

WORKING GROUP REPORT

Proposed Edgemont Seniors Living Project – Summary of Findings

Executive Summary

The original Working Group (WG) Report of August 2012 reflected the Preliminary Application submission by the Applicant for the proposed Edgemont Seniors Living Project. The Detailed Application has now been submitted and this report up-dates the information in the earlier report.

There were and remain three main categories of concern:

- 1) The ‘process concern’ is evolving. Although the Edgemont Village refresh has now begun, there is a pressing need to understand the proposal in the overall context of the Village and, in particular, the north-west quadrant.
- 2) The ‘operator concern’ is still there and while some information has been provided there remains no concrete arrangement in place.
- 3) Some of the ‘building- level’ concerns have been addressed with some success (e.g. the public plaza arrangement at Highlands/Woodbine being a more successful developer response). The Developer has prepared a model of the development which puts the size issue into perspective by showing the project in the context of the surrounding buildings and homes.

Background

When a proposal came forward to build a Senior's Living Complex in the Canfield residential area adjacent to Edgemont Village the EUCCA recognized that this would have significant implications for Edgemont Village and the adjacent residential areas. The District Official Community Plan (OCP) had recently been completed and an update or “re-fresh” of the Edgemont Village Development Permit Area was contemplated.

As the District was unable to commit to the timing of the “refresh” due to staffing constraints, in order to address this application in the absence of a refreshed plan, the District sought to create a framework under which there would be a greater level of community engagement in the review process than is typical for this type of proposal.

Accordingly, at the suggestion of the District, the Edgemont & Upper Capilano Community Association (EUCCA) canvassed the community for 12-14 volunteers to join a Working Group to participate in the planning process with the Developer, District Planning Staff and other stakeholders.

The group was tasked to engage in meaningful consultation with the Developer and Staff and to provide input and feedback from a community perspective. The Group would report back to the Community Association, Upper Capilano Local Area Plan (LAP) Monitoring Committee and key stakeholders such as the Edgemont Business Association.

A Working Group Report on the Preliminary Application was submitted in August 2012. A Detailed Application has now been submitted and this report is an update on this.

Summary of Activities Since the August 2012 Report

Feb 05, 2013	Working Group Meeting with DNV Planning Staff Refresher on planning process and review of DNV Response Letter to Preliminary Application package
Feb 21, 2013	Working Group Meeting with Proponent and Architect Presentation of ESL Feb 8, Detailed Application package
Feb 28, 2013	Working Group Meeting Discussion of the ESL Detailed Application
Mar 13, 2013	Public Information Meeting First presentation to the public of the Detailed Application
Mar 14, 2013	Advisory Design Panel (ADP) Meeting Presentation of the ESL Detailed Application. Separate report to be issued by the ADP.

Summary of Findings

The WG Report on the Preliminary Application established that the issues surrounding the proposal fell into the following 3 categories:

- A) Process, planning and social policy issues over which the Developer has no control as these fall under the purview of the District.
- B) The credentials and financial viability of the Developer as these are unknown at present
- C) The perceived impact that this specific proposal would have on the liveability and character of the Village

Following is an updated summary of the findings of the Working Group in each category:

A) Process/Planning/Social Policy Issues

The Edgemont Village Local Area Plan (EVLAP) Refresh began in February 2013. Three Public Ideas Forums were held (Feb 16, 19 and 25) and were well attended. An Edgemont Village Planning Working Group is being established. Web based information links for the EVLAP Refresh have been established on the DNV Website.

The August 2012 WG Report included recommendations regarding issues which should be addressed in the “refresh” process. These have been acknowledged by the Planning Department and are now included in the scope of work for the “refresh”.

With the EVLAP Refresh now underway, it is suggested that early priority be given to the Ayr/Woodbine/Highlands/Ridgewood triangle and the adjacent Super Valu site to allow this development application to be considered in that context.

B) Developer Credentials/Financial Viability

The August 2012 Report noted the importance of an agreement with an experienced and reputable operator to safeguard the community from the consequences of disruption or failure of the project.

The Developer has advised that negotiations are currently underway with an experienced operating entity on an agreement which would see that entity assume responsibility for operation and administration of the facility.

As of March, 2013, an operating entity has not been disclosed, however, the Developer has advised that several negotiations are underway and progressing well for either joint venture partnerships or operator agreements. The Developer has indicated that there is no plan to sell and ESL will remain involved and uphold its commitment to the community.

The Working Group nevertheless re-iterates its position stated in the August 2012 Report that the long term ownership and operation of the facility should be confirmed prior to Council’s consideration of the project.

C) Physical Impact/Liveability Issues with the ESL Proposal

On January 24, 2013, DNV Planning provided a response to the ESL Preliminary Application outlining policy/planning requirements, Planning staff and initial community comments from the August 2012 Working Group Report.

In February, 2013, the Developer proceeded to the Detailed Application stage with some changes to project arrangement and greater architectural details incorporated into the proposal including:

- Confirming a three storey configuration with 129 units.
- Including Sloping and Gable architectural features to the roof lines
- Confirming provision of additional underground parking
- Incorporating a public plaza at the corner of Woodbine and Highlands and an adjacent semi-private dining terrace.
- Outlining the landscaping approach and detailed planting plans
- Detailing the proposals for streetscapes on Woodbine and Highlands and mitigation approaches to adjacent properties along Ridgewood/Woodbine/Ayr/Highlands.

The August 2012 Report identified specific issues and concerns with the ESL proposal as listed on the following table.

Based on increasing awareness from the Public Information Meeting and feedback from the community, the table has been updated to include the Developer's responses in the Detailed Application and the Working Group's assessment of each.

Community Concern or Issue	ESL Response	WG Perspective August 2012	Detailed Application Proposal Feb 2013	WG Perspective on the Detailed Application.
Number of Units in the Proposal	Number of Units revised from 140 to 125, based on height reduction to 3 storeys and 6-lot configuration.	<p>There is significant community sentiment that the proposed building form is too "big" and intrusive.</p> <p>Senior's accommodation has general support but not at this scale.</p>	<p>Number of units increased to 129.</p> <p>Financial viability of the project is based on this number.</p>	<p>Proposed building would be the most dominant feature in Edgemont, pending imminent plans for redevelopment of the Super Valu site which is understood to be larger.</p> <p>Fewer units would be preferable although this needs to be considered carefully because it may well impact the "affordability" of the project rents.</p> <p>Senior's accommodation has general support .</p> <p>Size continues to remain an issue for some people.</p>
Height of the Building	<p>On June 13, it was announced that the building height will be reduced from 4 floors to 3.</p> <p>1 st story: 12 feet 2 nd & 3 rd stories: 9 feet.</p>	The community may be more receptive to a maximum height of 3 storeys, subject to acceptable building configuration and overall size.	3 Stories limit for accommodation. Variable roof lines of gables and shallow slope uplifts to enhance architectural features – increases height about 6' at the north and south peripheries.	Variable roof lines (gable & shallow upslopes) enhance the architecture and present a more varied elevation view from the adjacent streets. Results in an increased building height in some areas.

Community Concern or Issue	ESL Response	WG Perspective August 2012	Detailed Application Proposal Feb 2013	WG Perspective on the Detailed Application.
Stepping between floors	First floor 10 ft. from lot line Second floor set back 10 -15 ft. from first floor	Stepping back of upper floors should be maximized to enhance human scale proportions.	Step back between floors 1 and 2/3 has been reduced to along Woodbine in the amenities area only.	A continuous step back along Woodbine and also Highlands would contribute to a more human scale.
Overall site coverage	FSR 1.55 Site Coverage 52%	The FSR should be in the range of 0.80 to 1.20. Site coverage should remain in the 50% range. This will help address the concern over the "bigness" of the current proposal.	FSR now 1.50. Site coverage 50% (excluding balconies & porte cochere).	Slight decrease in FSR. Slight decrease in site coverage. Redevelopments in the Village are generally around 1.75 FSR with lot coverage generally greater than 50%. The topographic/building model provides clarity to the context of the development and this appears to have lessened the concern in the community for the building size and massing.

Community Concern or Issue	ESL Response	WG Perspective August 2012	Detailed Application Proposal Feb 2013	WG Perspective on the Detailed Application.
Massing and Building Orientation should be away from the Highland & Woodbine corner to reduce visual impact	Woodbine frontage has been set back and stepped between first & second floor. Now wholly enclosed configuration to suit 6 lot development	<p>Building façades need careful articulation to provide visual relief and enhance a residential appearance.</p> <p>The enclosed interior courtyard presents an “institutional feel” to the building. The sentiment is that the building configuration should enable outdoor garden and leisure area(s) on the exterior of the building for connectivity to the community and to provide more sun exposure.</p>	<p>Articulation to building facades with patios, balconies, etc. have been incorporated to enhance a residential appearance.</p> <p>Central courtyard retained as a feature for residents & to enable natural light and ventilation to all interior units.</p>	<p>The frontages on Woodbine and Highland are quite long at 200’ but an attempt has been made to break up the appearance with gables, balconies, articulation, etc.</p> <p>Retention of the central courtyard continues to result in the impression of a large dominant building mass. However, this has been mitigated somewhat by opening up a wide atrium from the entry foyer to the interior courtyard.</p>
Mitigation of impact on views and sightlines	Site topography (elevation difference) mitigates additional view impacts	Existing public views should be respected and mitigated to the greatest extent.	Mitigation opportunities presented.	The roof elevation at the corner of Woodbine and Highland is approximately the same as the apartment building to the south so there should be no significant impact on the view from the main intersection at Edgemont and Highland.

Community Concern or Issue	ESL Response	WG Perspective August 2012	Detailed Application Proposal Feb 2013	WG Perspective on the Detailed Application.
Transition to the adjacent properties on Ridgewood as well as those across Highland and Woodbine	Topography mitigates impact for homes along Ridgewood	DNV Planning should review the context implications for the proposed development on adjacent properties and opportunities for enhancement of the Village ambience.	Details of proposals for streetscapes on Woodbine, Ayr, Ridgewood, Highlands provided. Details of mitigation approaches to adjacent properties outlined.	Streetscape improvements along Woodbine and Ayr noted and should enhance the ambience of the street. Topographic opportunities have been utilized to reduce impact on homes on Ridgewood. The mere presence of the building will still likely be a concern for some home owners in the vicinity as well as the height of the building when viewed from across neighbouring streets.
Provision of public space at the corner of Woodbine and Highlands	Not provided in this proposal	Enhanced public spaces are an important community expectation and have been provided by all recent re-zoned re-developments in Edgemont Village. Could be achieved by locating garden and leisure areas external to the building as discussed above.	Details of a public plaza at the Woodbine/Highlands corner are included and an adjacent semi-private dining terrace in the Residence.	The addition of the public "parkette" and linkage to the Residence dining terrace will create an attractive linkage to Edgemont Village and a needed public amenity.

Community Concern or Issue	ESL Response	WG Perspective August 2012	Detailed Application Proposal Feb 2013	WG Perspective on the Detailed Application.
Architectural Style	Propose West Coast Contemporary; no Stucco; Flat Roof	Pitched roof may be preferable to achieve a more "residential feel", depending on the impact on the building height.	Partial upslope & gable roof lines included.	The partial sloping & gable rooflines are an interesting architectural feature – appears to increase building height by about 6' in some areas.
Tree Preservation and Landscaping	Significant trees will remain untouched on the adjacent north east property which is no longer included in this development	The Developer cannot guarantee the retention of existing trees not on its property. The on-site landscaping plan should reflect the residential character of the neighbourhood.	Landscape plans indicate the range of trees and planted areas. Boulevard planting on Highlands restricted by underground utilities.	Comprehensive landscaping plans enhance the proposed project, public areas and linkage to Edgemont Village.
Community Benefits accruing from the closure and sale of the Canfield Cr. road allowance and any uplift in density	Developer estimates about \$1.0 M from the sale of Canfield Cr. may be available for community benefits at DNV discretion	The local community should be consulted to identify benefits which could be provided from the sale of Canfield Cr. and any land value uplift.	Acknowledged, subject to agreement with DNV. Developer advises that value of Canfield road allowance has been agreed at \$1.9 M.	No further comment.
Traffic, Parking and Transportation Impacts	Bunt and Associates will be retained to undertake a Traffic Impact and Transportation Analysis Required parking: 41 stalls Proposed parking: 57 stalls	Study results are awaited. Study scope should include mitigation opportunities for any identified impacts.	Bunt Traffic and Transportation Report completed and provided. 59 parking stalls and also charging stations and bike racks incorporated.	No significant impacts reported. Relocation of parking and commercial vehicle access away from Ayr/Woodbine should mitigate future conflicts with Super Valu site.

Community Concern or Issue	ESL Response	WG Perspective August 2012	Detailed Application Proposal Feb 2013	WG Perspective on the Detailed Application.
Economic Impact Assessment	GP Rollo and Associates will be retained to undertake an economic impact analysis on Village Merchants and Businesses	<p>Study results are awaited.</p> <p>The Village Merchants have not taken a stand as yet on potential business impacts – positive or negative. Their feedback has been provided only from their perspective as Village denizens and they are equally concerned about the “bigness” of the development.</p>	Rollo Economic Impact Study completed and provided.	Some contribution to business volume noted.
Project accessibility for local residents	An initial 90 day window for advanced registration will be provided for local residents in Upper Capilano Area	Eligibility should also be extended to adult children living in the area who may wish to have their senior parent(s) locate locally.	Advanced registration opportunities for local families confirmed.	Residents and family members in Upper Capilano and Delbrook may take advantage of this.

Note: This summary captures the key issues identified around the ESL proposal. As anticipated, members of the Working Group and the wider community have diverse views and are free to express their views as individuals during the planning review and public input processes.

APPENDIX A**Working Group Membership and Viewpoint on this Report**

<u>Member</u>	<u>Endorse</u>	<u>Reject</u>
Brian Albinson		X
Grig Cameron	X	
Adrian Chaster		X
Robin Delany		X
Bill Hayes	X	
Susan Hingson		X
Susan Kimm-Jones	X	
Corrie Kost		X
Lenora Moore		X
Louise Nagle		X
Peter Thompson	X	

Some members have chosen not to support the report as they do not agree with the fundamental premise that the Group's function was to participate in the planning process with the Developer and District Staff, primarily by engaging in meaningful consultation with the Developer and Staff so as to provide input and feedback from a community perspective in order to surface key issues and concerns around the proposal that needed to be addressed.

These members are generally of the opinion that the language used is not sufficiently strong enough to denounce the size and density of the development and believe that the Group is entitled to judge the proposal and advocate for its rejection at this-stage of the process.