



**BLUEGREEN**

Original - June 9<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Revision 4 – September 25, 2023

Wendy Rempel, Architect AIBC  
Bluegreen Architecture  
100 – 1353 Ellis Street,  
Kelowna, BC, V1Y 1Z9

Yvonne Mitchell  
Planner II  
City of West Kelowna  
2760 Cameron Road,  
West Kelowna, BC, V1Z 2T6

**Subject: Design Rationale**

Dear Yvonne,

Please find enclosed, our responses to your additional enquiries and comments sent on September 7, 2023. In accordance with our Design Review Committee (DRC) response letter (sent with further comments), we have made the requested updates to the design rationale for the project. Please note that the revised rationale should be read in conjunction with the accompanying revised drawings and reports.

We kindly request your attention to the updated design rationale, which provides further clarification of the variances being requested regarding the loading drive aisle and the parking setback.

We trust that these few modifications to our design rationale will provide the clarity required to address the City's comments, and will allow the project to move forward to Council.

**BLUEGREEN ARCHITECTURE**  
100 – 1353 Ellis St, Kelowna, BC, V1Y 1Z9  
236.420.3550  
bluegreenarchitecture.com

## Contents

1. Design Introduction:.....	3
2. Community and Neighborhood Benefit:.....	3
3. Impact Assessment.....	3
Retaining walls .....	3
Building Height .....	3
Setback Variance Pop Out.....	4
4. OCP Assessment .....	5

## **1. Design Introduction:**

The proposed development includes 29 townhomes on a sloped lot on Shannon Ridge. The townhomes are a mixture of 3- and 4-bedroom homes which are located along Shannon Ridge Drive, as well as a new internal road that slopes down to the lower townhomes. The buildings are designed with the hillside in mind and slope down the hill, allowing for a design that better speaks to the conditions of the natural terrain present.

## **2. Community and Neighborhood Benefit:**

The building site is located on Shannon Ridge Drive, an area of West Kelowna that is renowned for its scenic backdrop, natural beauty, and its greenery. The proposed townhomes are designed with this in mind and are intended to blend with the existing context in terms of massing and aesthetics.

With 3 separate access points, the street frontage of the development allows the design of the buildings to slope downhill. This allows for a more natural streetscape and breaks up the massing of the site with a walkway between the buildings, connecting to the trails and communities above and below.

## **3. Impact Assessment**

The existing site is a desolate area with an assortment of waste and fill (presumably from the melting of snow piles). The proposed development would look to use landscaping to improve the natural beauty of the hillside area. As the site is on a hillside, only a small portion of the site can be developed (22% lot coverage, with 0.6 FAR).

### Retaining walls

In order to address the sloping grades of the site, the design incorporates a series of thoughtfully integrated retaining walls. While some of these walls exceed the permissible height limits, a variance is sought to ensure their inclusion in the project. The primary objective behind their design integration is to minimize the visual impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Consequently, these retaining walls play an indispensable role in achieving a harmonious and functional development layout.

### Building Height

The proposed development requires a variance to exceed the maximum building height of 18.6m. This variance applies to multiple buildings, including A1, A2, C1 and C2.

The need for the height variance arises due to the site's unique topography and sloping landscape. By allowing certain buildings to surpass the prescribed limits, we can address the functional requirements of the homes and achieve a harmonious integration with the surrounding context through the relationship between massing and topography throughout the site.

The variance in building height is essential to accommodate the site conditions, optimize the layout, and create an aesthetically pleasing development that integrates well within its context, and we believe that the taller structures have been thoughtfully designed to respect the neighborhood character while creating architectural interest for the site.

Revision notes have been added to the file to denote building heights from the midpoint of the roof assemblies on these specified units. Please refer to the Site Sections on A 1.2, and on Building Elevations on A 3.3, 3.5, 3.6 and 3.7 to see these markers.

#### Setback Variance Pop Out

The proposed development necessitates a setback variance from 4.5m to 2.83m for the north interior side parcel boundary, as stated in the action. It is important to note that the design includes a pop-out feature on this side of the building, which measures 6 inches (0.15m).

The pop-out size aligns with the siting exemption requirements outlined in section 3.8.4 of Part 3 - General Regulations in the zoning bylaw. The revised pop-out does not exceed 0.6m as specified in the regulations, and it occupies less than 35% of the building face.

The pop-out feature adds visual interest and breaks up the wall. These updates have been accurately illustrated in the architectural plans, demonstrating our commitment to adhering to the relevant regulations and creating a well-designed and compliant development.

#### Internal Roadway Drive Aisle and Parking

The internal laneway on the site that provides garage access to Unit B1, B2, C1 and C2 is more than 7m wide, though it has been noted in past discussion that it looks to be less than this. The differentiation in floor material between the drive aisle and the driveway on the B Units driveway entry spaces are not paths, but extensions of the road aisle. Further to this, space in front of the C Units is provided for turning depth, in addition to the 7m already found on the drive aisle. The drive aisle between Blocks B and C has a 6m clear width of asphalt plus a 1.5m apron of concrete, poured flush with the asphalt. This added width will allow loading and other vehicles to temporarily use this additional 1.5m width, as needed, for infrequent loading purposes. We have also provided two loading stalls on site. While the zoning bylaw requires 2, based on our discussions with Planning, that both staff and council recognize that one loading stall for a townhome development is sufficient, due to the typically low use for move-ins. We are therefore seeking a variance to allow the 6m aisle considering the infrequency of the use of these stalls.

Further, the differentiation in roadway material, and the addition of roadway planting space is done to provide a more comfortable experience for pedestrians on the roadway. These moves do not come at the cost of adequately designing for the minimum requirements required for drive aisle width.

#### Parking Space Sizes

Regular parking spaces within the units have been extended to match the Kelowna Zoning Bylaw's parking standards, with width changing from 2.7m to 2.75m for each individual regular parking space on the site.

#### Parking Space Setback

There are 2 regular parking spaces located within the 3m parking setback at the front of the development. Attention has been given to reduce the visual impact of these two stalls. The southern of the two spaces is located behind the landscape buffer which creates a significant visual screen, and the other is located in a portion of the site that is retained; the stall is set down from the road, away from the view of the road. We are requesting a variance to accommodate these two stalls within the parking setback.

#### **4. OCP Assessment**

Although the zoning requirement for the site would usually allow for a multi-family condo building, the specific site zoning requirements only allow for townhomes on the site.

The design of this development has called for 2 variances. The first is the setback to the North where the setback requirement is 4.5m and the proposal calls for 2.83m. This variance is due to the need to retain the neighboring site as well as provide space for the townhomes. The 2.83m setback requested is comparable to the R3 townhome setback.

The second variance is the height. As per previous discussions with the city, the zoning bylaw definition of height is not tailored to sloped developments. All blocks within the development are 3 storeys in height, however a variance to 16m (3 storeys) was necessary.

**End of document**