

The applicant has explored four options that re-examine the proposed access to the site as follows:

1. Piccadilly South: access from east frontage

This option would bring the driveway from Piccadilly South from the eastern portion of the property. This option is not desirable as it would eliminate a large rock outcrop in the front yard, impact the re-aligned non-permanent watercourse and its associated riparian area, would result in a “switch-back” style driveway requiring significant excavation and retaining walls, and reduce the overall ability to landscape and screen the property and boulevard in the front. As such, rendered drawings of this option was not prepared.

Staff Analysis: Staff is concerned with accessing the property from this position as it would not comply with the area guidelines and would likely exceed soil removal and rock blasting limits.

2. Piccadilly South: access from west frontage (retaining wall consideration)

This option would bring the driveway from Piccadilly South from the western portion of the property, with retaining walls that would comply to achieve this access. The driveway does not comply with the maximum slope in the apron areas from the road way and into the garage in this scenario.

The retaining walls would vary in height from three to four feet at the entrance near Piccadilly South, and increase up to the maximum height of eight feet within the property (on both sides of the driveway). This is the scenario sketched out in **Appendix A**.

Staff Analysis: Staff is concerned with this option as it does not comply with the guidelines as it would: result in highly visible retaining walls visible from the road frontage; alters the existing terrain; disrupts the site’s natural characteristics; and does not reduce the visual impact of the driveway.

3. Piccadilly South: access from west frontage (driveway slope consideration)

This option also brings the driveway from Piccadilly South from the western portion of the property, as per Option 2. However, in order to make the driveway comply with the maximum slopes in the apron areas, but not exceed the maximum 20% slope and transitional slopes, the garage would need to be lowered by approximately four feet. This would result in retaining walls that would exceed the maximum permitted height – i.e. greater than 4 feet near the road edge and up to 12 feet within the property.

Staff Analysis: Staff has concerns with this situation given the over-height and much more visible retaining walls that would be required, and much greater blasting volumes and soil removal needed. It would arguably increase the amount of alteration of the terrain required, further disrupt natural site characteristics and would not assist in reducing the visual impact of the driveway.

The District’s requirement for driveway grades is attached as **Appendix B**.

4. Right-of-way: access from the east:

The applicant has explored maintaining the existing driveway access that is located on the right-of-way to the west of the property (known as Clovelly Walk). This concept is also set out in **Appendix A**. This scenario would keep the driveway in its present location, and the applicant proposes to:

- delete the existing parking pad and its retaining walls in the right-of-way. This area would be re-landscaped.
- delete the existing fence within the right-of-way. A new fence would be installed along the property line, up to the point where it would meet the driveway.
- retain the existing hedge and its retaining wall in the right-of-way adjacent to the property. This hedge provides good screening to the property.
- retain the lower rock wall and hedge at the road edge. It supports the driveway and offers screening of the property from the road.

The existing driveway access has been in place since the property originally developed in 1966 (see **Appendix C**).

Staff Analysis: Staff recommends that the access from the right-of-way be maintained as it allows for the proposal to generally comply with the guidelines and would help to preserve neighbourhood character by avoiding excessive site alteration, excavation and blasting, and highly visible retaining walls in order to achieve access via Piccadilly South. The walkway would still be accessible by the public and through the measures proposed would be reduced in “privatized” appearance.

Conclusion

Access is the thrust of the concept ideas as it directly impacts other aspects of the proposed development and how the development relates to the Heritage Conservation Area guidelines. The applicant has attempted to demonstrate the impacts associated with access via the existing condition (right-of-way) or via Piccadilly South. Each scenario presents its challenges and concerns – i.e. in terms of occupying a portion of a public right-of-way or by challenging the guidelines in terms of being unable to screen the property and installing large visible retaining walls.

The applicant has eliminated any Zoning Bylaw variances, and with respect to the watercourse, the proposal would comply with the District’s Environmental Guidelines.

Consideration

Staff requests the LCAC:

- consider the concept ideas provided by the applicant; and
- provide a recommendation that is able to assist in the determination on the appropriate course of development – i.e. access, in context of the guidelines.

Date: March 17, 2016
To: Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee
From: Lisa Berg, Senior Community Planner
Re: **Heritage Alteration Permit No. 15-058 for 4701 Piccadilly South (second submission)**

Page: 4

Appendices:

- A. Access Concepts (provided by the applicant)
- B. Driveway Requirements for Garage above Road (District document)
- C. 1966 Building Plan (shows driveway access)