

WORKING GROUP REPORT

Proposed Edgemont Seniors Living Project – Summary of Findings

Executive Summary

To effectively evaluate the preliminary application for this proposal, DNV Staff and Council should consider the following:

An expeditious “refresh” of the Edgemont Village Local Area Plan to address the planning and social policy issues identified in Section A.

An investigation of the Developer’s experience and financial viability to assess the risk to the community as outlined in Section B.

Resolution of the issues and concerns identified by the community as listed in the table in Section C.

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) has recently been completed and an update or ‘re-fresh’ of the Edgemont Village Development Permit Area was contemplated.

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

To be effective, it was expected that the Working Group would be composed of individuals with a variety of perspectives and from a broad demographic.

Summary of Activities

May, 2012	Working Group established from community volunteers
May 23, 2012	Working Group Meeting with Proponent

	Introductory meeting. Discussion of process. Arrange neighborhood walkabout to review issues and opportunities
May 29, 2012	Workshop held at Capilano Branch Library Consultant led examination of Edgemont Village and possible relationship with a seniors living proposal
June 7, 2012	Working Group meeting with the Proponent and Architect Review of Workshop and discussion of ESL proposal
June 12, 2012	Open House held at Highlands United Church Presentation of Edgemont Urban Design Study and ESL proposal
June 13, 2012	EUCCA general meeting at Capilano Branch Library Presentation and discussion with audience of the ESL proposal
June 14, 2012	Working Group Meeting 'Brainstorming' session to identify and develop community concerns/opportunities around ESL proposal
June 27, 2012	Working Group Meeting Review of community concerns/issues/opportunities. Consolidation into a three part Working Document: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Process/Planning/Social Policy Issues- Physical Impact/Liveability Issues with the ESL Proposal- Developer Credentials/Financial Viability
July 5, 2012	Working Group meeting with the Proponent and Architect Review of updated project design. Land assembly reduced from 7 to 6 lots. Building height reduced from 4 to 3 floors; additional parking spaces. Traffic and Transportation Analysis to be undertaken Review of input from Village Merchants Association rep. – Economic Impact analysis of ESL project on Village business to be undertaken
July 25, 2012	Working Group meeting Review and development of Working Group Report

Summary of Findings

At the initial meeting the Working Group confirmed its role to provide the Developer with a direct conduit to the larger community with the aim of acting as a funnel to the Developer and District Staff for issues and concerns raised in the community. The

primary objective was to ensure that all concerns were captured, acknowledged by and responded to by the Developer. The purpose of the Working Group was not to endorse or reject the proposal recognizing that role is reserved for Staff and Council.

During the review process, it became evident 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 a summary of the findings of the Working Group in each category:

A) Process/Planning/Social Policy Issues

This proposal reflects the intent of the new OCP policies with respect to Housing Diversity and Social Well-being, for example, but does not comply with the land use requirements of the “Legacy” Edgemont Village Local Area Plan. There is also the fundamental question of whether a Supported Seniors Independent Living complex is an appropriate facility for the Village or is some other care model more desirable to the community or some other land use.

The developer is assuming that the evaluation of its application will be carried out concurrently with the EVLAP Refresh process.

It is, therefore, imperative that the District move forward with the “Refresh” of the LAP in order that the LAP refresh process and the ESL application approval process ultimately synchronize the regulation of use and density on the Canfield site.

The “refresh” process should consider the following issues:

1. Include peripheral residential areas as well as the Village commercial core
2. Transitioning from the commercial zoning to single family areas
3. Identification of potential areas suitable for mixed population (singles, families with children, empty nesters, seniors) in multi-family residential (duplexes, triplexes, row houses, low-rise apartments)

4. Preferred use of the Canfield site if the ESL Project does not proceed
5. Identification of potential areas suitable for various levels of seniors accommodation (independent supported living, congregate care, end-of-life care)
6. Building heights, lot coverage, FSR's, set backs, etc. in the Village commercial core and the peripheral areas
7. Bonusing options for provision of social benefits such as higher levels of care for seniors and persons with disabilities or special needs (consider the Pacific Arbour model)
8. Benefits accruing to the Village of any uplift levies due to re-zoning
9. Design Guidelines to maintain the Village character

B) Developer Credentials/Financial Viability

Although the Developer is ultimately responsible for the viability of his/her own business plan, certain requirements should be met to safeguard the community from the consequences of disruption or failure. Some of these are:

1. Details of development companies' corporate structure
2. Details of the Developers' previous project development experience
3. Details of the Developers' previous facilities operation experience
4. Details of the Developers' financial strength
5. Details of the Business Plan for the Canfield ESL Project:
 - a. Living unit sizes and rental rates
 - b. Minimum services which will be included in the rent and what optional extra services will be available at what fees
6. Contingency plan if the business plan fails, for example, conversion to:
 - a. Strata title condominiums – all demographics or seniors only

- b. Market rental accommodation – all demographics or seniors only
- c. Provision of congregate care
- d. Provision of end-of-life care

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. Successful conclusion to this negotiation would enable some of the above concerns to be addressed.

C) Physical Impact/Liveability Issues with the ESL Proposal

Based on feedback from the community, specific issues and concerns with the ESL proposal which need to be addressed due to their potential impact on the liveability and character of the Village and adjacent areas are included in the following table, together with the response from the Developer and additional comment from the Working Group:

Community Concern or Issue	ESL Response	Working Group Perspective
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	There is significant community sentiment that the proposed building form is too “big” and intrusive. Senior’s accommodation has general support but not at this scale.
Height of the Building	On June 13, it was announced that the building height will be reduced from 4 floors to 3. 1 st story: 12 feet 2 nd & 3 rd stories: 9 feet	The community may be more receptive to a maximum height of 3 storeys, subject to acceptable building configuration and overall size.
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.

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.
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	Building façades need careful articulation to provide visual relief and enhance a residential appearance. 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.
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.
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.
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.

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.
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.
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.
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 awaited. Study scope should include mitigation opportunities for any identified impacts.
Economic Impact Assessment	GP Rollo and Associates will be retained to undertake an economic impact analysis on Village Merchants and Businesses	Study results awaited. 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.
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.

--	--	--

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	

NB. The members choosing not to support the report 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 early stage of the process.