



CITY OF RICHMOND

REPORT TO COUNCIL

TO: Richmond City Council **DATE:** April 5, 2000
FROM: David McLellan **FILE:** 0100-20-DPER1
Chair, Development Permit Panel
RE: Development Permit Panel Meetings Held in March 2000

PANEL RECOMMENDATION

That the recommendations of the Panel to authorize the issuance of:

- i) a Development Permit (DP 99-170446) for the property at 11300, 11320, 11340, 11360 and 11460 Steveston Highway;
- ii) a Development Permit (DP 99-170076) for the property at 10711 Shepherd Drive;

be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "David McLellan".

David McLellan
Chair, Development Permit Panel

PANEL REPORT

The Development Permit Panel considered two larger development permit applications at meetings held in March 2000.

DP 99-170446 – 563687 B.C. LTD. – 11300, 11320, 11340, 11360 AND 11460 STEVESTON HIGHWAY

The proposal to construct a automotive retail centre immediately west of Ironwood at the south west corner of Steveston Highway and Coppersmith Place generated some public comment from a resident to the north of the site and from a land owner in the Riverside industrial park. The resident expressed concern regarding the pedestrian access through the site, the landscaping particulars, the architectural treatment for the major tenant and parking management. The industrial land owner raised questions regarding the proposed design at the south edge of the development and traffic management issues.

The Panel found that the issues raised by the public and by staff in their review of the proposal, were dealt with reasonably well by the proponent with the single exception of the architectural treatment for the major tenant. In particular, the proposed roof line on the north façade of the major building was criticized as being far to industrial for the site. The majority of the Panel was of the view, however, that the architect's approach to breaking up the major building complied with the development permit guidelines. The Panel on a split vote concurred with the recommendation of staff.

The Panel recommends that the permit be issued.

DP – PROGRESSIVE HOMES LTD. – 10711 SHEPHERD DRIVE

The proposal to develop non-market rental townhouses in the Odlinwood development did not generate any public comment. The Panel reviewed a number of the issues in the development, including: the number of trees provided in the common driveway, the overall layout, the location of the child care facility, access to the adjacent park, the location of the garbage and recycling facilities and the school site levy. The proponent committed to a number of improvements at the Panel meeting including the deletion of a few parking stalls to allow vehicular turning at the child care facility, the addition of disabled parking spaces, additional trees for the main driveway and no movement closer to the street of the garbage and recycling facilities. The overall layout was deemed to be appropriate given the industrial use to the east.

The Panel recommends that the permit be issued.

DJM:djm

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL

Wednesday, March 29, 2000

Time: 3:30 p.m.

Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall

Present: David McLellan, Chair
Chuck Gale, General Manager, Engineering & Public Works
Jim Bruce, General Manager, Finance & Corporate Services

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

The Chair introduced the members of the Development Permit Panel to the audience and explained the procedures.

1. **MINUTES**

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, March 15th, 2000 be adopted.

CARRIED

2. **DEVELOPMENT PERMIT DP 99-170076**

(Report: Mar. 9/00; File: DP99-170076, REDMS: 141190, 142292, 132944, 119475, 141834)

APPLICANT: Progressive Homes Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 10711 Shepherd Drive

INTENT OF PERMIT: That a Development Permit be issued for 10711 Shepherd Drive which would:

1. Permit the construction of 48 rental townhouses and ancillary facilities on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/62); and

2. Reduce the setback to a property line from 6 m (19.685 ft.) to 4 m (13.123 ft.) for two units and to 0 m for a garbage/recycling enclosure and to 4.5 m (14.764 ft.) for columns and trellises.

APPLICANTS' COMMENTS

Julio Gomberoff, Principal and Dafina Curtis, of Gomberoff-Bell Lyon Group of Architects, 101-1012 Butler Avenue, Vancouver; Mary Chan-Yip, Principal, DMG Landscape Architects, 200-6545 Bonsor Avenue, Burnaby, were in attendance to make a presentation to the Development Permit Panel.

Utilizing site plans, photographs, a colour board and artistic renderings, Mr. Gomberoff provided the following information:

- the proposed project was approved in 1999 for social housing (operator - Greater Vancouver Housing Corporation)
- the location of the proposed project in the Odlinwood area
- the photographs illustrating the site and surrounding properties
- the project consists of 48 – 2 ½ and 3 storey units, comprised of 16 – 2 bedroom units; 2 handicapped units; 28 – 3 bedroom units; 4 – 4 bedroom units
- context plan showed Shepherd Drive to the east, an industrial wall along the back of the property and a park to the south
- the amenity building could be viewed from the street
- solutions to design problems resulted in pushing the development away from the wall to the back of the property, and the placement of buildings as far from the highway as possible
- the location of the adjacent park, as well as the sidewalk through the project to access the park
- the location of the proposed day care and the resulting variances because of the provision of this facility
- the 2 handicapped units located next to the amenity building, over which would be located a separate 2 bedroom unit
- the FAR would be .55; with site coverage 12% below standard requirement
- though 57 parking stalls required, 63 parking stalls would be provided
- the site elevations were referenced, with different roof styles at different elevations
- the scale of the buildings and the various views were displayed.

Mr. Gomberoff referenced several differences within the submitted staff report. He then clarified the requested variances and commented that they were not as significant as reported by staff. He noted that, in response to requests by staff, they had added two fire hydrants and changed the location of the garbage enclosures. He then presented a streetscape showing the impact of the garbage enclosure viewed from the park and the location of the two garbage enclosures on the site plan.

Mary Chan-Yip, Landscape Architect, pointed out the the following:

- low plantings were to be placed along Shepherd Drive with trees to match existing street trees
- individual walks led into each unit
- shrub plantings led into the site, and 6 ft. partition fencing delineated individual patios
- a heavy buffer planting provided separation along the back of the property and was brought into the development to separate rear yards and amenity space
- a generous amount of amenity space was provided within the site

- two play areas were indicated: one tot lot area with spring toys, climbing toys, etc., and the other, a larger play component with multiple climbing play structures
- seating for surveillance by the parents was provided as well as generous play space
- an open grassy area was situated to the north, to provide the opportunity for ball sports for younger children
- the day care facility would be situated at the end of the complex, with provision for a smaller play area

Upon query, Ms. Chan-Yip referred to the resilient-surfaced playground material of rubberized soft tile which could be laid in a checkerboard pattern.

Elain Duval, of Progressive Homes Limited, was in attendance to comment on the proposed project. She advised that the Greater Vancouver Housing Corporation (GVHC) had requested the applicant move the proposed garbage enclosure 10 ft. closer to the property line due to the maintenance issue, and to increase the liveability of the adjacent unit. It was suggested that this be aligned with the front of the building face to lessen the impact on the park and the streetscape from Shepherd Drive.

Mr. Gomberoff advised that City staff had requested sidewalks and access to the units from the park and that the GVHC had been unwilling to accept these requirements for security reasons.

STAFF COMMENTS

Holger Burke, Development Co-ordinator, advised that staff were recommending approval of the Development Permit. It was felt that the applicant had responded to all issues raised in the report. The applicant had been encouraged to apply more landscaping on the internal roadway, to break up the visual lines of the garage doors. In response to a query, Mr. Burke reminded members that, because the proposed project was for social housing, the School Site Levy was not required. It was noted that the Social Planner did review the application, but that these comments had not been received in time to produce the report.

The Chair referred to a project in Terra Nova which was able to take advantage of its close proximity to a park and use the facilities. Ms. Duval explained that the configuration of the Terra Nova site was very different, with the amenity area situated at the entrance, and stated that the objectives of each project were quite different.

Brian Guzzi, Planner 1, Urban Design, advised that there had been discussions with both the applicants and the social planner regarding relocation of the day care facility to a more central area, adjacent to a drop-off facility. It was suggested that the amenity space could be utilized for home day care. The impact of industrial adjacency to the east was noted which necessitated the design of having open amenity space with good pedestrian access to the site. Mr. Guzzi further suggested that, due to the surplus of parking spaces, two spaces could be eliminated to ease the turning movement of vehicles accessing the proposed day care centre. Ms. Curtis, Architect, commented that there was one additional parking space planned for drop off at the day care centre.

The Chair suggested that the applicant supply corrected drawings of appropriate scale prior to the submission of this proposal to Council and expressed concern regarding the location of the garbage enclosure. Mr. Guzzi agreed that the movement of the garbage enclosure west into the boulevard would affect liveability of the adjacent unit, and stated his preference to have this placed along the setback, to reduce the impact.

Chuck Gale, General Manager, Engineering & Public Works Department, encouraged the placement of access into the park space from the proposed day care centre.

Ms. Chan-Yip provided clarification as to the reasoning behind the difference in trees shown in the renderings along the interior roadway, noting that this had been regulated by the Fire Department which requires a 6 m vertical clearance along the roadway to facilitate a "fire station area of 34 ft. x 32 ft."

Ms. Chan-Yip noted that low picket fencing would be built on the southern boundary against the park to provide a transition between the park and the project, approximately 1 ½ m from the property line.

Mr. Gale suggested that the applicant consider using a sturdier type of fencing material, such as chain link, to minimize the possibility of damage by park users.

CORRESPONDENCE

None.

GALLERY COMMENTS

None.

PANEL COMMENTS

The Chair expressed concern regarding the location of the day care facility. He expressed further concern regarding the removal of the trees from the internal driveway which, he commented, lessened the liveability of the environment. Mr. Gomberoff stated that he would formally request the Fire Department to relax the roadway clearance requirement to facilitate the placement of appropriate trees.

PANEL DECISION

It was moved and seconded

That the following recommendation be endorsed and forwarded to Council for adoption:

That Development Permit 99-170076 be issued for property located at 10711 Shepherd Drive:

- 1. To permit the construction of 48 rental townhouses and ancillary facilities on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/62); and***

2. ***To reduce the setback to a property line from 6 m (19.685 ft.) to 4 m (13.123 ft.) for two units and to 0 m for a garbage/recycling enclosure and to 4.5 m (14.764 ft.) for columns and trellises.***

CARRIED

3. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

The next meeting will be held on **Wednesday, April 26, 2000.**

4 **ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Wednesday, March 29, 2000

David McLellan
Chair

Susan Kopeschny, Admin. Asst.