

Meeting Notes

Meeting Subject / No.:	BOWDA Workshop		
Date and Start Time	2018-06-07 1:00pm	Location:	Canmore Council Chambers
Date Prepared:	2018-06-13	Prepared By:	Michael Rac
Project Name:	Canmore Land Use Bylaw Updates and Engagement	O2 Project No.:	180205

Attendees:	Section/Position	Email
Alaric Fish	Town of Canmore	afish@canmore.ca
Camila Ramos-Strankman	Town of Canmore	cramosstrankman@canmore.ca
Audrey Rogers	Town of Canmore	arogers@canmore.ca
Lindsay Allman	Town of Canmore	lallman@canmore.ca
Lisa Guest	Town of Canmore	lguest@canmore.ca
Rachelle Dillon	O2 Planning + Design	rachelle.dillon@o2design.com
Michael Rac	O2 Planning + Design	michael.rac@o2design.com
BOWDA Members (10)	BOWDA	ceo@bowda.ca

Summary of Feedback from BOWDA

Building Heights & Roof Slope

- The Envelope Model for building height and slope would allow for greater design and architectural variety, but preferably would have use controls for the front and rear of the building, while having more relaxed or minimal controls for the middle of the structure. However, members would like to see an overall increase in building heights, and for the regulations to include varying building heights for different zones, and/or for valley bottom and slope sites.
- The Fernie Model, with building height cut-offs, may result in less variety in building design (compared to the Envelope Model) as builders/developers will likely build to the maximum 3:12 roof pitch. The experience in Fernie has resulted in contemporary buildings with 3:12 roof pitches, and regulations that are easier to understand and follow. However, more investigation needs to happen to determine how this model will work with less conventional roof designs, such as butterfly roofs.
- Generally, 5 BOWDA members preferred the Envelope Model, while 2 preferred the Fernie Model. However, a few members were undecided and wanted to test out the models further.

Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (DADUs)

- There is acknowledgment that some concerns about DADUs from the general public should be addressed through the ADU section of the Land-Use Bylaw (i.e. building height and massing), while other concerns (i.e.. parking) are Town-wide concerns and should be handled as such.
- The Bylaw should allow for greater flexibility and leniency for having sheds and other outbuildings excluded from the 10% coverage rule, especially if the overall 40% max lot coverage has not been met. Mechanical, storage, and other uses should be permitted on the ground floor to allow for more liveable space on the second floor. Detached Accessory dwellings should also be able to have a larger footprint when they can absorb lot coverage from the primary building (if it is below the 40% lot coverage).
- If the Town is reluctant to make the second story of DADUs larger, than the ground level should be larger as it does not contribute to privacy or height concerns from the public.
- Members are supportive of the Town making single storey DADUs a permitted used.
- The placement and design of windows should be part of the development permit process.

Public Tree Protection

- Members are open to the idea of trees having a monetary value and are willing to pay for damaged or removed Town trees. However, there needs to be an appeals process in place for tree evaluations.
- Some members prefer to plant trees for new development, while others prefer to pay.
- Members are open to the idea of a tree protection bylaw, but that it should be simple, clear, and apply to all landowners; and that the bylaw should have a cap on the value of a tree or multiple trees.

Meeting Notes

1. Welcome by BOWDA, the Town of Canmore, and O2

2. Introductions

3. Presentation

Overview of Project

- Project purpose
- Project topics
- Public engagement
 - o As of June 6 – 1,400 survey comments

- Project timeline
 - o Question – Will BOWDA get a chance to review first draft of amendments?
Rachelle – Yes, there will be touchpoints throughout project
Alaric – Council First Reading may be pushed back towards the end of the summer
- Past BOWDA meetings/workshops
- Purpose of today's workshop

Building Heights & Roof Slope

- Amendment goals
 - o Limit impacts on neighbour's access to light, views, and privacy
 - o Allow greater architectural variety
 - o Reduce the visual massing of homes
 - o Simplify the height regulations
- Two approaches
 - o Model 1 – The Envelope
 - o Model 2 – The Fernie Model (the Single cut-off)
- Approach 1 – The Envelope – What works and what doesn't work?
 - o Question – What is the difference between the two models?
Rachelle – Fernie model has the cut-off and is a simplification of the existing regulations
 - o Comment – There is a zone in Calgary that may be worth looking at that is stricter with the front of the building
 - o Comment – This approach makes sense with stricter regulations for the front and rear, with more relaxed regulations for the middle of the property
 - o Question – Will the Town allow three storeys or not? Seems no?
Comment – The resulting half storey produces the same massing
Comment – These lofts result in loss of useable space, especially because we can't build basements in Canmore
Comment – The price of land justifies three stories
Comment – Three storey's can work if its contextualized
Alaric – We do want efficient use of land, do larger homes achieve the Town goals?
Comment – Three storeys might make sense in the downtown, allows for accessory dwelling unit
Comment – There is a market/demand for three storeys
Alaric – We don't want to suppress development, but would taller homes meet our goals (see above). A third storey would have to support amendment goals
Comment – The existing policy doesn't really meet the goals (i.e. architectural variety)
Alaric – We've heard this, and that will be part of the LUB update process
 - o Comment – The Fernie model makes assumption about standard lot size
 - o Comment – Do like the Envelope model, but the heights are too low
 - o Comment – Would like to see more height overall, even an extra metre, to allow for 9ft or 10ft ceilings

There are two height environments in Canmore, valley bottom and everything on the slopes, which complicates the formula. The Envelope model needs to accommodate this.

- Approach 2 – The Fernie – What works and what doesn't work?
 - o Comment – This model seems a little more fair
 - o Camila – This model would result in a two-row regulation table
 - o Question – What's the experience in Fernie?
Comment – Lots of contemporary designs with 3:12 roof pitches, and regulations are easier to get through
 - o Comment – Will need confirm about how this will work for butterfly roof designs
 - o Comment – Could it allow for three storeys?
 - o Comment – Might look odd as everyone will want to max out and build 3:12
- Is there a preferred approach? Is there another option?
 - o Envelope – There is opportunity for variety, including with heights
 - o Envelope – Need to consider building heights changing with the zone. R1 may work as existing, with R4 being three storeys
 - o Fernie – Simple for everyone
 - o Envelope – Though both are an improvement on the current regulations
 - o Fernie – On the fence though, need to check how it would work with duplexes
 - o Envelope – With varying height levels
 - o Envelope – Though need to investigate more
- Question – Could both models be used?
 - o Alaric – We could, but it may make things more complicated
 - o Comment – The less prescription the better
- Question – Would slope adaptive rules change?
 - o Alaric – Might warrant revisiting
 - o Comment – Would be interesting to see how different topographies effect the envelope model
- Camila – Review the SketchUp and send us your additional thoughts

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

- Amendment goals
 - o Limit impacts on neighbour's privacy, light access, and views
 - o Ensure detached accessory dwelling units are secondary in form, massing and size to the primary dwelling
 - o Consider the context with respect to parking requirements
 - o Maximize livable space while minimizing the built envelope
- Past feedback from the community on ADUs
 - o No larger, if anything make them smaller – concerns with privacy
 - o Adding density is changing the nature of neighbourhoods
 - o Concerns over parking
 - o Loss of mature trees
 - o Prefer unit within primary building

- Due to feedback, the Town is not looking to change maximum size, but may be open to changing size on the ground floor
- What do you like about the draft regulations and what would you like to see changed?
 - o Comment – Concerns from the community about design are warranted but other comments (i.e. parking) can be controlled through other means
 - o Comment – There should be leniency in having sheds and other outbuildings excluded to the 10% coverage rule, especially if the overall 40% max lot coverage has not been met
Comment – Accessory dwellings should be able to absorb lot coverage if primary building is below 40% lot coverage
Comment – Allow for mechanical, storage, and other uses on the ground floor, which makes for more liveable space on the second floor
 - o Comment – How many AUBs have been built?
Alaric – 15 or 17 in total
 - o Comment – they have a high cost to build in relation to their size, having mechanical on the ground level helps keep costs down
Comment – 20k of 30k for utilities along in detached units
Comment – the expense is not a reason to no permit them
- Discussion on proposed regulations
 - o Comment – If you have a 6:12 roof then it will result in more dormers
 - o Comment – Fernie model seems to make sense for detached AUDs
 - o Comment – Possibly include requirements for screening, particularly from decks
 - o Comment – 1 1/2 storey buildings are difficult to have marketable livable space
 - o Comment – Envelope model may be more cost effective
 - o Comment – Shed roofs are less expensive, and allow for more interior space
 - o Comment – Only allowing single storey detached AUDs would kill demand
 - o Comment – 6.5 m height seems to work – wouldn't suggest higher
- The Town has been considering making AUDs permitted uses
 - o General consensus that this is best
 - o Comment – What about enforcement?
Audrey – Standard bylaw enforcement procedures
 - o Comment – Is 50 m² non-negotiable?
Alaric – Comes back to massing, we're open to changing this, but more so on the first/ground floor. Will less than 50 m² work?
Comment – The livable space gets quite small, especially because of the roof slope
- Thoughts on windows?
 - o Comment – Dormers have an impact
 - o Comment – Perhaps windows are decided on a contextual basis, i.e. windows overlooking neighbours
garage is not really an issue
Comment – Should be decided through the development permit process
- Comment – What about not requiring outdoor amenity space in areas such as the downtown?

- o Comment – Could increase affordability
- o Comment – Outdoor is a nice to have but not a need to have

Public Tree Protection

- Process goals
 - o Recognize trees as valuable assets
 - o Protect public trees
 - o Create consequences for illegal tree removal
 - o Create opportunities for the relocation/replacement of trees when no other option is available
- What is a public tree
 - o Trunk has to be on public/Town land
 - o Tree's that are half on private and half on Town land are considered public
- Draft process
 - o Application submitted - Trees will be identified on all plot plans
 - o Discussion - Planner describes options and potential costs to applicant
 - o Arborist evaluation - An arborist will determine the trees value
 - o Cost calculation - Planner will discuss the cost with the applicant
 - o Public tree replacement
 - If the applicant chooses to pay, the tree will be removed
 - Funds obtained from the tree will be used to plant new trees nearby, or remain in a reserve fund for future tree planting elsewhere
- Comment – Are the values calculated?
Camila – There is a standardized process
- Comment – Do you expect dollar for dollar back?
Camila – its up for discussion, we are considering a cap. Typical cost for mature tree is around \$1,000
Alaric – Though evaluations can vary depending on the evaluator
- Approach 1 – Single Tree
 - o Comment – Put a value on the tree and have the developer/landowner pay the fee
 - o Question – Would you ever reject a development over a tree?
Alaric – The intent is not to say no to development, but it is Town land. We're striving for clarity on the process.
- Approach 2 – Multiple Trees
 - o Comment – Is there any issues with services coming in?
Camila – Sometimes
Comment – Would pay for the trees before paying for directional drilling
 - o Question – What happens when trees on private land grow onto public land?
 - o Question – Does the evaluation take into account benefit to public realm?
Lisa – Yes, it's built into the evaluation
Comment – There is a bit of a discretionary/bias issue here
 - o Comment – 90% of the time developers will prefer to pay for the trees

- o Comment – You are on the right track, but there needs to be an appeal process for evaluations
- Approach 3 – Numerous Trees
 - o Should the cost calculation have a cap?
 - o Or a sq. m cost?
- Approach 4 – Private Tree Removal Causes a Public Tree to Become Hazardous
 - o Comment – Wouldn't get too concerned over this
 - o Comment – There has to be a reciprocal relationship with the Town, if a public tree causes damage to a private tree
 - o Comment – Keep the process simple
- Approach 5 – Public Trees in Undesirable Locations
 - o Comment – These trees should not even be there
 - o Comment – Important to have a third-part evaluator
 - o Comment – Anything to do with servicing should be the responsibility of the Town
- Valuable Vegetation – Shrubs and Brush
 - o Comment – Shouldn't this be cleared because of FireSmart
 - o Comment – Swales are often difficult to deal with
 - o Comment – Need to be clear and consistent
- Trees Damaged During Construction
 - o Comment – Need to know how this will work with servicing
 - o Comment – If a tree is damaged, then reassess the value, if its killed, then charge the value
- Public Benefit
 - o Comment – Prefer to replant
 - o Comment – Prefer to pay
 - o Comment – The Town should determine this
 - o Comment – Need consistent application of the rules for developers and landowners
 - o Comment – Might be helpful for BOWDA to review the regulations a year after their implementation

Wrap Up

- Camila/Rachelle will reach out to BOWDA for engagement on the other 12 LUB topics
- BOWDA comments from this workshop are requested to be provided by June 21

These notes are considered to be an accurate account of the meeting. If any discrepancies or omissions are noted, please contact O2; otherwise these notes shall be deemed acceptable to all.