

Applicant's Submission



March 25, 2020

This proposal is to explain the intention to redesignate this property to a multi-family designation. The property is currently a large lot single family home, with an S-FUD designation, and is adjacent to multifamily rowhousing on the north side and villas on the south. It is bordered on the west by Prominence Way SW and on the east by Patina Hill SW. The site drops gradually from west to east with a rapid drop-off on the boulevard to Patina Hill SW.

The neighbourhood contains other small lot single family developments, a variety of medium density multi-family developments, and a seniors' lodge. Down the hill to the east is a variety of developments from townhouses to mixed villa/apartments. The greater area has designated densities from 27 to 76 Units/ha.

There is an existing Concept plan from the early 1990's, with revisions most recently in 2014. The densities in this Concept Plan do not reflect the current land use designations on the City's LUB maps. The property adjacent to the north is currently zoned with a density of 30 U/ha. (slightly more than the 1994 Concept Plan). At 2.04 ac., it could have had 24 units but only has 20 (which was based on the original Concept Plan). The property adjacent to the south is 5.0 ac. with 32 units (semi-detached), a density of 16 U/ ha. And to the south of that development, the property is zoned at 30 U/ha, and to the south of that, 50 U/ha.

The proposal for this redesignation is to apply an M-CGd30 designation with a density of 30 U/ha (M-CG d30). Based on the size of the property at 1.24 ha. (3.07 ac.), this would permit up to a maximum of 37 units. These units would be in a condominium style property subdivision. The townhouse units would be similar in concept to the units on the property to the north in size and density. They would have attached 2-car garages with additional driveway parking. The apartments would have underground parkade parking and some surface visitor parking.

The construction of the units would likely be phased as the demand for the units dictated, on a cluster by cluster basis as the market need arises.

Due to the proposed unit density in the application, our firm met with the community on June 20th, 2019 prior to our later submission. We presented 3 options for the application for their review and comment. We subsequently received a response from the community saying that they would support our application as presented.

Since making the application, we received comments from the file manager and, once a density was agreed to with our client, we began to organize community engagement. We tried to contact the community to set up an open house. Several weeks went by

Applicant's Submission

before we finally made contact with them and, through some back and forth discussions, settled on March 25th for the date at the local Seniors centre (where we held the first community meeting). With the unexpected turn of events with the COVID-19 situation, we relocated to another venue but, with the situation worsening, we were forced to cancel any in-person community engagement. We examined a 'virtual' offering but could not organize what we felt would be something equivalent to an open house where the local residents could visit at their leisure during the evening to view the presentation boards, could ask questions of the architects and City file manager, and could submit comments to the architects for organizing and submitting to the file manager for review by Planning Commission. The open house was officially canceled with the community on March 20th.

We have been in contact with the Condo association to the south but have not made any specific plans to get the proposal to them at this time. Again, the COVID-19 situation has compromised our ability to meet with the interested parties.

Wm. (Bill) R. Kumlin, Architect, AAA, AIBC, SAA, MRAIC
Principal