Supports Item No. 3 PT&E Committee Agenda May 16, 2012



ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Report Date:April 17, 2012Contact:Vicki PotterContact No.:604.871.6033RTS No.:09603VanRIMS No.:08-2000-20Meeting Date:May 16, 2012

- TO: Standing Committee on Planning, Transportation and Environment
- FROM: Subdivision Approving Officer
- SUBJECT: Proposed Amendment to Subdivision By-law Number 5208 Reclassification of 3582 McGill Street

RECOMMENDATION

- A. THAT Council approve the application to reclassify the property at 3582 McGill Street from Category C to Category A of Schedule A, Table 1, of Subdivision Bylaw Number 5208;
- B. AND FURTHER THAT if Council approves Recommendation A, the Director of Legal Services be instructed to prepare the necessary by-law to amend the Subdivision By-law implementing the required change.

REPORT SUMMARY

This report addresses an application to reclassify the property 3582 McGill Street from Category C to Category A of Schedule A for the purpose of subdivision, in accordance with the minimum parcel size requirements of Schedule A, Table 1, of the Subdivision By-law.

COUNCIL AUTHORITY/PREVIOUS DECISIONS

Council Policy regarding amendments to the subdivision categories in the RS-1, RS-3, RS-3A, RS-5 and RS-6 Zoning Districts is reflected in the Manager's Report as approved by Council on October 28, 1987. As well as establishing seven parcel size categories for subdivision in the RS Districts, the report provided for possible future changes in the categories in cases where property owners seek to classify their parcel category either up or down, to either facilitate or prevent subdivision.

CITY MANAGER'S/GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMENTS

The General Manager of Community Services and the City Manager RECOMMENDS approval of the foregoing.

REPORT

Background/Context

In 1988, Council enacted an amendment to the Subdivision By-law by introducing seven categories of minimum parcel width and area to govern the subdivision of parcels zoned RS-1. Subsequently, parcels zoned RS-3, RS-3A, RS-5 and RS-6 have been included as well. All lands in these zoning districts are classified on a block-by-block basis, as shown on 279 sectional maps which are on file with the City Clerk and which form part of Schedule A of the Subdivision By-law.

The minimum standard for each of the seven subdivision categories is shown in the table below.

Subdivision Category	Minimum Width	Minimum Area
A	30 ft.	3,000 sq. ft.
В	40 ft.	3,600 sq. ft.
С	50 ft.	5,000 sq. ft.
D	60 ft.	5,400 sq. ft.
E	75 ft.	6,750 sq. ft.
F	100 ft.	12,000 sq. ft.
G	150 ft.	18,000 sq. ft.

As shown on Appendix A, the blocks immediately to the north and northeast of the subject block are classified as Category C. The properties to the south across the lane, as well as to the east of the subject block, are classified as Category A, which prescribes a minimum width of 30.0 ft and a minimum area of 3000 sq. ft., for each new parcel created by subdivision.

In 2004, City Council approved the reclassification to Category A of a similar sized lot located immediately to the west of the subject property, which was subsequently subdivided into two 33.0 ft. -wide lots. As a result, the current blockface contains a total seven lots ranging from 33 feet to 66 feet in width with the majority of the properties having a width less than Category C standards.

If approved, this reclassification would allow for consideration of a subdivision proposal of the subject parcel to create two new parcels measuring 33.0 ft in width.

Reclassification Assessment Criteria

Since 1987, staff have based recommendations for reclassification applications on criteria identified in the original Council policy. More recently, Council directed staff to also look at other criteria that contribute to the City's sustainability policies, especially as they pertain to densification. Reclassifications have tended to be supported if:

- Whole blocks came forward together for reclassifications, and 60% of the block was in support;
- The parcel was considerably larger than other parcels on the block, had no opportunity for subdivision even if consolidated with adjacent parcels, and if the resulting parcels would be more, rather than less, consistent with parcels on the rest of the block;
- A precedent had been established by the approval of other reclassifications since 1988;
- The parcel was in close proximity to higher density developments; and
- The reclassification would promote the ability to create new housing forms appropriate to the context.

Neighbourhood Notification

Twenty-five property owners in the immediate area were notified in writing of this application and asked to comment. A total of three responses were received, with the following results:

Support reclassification:	2
Oppose reclassification:	
Undecided:	1
Did not respond:	22

One owner who supported the reclassification expressed concerns with regards to the current site condition and water runoff issues, and anticipates the potential redevelopment could help address these issues.

Strategic Analysis

If the reclassification to Category A is approved, which prescribes a minimum parcel width of 30 ft. and a minimum parcel area of 3,000 sq. ft., the subject parcel could be subdivided into two 33.0 ft. -wide lots which would meet Category A standards. It would also be possible to construct a laneway house on each of the proposed lots.

This application meets the criteria set out above in several respects:

- A precedent had been established by the approval of other reclassifications within the same blockface since 1988;
- No opposition received from neighbourhood notification;
- The adjacent blocks to the east and south consist of smaller parcels in Category A;
- There is no opportunity for subdivision even by consolidating with the adjacent parcel; and
- The promotion of additional housing forms can be achieved.

Implications/Related Issues/Risk (if applicable)

Financial

There are no financial implications.

Human Resources/Labour Relations

There are no human resource related issues.

Environmental

There are no environmental impacts

Legal

There are no legal issues

CONCLUSION

With lack of opposition from the neighbourhood and the issue of precedent with regards to approval of a similar reclassification in this block in 2004, the Subdivision Approving Officer recommends approval of this application.

* * * * *

APPENDIX A PAGE 1 OF 1

