicant that:

- the acoustical measures will be incorporated into the final design and construction, based on the consultant’s recommendations;
- adequate and effective acoustic separation will be provided between the commercial and residential portions of the building; and
• mechanical (ventilators, generators, compactors and exhaust systems) will be designed and located to minimize the noise impact on the neighbourhood and to comply with Noise By-law #6555;

A.1.9 provision of top of ridge elevation on multiple dwelling;

A.1.10 city building grades, existing and finished grades to be shown on the site plan including around the perimeter of all principal and accessory buildings;

A.1.11 provision of a minimum of 5.7 m (200 cu. ft.) of useable storage space for each dwelling unit for the storage of bulky items such as winter tires, ski and barbecue equipment, excess furniture, etc.;

Note to Applicant: The storage area[s] may be below grade with individual lockers in a common space or may be provided en suite; however, laundry facilities should not be located inside such storage areas. Refer to Bulk Storage - Residential Development bulletin for more information.

A.1.12 updating the Statistics drawing on Page A002;

Note to Applicant: Parking and floor area numbers are to be revised.

A.1.13 provision of cross-section of top floor on multiple dwelling;

Note to Applicant: This is to confirm that there are no adjacent attic spaces (areas greater than 3’11” in height.

A.1.14 labeling open balconies/porches/etc on floor plans;

A.1.15 confirmation that balcony on 4th floor is open to above;

Note to Applicant: Floor plans on page A103 show a wall that may be enclosing the balcony.

A.1.16 confirmation that roof deck trellis is open or covered;

Note to Applicant: If the trellis is covered, the area will be counted in floor area.

Standard Landscape Conditions

A.1.17 design development to retain and protect existing healthy Cedar trees #1, #2, #3, #5, #6 (arborist report) at the front yard as part of the redevelopment of this site, to maintain the continuity of mature greenery as a visual amenity between streetscape context sites;

Note to Applicant: Tree location noted on the survey and in the arborist report. Revise Site Plan and Landscape Plan to show the retention and protection of more trees. Resolve conflicts between proposed excavation and critical root zone requirements for the protection of retained private site and off-site trees through building design revision and further arborist consultation. Please refer to Design Condition 1.11 for comments about modifications to building design.

A.1.18 provision of landscape and architectural plans, survey, and arborist report that are better coordinated to clarify trees to be retained and removed with tree protection measures;
Note to Applicant: Tree barriers as noted in the arborist report should be illustrated on the Landscape Plan. Clarify trees to be retained and protected and removed on all plan drawings. Further arborist consultation is required to clarify tree protection measures for existing trees at the northwest side yard, and east corner of the site, as noted on the survey.

A.1.19 design development to improve the functionality of the at grade Courtyard as a common amenity space by:
   i. removal of proposed hedge enclosures to provide more direct and open entry to private dwellings from the main courtyard space with foundation plantings to separate entry porches;

   Note to Applicant: The intent is to create a more open and inviting space within the courtyard for gathering of residents. Recommend providing a mixed shrub foundation planting along the building face as a separation between private entry paths. Suggested width for foundation planting 4 to 5 feet, with the use of Cedar as accent rather than creation of solid walls.

   ii. incorporation of pavers/stepping stones at a minimum 2”-0” spacing within the lawn area to create a low maintenance permeable green area for this shady courtyard;

   Note to Applicant: Revise Landscape Plan as needed.

A.1.20 provision of enhanced greening at the entry porch to the infill dwelling unit at the lane;

A.1.21 provision of larger-scale architectural details at ½”=1'-0” to illustrate special footing design for proposed retaining walls located in close proximity to retained trees at the front yard as recommended by the arborist report.

A.1.22 reduction to the width of the two proposed entry stairways at the south front yard property edge to a maximum of four ft., to minimize excavation within the critical root zone of retained trees;

   Note to Applicant: Shift southernmost stairway towards the west to provide at least a 3 ft. setback at the shared property line and adjacent to existing neighbour’s Holly tree.

A.1.23 provision of notation on Landscape Plan to read: “Provision of 6.5 ft. wide fully planted landscape strip to the satisfaction of the City Engineer”;

   Note to Applicant: The intent is to provide a landscaped strip measuring 6.5 ft. in width located along the rear property boundary as a visual amenity for the landscape to be illustrated on the Landscape Plan. A separate permit approval is required by the Engineering Department.

A.1.24 provision of a permeable paver system for the proposed disability surface car space located in close proximity to retained shared 1.8 ft. Cedar;

   Note to Applicant: Installation of pavers should utilize low impacts methods of installation to minimize excavation within the critical root zone for retained tree.

A.1.25 provision of a durable curb edge, with a minimum height of 8 inches, to protect lane edge plantings from maneuvering vehicles.

   Note to Applicant: if the planting area extends onto City property, the curb should be placed on City property. Consult with Streets Engineering for final details. Provide a large-scale architectural elevation drawing at ½”= 1’0”, to illustrate this condition.
A.1.26 provision of larger-scale architectural details to illustrate proposed permanent planters on roof deck, arbour, fences and gates, retaining walls and planters at grade, other special landscape;

**Note to Applicant:** Planter details to confirm planter depth and to exceed BC Landscape Standard (latest edition).

A.1.27 provision of high efficiency irrigation system for common landscaped planters and hose bibs on roof deck and courtyard areas to facilitate hand watering of landscape plantings, illustrated and labelled on the Landscape Plan;

A.1.28 provision of a common screened garbage and recycling bin enclosure (illustrated on the Landscape Plan);

**Note to Applicant:** Provide a large-scale architectural detail at ½”=1’0” to illustrate;

A.1.29 submission of a landscape lighting plan for the inner courtyard area for security and safety purposes;

**Note to Applicant:** Lighting details should be included on the Landscape Plan;

A.1.30 illustration on the Landscape Plan and the Site Plan to show all lane edge utilities such as gas meters and transformer and below grade utilities including gas, water, storm sewer, sumps;

A.1.31 submission of an addendum to arborist report to include written assessment and comments for tree protection measures for all private trees noted on the survey;

**Note to Applicant:** Comments regarding existing trees at west side yard and east corner of site are missing from the report.

A.1.32 submission of a letter of assurance to confirm arborist supervision of tree protection. Letter to outline the duties of the arborist, outline special arboricultural measures and phases of construction including excavation, when arborist supervision is required. Letter to be signed by arborist, property owner and contractor.

**Social Planning/Housing Centre/ Cultural Affairs**

A.1.33 design development to the common rooftop outdoor space to provide potential for urban agriculture, including edible landscaping in planters and/or planters which may be planted by residents, as well yard waste composter, tool storage chest/potting bench and a hose bib, as per the City's Urban Agricultural Design Guidelines for the Private Realm.

**A.2 Standard Engineering Conditions**

A.2.1 provision of a copy of a current title search for each parcel of land involved in the development site is required. The title search must be dated within one week of the intake date. Also, copies of all non-financial charges and legal notations listed on each title search for the development site must be submitted. Examples of common non-financial charges include Statutory Right of Way, Right of Way, Covenant, Easement, Option to Purchase, and Easement and Indemnity. Examples of financial charges, which are not required, include Mortgage, Assignment of Rents, and Builders Liens. This information may be obtained from the Land Title Office in New Westminster. An applicant may require advice or assistance from a Solicitor, Notary, Realtor, BC Land Surveyor, or Land Agent to obtain this information. We reserve the right to ask for an updated title search and charges prior to issuance of the permit.
A.2.2 provision of a 2.9 m wide parking space for the shared vehicle parking spaces;

Note to Applicant: This is a requirement of the Shared Vehicle Agreement for a shared vehicle parking space.

A.2.3 enter into a Shared Vehicle Agreement with the City to secure the provision, operation and maintenance of [3] Shared Vehicle(s) and the provision and maintenance of [3] Shared Vehicle Parking Space(s) for use exclusively by such Shared Vehicle(s), [with such parking spaces to be in addition to the minimum parking spaces required by the Parking Bylaw], on terms and conditions satisfactory to the General Manager of Engineering Services and the Director of Legal Services, including the following:

iii. provide 3 Shared Vehicle(s) to the development for a minimum period of [3 years];
iv. enter into an agreement with a Shared Vehicle Organization satisfactory to the General Manager of Engineering Services to secure the operation and maintenance of the Shared Vehicle(s);
v. provide and maintain the Shared Vehicle Parking Space(s) for use exclusively by such shared vehicles;
vi. make arrangements to allow members of the Shared Vehicle Organization access to the Shared Vehicle Parking Space(s);
vii. provide security in the form of a Letter of Credit for $50,000 per Shared Vehicle; and
viii. registration of the Shared Vehicle Agreement against the title to the development, with such priority as the Director of Legal Services may require and including a covenant under section 219 of the Land Title Act of British Columbia, a statutory right of way, or other instrument satisfactory to the Director of Legal Services, securing these conditions.
ix. provision of a letter of commitment from a car share company indicating their willingness to supply car share vehicles on the site at building occupancy.

A.2.4 modification of the bicycle parking layout to eliminate the proposed “stacked” bicycle lockers. In addition, ensure the vertical bicycle spaces are placed up against a wall.

Note to Applicant: the Parking By-law does not permit stacked bicycle spaces or stacked bicycle lockers. Vertical bicycle spaces must be placed up against a wall and not suspended from the ceiling.

A.2.5 consideration of repurposing the proposed tandem parking space to provide additional bicycle parking;

Note to Applicant: Tandem parking spaces may not be counted towards the required on-site parking and this space may be better suited to the provision of required Class A bicycle parking or additional storage for units.

A.2.6 provision of design elevations within the proposed parking spaces including notation of the slope;

Note to Applicant: Provide confirmation that the slope and cross fall does not exceed 5%.

A.2.7 deletion of the proposed plants located between the parking spaces as these may grow large and obstruct both vehicle access into the parking spaces and sight lines into the lane of oncoming pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

A.2.8 provision of a fully accessible side yard access with ramps at a slope of no greater than 6% and/or provide a sidewalk with adequate lighting from the infill site to Cardero Street or Nicola Street;
Note to Applicant: The proposed conditions support Laneways 2.0 which identifies the need for accessibility provisions for persons with disabilities. Generally, these include provision of a universally accessible egress route to and from new infill units through either sufficient side yard access or through the provision of sidewalks in the lane leading to the units.

A.2.9 make arrangements to pay for any signage changes required to provide firefighting access from the lane;

A.2.10 clarify garbage pick-up operations. There does not appear to be adequate side yard width to move the garbage from the storage location to the lane for pick-up. Confirmation that a waste hauler can access and pick up from the location shown is required. Pick up operations should not require the use of public property for storage, pick up or return of bins to the storage location;

A.2.11 the General Manager of Engineering Services will require all utility services to be underground for this “conditional” development. All electrical services to the site must be primary with all electrical plant, which include but not limited to Vista switchgear, pad mounted transformers, LPT and kiosks (including non-BC Hydro kiosks) are to be located on private property with no reliance on public property for placement of these features. It is presumed with your consultation so far with B.C. Hydro that an area has been defined within the development footprint to accommodate such electrical plant. Please confirm that this space has been allocated and agreement between both parties has been met. In addition, there will be no reliance on secondary voltage from the existing overhead electrical network on the street right-of-way. Any alterations to the existing overhead/underground utility network to accommodate this development will require approval by the Utilities Management Branch.
B.1 **Standard Notes to Applicant**

B.1.1 The applicant is advised to note the comments of the Processing Centre-Building, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority and Fire and Rescue Services Departments contained in the Staff Committee Report dated March 25, 2015. Further, confirmation that these comments have been acknowledged and understood, is required to be submitted in writing as part of the “prior-to” response.

B.1.2 It should be noted that if conditions 1.0 and 2.0 have not been complied with on or before **October 2015**, this Development Application shall be deemed to be refused, unless the date for compliance is first extended by the Director of Planning.

B.1.3 This approval is subject to any change in the Official Development Plan and the Zoning and Development Bylaw or other regulations affecting the development that occurs before the permit is issuable. No permit that contravenes the bylaw or regulations can be issued.

B.1.4 Revised drawings will not be accepted unless they fulfill all conditions noted above. Further, written explanation describing point-by-point how conditions have been met, must accompany revised drawings. An appointment should be made with the Project Facilitator when the revised drawings are ready for submission.

B.1.5 A new development application will be required for any significant changes other than those required by the above-noted conditions.

B.2 **Conditions of Development Permit:**

B.2.1 All approved off-street vehicle parking, loading and unloading spaces, and bicycle parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the relevant requirements of the Parking By-law prior to the issuance of any required occupancy permit or any use or occupancy of the proposed development not requiring an occupancy permit and thereafter permanently maintained in good condition.

B.2.2 All landscaping and treatment of the open portions of the site shall be completed in accordance with the approved drawings prior to the issuance of any required occupancy permit or any use or occupancy of the proposed development not requiring an occupancy permit and thereafter permanently maintained in good condition.

B.2.3 Any phasing of the development, other than that specifically approved, that results in an interruption of continuous construction to completion of the development, will require application to amend the development to determine the interim treatment of the incomplete portions of the site to ensure that the phased development functions are as set out in the approved plans, all to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

B.2.4 The issuance of this permit does not warrant compliance with the relevant provisions of the Provincial Health and Community Care and Assisted Living Acts. The owner is responsible for obtaining any approvals required under the Health Acts. For more information on required approvals and how to obtain these, please contact Vancouver Coastal Health at 604-675-3800 or visit their offices located on the 12th floor of 601 West Broadway. Should compliance with the health Acts necessitate changes to this permit and/or approved plans, the owner is responsible for obtaining approval for the changes prior to commencement of any work under this permit. Additional fees may be required to change the plans.

B.2.5 **This site is affected by a Development Cost Levy By-law and levies will be required to be paid prior to issuance of Building Permits.**
Scope of Work

1. Redevelopment of a heritage home from its historical appearance at the turn of the century to include 1 two bedroom units and 1 three bedroom unit.

2. In-suite laundry with additional infill building, comprising of 27 units: 12 Two Bedroom units, 13 Three Bedroom units, 1 Dining Room unit and 1 Studio units.

Name: Alan Residence
Original Owner: James B. Allan
Original Date of Construction: 1907

Description of the Historic Place

The Allan Residence is a three bedroom and one bathroom tenancy house located at 1529 Comox Street in the historic West End neighborhood of Vancouver. Built during the Edwardian era, the house displays an Arts and Crafts influence featuring a cross-gabled roof with flared eaves, side entry, bellcast corner buttresses, and variety of multi-paned wooden windows, some with stained glass panels.

Heritage Value of the Historic Place

The Allan Residence, built in 1907 as an early Edwardian era home, reflects the period of the house's original construction, and as such, provides a valuable research tool for understanding the architectural history of the West End. The house is a fine example of Edwardian-era architecture, and demonstrates the influence of the Arts and Crafts style and the early use of stained glass windows.

Existing Building:

The Allan Residence exists as a grand example of Edwardian-era architecture, and demonstrates the influence of the Arts and Crafts style. Typical of the times, the house features wood-frame construction and finishes that reflect the wood products produced in local sawmills. In addition to its pleasing aesthetics, the height of the house enhances its stature and allowed occupants to take advantage of the expansive views across the neighborhood.

Technical Data:

Site Area: 8,484 sq ft (8,492.34 m²)
Proposed Gross Floor Area: 13,934 sq ft (1,292.66 m²)

Unit Counts:

Existing Building:

1 Bedroom
1 (Bedroom)
2 (Bedroom)

Total number of units: 16

Proposed FSR:

Proposed FSR (Per 4.7.1): 8,750 (28.8%)
Proposed FSR (Per 4.7.3): 6,184 (21.6%)

Parking Requirements:

Residential (as per 6.2.1.2 - 1.25 per unit)

Class A Bicycle Parking:
- 22 horizontal bicycle parking spaces (which includes 10 lockers)
- 9 vertical bicycle parking spaces

Class B Bicycle Parking:
- 2 bicycle parking spaces (which includes 10 lockers)

Parking Provided:

Total number of units in existing building: 18

Total number of units in proposed infill building: 27

Recycling = 27 x 57.5 (all inclusive) = 1553 / 360 = 4 Carts

Garbage = 27 x 95 = 2,565 / 360 = 7 Carts

Compostables = 27 x 14 = 378 / 360 = 1 Cart

Total number of carts provided = 12 (8 x 360L and 1 x 2 cu. yd)
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The project proposes minor encroachments only into the 120 degree shadow envelope. These protrusions are on the lane side of the project only and as demonstrated by this cross section diagram (below), are compensated for by areas of unused shadow envelope to the street side of the property.

The concentration of the mass to the lane (North) side of the property diminishes the shadow to the public realm on the south side of the property, compared to a ‘conforming solution’ which could be situated further south. This configuration has minimal shadowing impact on the southeast neighbours property where a portion of the shadow would fall.

Unused zoning capacity to respect heritage residence
Proposed 120 degree shadow envelope encroachment to compensate
Existing Photographic Streetscape - Lane

Proposed Photographic Streetscape - Lane

Proposed Streetscape - Lane
Heritage and Existing Conditions Photographs

- Heritage Front Elevation (Image Date: 1970)
- Original Window
- Original Main Door
- Existing Main Elevation
- Existing Main Entry
- Existing Streetscape - Comox Street

Project Number
1529 COMOX
VANCOUVER

Scale: 8'3

Plot Date:
2015-01-30 1:31:15 PM
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Proposed Context Plan

3D Representations of Existing and Proposed

Proposed Streetscape - Comox Street
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Introduction

The proposed development, includes a renovation to revive the existing residence, plus new infill, to be situated behind its original historic building, with access through the laneway. Re-inventing traditional notions of a “back alley”, requires creating a walkway. Re-inventing traditional notions of a “back alley”, requires creating a walkway. Re-inventing traditional notions of a “back alley”, requires creating a walkway. Re-inventing traditional notions of a “back alley”, requires creating a walkway.

The overall intent is to bring new life to the laneway, by creating a streetscape and revitalization of the laneway, by designing pedestrian landscaped public walkways, and enhancing livability.

The Infill Building matrix is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>11 x 2 Bedroom units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>4 x Studio units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>3 Bedroom units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL UNITS = 27 (we have allocated the 0.5% factor to the 2 bedroom unit as there is a greater demand for 2 bedroom units in the rental market, as this building will be purely rental).

The contextual design is distinguished by:

- 4 story height
- Distinctly modern architectural & facade
- Sustainable design
- Roof top solar panels
- Storage, parking, allocation for car-share arrangements, etc.
- Indoor outdoor experience that increases general livability (patios, balconies, etc.)

The new infill building is conceived as a 17 unit, 4 storey multi-family residence. It will provide 9,639 SF of rental accommodation, with the following mix of units. This new ground-oriented, contemporary building will provide 1,699 SF of new floorspace, to enhance the sense of community between the existing and incumbent residents and the neighbours.

The designs of the new architectural features include:

- Modern building materials, e.g. aluminium
- Balconies with glass railings
- The new design is harmoniously designed in contemporary style, with an injection of affordable rental units, through a subtle-scale, carriage-house location. This new ground-oriented, contemporary building, will provide 9,639 SF of rental accommodation, with the following mix of units.

Contract, Planning & Sustainability

Locate in a neighbourhood, of both low and high-rise rental properties, with the following mix of units.

- 2 Bedroom units
- Studio units
- 3 Bedroom units

Architectural Design - Renovation & New Infill

The addition and renovation will include a side entry with a small enclosed lobby. The roof plan will be a flat roof, to accommodate the addition and renovation of the laneway, by designing pedestrian landscaped public walkways, and enhance the sense of community.

The addition to the main building will include a side entry with a small enclosed lobby. The roof plan will be a flat roof, to accommodate the addition and renovation of the laneway, by designing pedestrian landscaped public walkways, and enhance the sense of community.
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Location of 1529 Comox Street
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Date               Description

Project Status:

SHADOW STUDY
Project Number
1529 COMOX
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VANCOUVER
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REVISION
No.  Date  Description
1 : 2002 Shadow Analysis - September 21 - 10am
1 : 2001 Shadow Analysis - September 21 - 12pm
1 : 2003 Shadow Analysis - September 21 - 2pm
All Drawings in this set to be read in conjunction with each other. Any errors or discrepancies to be reported to the Architect before commencing work.

Contractors are responsible to ensure that all work is executed to the requirements of the appropriate Building Code Authority.
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PERMEABLE LANDSCAPING
1338.58 SF = 16%

PERMEABLE PAVING
1777.47 SF = 21%

NON-PERMEABLE LANDSCAPING
3976.47 SF = 46.0%

EXISTING LANE
1387.75 SF = 17.0%

NEW PROPOSED INFILL
RAMP
STAIRS
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The site area of 8652 sq. ft/ 803.7 sq. m requires a total of 6 new or retained trees.

The plan proposes six new on site trees, which count as 6 as per the bylaw.

Indicates existing tree to be retained, and tree protection fencing

Indicates existing tree to be removed

The site plan and construction work require that all existing trees be removed. Existing trees along Comox Street are leaning as a result of growing very closely with other trees, and others are in very poor health, with many dead branches and trunk decay evident.

The plan proposes removal of site trees, which count as 6 as per the bylaw.
### Recommended Plant List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scheduled Size</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shrubs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>H. japonica 'Jester'</td>
<td>Japanese Anemone</td>
<td>#3 pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shrubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P. polyblepharum</td>
<td>Tassel Fern</td>
<td>#1 pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shrubs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>St. psd</td>
<td>Samarac cord</td>
<td>#2 pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shrubs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S. ruscifolia</td>
<td>Fragrant Sarcococca</td>
<td>#3 pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shrubs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M. x media 'Charity'</td>
<td>Charity Mahonia</td>
<td>#3 pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shrubs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S. ruscifolia</td>
<td>Himalayan Sarcococca</td>
<td>#1 pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shrubs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S. ruscifolia</td>
<td>Japanese spurge</td>
<td>#3 pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Groundcover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scheduled Size</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Groundcover</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>H. japonica 'Jester'</td>
<td>Japanese Anemone</td>
<td>#1 pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

All materials and workmanship to BCCLA/BCLNA Landscape Standards latest edition

**Recommended Plant List**
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  - S. ruscifolia (Fragrant Sarcococca)
  - M. x media 'Charity' (Charity Mahonia)
  - S. ruscifolia (Himalayan Sarcococca)

- **Groundcover**: H. japonica 'Jester' (Japanese Anemone)
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Processing Centre - Building Comments

The following comments are based on the preliminary drawings prepared by Ankenman Marchand dated Jan.19/15 for the proposed development permit. This is a preliminary review in order to identify issues which do not comply with the 2014 Vancouver Building Bylaw.

Building safety facilities such as central alarm and control facility, fire fighters elevator, and stairwells equipped with standpipe connections shall be coordinated with the location of the fire fighters' entrance.

Existing Building:

a) Fire protection, structural capacity, and accessibility of the existing building are required to be upgraded per Part 11 of the VBBL. This is considered to be a Relocation/ Horizontal addition with corresponding level of upgrade of F4,S4,N4,A4 and E4.

b) There are exit exposure issues.

c) Firefighters’ path of travel does not comply with minimum width requirements, the lower roof on the west elevation appears to encroach on the required width.