DISTRIBUTION OF WEST VANCOUVER
750 17th STREET, WEST VANCOUVER, BC V7V 3T3

COUNCIL REPORT

Date: January 29, 2015
File: 1010-20-12-053
From: Lisa Berg, Senior Community Planner
Subject: Official Community Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit Application No. 12-053 for 370 and 380 Mathers Avenue (Residences on Mathers)

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. Official Community Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit No. 12-053 for 370 and 380 Mathers Avenue known as the Residences on Mathers project advance in the application review process;

2. Staff bring forward proposed bylaws to amend the Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw, and a proposed Development Permit for 370 and 380 Mathers Avenue for Council consideration;

3. Staff bring forward a draft covenant for tree protection as part of the development package; and

4. Staff bring forward a Phased Development Agreement to secure a Community Amenity Contribution.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to:

- report back to Council with a review of the development plans based on the recommendations of the Design Review Committee meeting held on September 25, 2014;
- advise on the outcome of a Community Consultation Meeting held on November 25, 2014; and
- determine the suitability of the development proposal for further consideration.

Executive Summary

Darwin Construction has applied for an Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment, a rezoning and a development permit at 370 and 380 Mathers Avenue, for a 17-unit strata development (see Appendix A – Context Map). The proposal consists of nine single family dwellings and eight duplex units. The proposal is to rezone the site to allow for the proposed 17 units with a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.38.
Redevelopment of the site is guided by OCP Policy H3 which recognizes that opportunities occur in limited site-specific situations where a housing need may be addressed in a manner that is consistent with the principles of the OCP. Further, while not official District policy, the final report and recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing working group provides further direction for the review of this development application.

On March 18, 2013, Council directed that a Community Consultation Meeting be held and that the application for a 19-unit strata development be referred to the Design Review Committee. A public meeting was held on April 24, 2013 and the DRC considered the proposal on May 30, 2013. Staff reported back to Council on the results of the consultations and the recommendations of the DRC on September 23, 2013. Staff was directed to work with the applicant to revise the proposal in response to community concerns and DRC considerations, however since that time the application was on hold at the request of the applicant.

In the summer of 2014, the applicant approached the District with a revised proposal, showing a reduction in the number of units from 19 to 17. The revised proposal was re-submitted to the DRC at its September 25, 2014 meeting. The committee passed a recommendation of support, subject to minor modifications. Staff has reviewed the applicant’s responses to the DRC and find them to be appropriate.

On November 25, 2014, the District hosted a second Community Consultation Meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to share the revised plans with the community prior to reporting back to Council. The meeting was held in an Open House format, where the public were able to drop-in, review the revised plans and fill out a comment sheet. 27 people attended the meeting. The meeting revealed that the surrounding neighbours remain opposed to any development beyond that of single family residential and a FAR of 0.35; however, some support was expressed for the proposal.

The development would add 6,360 square feet over what is allowed under the current RS3 zoning, and would create smaller residential units in the community. This approach is aligned with broader housing needs identified through the Community Dialogue. Development controls would be put in place to deal with the greatest threat to established neighbourhoods: large home construction and associated construction practices. This includes tree protection, landscaping, site access and control of the form and character (architecture and massing) of the homes constructed.

Should Council support the staff recommendation outlined in this report, staff would prepare bylaws to amend the OCP and zoning bylaw and prepare a development permit, and a draft tree protection covenant. An analysis on a Community Amenity Contribution (CAC) would also be presented as part of a Phased Development Agreement bylaw, the legal instrument to secure the CAC. When the draft bylaws are returned to Council, Council may consider giving first readings to the proposed bylaws and set a date for a public hearing.
1.0 **Background**

1.1 Prior Resolutions

At the September 23, 2013 Council meeting Council passed the following motion:

1. Official Community Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit application 1010-20-12-053 for 370 and 380 Mathers Avenue (Unitarian Church Site) be revised to address outstanding items identified during the Community Consultation Meeting held on April 24, 2013 and by the Design Review Committee on May 30, 2013 prior to advancing in the application review process, specifically:
   a. to reduce the size and/or number of units and modify unit layouts to reduce density;
   b. to provide for adequate visitor parking;
   c. to provide more contextual information (for re-submission to the Design Review Committee);
   d. to increase useable open space, provide private outdoor space for the units and provide landscaped buffers between the neighbours;
   e. to ensure ease of vehicle turnaround within driveways;
   f. to introduce more variety, materiality and roof forms and consideration to the Elliott House; and
   g. to provide details about the proposed sustainability measure and landscape.

2. Staff report back to Council with a review of the revised development plans and recommended next steps on advancing the application once the outstanding items are addressed.

At the March 18, 2013 Council meeting Council passed the following motion:

1. Community consultation on Official Community Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit Application No. 1010-20-12-053 for 370 and 380 Mathers Avenue take the form of Design Review Committee consideration and a public meeting in April 2013 with direct notification of the public meeting provided to the properties shown on the map attached as Appendix E to the staff report dated March 7, 2013 from the Senior Community Planner and the Manager of Community Planning, and a notice of the public meeting be posted on the District website; and

2. Following the community consultation on the development proposal for the land at 370 and 380 Mathers Avenue, staff report back to Council on the results of consultation, and provide a complete review of the development proposal and recommended next steps.
1.2 History

A previous application for an Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment, rezoning and a development permit for this site (File No. 1010-20-08-014) was submitted in 2008. The initial proposal was for 48 townhouse units and an FAR of 0.70, and was later revised to 33 townhouse units and an FAR of 0.62.

Two public meetings were held on that application, one by the District in May 2009, and one by the applicant in October 2010. At the District-hosted consultation meeting in 2009, the issues identified were density, traffic and loss of neighbourhood character. At that time, the residents identified other concerns with recent home construction in the area, loss of trees, proposed uses for Hugo Ray Park and associated traffic.

Despite the revisions made to the proposal in 2010 in response to neighbourhood comments, this application was ultimately abandoned by the applicant.

In August 2012, the current applicant submitted a proposal for 24 units consisting of single family and duplex dwellings. The application was reduced to 19 units and consultations with the DRC and the community began. Since that time, the applicant has further reduced the units to 17, which has been reviewed by the DRC and the community at a second public meeting.

The following chart compares the proposals brought forward by the two different applicants, and the reducing density with each revision:

|                      | Summer 2009 (No. 08.014) | December 2010 (No. 08.014) | August 2012 (No. 12.053) | February 2013 (No. 12.053) | Summer 2014 (No. 12.053)  
Current Proposal |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Unit Area</td>
<td>1,400 ft²</td>
<td>1,800 ft²</td>
<td>SFD: 2,121 ft²</td>
<td>DPX: 1,834 ft²</td>
<td>SFD: 2,121 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DPX: 1,834 ft²</td>
<td></td>
<td>DPX: 1,834 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area*</td>
<td>66,920 ft²</td>
<td>59,335 ft²</td>
<td>48,646 ft²</td>
<td>38,307 ft²</td>
<td>36,360 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Storeys</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 + bsmt</td>
<td>2 + bsmt</td>
<td>2 + bsmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>25 ft</td>
<td>36 ft</td>
<td>23.6 ft</td>
<td>23.6 ft</td>
<td>2.1 + 6 visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio</td>
<td>2:1 + 6 visitor</td>
<td>2.7:1 + 10 visitor</td>
<td>2:1 + 5 visitor</td>
<td>2:1 + 6 visitor</td>
<td>2:1 + 5 visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spaces**</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes garages & basements

**Parking spaces are within private enclosed garages; driveways designed for additional parking.

In summary, two applications have resulted in five different proposals, resulting in the density being reduced from 48 townhouses with an FAR of 0.70 to 17 single family and duplex units with an FAR of 0.38.

See Appendix C for the current application’s review process and timelines.
2.0 Policy

2.1 Official Community Plan

Housing

Redevelopment of the site is guided by OCP Policy H3 which recognizes that opportunities occur in limited site-specific situations where a housing need may be addressed in a manner that is consistent with the principles of the OCP.

This policy specifies that applications for such site specific zoning or OCP amendments within a single family area should apply in limited circumstances and be subject to Council's Public Involvement Policy and defined criteria; namely that development would have minimal impact on established areas in terms of access, traffic, parking, and obstruction of views and the site would provide a degree of physical separation (e.g. a road, green belt, alternate use, or change in natural grade) from the surrounding neighbourhood.

Community Dialogue

While not official District policy, the final report and recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Working Group (September 2008) provides further direction for the review of this development application; specifically, the proposed housing types and unit sizes, and how these could address community objectives for greater housing diversity in established neighbourhoods. Importantly, the discussion of neighbourhood character issues as part of the dialogue provided broader context for considering how new housing types “fit” with the established physical and social fabric of neighbourhoods.

Heritage

The proposed development site includes the Elliott House at 380 Mathers Avenue. This building is identified in the “West Vancouver Survey of Significant Architecture: 1945 – 1975”\(^1\) as a 'primary' heritage resource. This property was nominated to the West Vancouver Community Heritage Register in May 2008, but it has not been added. Applicable heritage policies in the OCP are as follows:

- Policy HE1: Encourage the preservation, retention and maintenance of buildings, sites and landscapes listed in the municipal heritage inventories.

- Policy HE2: Where retention is not possible or is not desired, cooperate with owners in documenting heritage features of buildings and sites for the Municipal archives.

\(^1\) This is the District's inventory of significant mid-century modern buildings.
The Elliott House suffers from design flaws that have resulted in its existing poor condition. It has no roof overhangs, poor building envelope performance, single glazing and jalousie windows and small clerestory lights set into routed groves that cannot be replaced with modern sealed units. It has also been modified over the years; windows have been enclosed and a carport has been added. As such, its retention is not proposed. A replacement house will be sited on this lot, incorporating key design elements from the original Elliott House.

2.2 Zoning Bylaw

The site consists of two properties:

- 380 Mathers Avenue makes up the northwest frontage of the site and is zoned RS3 (Single family Residential Zone 3).
- 370 Mathers Avenue comprises the majority of the site and is split-zoned: RS3 along the frontage of Mathers Avenue, and PA2 – Public Assembly Zone 2 (Places of Worship) on the balance of the property.

PA2 (Places of Worship) zoning permits places of worship and single family dwellings as per the regulations of the RS3 (Single Family) zone. Based on the minimum lot size in the RS3 zone of 1,115 square metres, the subject site could be developed with six single family lots.

2.0 Analysis

2.1 Discussion

The Proposal

The proposal is for a residential development comprising of 17 strata units (9 single family dwellings and 8 duplexes). It has been revised based on the outcome of consultations as outlined in this report. Key features of the proposal include:

- A Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.38.
- Two-storeys plus basement units, with attached two-car garages and private driveways.
- A total of 39 parking spaces: 34 within private enclosed garages plus five visitor parking spaces distributed on the site.

Five different unit types and sizes are proposed: eight houses ranging from 206 to 218 square metres (2,214 to 2,343 square feet); one house fronting Mathers Avenue ("Elliott House" replacement) at 229 square metres (2,460 square feet); and eight duplex units with a floor area of 181 square metres (1,945 square feet) each.
Access to the site is proposed to be from Mathers Avenue, through an “S” shaped driveway designed to preserve mature trees at the entrance. The replacement dwelling fronting onto Mathers Avenue, along with the preservation of mature trees along the frontage of the site complement and preserve the existing street character.

To deal with a long narrow site, the dwellings are situated along a common access driveway which is visually broken up with a mid-site landscape feature. A storm water retention area is at the southern end of the site, which provides a buffer between the adjacent townhouse development, known as Esker Lane. The two single family dwellings along the eastern property line have been oriented in a north-south direction, in order to respond to adjacent neighbour’s concerns about privacy, massing and siting.

The landscape plans see the retention of mature trees at the entrance and at the rear of the site. While the majority of the trees would be removed to accommodate the development, new trees and landscaping would be installed. The tree protection areas will be secured by a covenant, and the landscaping is subject to reviews in accordance with the Development Permit. The new landscaping, together with the preserved trees, would mature over time and blend in with the character of neighbourhood and add privacy.

A traffic study has been submitted by the applicant, which concludes that the proposed 17-unit residential development would have a nominal traffic impact on weekdays, and significantly less traffic on Sundays than the existing uses on the site. Emergency vehicle and pedestrian access only is provided to Lawson Avenue to the east.

See the Project Profile in Appendix B and Appendix G for the Development Application Proposal Booklet.

Site Context and Features

The 8,825.5 square metre (2.2 acres) site is located within the British Properties. It is bounded by a townhouse development to the south (Esker Lane) with the Upper Levels Highway beyond, Mathers Avenue to the north and single family dwellings to the east and west (Mathers Mews). It has a north to south slope of approximately 16% with stands of mature coniferous trees throughout.

The Unitarian Church and child daycare are located at 370 Mathers Avenue. The church wishes to relocate to a new facility on the North Shore with a more accessible location, as there is no public transit in the neighbourhood. The existing daycare may choose to relocate with the church; they serve a similar geographic catchment as the congregation and provide care for North Shore families.
A vacant single family dwelling is located at 380 Mathers Avenue. This house is known as the “Elliott House,” which is identified in the West Vancouver Survey of Significant Architecture: 1945 – 1975 as a primary heritage resource. Although nominated to West Vancouver’s Heritage Register, it has not been added nor does it have any legal protection status. The Elliott House is not proposed for retention as part of the development plans.

**Design Review Committee**

The DRC considered the proposal for a second time at its September 25, 2014 meeting, and the members were supportive of the revised proposal. The Committee passed the following recommendation:

“THAT the Design Review Committee recommends SUPPORT of the 17 residential units for 370/380 Mathers Avenue; SUBJECT TO further review by staff of the following items:

1. planting plan to be reviewed with respect to size and spacing;
2. viability of western lawns to be reviewed;
3. consider comments made by the committee regarding an architectural vocabulary consistent with the Elliott House;
4. develop the LEED and heating strategy;
5. storm water management plan should confirm that drainage still works if the permeable pavers are clogged;
6. consider simplifying the colour palette to reflect a more consistent relationship to mid century architecture.”

The applicant has responded to the recommendations made by the DRC as follows:

1. As the focus of the discussions has been on land use, the planting plan is a high level concept at this stage. Should the project advance to the bylaw and development permit stage, the planting plan will be refined and further detailed and presented to Council for consideration as part of the Development Permit review process.
2. A shade-tolerant lawn variety will be chosen for the development. The applicant notes that the western lawn areas should be okay as there is less shade (fewer trees and buildings) to the immediate west.
3. The style of the Elliott House is reflected in its replacement and throughout the remainder of the development; however, the varied architectural expression within the development provides choice, interest and responds to the neighbourhood context.
4. LEED Silver is the minimum target for the development. System details would be further developed through the development review process.
5. The storm water management plans account for enough capacity to handle the incremental increase in runoff, should the pavers not be properly maintained. The applicant notes that the pavers are a benefit to the storm water management on the site, but not essential to the function of the site drainage design.

6. The range of colours chosen for the development borrows from the colour scheme of the Elliott House and subtly varying colours throughout the project create a palette of muted Earth tones. All of the buildings coordinate and the applicant suggests that they are consistent with the mid-century modern architecture for BC.

See Appendix D for excerpts from the September 2014 DRC meeting.

Community Consultation Meeting

On November 25, 2014 the District hosted a second public meeting to obtain community feedback on the revised proposal, given that a significant amount of time has passed since the community last saw the plans. A notice of the meeting was mailed out to owners and residents within a defined notification area previously approved by Council on March 18, 2013 (attached as Appendix E). Notice of the meeting was also posted to the District website and on the Community Calendar.

The meeting was held in an Open House format, where people were invited to drop-in, review the revised plans and leave comments. The applicant was in attendance and displayed boards of the revised proposal. 27 people attended in addition to three staff members.

Meeting Analysis

One pre-written letter was received at the meeting and no comment sheets that were provided by staff were filled out. Council and staff did receive some email correspondence after the meeting. Discussions at the meeting focused around the changes between the previous proposal for 19 units and the current proposal for 17 units, view studies, landscaping changes, and overall site planning.

A few comments of support were made at the meeting. While support is limited, those that do support it acknowledged that the design brought with it development controls for landscaping, grading, and building form and character. It was felt that if the property were to be developed with six single family lots, the neighbourhood would lose any say in how the development is constructed. Recent home construction in the area was cited that saw the clearing of three lots, which was seen as a character change in the neighbourhood.
At the meeting, the District heard that the surrounding neighbourhood is opposed to the proposal and that they remain opposed to any development beyond that of single family residential. Concerns continue to be focused on the threat to existing neighbourhood character, privacy for adjacent homes and traffic.

See Appendix F for a summary of the meeting.

Project Evaluation

Local Area Context

The site is located within a neighbourhood that is generally defined as the area bounded by Stevens Drive to the north, Capilano View Cemetery and Hugo Ray Park to the east, the Upper Levels Highway (Highway No. 1) to the south and Hadden Creek to the West.

Within the neighbourhood, there are a variety of land uses and densities occurring. Immediately to the south of the site is Esker Lane, a 12-unit townhouse development. To the immediate west is Mathers Mews, a bare-land strata with eight single family dwellings and detached garages. There are two additional properties zoned PA2 (Places of Worship): the Baptist Church to the west and the Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses to the east. The remainder of the neighbourhood consists of single family dwellings within the RS3 zone.

Zoning Evaluation

The proposed FAR of 0.38 is slightly more than the density permitted within the surrounding RS3 zone of 0.35. It is below the density of Esker Lane, which is 0.43 FAR. Mathers Mews is approximately the same density as the surrounding RS3 zoned areas and is subject to a Development Area Agreement (DAA), which is a covenant.

Under the current zoning, the site could be subdivided into six single family lots that would have an average lot area of 14,300 square feet. With a maximum FAR of 0.35, six single family dwellings of approximately 5,000 square feet each could be built. Alternatively, six slightly smaller single family dwellings plus six coach houses could be constructed. In either situation, this would translate into approximately 30,000 square feet of building area under the existing zoning. There are no development controls with typical subdivision development; currently all trees could be cut down and the site cleared, and there are no design reviews for architecture, massing, or materials. Site access would be from Mathers Avenue (possibly two fronting lots) and the remaining lots would be accessed from Lawson Avenue.
The proposed 17-unit development comprises 36,360 square feet of building area, which is a modest increase in buildable floor area of 6,360 square feet over what is allowed under RS3. The thrust of the proposal is to create smaller housing units that would add a housing choice to the community. Development controls offered by the rezoning and development permit would see: retention of the mature trees at the entrance and rear of the site, integrated storm water management, access, added landscaping and screening, siting of the houses in response to neighbouring houses, and control of the form and character (architecture) of the houses.

The chart below compares a hypothetical six-lot subdivision with the current proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RS3</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Area*</td>
<td>85,670 sq ft</td>
<td>95,600 sq ft</td>
<td>+9,930 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>6 SFD (± 6 suites) = 6 to 12</td>
<td>17 (SFD + Duplex)**</td>
<td>+5 to 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>+0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average House Size***</td>
<td>5,000 sq ft (or 3,800 sq ft house + 1,200 sq ft coach house)</td>
<td>2,139 sq ft</td>
<td>-2,861 sq ft smaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Buildable Square Footage</td>
<td>30,000 sq ft</td>
<td>36,360 sq ft</td>
<td>+6,360 sq ft more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>Max 30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Site area would be reduced to accommodate Lawson Avenue road dedication/extension for a 6-lot subdivision.
**Suites would not be a permitted use as part of the development proposal.
***Excluding basements & exempted garage areas.

While the neighbourhood remains opposed, the proposal aligns with the existing single and multifamily housing development in the area. The proposal differs from traditional residential subdivision development as it distributes the density across more units, creating smaller housing sizes. In addition to creating smaller houses, the proposal also brings development controls to ensure that the project "fits" within the surrounding neighbourhood.

In summary, the density proposed is closely aligned with the density permitted in the surrounding neighbourhood, creates smaller units and offers a combination of smaller single family homes and duplexes while better preserving neighbourhood character than a conforming RS3 subdivision.

Housing Diversity

The Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing identified a strong community desire for greater housing diversity. The Dialogue revealed that West Vancouver has evolved from a community of traditional family households (parents and children) to many "empty nesters," seniors, smaller households (fewer or no children), and conversely, households embracing extended families and multi-generations.
The Dialogue identified fundamental planning challenges, including:

- How to provide for improved housing choices and affordability;
- How to achieve more affordable housing in close proximity to existing community services and amenities;
- How to meet the changing housing needs of residents by providing new housing opportunities within their own neighbourhoods, while maintaining the character of those neighbourhoods; and
- How to meet the challenges of “designing with nature” and encouraging both the rural, natural character of West Vancouver, and environmentally sustainable development within dramatically different areas of the community with different character attributes.

The 2008 Community Dialogue survey revealed that 84% of residents believe that a greater variety of housing types is needed in West Vancouver to meet the community’s social, economic and environmental sustainability objectives. When considering new housing types, there was considerable interest in exploring small-scale “infill” options. While the notion of a detached house is still highly valued in the community, residents wanted to see more variations to the traditional housing form, such as smaller units (1,000 to 1,500 square feet), more manageable gardens, opportunities for one-level living, and flexible designs to accommodate changing household needs.

The proposed development generally aligns with these objectives as it would fill a housing gap by providing smaller single and two-family units (1,945 to 2,460 square feet), as opposed to 5,000 square foot houses that would be created from traditional subdivision. The Unitarian Church Site presents a unique opportunity to “infill” underutilized land with a housing type that respects the surrounding neighbourhood while directly responding to a community need.

While the proposal calls for an increase in density (i.e. an additional 6,360 square feet in floor area), the proposed housing forms (single family homes and duplexes) would be compatible with the surrounding built form context.

**Neighbourhood Character**

The greatest threat to the established character of existing neighbourhoods is the construction of new large homes and associated construction practices, such as complete lot clearing of all trees and vegetation, altering the existing grade lines and constructing retaining walls, lengthy construction timelines, parking during construction, and alteration of public boulevards.

The proposed development would see development controls put in place to deal with many of these construction practices. The design concept responds to and respects the established neighbourhood character via the following measures:
• Retention of the grove of mature trees at the entrance (protected by covenant);
• Single curving driveway access to buffer the development from the street;
• Elliott House replacement of similar architecture, size and scale;
• Architecture, colour palette and finishing materials that express a "mid-century" modern architecture;
• Installation of trees and hedging along the east and west property lines;
• Retention of trees at the rear of the site (protected by covenant);
• Construction of smaller dwellings;
• Closing of Lawson Avenue to emergency vehicles and pedestrians only; and
• Generous rear yard setback to allow for storm water management, tree retention and additional landscaping.

These measures work together to maintain the street-front single family character while providing privacy to the adjacent neighbours. Development controls would be established through a Development Permit to implement the plan.

2.2 Consultation/Communications

As described in this report, the application has been presented at two Community Consultation Meetings, and has been considered twice by the Design Review Committee. Project updates have been posted to the District website.

If Council approves the staff recommendations, staff would bring forward amending bylaws, a draft development permit, a tree protection covenant and a Phased Development Agreement (PDA) bylaw as part of a Community Amenity Contribution analysis. A Phased Development Agreement is an emerging best practice to legally secure a Community Amenity Contribution. This tool would set out the framework between the District and the applicant in terms of receipt of any amenities, money or works to be delivered, paid or constructed as part of the development.

Council may choose to give readings to the proposed bylaws and set a date for a public hearing. The public hearing would be held in accordance with the Local Government Act. Additionally, the applicant would be required to publicize and host a Development Application Information Meeting prior to the public hearing.
2.3 Conclusion

Staff recommends that Council advance the application in the review process given that:

- The proposal has been revised by reducing the number of units in response to neighbourhood concerns over density and character and is closely aligned with existing residential zoning in the area;
- Encourages the preservation of existing neighbourhood character by creating smaller houses with development controls in place to address tree retention, buffering, architectural reviews, and landscaping;
- Aligns with OCP Policy H3 by addressing a housing need by providing a development that has minimal impact on an established area and provides for a buffered landscape from adjacent properties.

3.0 Options

(as recommended by staff)

A. The proposed development application advance in the review process and that staff prepare amending bylaws, a draft development permit, a draft tree protection covenant and a Phased Development Agreement bylaw as part of a Community Amenity Contribution, all for Council consideration.

(or, alternatively)

B. Same as Option A, but with further direction on modifications to the project (to be specified); or

C. Reject the application.

Author: Lisa Berg, Senior Community Planner

Concurrence: Chris Bishop, Manager of Development Planning

Appendices:

A – Context Map
B – Project Profile
C – Application Review Process & Timelines Flow Chart (as of January 29, 2015)
D – Design Review Committee Minutes, September 25, 2014 (excerpt)
E – Community Consultation Meeting Notification Map
F – Community Consultation Meeting Summary, November 25, 2014
APPENDIX A – CONTEXT MAP

Subject Development Site
APPENDIX B – PROJECT PROFILE

at January 29, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project: Residences on Mathers (Unitarian Church Site)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application: OCP/RZ/DP No. 12-053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant: Darwin Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect: Matrix Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 370 Mathers Avenue (Unitarian Church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Description:</strong> The East 1/4 of the North West 1/4 of District Lot 1074 Group 1 New Westminster District except part in Plan 10097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID:</strong> 015-957-187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 380 Mathers Avenue (Elliott House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Description:</strong> Lot 1 District Lot 1074 Plan 10097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID:</strong> 009-506-438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP Policy: HE3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning: RS3 &amp; PA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Before Council:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 23, 2013 (direction on Community Consultation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal: An Official Community Plan amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit to a Comprehensive Development (CD) zone for a 17-unit strata residential development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Area: 95,600 ft² (8,885 m²)
Zoning: RS3 & PA2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bylaw</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning</strong></td>
<td>RS3 &amp; PA2</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</strong></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Area</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>36,360 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Coverage</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (north, Mathers Ave)</td>
<td>9.1 m</td>
<td>7.3 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear (south)</td>
<td>9.1 m</td>
<td>10.2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>1.52 m</td>
<td>3.5 to 4.3 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1.52 m</td>
<td>6.2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Height</strong></td>
<td>7.62 m</td>
<td>7.62 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Storeys</strong></td>
<td>2 plus basement</td>
<td>2 plus basement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>2:1 plus visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUC/DAA Area</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP Area</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Elliott House (nominated but not registered)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW's</td>
<td>Yes (utilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenants</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Removal</td>
<td>Unknown. Any rock removal to comply with Soil Removal Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max Driveway Slope</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Traffic Mgmt Plan req'd at BP. Primary vehicle access from Mathers Avenue; Lawson Avenue emergency vehicle access only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanitary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storm</strong></td>
<td>Storm Water Mgmt Plan req'd at BP, must comply with development plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water line upgrades and connections as required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C – APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS & TIMELINES
FLOWCHART

RESIDENCES ON MATHERS - OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT,
REZONING & DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 13-053
PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION

Application Submitted (August 2012, revised February 2013)

Staff Review

Council directed that community consultation take place (March 18, 2013)

District holds Community Consultation Meeting

Meeting Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2013
Time: 6:30 pm Open House Displays
5:00 pm Presentation & Discussion
Location: Unitarian Church, 370 Mathers Avenue in the Fireside Room

DRC Review (May 30, 2013)

Council considers outcome of consultation process (Sept 23, 2013)

Applicant submits revised plans to the District

DRC Review (September 25, 2014)

District holds Community Consultation Meeting

OPEN HOUSE

Meeting Date: Tuesday, November 25, 2014
Time: 6:00 to 8:30 p.m.
Location: Hugo Ray Park Clubhouse
1950 3rd Street, West Vancouver

Council considers outcome of revised development proposal, community
consultation and recommended next steps (February 16, 2015)

We are here

Staff directed to prepare proposed amending bylaws and a draft Development Permit

OCP Amendment and Rezoning Bylaws introduced for 1st reading and
proposed draft Development Permit presented

Applicant Hosts a Development Application Information Meeting
(typically held 3 to 5 days prior to the public hearing)

Public Hearing

Council considers 2nd and 3rd readings of OCP Amendment and Rezoning Bylaws

Council considers adoption of OCP Amendment and Rezoning Bylaws and Development Permit approval
APPENDIX D – DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 25, 2014

370/380 MATHERS AVENUE (RESIDENCES ON MATHERS), RESUBMISSION OF 17 RESIDENTIAL UNITS
FILE: 1010-20-12-053

Background:
Lisa Berg referred to her report outlining the Committee’s recommendations from the last meeting May 30, 2013. The applicant is proposing significant changes including reduction in the number of units from 19 to 17 units.

Project Presentation:
Applicant Laurie Schmidt Senior Building Manager of Darwin Properties opened the presentation. Architect Paul Lebofsky addressed the changes from the last presentation including:

- Sustainability – undertaking to meet LEED silver standard.
- New site plan is less cluttered by reducing number of units and redistributing to provide more space.
- Overall density reduced to less than that of adjacent Esker Lane development, currently at .357 FAR.
- Visitor parking - 2 spaces in each driveway plus additional 5 cars distributed through site, for 1 visitor space per 3 units.
- Lawson Extension used primarily for turning trucks and is bollarded to stop through traffic.
- Enhancing and maintaining existing trees and hedges to provide landscape buffering.
- Landscape includes comprehensive storm water management plan.

Using power point presentation the architect went over a photo montage of the neighbourhood context and addressed potential impacts the development may have on neighbours. He went over the changes to design: Site divided into three character areas: 1) Elliott house - replicating architectural language and proportions in replacement building; 2) area that responds to the language and proportions of mid century modern Elliott house; and 3) more conventional west coast traditional form and character to reflect the surrounding single family and Esker Lane development. Lightened the colour scheme and materials include: stucco, stained wood, punched concrete, locally sourced granite stone, shingles, and translucent glazed garage doors.

Landscape Architect Daryl Tyackel went over concept: Mather’s entry retaining a large number of trees and under planted with native ground cover. Substantial hedging along east side retained, west side existing shrubs pruned and retained where possible. Storm water management will be a dramatic and beautiful addition to the site planning, draining into a series of rain gardens that flank the central driveway to storm water retention area. Aiming at LEED silver with high efficiency irrigation and drought tolerant plant material, including native plant materials. Stepping between units provides for hedging on both sides of retaining wall for solid screen between the units. Proposing communal observation deck that hangs over storm water retention area.
Committee Questions:
The Committee went on to question the presenters, with the applicants' response in italics, including the following:

- Visitor parking - did you consider fire access and have parking on one side of the street? *Rejected in favour of more green space and larger driveways for additional cars.*
- Elliott house have you looked at ways to restore/rehabilitate it? *Talked at length about applying strategies but house is very poorly built with not a lot worth saving other than spirit of house itself.*
- What is primary heating for the new houses? *Still under discussion, like to see some form hydronic heating on ground floor.*
- Are you going to build to engineering road standards? *Will be building to proper engineering standards as a private driveway.*
- Quite a long private driveway, delivery trucks driving up private driveways can put a lot of stress and strain and will disturb multiple houses. *Point noted.*
- When analyzing your street context you chose a traditional vocabulary other than the Elliott house vocabulary, pictures show house on Lawson mid century style with sloping roof did you consider using that vocabulary to give variety want versus traditional approach as more as more sympathetic attitude? *There is a large variety of architectural styles to pull from in area, chose two fundamental styles to work with.*
- How wide is internal road? *6 metres.* Where are the permeable pavers? *Main road asphalt but all driveways permeable pavers.* Who will maintain private driveway? *Believe maintained by owners.* Rain garden calculations taken into account permeable pavers, if not maintained will be adding equivalent of another access road to rain gardens also driveways must be graded so drain into themselves as permeable pavers.
- Keith Fenton's comment was raised concerning cul-de-sac versus dead end and trucks backing up.
- Storm water platform how often will basin be full of water? *Could be some ground water but know more when get geotechnical report.*
- Noisy location, any consideration for acoustic performance in buildings? *Yes, will have to retain an acoustical consultant at least for the duplexes.*
- Rear yard properties on western side and proximity of retaining wall to house almost entirely underground any further consideration given to those spaces? *More room due to shifting of building, gone from approximately 14 feet in the smallest case to 20 feet.*
- How many existing trees on site? *Not sure but 102 trees going back in.* Any thought how rear lawn areas to be maintained? *Will have stepping stone pathways between buildings going down to lawn areas.*
APPENDIX D – DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 25, 2014

Committee Comments:
Members’ comments on the application included:

- Reduction in density from 19 to 17 is a significant improvement and alleviates feeling of density when entering street. Architecture overall feel it will be a pleasant community and fits this type of project. Only issue is the Elliott house, feel lost opportunity as would like to see kept in some way, if all agree it has to go then it becomes less of an issue.

- Like to see more development for LEED silver approach as seems that you don’t know what doing for heating source and could change architectural footprint depending on which approach you take. If go with heat pump could have noise affects to neighbours and be shown on landscape plans with sensitivity to location.

- Keith Fenton’s item was referred to: He asked that the width of the internal road be wider on one side to ensure vehicle deliveries, fire trucks etc. can turn and not go into approaching line in other direction, make wider on one side and taper down into two parking spots. Look at turning radius off Mathers into the private road.

- Elliott house prefer to see restoration or rehab of existing but not totally opposed to response that has been made to that. This particular house takes a significant position on the streetscape of the development and is the face of development and all else behind, the vocabulary that would have been appropriate is to continue the idea of the Elliott house as a composition of the whole neighbourhood. Opportunity explored to explore the whole as a fresh new reinterpretation of mid century modern that could have unified this whole composition.

- Permeable pavers are great when they work but not if they clog up, doubt owners will maintain and will add all that extra water to the rain gardens. The pavers should be treated as an impermeable surface and grade it that way.

- Think good presentation all issues address and project improved. Would have been so great to see Elliott house theme done as comprehensive theme for the development would have been an even better asset to development.

- Clear presentation, like the modernist look over the traditional look, but mix is fine. Internal side of duplex could be more elegant. Increased setback good but think lawn space seems too small inclined to just plant there. Can’t comment on planting plan as sizes and quantities seem to be missing, need to review some of the sizes and spacing. Storm area building wall on property line against existing wall not clear how handle the footings and impact to trees, needs to be reviewed, also the grading on the retention pond and tree roots. Plant sizes listed seemed small.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Design Review Committee recommends SUPPORT of the 17 Residential Units for 370/380 Mathers Avenue; SUBJECT TO further review by Staff of the following items:
1. planting plan to be reviewed with respect to size and spacing;
2. viability of western lawns to be reviewed;
3. consider comments made by the committee regarding an architectural vocabulary consistent with the Elliott house;
4. develop the LEED and heating strategy;
5. storm water management plan should confirm that drainage still works if permeable pavers are clogged;
6. consider simplifying the colour palette to reflect a more consistent relationship to mid century architecture.

CARRIED
APPENDIX E – COMMUNITY CONSULTATION MEETING
NOTIFICATION AREA MAP

Proposed Notification Area

Subject Site

370/380 Mathers Avenue

Direct Notification for Community Consultation Meeting on the Residences on Mathers Redevelopment Proposal

FILE: 12-053
APPENDIX F – COMMUNITY CONSULTATION MEETING SUMMARY
NOVEMBER 25, 2014

The Meeting

The meeting was hosted by the District and attended by 27 people and three staff members. The format of the meeting was an Open House, where presentation boards by the applicant and staff were on display for the public to review. People were invited to fill out comment sheets provided by the District. The meeting was held in the Hugo Ray Clubhouse at Hugo Ray Park from 6:00 to 8:30 p.m.

Meeting Notification

Invitations were mailed to property owners and applicants within a defined area previously approved by Council (167 properties), and the meeting was publicly advertised on the District website and community calendar. A link to the District website was provided on the notice that was mailed out, which contains information on the application including materials from the previous Community Consultation Meeting held on April 24, 2013.

Feedback

Although no completed comment sheets were collected, one pre-written letter was received at the open house. Staff and Council received email correspondence after the meeting, expressing both opposition and support for the proposal. Many people expressed (at the meeting or via email) that their views on the project had not changed and that the majority of the neighbourhood is opposed to the project.

Conclusion

The Open House was held to give people an opportunity to review the revised plans, as the project density has been reduced since the last public meeting in April 2103. People reviewed the current plans with staff and the applicants, who were in attendance to answer questions. The Open House revealed that there is neighbourhood opposition to the project to anything beyond single family residential development, however some support was also heard.
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THE RESIDENCES ON MATHERS
REZONING & DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR
370 & 380 MATHERS AVENUE, WEST VANCOUVER

APPENDIX G

RESUBMITTED JANUARY, 2015
PRELIMINARY OCP AMENDMENT and REZONING APPLICATION: NORTH SHORE UNITARIAN CHURCH (NSUC) - REZONING RATIONALE

1. BACKGROUND

The NSUC Community

The North Shore Unitarian Church (NSUC) is a religious community of over 350 people based in West Vancouver that has served the North Shore for 45 years. It moved to its present location at 370 Mathers Avenue in 1984, when it purchased the church property from the Alliance Church, which had built the main church building in 1970. In 2002, NSUC constructed a $650,000 education building at the back of the property.

Problems with the Building:

With NSUC’s capital funds going toward the new education building, NSUC has never been able to modernize, upgrade or make necessary improvements to the 42-year-old main building — the original heating, plumbing and electrical systems are still in place, the sanctuary is too small for the enlarged congregation, the kitchen and washrooms are woefully inadequate, and the structure has not been seismicily upgraded. Of greatest concern, the building has never been made adequately accessible to the disabled, and lacks such essentials as an elevator to connect floors, and washrooms that are wheelchair accessible.

NSUC’s financial problems with keeping the old building functioning became painfully clear in 2006 with discovery of the need to make approximately $200,000 of repairs to the roof. Fully aware the roof problem might be just the tip of the iceberg, NSUC undertook a review of possible alternative strategies for coping with its financial quandary. Four alternatives were explored:

1. Stay in place and have a capital campaign to upgrade and modernize the building, make it accessible, etc.
2. Subdivide and sell the property for single family housing
3. Sell the property to a developer subject to rezoning for multifamily housing
4. Sell the property to another religious organization that could use it for building a much bigger church or other religious structure, taking advantage of our existing PA zoning that will permit a much larger structure

Of these alternatives, NSUC concluded alternative 1 was not feasible, and alternative 2 would not raise enough money to allow NSUC to buy and build elsewhere. It decided to explore alternative 3, selling to a developer for multifamily housing at a price high enough to buy and build a new church elsewhere on the North Shore. This was felt to be preferable to seeking out a religious buyer in need of a large new building.

Desire for More Accessible Location:

In addition to the major inadequacies and problems with the building itself, the site at 370 Mathers Avenue has major drawbacks as the location for NSUC:

- The location is not reachable by public transit. This is a major drawback for the NSUC congregation, with its strong environmental ethic and its commitment to being open and welcoming to people from any economic background and income level.
- The location, deep within a residential area, hides the church and makes it difficult for the greater community to know about and take advantage of the church’s services and activities.

Development Agreement with Darwin:

With NSUC’s decision in 2007 to follow the strategy of selling the property to a developer subject to rezoning for multifamily housing, the church contracted with Hynes Developments, a local developer, and Hynes submitted a rezoning application to the District. Due to financial and other difficulties encountered by Hynes in pursuing its application, the contract with Hynes was terminated in early 2011. Thereafter NSUC entered into a wholly new development agreement with Darwin Properties, with Darwin undertaking to design an entirely new development plan, and submitting an entirely new rezoning application. After reviews by District staff, the Design Review Committee and discussion with the neighbourhood, changes were made and comprised the current submission.

2. PROPOSAL CONCEPT

Darwin’s proposal, known as the “The Residences on Mathers”, has gone through a number of iterations and now calls for 17 homes, including 9 detached houses and 8 duplexes. This is a reduction of two units from the original rezoning application in 2013. The proposed form and density are not unprecedented in the area. The proposed density is slightly less than the density of the Esler Lane development adjacent to the south.

The proposal is intended to broaden housing choices in West Vancouver by supplying smaller homes which would appeal to empty-nesters, small families and retirees. Currently, there is a shortage of such housing in the District, and the subject site is well-suited to accommodating a number of well-designed, compact homes.

The impacts of the proposed development on the adjacent community have been minimized by:

- retaining and enhancing vegetation around the perimeter of the property, providing visual screening;
- removing 2 formerly proposed single family units from the north-east quadrant of the site, adjacent to existing single family development;
- reorienting the single family homes along the eastern property line resulting in a better transition to the single family homes to the east meeting the OCP Housing Objective to “provide sensitive transitions in form and density between existing and new development”;
- the variety of architectural form and character has been revised to respond to surrounding development and the iconic Elliott House;
- increasing rear yard and side yard setbacks to minimize outlook and obtrusiveness and increase on-site green space;
- limiting the heights of the homes to two storeys — often lower than neighbouring structures;
- ample on-site resident and visitor parking; and
- eliminating the one-way circulation system, thus obviating the need for an egress on to Lawson Avenue. This will eliminate through traffic on Lawson previously generated by the site.
3. DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN

The District of West Vancouver Official Community Plan (OCP) goals and objectives are generally supportive of multi-family development in order to accommodate a variety of lifestyles and housing needs. The Housing Objectives section states: "Choice: Encourage a variety of housing types, forms, tenures, sizes and densities that meet diverse needs." (OCP, Housing, pg. 49).

The OCP acknowledges the growing need for smaller homes to accommodate the changing lifestyle of residents, including downsizers:

"Demand for Smaller Homes and Multi-Family Housing. Changing lifestyles (activities outside the home, travel, dual working couples, older singles) and an aging population are creating increased demand for smaller homes that are more affordable, more energy-efficient and that require less maintenance than detached single-family houses on large lots. Young adults also seek a range of non-single family options, including apartments and suites" (OCP, Housing, pg. 45).

The OCP also outlines the need to accommodate smaller homes in order to address housing turnover:

"Housing for Young Families. Meeting the housing needs of younger families has become increasingly difficult to achieve, given the high cost of land in West Vancouver. The limited availability of smaller lots and suites also impacts housing affordability. In addition, the degree to which older residents can move to other homes affects the turnover of homes to younger families" (OCP, Housing, pg. 43).

The OCP also discusses the importance of housing diversity in association with built form and neighbourhood character. Built Form Objectives section specifies this need:

"Support the development of a more complete community that addresses the needs of all residents and maintains and improves the quality of life - a community where residents can live, work, and play." (OCP, Built Form, pg 56).

The 2007 Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing echoes this policy direction. It recognizes the need for new housing types to accommodate a larger variety of lifestyles (OCP, Housing, 48).

In addition to supporting housing diversity and smaller footprints, the OCP also includes specific precedent-setting policies in the vicinity of the subject site. The site is located directly adjacent to the Esker Lane multi-family development which is allowed for under a Development Permit Area BF-B 8. The proposed development would provide similar discrete density, while providing alternate housing options for residents.

4. DESIGN, CHARACTER AND FEATURES

Site Plan

The surrounding neighbourhood context has been respected by:

- Retaining and enhancing peripheral landscaping and fencing to screen neighbouring properties;
- Increasing side and rear yards to improve livability and increase landscape screening;
- Limiting the height of the proposed houses to less than that allowable in the adjacent single family zone. Low profile roofs further mitigate any visual impact of height and mass;
- Fronting the new detached house at the northwest corner, on the site of the current Elliott House, directly on to Mathers to fit into the neighbourhood;
- Providing visitor parking tucked into landscape and paved with permeable pavers. Similarly, permeable paved driveways are sized to accommodate vehicles in addition to those in double garages to help ensure that visitors do not need to park on neighbourhood streets; and
- Preserving the significant canopy of trees at the north end of the site by incorporating an "S" curve at the entrance. This not only helps preserve specimen trees, but ensures that there is limited visibility into the site from the surrounding neighbourhood.

Architectural Treatment

The Elliott House (see Appendix A)

The Elliott House is an iconic presence on the site. While it has significant architectural merit, a number of intrinsic flaws in its design and construction have seriously compromised its current condition, and its potential for retention in the project.

These design flaws include: no overhung eaves; deep eaves; single glazing and jalousie windows, and a style of site-built glazing (small clerestory lights set into routed grooves) that could not be replaced with modern sealed units. The original house has been significantly modified over the years. Its windows have been closed in, because there was too much north-facing single glazing, overwhelming its antiquated heating system. As well, a carport, visible from Mathers Avenue and not part of the original design, has been added.

While using the palette of materials and colours used elsewhere in the development, the proposed detached house on the site of the existing Elliott House refers directly to the original architecture of the Elliott House (see accompanying comparison). Flat roofs and wide eaves contribute to its character: that of a mid-century modern house, a style contemporary with the original Elliott House.

Form and Character

In order to respond to the iconic historical influence of the Elliott House, to create a more sensitive transition to neighbourhood context, and to provide architectural variety in the development, 3 distinct yet related architectural character areas have been created on the site.
In general, varying roof forms enhance a mix of architectural styles throughout the site, providing variety while ensuring neighbourhood fit. Glazed garage doors throughout the development provide a sense of light and scale without the utilitarian feel of typical garage doors. Maximum glazing in the main living areas provides the strong connection between indoor and outdoor space that is the hallmark of West Coast contemporary architecture. Wall surfaces, other than concrete, stained wood or stone are painted with a colour selected from a carefully chosen palette of earth tones so that no neighbouring buildings are the same colour.

**Landscape Features**

Of primary importance is the retention of significant existing trees to both acknowledge their importance in creating a sense of place and to provide a privacy screen from Marine Drive and from adjacent properties.

The Marine Drive frontage and vehicle entry point will maintain the neighbourhood character and emulate the existing single family character.

The establishment of a strong internal streetscape is created through the planting of street trees. Tree species will be varied to highlight nodes along the roadway.

A specific landscape node, incorporating a rain garden with an integrated marsh at the south end of the property, will serve as both a focal point and provide spatial screening to Esker Lane to the south. The rain garden will collect storm water and allow it to percolate and be “scrubbed” before entering the municipal storm system.

The pedestrian connection from the site to Lawson Avenue will be given special consideration as a street end and community linkage.

**Aging in Place Features**

Because part of the target market for the proposed housing includes retirees and empty nesters, more than one quarter of the units have a master bedroom on the main floor.

All units provide the sense of privacy, space, and interior appointments of a single family home without the need to maintain a single family lot.

**Design Changes**

In response to District and community feedback the following changes were made to the conceptual design:
A. Reduce the size and/or number of units and modify units to reduce density
Response:
- The number of units has been reduced from 19 to 17 (9 single family and 8 duplex)
- The floor plans of the single family units have been refined and reduced slightly in area
- Overall density has been reduced to 0.357 FSR

B. To provide for adequate visitor parking
Response:
- We are proposing six (6) visitor parking spaces distributed amongst the site
- Exceeds the required number of visitor spaces
- Driveways have been expanded and are large enough for additional visitors to park

C. Provide more contextual information
Response:
- Additional context photos have been submitted as part of the formal resubmission package

D. To increase useable open space, provide outdoor space for the units and provide landscape buffers between the neighbours
Response:
- By reducing the unit count from 19 to 17, we were able to reconfigure and reorient the units to substantially increase the useable open space
- The reduction and reconfiguration also allowed for a generous increase in setbacks to the neighbouring properties
- The increase in these setbacks allowed for additional and larger landscape buffers

E. To ensure ease of vehicle turnaround within driveways
Response:
- The reduction in unit count and reconfiguration allows for increased yards and driveways, allowing for easier on site maneuvering

F. To introduce more variety, materiality and roof forms and consideration to the Elliott House
Response:
- In consideration of the Elliott House, form for the single family dwellings has been varied while ensuring harmony with neighbouring development.
- Materials and colours have been further refined to lighten the previous colour palette as well as provide a variation of colour and natural material choices while still maintaining the context of the neighbourhood

G. To provide details about the proposed sustainability measures and landscape
Response:
- The developer will undertake to ensure a minimum standard which is equivalent to LEED for Homes silver.

Design Review Committee Comments and Response
On September 25, 2014 the project was re-submitted for review by the Design Review Committee. The committee’s comments and Darwin’s responses are as follows:

A. Planting plan to be reviewed with respect to size and spacing
Response:
- Sizes and spacing are appropriate for this level of submission but will be further reviewed and revised as needed.

B. Viability of western lawns to be reviewed
Response:
- The western lawn areas should be fine given there are a few trees or buildings immediately west to shade. The related trees along this property line will cast shadows. We will specify a shade lawn seed. The shading is no worse than many suburban conditions.

C. Consider comments made by the committee regarding an architectural vocabulary consistent with the Elliott House
Response:
- While the iconic status of the Elliott House is acknowledged, varying architectural expression within the development is felt to be an important means of providing a variety that adds choice, interest, and responds to its incrementally-developed neighbourhood context. As a response to DRC’s comments, the style of the building that fronts onto the extension of Lawson Avenue into the development has been changed to a more modernist aesthetic so that the rhythm of expression on the east side of the internal road, being more complex, is richer, and so that the north side of Lawson between the new development and 3rd Street is boldered by like expressions.

D. Develop the LEED and heating strategy
Response:
- The owner is committed to meeting a minimum LEED Silver rating for the project. Although early in the process, the owner is also committed to providing a heating system that is not only highly efficient but sustainable as well. As we proceed through the rezoning/development permit and into the building permit stage further detail on these systems will be provided and agreed upon with the District of West Vancouver.

E. Storm water management plan should confirm that drainage still works if the permeable pavers are clogged
Response:
- The drainage facilities proposed for the site are designed with enough capacity to handle the incremental increase in runoff, should the pavers not be maintained and clog up over time. The pavers are a benefit to the management of stormwater within the site, but not essential to the function of the site drainage design.

F. Consider simplifying the colour palette to reflect a more consistent relationship to mid-century architecture.
Response:
- The range of colours used historically in the architectural style that has come to be known as "mid-century modern" is very broad, ranging from the hot colours and pastels of Palm Springs California, the "hometown" for the mid-century modern style, to the earth tones and colours of indigenous materials in our region. The proposed colour scheme begins by borrowing from the colours of the iconic Elliott House, and subtly varying colours building to building along the internal road in a way that results in a harmonious palette of muted earth tones. All of the buildings are tied together by this scheme and a limited palette of materials. The result is, we feel, very much consistent with the mid-century modern architecture of British Columbia.
5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

In addition to a number of meetings with individual neighbours, and the strata council of Esler Lane and Mathers Mews, two neighbourhood events have been held to date.

Event Details:

Workshop:

Date: Wednesday, May 30, 2012
Time: 5:30 PM – 7:30 PM
Location: North Shore Unitarian Church (370 Mathers Avenue, West Vancouver)
Notification: Flyers were distributed by hand to residents living in the area
Attendees: 15

Community Meeting:

Date: Thursday, July 12, 2012
Time: 5:30 PM – 7:30 PM
Location: North Shore Unitarian Church (370 Mathers Avenue, West Vancouver)
Notification: Flyers were distributed by hand to residents living in the area
Attendees: 10

Feedback

Attendees of the two events raised the following issues:

- too dense for the character of the neighbourhood and the size of the site; and,
- potential for increased traffic.

The following community amenity ideas were also raised by the attendees:

- small trails to improve access to existing trails;
- sidewalk on Mathers Avenue; and,
- traffic circle at Mathers Avenue and Hadden Drive.

Neighbourhood Meeting:

Date: Monday, August 18, 2014
Time: 4:00 PM – 5:00 PM
Location: 520 Mathers Avenue, West Vancouver
Notification: Coordinated through established neighbourhood contacts
Attendees: 8

Feedback

Attendees of the event raised the following issues:

- too dense for the character of the neighbourhood and the size of the site; and,
- concern over the Lawson extension and safety issues for pedestrians and children.

Comments

Attendees of the event had the following comments:

- a majority of the attendees liked the proposed reconfiguration of the eastary single family homes
- a majority of the attendees appreciated the increased setbacks along the western property line

Note: Attendees of the event were offered the opportunity to have a view analysis conducted from their residence.

Neighbourhood Meeting:

Date: Tuesday, November 25, 2014
Time: 6:30 PM – 8:30 PM
Location: Hugo Ray Cricket Club
Notification: Open House organized and hosted by the District Planning Department

Darwin had offered neighbours the opportunity to have a view analysis conducted from their residence. Views from viewpoints selected by neighbours who had responded to Darwin's were presented along with material describing the updated proposal.
6. VIEW ANALYSIS

The View Analysis presented on the following pages is an accurate rendition subject to the quality of the information available.

In each of the images:

1. Existing structures have been left in place.
2. Existing landscape that will be retained or replaced has been left in place. New landscape that will augment this has not been shown.
3. The existing church, which will be removed, has been left in place.
360 MATHERS FROM UPPER REAR DECK LOOKING NORTH

1455 3RD STREET FROM UPPER FLOOR HOME OFFICE

Note: The Site Model is shown as a Wire Frame since the buildings will be hidden in their entirety by existing construction and/or landscape

MATHERS MEWS FROM BEDROOM DECK OFF NORTHEASTERLY-MOST UNIT
REFERENCING THE ELLIOT HOUSE

The top drawing to the right shows the principal elevation of the Elliot House, facing Mathers Avenue, as it was originally conceived by Wensley and Rand Architects in 1960. The drawing below shows the same view of the proposed design.

The proposed design refers to the original building in many ways, beginning with its fundamental massing. Exposed concrete used at the base in the lower east quadrant, to anchor the mass in the way the original design used concrete block. The pattern of fenestration, particularly at the lower level, is similar. The overall proportions of glass panels is similar. Glazing goes all the way to ceiling with a similar proportion of transom to full height in each panel. In the proposed design, at the upper level, the amount of glazing is reduced and sill heights raised in recognition of the need for privacy to upper floor bedrooms, noting that the original building bedroom windows on this street-facing elevation were ultimately permanently boarded up with plywood cladding. Floor to ceiling glass in the main living spaces on the west end in both the original and proposed design, produce the ambiguous boundary between indoors and out, a hallmark of west coast modernism.

The original building has no overhangs. In the proposed design, in recognition of current accepted building envelope design principles and construction practice overhangs have been added. While this is different from the original design, at the same time these overhangs help to emphasize “horizontality”, an important aspect of the character of the original.

The original design had no covered parking, though a carport was eventually added. The proposed building has a garage, a concrete mass with a glazed panel door, in recognition of current market expectation and to add to the general strategy of producing enough on-site parking to ensure that neither residents or visitors need to park on neighbourhood streets.

Departing somewhat from the original massing, a mass has been added to the east end of the lower level. This mass houses a main floor master bedroom provided for the aging-in-place empty-nester target market. Essentially hidden from view from Mathers by existing trees, this mass also provides the opportunity of a covered roof deck that will enjoy significant city views to the south.