

REPORT TO COUNCIL



Date: September 19, 2017

RIM No. 0940-00

To: City Manager

From: Community Planning Department (TB)

Application: DP16-0101 DVP

Owner: Paul Benjamin Neufeld
Douglas Richard Kirk

Address: 815 Rose Avenue

Applicant: Douglas Richard Kirk

Subject: Development Permit and Development Variance Permit

Existing OCP Designation: MRL – Multiple Unit Residential (Low Density)

Existing Zone: RU6 – Two Dwelling Housing

Proposed Zone: RM1 – Four Dwelling Housing

1.0 Recommendation

THAT final adoption of Rezoning Bylaw No. 11416 be considered by Council;

AND THAT first, second and third readings of Rezoning Bylaw No. 11256 be rescinded and the file closed;

AND THAT Council authorizes the issuance of Development Permit No. DP16-0101 and Development Variance Permit DVP17-0108 for Lot 2, District Lot 136, ODYD, Plan 8116, located at 815 Rose Avenue, Kelowna, BC subject to the following:

1. The dimensions and siting of the building to be constructed on the land be in accordance with Schedule "A,"
2. The exterior design and finish of the building to be constructed on the land, be in accordance with Schedule "B";

AND THAT variances to the following sections of Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be granted:

Section 8.1.9(c) Parking and Loading: Location

To allow two required parking stalls to be located within 1.5m of the side property lines on the east and west sides;

AND FURTHER THAT this Development Permit is valid for two (2) years from the date of Council approval, with no opportunity to extend.

2.0 Purpose

To consider the form and character of four-plex housing and to vary the location of two required parking stalls to be located within 1.5 m of the side property lines on the east and west sides.

3.0 Community Planning

Community Planning supports the Development Permit and Development Variance Permit on the subject property as it is consistent with Official Community Plan (OCP) Policies regarding Urban Growth and Infill. The proposed design meets the majority of the design guidelines for Comprehensive Development – Multi-Family and attention has been given to ensure the street facing frontages have a high quality of design.

The two variances are to allow two required parking stalls to be located within the side yard setback within 1.5m of the property lines on the east and west sides. The impact will be minimal on the adjacent properties as the stalls are located in the rear off of the lane and the applicant has proposed fencing around the property to ensure privacy.

4.0 Proposal

4.1 Background

The subject property features a 1 ½ storey single family dwelling that was constructed in 1960 and a small storage shed that will be demolished as part of this development. The applicants began this process in April 2016 with a proposal for a total of 3 units. Council passed 2nd and 3rd readings on the rezoning for that proposal on July 12th, 2016. The applicants requested their application to be put on-hold and have come up with a redesign and a new proposal for 4 units which received 2nd and 3rd reading on June 27th, 2017.

4.2 Project Description

The proposed four-plex housing meets the current OCP Policies regarding Compact Urban Form and Sensitive Infill by creating density where infrastructure exists, and providing a height and massing that is sensitive to the neighbourhood.

The four-plex is designed in modern and contemporary style with visually interesting rooflines in addition to rooftop patio outdoor amenity space for each unit. The materials and colours relate to the region's visual landscape by incorporating natural materials such as stone into the design. Attention to the streetscape is apparent as the two front units have ground-oriented and well defined front entrances. There are wall projections and indentations that create visual interest along the front facade. The height is consistent with several other new builds in the area, and it is anticipated that as this area redevelops this proposal will be consistent with the future streetscape.

4.3 Variances

Two variances are considered as a function of the site layout. Each of the four units requires 1.5 parking stalls for a total of 6 parking stalls. The applicant is proposing 4 covered stalls in a common garage accessed from the lane, with 2 additional stalls on either side of the garage. The 2 uncovered stalls are located at 0.0 m to the lot line when 1.5 m is required in the Zoning Bylaw. The stalls have been increased in width to 3.45 m to accommodate the additional width required when both sides of a parking stall are obstructed (fence, and garage wall). It is not anticipated that the location of these parking stalls will have a negative impact

on the adjacent properties as they are located in the rear of the property well away from the nearby homes, and fencing will be used for screening.

4.4 Site Context

The subject property is located in South Pandosy east of Richter Street and south of Ethel Street on the south side of Rose Avenue. The subject property is within walking distance to a variety of amenities including Guisachan Village, Cameron Park, Kelowna General Hospital, and is located on a bicycle corridor with access to the proposed Ethel Street Active Transportation Corridor.

There are two other applications on Rose Avenue at this time that are also rezoning to a four-plex with similar elevations and floor plans. The representatives from each project have taken care to ensure that differences in the materials and colour palette of each application provides variety and individuality of the projects.

Subject Property Map: 815 Rose Ave



5.0 **Current Development Policies**

5.1 Comprehensive Design Guidelines

COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA	YES	NO	N/A
Authenticity and Regional Expression			
Do landscaping and building form convey a character that is distinct to Kelowna and the Central Okanagan?	✓		
Are materials in keeping with the character of the region?	✓		
Are colours used common in the region’s natural landscape?	✓		
Does the design provide for a transition between the indoors and outdoors?	✓		
Context			
Does the proposal maintain the established or envisioned architectural character of the neighbourhood?	✓		

COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA	YES	NO	N/A
Does interim development consider neighbouring properties designated for more intensive development?			✓
Are façade treatments facing residential areas attractive and context sensitive?	✓		
Are architectural elements aligned from one building to the next?			✓
For exterior changes, is the original character of the building respected and enhanced?			✓
Is the design unique without visually dominating neighbouring buildings?	✓		
For developments with multiple buildings, is there a sense of architectural unity and cohesiveness?	✓		
Relationship to the Street			
Do buildings create the desired streetscape rhythm?	✓		
Are parkade entrances located at grade?			✓
For buildings with multiple street frontages, is equal emphasis given to each frontage?			✓
Massing and Height			
Does the design mitigate the actual and perceived mass of buildings?	✓		
Does the height consider shading and view impacts for neighbouring properties and transition to less intensive areas?	✓		
Human Scale			
Are architectural elements scaled for pedestrians?	✓		
Are façades articulated with indentations and projections?	✓		
Are top, middle and bottom building elements distinguished?			✓
Do proposed buildings have an identifiable base, middle and top?			✓
Are building facades designed with a balance of vertical and horizontal proportions?	✓		
Are horizontal glazed areas divided into vertically proportioned windows separated by mullions or building structures?	✓		
Does the design incorporate roof overhangs and the use of awnings, louvers, canopies and other window screening techniques?		✓	
Is the visual impact of enclosed elevator shafts reduced through architectural treatments?			✓
Exterior Elevations and Materials			
Are buildings finished with materials that are natural, local, durable and appropriate to the character of the development?	✓		
Are entrances visually prominent, accessible and recognizable?	✓		
Are higher quality materials continued around building corners or edges that are visible to the public?	✓		

COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA	YES	NO	N/A
Are a variety of materials used to create contrast, enhance the pedestrian environment and reduce the apparent mass of a building?	✓		
Are elements other than colour used as the dominant feature of a building?	✓		
Decks, Balconies, Rooftops and Common Outdoor Amenity Space			
Are decks, balconies or common outdoor amenity spaces provided?	✓		
Does hard and soft landscaping enhance the usability of decks, balconies and outdoor amenity spaces?	✓		
Are large flat expanses of roof enhanced with texture, colour or landscaping where they are visible from above or adjacent properties?			✓

6.o Application Chronology

Date of Application Received: April 6, 2016
 Date Public Consultation Completed: April 9, 2016
 Date of Public Hearing: July 12, 2016
 Revised Plans Received: May 3, 2017
 Date Revised Public Consultation Completed: May 9, 2017
 Date of Revised Public Hearing: June 27, 2017

Report prepared by: Trisa Brandt, Planner

Reviewed by: Terry Barton, Urban Planning Manager

Approved for Inclusion: Ryan Smith, Community Planning Department Manager

Attachments:

Draft Development and Development Variance Permit DP16-0101 and DVP17-0108
 Schedule "A": Dimensions and Siting
 Schedule "B": Exterior Elevations and Materials