

Union Courtyard



Presentation to
North West Planning Advisory Committee

April 4th, 2018

KWR Approvals Inc.



Current Project Development Team

| Project Team Member | Contact Name | Project Responsibility |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| Vanguard Developments Inc. | Bassem Iskander Wael Hamroush | Applicants/Developers |
| KWR Approvals Inc. | Kevin W. Riles, President & CEO (Project Manager) Will Robinson-Mushkat, M. Pl. | Project Management, Urban Planning & Developers' Representative |
| SDMM Ltd. | Geoff MacLean, P. Eng. | Site Plan, Servicing Schematics, Civil Engineering |
| Levis Street Design Group Ltd. | Andrew Holley, CHP, CAPS | Architecture & Building Design |
| exp. Services Inc. | Beth Casey, P. Eng. | Stormwater Management |
| Outside! Planning and Design | Sue Sirrs, CSLA, APALA | Landscape Architecture |

Background/History

- ✓ 2007 - Vanguard Developments Inc. enters Agreement of Purchase & Sale with property owner.
- ✓ 2008 - (another consultant) applies to HRM for 23-unit townhouse development with access off 26 Bridge Street. Rejected by Regional Council.
- ✓ **May 2010 - KWR Approvals Inc. (KWRA) retained to manage the project and planning approval with HRM.**
- ✓ 2011 - Error found in approved 1985 subdivision for lands. Acreage is 2.61 not 4.1 acres.
- ✓ Based on correct acreage, maximum density for property is 15.6 townhouses, not 23 as originally applied.
- ✓ July 2012 – KWRA, on behalf of developer, applies for 16 townhouse development off Union Street versus Bridge Street.
- ✓ Since width of access off Union Street can be maximum 50' feet (driveway) not required 66' for public street, the development must be condominium.
- ✓ 2013 - Union Courtyard Neighbourhood Public Participation Committee (PPC). To date eight meetings held. **Current Proposal 14 townhouses and two options for community to consider.**
- ✓ February 2, 2017 - Public Information Meeting held.



Union Courtyard – Factors from PPC

| Factor | Professional Development Team (PDT) Response |
|---|--|
| Density/Number of Units | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site plan revised from sixteen to fourteen units. |
| Privacy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All townhouse units front into the development. • Decks are located at back of units and face retaining walls. • There are no internal walkway connections from development to existing neighbourhood. |
| Parking | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each townhouse has two spaces: one inside (garage) and one outside. • Ten additional guest spaces – total of 38 vehicle spaces. • Firetruck access route schematic prepared by SDMM. |
| Preservation of Drainage Features and Trees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage features fall outside of limits of disturbance. • Landscaping plan to be implemented. • 35% of site left undisturbed, 33% landscaped. |
| Clustering/Screening | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Townhouses are clustered into three blocks, (5-4-5) running from South to North along proposed development. • Landscape plan developed to provide screening with natural vegetation. |



Union Courtyard – Factors from PPC

| Factor | PDT Response |
|--------------------------|---|
| Minimize Blasting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Blasting will be limited and fall within the municipal regulations found in the B-600 Bylaw. |
| Buildings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Townhouse units will be 30+/- feet in height. R1 zoning allows 35 feet as of right. |
| Lighting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lighting contained within development – will not impact existing houses. |
| High-End Design Features | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sloped roof at 12:10 ratio – This is not flat. Proposed design contains features unique to each individual unit within clusters - varied windows, dormers, balconies and garage doors. Design would feature a combination of wood, brick and stone siding in different colours and patterns. PDT used and drew from the specific examples provided by the PPC (i.e. Haynes Park style development). |
| Views | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is designed to maintain existing views and minimize views of neighbouring properties. Nottingham Street look overtop Union Courtyard; Bridge and Union Streets look into undisturbed area and retaining wall. |
| Water Pressure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water pressure will not be affected by proposed development. |



Union Courtyard Development Site 'As Is'



PPC Committee Example of Development



Haynes Park, Lithonia, Georgia, USA.



Site Plan A – Union Courtyard



Landscape Plan A – Union Courtyard



Site Plan B – Union Courtyard



Landscape Plan B – Union Courtyard



| | |
|--|------------------|
| | |
| <small>3000 Hwy 101, Suite 100, San Jose, CA 95128 408.944.1111 www.outsideinc.com</small> | |
| PROJECT NAME: | |
| Client: Union Court | |
| DESIGNER: | |
| Landscape Plan Option B | |
| CLIENT: | |
| DATE: | |
| CONTRACT: | |
| <small>THIS COPY IS UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED IS THE PROPERTY OF OUTSIDE! INC. AND IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF OUTSIDE! INC.</small> | |
| DRAWN: JULIANA | PROJECT #: 1621 |
| CHECKED: SYBBS | Sheet/Plan: 1/22 |
| SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0" | DATE: 10/13/2016 |

Examples of Hardwoods

LARGE HARDWOOD



SMALL HARDWOOD



Proposed Plantings for Union Court, Bedford

- MATCH EXISTING NATIVE SPECIES
- REINSTATE PLANT MATERIAL
- MAINTAIN COMMUNITY CHARACTER



Examples of Evergreens & Shrubs

EVERGREEN



SHRUBS



Proposed Plantings for Union Court, Bedford

- MATCH EXISTING NATIVE SPECIES
- REINSTATE PLANT MATERIAL
- MAINTAIN COMMUNITY CHARACTER



Video Development and Production

1. Intent is to show the proposed development options as set in virtual model of the current site conditions.
2. SDMM completed traditional topographic survey, site plan (A&B) and grading plan (A&B).
3. Levis Street Design Group prepared building design plans conforming to SDMM's grading plan, which SDMM then turned into 3D models.
4. An aerial drone was used to collect a series of aerial photos of the project site and surrounding area.
5. These photos were stitched together, geo-referencing them via traditional land survey, allowing accurate measurement of building roof lines and tree canopy elevations.
6. Overlaid the aerial image onto satellite image for base map – provided accurate horizontal position of adjacent homes, driveways, trees, etc.
7. Roof lines and tree canopies can be matched. Exact position and species of tree cannot be confirmed.
8. Although video is based on available site data, the computer model may not depict exact site conditions as found in the field.



Video Presentation



Photoshop Development and Production

- Intent is to show the proposed development options from neighbouring properties.
- Members of the existing neighbourhood volunteered for their residences to be used for exercise.
- Photos of the development site were taken from various properties surrounding the development site (11 Nottingham Street, HRM Park, 23 Nottingham Street, 76 Union Street, 90 Union Street and 26 Bridge).
- **Photos were captured on Jan. 12, 2017** – therefore weather conditions in the photos are typical of Winter season.
- Existing trees, which would be removed as part of the development, were cropped from the photos of the existing conditions.
- 3D models of both site plans (A&B) were inserted into the photos to show how the projected view of each possible site plan would look from each of the selected houses.



23 Nottingham Street – Existing Conditions



23 Nottingham Street – Site Plan A



23 Nottingham Street – Site Plan B



11 Nottingham Street – Existing Conditions



11 Nottingham Street – Site Plan A



11 Nottingham Street – Site Plan B



26 Bridge Street – Existing Conditions



26 Bridge Street – Site Plan A



26 Bridge Street – Site Plan B



90 Union Street – Existing Conditions



90 Union Street – Site Plan A



90 Union Street – Site Plan B



76 Union Street – Existing Conditions



76 Union Street – Site Plan A



76 Union Street – Site Plan B



Proposed Development, Block A



Proposed Development, Block B



Proposed Development, Block C



Comparative Table

| <u>Two Options</u> | <u>Site Plan A</u> | <u>Site Plan B</u> |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Undisturbed Area | 35% | 33% |
| Landscaped Area | 33% | 37% |
| Retaining Walls | 3 retaining walls | 2 retaining walls |
| Front | Face towards Nottingham Street | Face towards Union Street |
| Decks/Backyards | Face towards Union Street | Face towards Nottingham Street |
| Vehicle Headlights | Shine into Retaining Wall | Shine into Slope |
| Guest Parking | 7 spaces along driveway 3 spaces along laneway | 7 spaces along driveway 3 spaces at top of entrance |

Questions and Comments

