

November 25, 2024

9099, 9107 & 9111 Cedar Street, Mission  
P2022-104  
City Council Comments

We have reviewed the council meeting recording and the comments provided by staff and will respond to each item in point form as follows:

### **Design Rationale:**

The building has been designed with both horizontal and vertical articulation with a combination of siding materials including cultured stone, fibre cement board and composite panel that all compliment each other for a modern contemporary look. All buildings have the same exterior materials for a cohesive feel throughout the development. The box outs have a horizontal composite panel, or equivalent, with a rich walnut wood finish that tie to the matching front doors. The main and upper level are enveloped in a lighter board and batten which draws the eye up to a rooftop patio. We have maximized the windows on the front and rear facades so there are no large blank wall areas which encourages natural light and energy savings but have minimized the windows on walls that are close to neighboring units to maximize everyone's privacy. All the garage entries are from the common strata roads, none will have access to city roads. All main floor balconies are recessed from the main façade and have full height partition walls to increase the privacy for each unit. All balconies and rooftop decks have the same exterior materials with aluminum and glass railings compliment the exterior design. The Architectural design package shows a rendering of the front of Building 10 facing Cedar Street (Sheet A-0.3 – View 6), as well as other exterior complex views from different sides of the complex which gives a very good representation of what you see from different perspectives of neighboring properties.

### **Variances:**

#### **#1 - Setbacks**

The first variance is for the setback on the north property line for buildings five through ten to reduce from 7.50m to 4.28m and the second is for the west side of building five to reduce from 7.50m to 6.69m. These setback adjustments respond to the immediate context of the site. The reduced setback along the north property line faces a future schoolyard, ensuring no adverse impact on residential neighbors or pedestrian connectivity. The closer placement enhances passive surveillance of the schoolyard, fostering a safer public realm. These adjustments allow for a more efficient and functional site layout while respecting adjacent uses. Extensive landscaping along the reduced setbacks on the north and west sides to create a visual buffer and enhance privacy for adjacent uses. Building orientation ensures minimal disruption to the adjacent schoolyard and neighboring properties, maintaining open sightlines and encouraging passive surveillance of the schoolyard and improving public safety to fall in line with the principles of CPTED. The compact setback allows for optimized site use and to be able to preserve greenspace elsewhere on the property while maintaining a sense of openness and community integration.

## **Attachment G - Developer's Design Rationale**

### **Variances Cont'd:**

#### **#2 – Building Height**

We are requesting a variance for buildings #8 and #9 to increase from 12.0m to 12.15m and the to increase the height of the amenity building from the maximum of 11.50m to 11.89m to match the three-storey height of the adjacent townhomes. The amenity building is attached to a townhouse block and is still lower than maximum permitted for the actual units. The marginal height increase of 0.15m is necessary to respond to the sloping grade from east to west, reducing the need for extensive and disruptive retaining walls. This ensures a more natural integration with the site's topography. By aligning the amenity building's height with the adjacent three-storey townhomes, the development presents a cohesive and visually appealing streetscape. The minor increase does not visually overwhelm the neighborhood and ensures architectural harmony. The variance supports the principle of "place-making" by creating an inviting and context-sensitive design while addressing grading constraints. Landscaping and stepped building designs mitigate any abrupt height transitions between structures and creates a cohesive streetscape and enhanced architectural harmony.

#### **#3 – Parking in Setback**

We are requesting a variance for parking stalls #2-#5 on the east side and stall #6 on the west side located within the setback. Locating these stalls within the setback optimizes site efficiency, ensuring functional parking solutions without compromising pedestrian circulation. Extensive landscaping around these parking stalls minimizes the visual impact on neighboring properties, maintaining the aesthetic quality of the development. The design mitigates concerns through visual buffers, and careful planning ensures no disruption to neighboring residents. Parking stalls #2-#5 border a property that is in the OCP to be NC1 which will have a parkade above grade, meaning there will be no impact on the neighboring development.

#### **#4 – Tandem Parking**

The overall development meets the bylaw for under 25% tandem parking with only 9 out of 45 units containing tandems (equal to 20%). We are requesting a variance for building #8 and #9 to achieve 100% tandem parking which exceeds the 50% maximum in a building. Tandem parking provides greater efficiency of land use and the design layout for these units while meeting the parking requirements for residences. The application predates recent changes to the bylaw, and the initial design of Buildings #8 and #9 incorporated tandem parking to optimize space and functionality. The arrangement is common in comparable townhouse developments and offers a practical solution without compromising usability. It provides a convenient solution for families with multiple vehicles who are looking for affordable smaller units that provide similar luxuries to larger units with side-by-side garages. Tandem garage units require that the upper floors interlock to enable 3 bedrooms in a narrow 16'-0" wide unit. Because of the interlocking requirement you need to have an even number of these types of units in each building. The second issue is that the parking bylaw requires a tandem garage be a minimum of 40'-0" deep, whereas a double garage is only required to be 20'-0" deep. This causes a distinct form & character architectural design issue; these types of units are much better to be designed in in one building and not mixed with double car garage units. We understand that council wants to limit the number of tandem garages, but we think that the number of tandem units in a building should not be restricted.

## Attachment G - Developer's Design Rationale

These concessions and urban design highlights underscore the project's thoughtful approach to balancing bylaw requirements with the practical realities of site development. Each variance is carefully designed to address specific challenges while aligning with the City's goals of sustainable, aesthetically pleasing, and community-oriented urban design.

Please let us know if you require any further information to move this project forward to 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> readings at council.

Regards

*Darren Hall*

Darren Hall  
Trio Architecture Inc