

# City of Richmond

# **Report to Council**

To:

Richmond City Council

Date:

April 4, 2006

From:

Joe Erceg, MCIP

File:

01-0100-20-DPER1-

General Manager, Urban Development

01/2006-Vol 01

Re:

Development Permit Panel Meetings Held on March 29, 2006 and

March 15, 2006

## Panel Recommendation

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

a Development Permit (DP 03-249671) for the property at 8580, 8600 and i) 8680 Cambie Road; and

ii) a Development Permit (DP 04-279805) for the property at 9231 Beckwith Road;

be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.

Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:blg

## **Panel Report**

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on March 29, 2006 and March 15, 2006:

<u>DP 03-249671 – PAUL LEONG ARCHITECT INC. – 8580, 8600 AND 8680 CAMBIE ROAD</u> (March 29, 2006)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a mixed-use light industrial building at 8580 Cambie Road, which is the third building of an existing mixed-use light industrial development, on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/163). Included in the proposal is a variance to reduce the number of required off-street parking spaces from 230 to 221 for the entire development. The architect, Mr. Paul Leong, provided an overview of the project.

Staff advised that some of the uses in Phase I had changed and additional parking for the entire site was being provided in Phase II and that the allocation of parking would be dealt with through the strata plan application process.

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Leong provided additional information on site signage, bicycle parking and vehicle parking allocation. Staff then responded to questions from the Chair on the matter of a restrictive covenant for airport noise on this site, and Ms. Badyal advised that aircraft noise attenuation only applied to residential uses and there was none existing currently nor any proposed for the future on this site.

A letter referencing concerns related to parking demand in the general area was submitted. There were no comments from the public on the proposal.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

<u>DP 04-279805 - ANDREW CHEUNG ARCHITECTS INC. - 9231 BECKWITH ROAD</u> (March 15, 2006)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a 472 m<sup>2</sup> (5,080 ft<sup>2</sup>) restaurant building (teahouse/café) on a site zoned Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6). Variances to reduce the minimum road setback, permit fabric awning projections, and reduce the width of manoeuvring drive aisles are included in the proposal. The applicant's representative, architect Francis Lao, provided an overview of the site context and advised that this was a small British inspired Tea House with the building sited close to the street to enhance the pedestrian environment. It was noted that all parking was situated at the rear of the site.

Staff advised that the site was adjacent to a trail right-of-way to the north, that bicycle parking was available and that it was possible to have a link from the back of the site to the trail if the applicant wished to do so. There were no comments from the public on the proposal

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.



## **Development Permit Panel**

# Wednesday, March 29th 2006

Time:

3:30 p.m.

Place:

Council Chambers

Richmond City Hall

Present:

Joe Erceg, General Manager, Planning & Development, Chair

Jeff Day, General Manager, Engineering and Public Works

Cathryn Volkering Carlile, General Manager, Parks, Recreation and Cultural

Services

The meeting was called to order at 3:37 p.m.

The Chair advised that a letter had been received from the architect, William Rhone, for item no. 4 on the agenda indicating their unavailability to attend to today's meeting. (Schedule 1)

It was moved and seconded

That Development Permit DP 05-293643 from William Rhone Architect for property at 7360 St. Albans Road, be deferred to the next meeting of the Development Permit Panel to be held on Wednesday, April 12th, 2006 at 3.30 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

CARRIED

## 1. Minutes

That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday March 15th 2006, be adopted.

**CARRIED** 

## 2. Development Permit 03-249671

(Report: March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006 File No.: DP 3-249671) (REDMS No. 1764909)

APPLICANT:

Paul Leong Architect Inc.

PROPERTY LOCATION:

8580, 8600 and 8680 Cambie Road

## INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To permit the construction of a mixed-use light industrial building at 8580 Cambie Road, which is the third building of an existing mixed-use light industrial development, on a site zoned "Comprehensive Development District (CD/163)"; and

2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to reduce the number of required off-street parking spaces from 230 to 221 parking spaces for the entire mixed-use light industry development, including two (2) existing buildings and a third proposed building

## **Applicant's Comments**

Paul Leong, architect for the project, and the landscape architect were in attendance. Mr. Leong described the project as being located between Brown Road and Odlin Crescent and directly opposite Sexsmith Road. He advised that the project was the third building of a three building project and the subject building was two storeys with a parkade fronting onto Cambie Road. The main floor would be approximately 11,000 square feet of retail space, with office space on the second floor. The office lobby would be located on the south end of the building which would be next to the parking. Mr. Leong then used a coloured rendering to describe the exterior finishes of the building.

#### Staff Comments

Jean Lamontagne, Director of Development, advised that some of the uses in phases I and II had changed and as a part of this phase additional parking for the entire site was being provided. In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Lamontagne advised that the projects and the allocation of parking would be dealt with through the strata plan application process.

#### Panel Discussion

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Leong advised that (i) the banners on the sides of the building were intended to create colour and would provide an area for future permanent signage of the building; and (ii) the bike rack was located for convenience to the entry to the second floor but there was a significant plaza where a further bike rack could be located if necessary.

The landscape architect advised that there was a walkway on the west side of the project which was fenced off and lead to the back doors of the building.

Mr. Leong then responded to further questions on the number of parking spaces being provided, and he advised that because educational uses as well as retail uses had been proposed in the rezoning, this increased the number of parking spaces required for the existing buildings. The developer wanted the opportunity to add educational uses on the site and was adding parking to support that use.

The Chair commented that he was happy to hear the project would have flexibility for future parking requirements because in the future the City may refuse to issue building permits for building improvements and business licences where the applicant could not demonstrate they have adequate parking on the site. Staff then responded to questions from the Chair on the matter of a restrictive covenant for airport noise on this site, and Ms. Badyal advised that aircraft noise attenuation only applied to residential uses and there was none existing currently nor any proposed for the future on this site.

## **Gallery Comments**

None.

## Correspondence

Letter from Andy H. Shimizu, Manager, Administration & Corporate Planning, JTB International (Canada) Ltd. (Schedule 2).

#### Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

- 1. Permit the construction of a mixed-use light industrial building at 8580 Cambie Road, which is the third building of an existing mixed-use light industrial development, on a site zoned "Comprehensive Development District (CD/163)"; and
- 2. Vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to reduce the number of required off-street parking spaces from 230 to 221 parking spaces for the entire mixed-use light industry development, including two (2) existing buildings and a third proposed building

CARRIED

#### 3. Development Permit 05-292371

(Report: March 2<sup>nd</sup> File No.: DP 05-292371) (REDMS No. 1767481)

APPLICANT:

Matthew Cheng Architect Inc.

PROPERTY LOCATION:

9800 Alberta Road

## INTENT OF PERMIT:

To permit the construction of six (6) townhouse units at 9800 Alberta Road on a site zoned "Comprehensive Development District (CD/155)".

#### **Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Mathew Cheng, architect for the project and the developer's representative were in attendance. Mr. Cheng advised that the project was a six unit townhouse complex at Alberta Road and No. 4 Road, configured with 4 units at the front of the lot and two at the rear of the lot. A cross-access agreement had been registered in favour of the neighbour to the west. The vehicle access would be located on the west side and the pedestrian access located on the east side of the property. Mr. Cheng stated that each unit would have a two car garage except for one unit which would have a carport which would provide a more open feel to the site and allow for better surveillance. The exterior finishing was wood siding using two colours.

#### Staff Comments

None.

#### Panel Discussion

The Chair expressed his dissatisfaction with the project and made the following observations:

- The model displayed in Council Chambers was better than the submitted drawings.
- The lack of design sensitivity to existing neighbours may demonstrate the need for the City to require bigger land assemblies to occur.
- The development permit application sign on the site was on the ground and seemed to have been down for a long time. It was the developer's responsibility under the bylaw to ensure that this was visible for the neighbours to see.
- The site had been filled and the fill had been placed within the canopy drip line of the two trees on the south side of the property and to the trunk of the tree at the front of the property and they appeared to be at risk. The fill needed to be removed from the tree drip lines immediately and the trees protected with a protective barrier until Council had the opportunity to review the proposal.

The Chair asked why the applicant's arborist had indicated the tree in the front yard needed to be removed, and the applicant advised that he believed that if it stayed, it would die. The Chair requested that this advice be reviewed because the tree appears healthy and does not conflict with the buildings or driveways. Mr. Erceg continued by noting that one of the trees on the school site has sustained damage and a limb had been removed, and he expressed the hope that this had not been caused by the developer's machinery when filling the site. He then made the following additional comments:

- The project appeared to be a big three-storey box. The applicant should seriously consider discussing the project further with City staff particularly in relation to the articulation and design of the buildings.
- The Applicant did not appear to seriously consider direction given by the Advisory Design Panel and staff. Design response to comments was minimalistic.
- There was landscaping on the east side of the property but virtually nothing on the west side which is dominated by the shared driveway.
- The future height of the development was a concern with three storeys on top of fill towering over neighbouring two storey homes. There was a development across the street which was not built on fill which may be a better way to proceed.
- The second and third floors of the project could be cantilevered to improve articulation and provide an opportunity for landscaping on the west side.

The Chair noted that the choice of siding was a positive feature of the design.

Mr. Day also expressed the opinion that the model looked better than the drawings largely because of the material and colours used. He added that he would also like to see landscaping provided on both sides of the site.

## Correspondence

None.

## **Gallery Comments**

None.

#### Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That the application for a Development Permit DP 05-292371 be deferred to a future meeting of the Development Permit Panel in order to allow the applicant to resolve design issues regarding the proposed project with staff.

CARRIED

## 4. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded That the meeting be adjourned at 4:01 p.m.

**CARRIED** 

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<sup>th</sup>, 2006.

Joe Erceg, General Manager, Urban Development Division Chair Valerie Wilmot Executive Assistant, Corporate Services Department

Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on Wednesday, March 29th, 2006.

WILLIAM R. RHONE - ARCHITECT M.A.I.B.C., F.R.A.I.C. 2178 Bartlett Avenue Victoria, BC Canada V8S 2P9

Tel: 250-370-0942 Fax: 250-370-0946

24 March 2006

City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, BC V6C 2C1

Director, City Clerk's Office Attn:

Re: 4 unit townhouse project

7360 St. Albans Road

Richmond, BC DP 05-293643

## Dear Sir

Unfortunately I am unable to personally attend the Development Permit Panel on Wed. 29 March, at which time this project will be considered.

As per the Notice of application I am submitting the following written submission together with a coloured rendering.

## Project description:

- 1. the project will consist of 4 housing units in the form of 2 duplex buildings.
- 2. the buildings will be 3 stories high comprised of:
  - a. ground floor with 2 enclosed parking spaces per unit plus an entry with an office/den/bedroom with bath and storage.
  - b. 2nd floor comprised of living, dining, kitchen, and a powder room.
  - c. 3rd floor comprised of 3 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms.
- 3. the two buildings will be separated by an 18' wide open space partially paved for a guest parking slot, the balance landscaped with an outdoor amenity space.
- 4. each housing unit will have its own individual entrance and will have 3 options for outdoor living-a fenced front yard, a porch over the entrance off of the living room, and a rear deck off of the kitchen.
- 5. the general design of the project will be a modified "craftsman style" with bay window wide trim, heavy barge boards, and a heritage-type colour scheme with dark trim. Traditional style exterior light fixtures in antique finish together with the landscaping will complete the semi traditional theme.
- 6. the existing required setbacks on St. Albans and General Currie will be

To Development Permit Panel Date: MARCH

adhered to but the front porches and 18" deep bay windows will require approval for projecting into these spaces.

7. vehicular access to the rear driveway will be by way of a cross access from the driveway of the multiple housing project at the immediate North.

In addition to the above we have submitted a revised plan showing an adaptation of one unit for wheelchair use.

We trust the above complies with all stipulations by the City of Richmond and look forward to the Development Permit being issued.

Yours very truly,

William Rhone Archite

William R. Rhone M.A.I.B.C., F.R.A.I.C.

cc Sara Badyal M.Arch Planner 1

cc Mike Olak



JB

JTB International (Canada) Ltd.

RICHMOND OFFICE

3899 Odlin Crescent, Richmond. B.C. VEX 3Z7

Tel: (604) 276-0300 Fax: (604) 276-2272 or 272-0034

March 28, 2006

David Weber
Director, City Clerk's Office
City of Richmond

RE: Development Permit DP03-249671

Dear Mr. Weber,

To Development Permit Panel
Date: March 29, 2006
Item #\_2
Re: DP03-24967]

_	L	_	_			11	٧T
	L		D	W			
		4	G.	J	1		
- 1		7	DGK	7	7		
- [		1	DA	N	1		
Ī		T	DE	1	$\dagger$		
ſ	_	1	DE NE	<u></u>	t		
r		H		_	├		$\dashv$
H		┝		-	L		$\dashv$
1	-	L.			_		J
L	4	_		_			7
L	.			I			7
Γ	1	_		+	_		$\forall$
Ц_	1			- 1			

We are sending this in response to solicitation of views related to the above Development Permit and the requested reduction in available parking: JTB International (Canada) Ltd. has some concerns about the proposed reduction of parking spaces for the neighboring industrial development to be located at 8580 Cambie Road.

We note that there continues to be a shortage of "free" or patron friendly parking in the general vicinity of our office. As the area covered by the development permit referred to above is adjacent to our property, any development with reduced parking will undoubtedly put pressure on private parking lots (such as the one attached to our facility) in the immediate area of such a development.

Other than our building and its associated parking lot, none of the other facilities seem to have adequate surplus parking to handle both employees and patrons. We would ask that the City exercise due care in granting any reduction in parking and that the Developer provide some assurances that the requested reduction will not likely lead to significant incidents of illegal parking in adjacent properties.

Previously, we had addressed these concerns "in principle" with the Developer, in part, through an understanding that a fence on a "shared cost basis" would be placed between our property and the adjacent property to which the development permit refers. This would of course be subject to approval from the City and we are unable to determine if such a barrier is part of the Developer's plans at this time. We ask that this option remain open and enforceable in the event that illegal parking becomes an issue after the development is completed.

Thank you very much for allowing us to submit the above concerns for the record.

With Best Regards

Andy H Shimizul CGA

Manager, Administration & Corporate Planning

JTB International (Canada) Ltd.

