



City of Richmond

Report to Council

To: Richmond City Council
From: Joe Erceg
Chair, Development Permit Panel
Date: April 19, 2006
File: 01-0100-20-DPER1-
01/2006-Vol 01
Re: **Development Permit Panel Meeting Held on April 12, 2006**

Panel Recommendation

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

- i) a Development Permit (DP 04-278011) for the property at 6311 and 6331 Cooney Road; be endorsed, and the Permit so issued.

Joe Erceg, MCIP
Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:blg

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following item at its meeting held on April 12, 2006:

DP 04-278011 – W.T. LEUNG ARCHITECTS INC. – 6311 AND 6331 COONEY ROAD

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a 12-storey residential building containing 47 dwelling units on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7). Variances to reduce the number of required parking spaces, reduce the width of the manoeuvring aisle and allow an entry canopy projection are included in the proposal.

The architect, Mr. Wing Leung, provided a brief description of the project. In response to questions from the Panel, staff provided information on the proposed Public Art gallery space and redevelopment of the area as related to tower separation, floor plates and shadowing.

Correspondence referencing concerns related to airport noise impact on the outdoor space, traffic congestion, the manoeuvring aisle width variance and land use were submitted.

Mr. Lam Sha Lu, of 8088 Spires Gate, expressed concern regarding building height. There were no further comments from the public on the proposal.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.



Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, April 12th, 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 3:31 p.m.

1. Minutes

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, March 29th, 2006, be adopted.

CARRIED

2. Development Permit 05-293643

(Report: Mar. 2/06 File No.: DP 05-293643) (REDMS No. 1593623) (Referred from the March 29th, 2006 Panel Meeting.)

APPLICANT: William Rhone Architect

PROPERTY LOCATION: 7360 St. Albans Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To permit the construction of four (4) townhouse units at 7360 St. Albans Road on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/120); and
2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to increase the maximum permitted porch and balcony projection into the General Currie Road setback from 1 m to 2.5 m for four (4) porch/balcony projections.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. William Rhone, architect, was in attendance. He advised that the application was for a small project consisting of two buildings with landscaping between the two. The design was an articulated craftsman style, using dark trim and earth tone paint colours. He advised that the site would be extensively landscaped with more trees and landscaping being added to the site, as well as preserving some existing boulevard trees.

Staff Comments

Jean Lamontagne, Director of Development, advised that new reference drawings had been provided to the Panel in response to a staff request for an adaptable unit which would have a wider staircase for universal access, with only minor modifications needed.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

None.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *permit the construction of four (4) townhouse units at 7360 St. Albans Road on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/120); and*
2. *vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to increase the maximum permitted porch and balcony projection into the General Currie Road setback from 1 m to 2.5 m for four (4) porch/balcony projections.*

CARRIED

3. Development Permit 04-278011

(Report: March 20, 2006 File No.: DP 04-278011) (REDMS No. 1681847)

The applicant was not yet in attendance, and it was agreed to move this item to the end of the agenda.

4. Development Permit 05-293065

(Report: March 14, 2006 File No.: DP-05-293065) (REDMS No. 1706255)

APPLICANT: Parmjit S. Randhawa

PROPERTY LOCATION: 8431 and 8451 No. 2 Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To permit the construction of 10 townhouses at 8431 and 8451 No. 2 Road on a site zoned "Townhouse District (R2 – 0.7)"; and
2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:
 - a) Reduce the minimum Colville Road side yard setback from 6 m to 4.5 m;
 - b) Reduce the minimum north side yard setback from 3 m to 1.5 m limited to the northeast unit; and
 - c) Increase the maximum permitted site coverage from 40% to 42%.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Matthew Cheng, architect, and Mr. Fred Liu, landscape architect, were in attendance.

Mr. Cheng explained that this was a 10-unit townhouse development at the corner of No. 2 Road and Colville Road consisting of four buildings. At the back of the site would be two, 2 storey duplexes and at the front two, 2-1/2 storey buildings. Mr. Cheng then referred to comments from the Advisory Design Panel, and he explained that:

- The site entrance had been re-oriented to have street access from the driveway along Colville Road.
- The Colville Road streetscape had been improved by orienting one of the entry doors.
- The garbage would be located on the east side of the driveway entrance.
- The garage door had been designed to have windows to improve the appearance of the building.

Fred Liu referred to the landscaping and advised that they had wanted to save as many of the existing trees as possible, however, none of the trees were worth saving especially since the site would be built up a couple of feet. They also wanted to provide good patios for the units facing No. 2 Road as well as allowing for visual surveillance. He noted that they had worked with staff to make it more interesting. Mr. Lui stated that the No. 2 Road sidewalk was very close to the existing property line so it would not be possible to locate street trees in this area, however, there would be 4 street trees along Colville Road. He noted that there was an issue with permeability of the site and since they did not want to increase the amount of grass, they would be using interlocking pavers over part of the driveway.

Staff Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

The Chair noted that existing trees had been removed and that plans had been made to relocate a boulevard Maple tree to a nearby park. He further noted that seven trees had been removed from the site and asked for an explanation of why and when these had been removed. The landscape architect noted that many of them had not been in good condition since they had been neglected. The site would be increased a couple of feet which would bury the root system of the trees and make it impractical to save them. In response to further questions from the Chair, the developer's representative who was also in attendance advised that when they purchased the site the trees had already been removed and it had been preloaded. Staff confirmed that the trees appeared to have been removed in September 2005. The Chair noted that this would have pre-dated the new tree bylaw, however, he asked if there had been a commitment given at the time of rezoning to keep the trees until a proper assessment of them had been undertaken. Staff advised that it was not clear if there was such a commitment but that staff had never encouraged removal of any trees. The Chair then expressed concern that applicants were coming forward and giving a very light commitment to keep trees and once they moved along the rezoning process and pre-loaded the site, removal or damage of trees occurred so that at the time of development permit application it was a fait accompli and nothing could be done about it. He then asked if the developer's representative had anything to offer by way of clarification of this current situation.

The landscape architect advised that he always visits job sites to get a good visual assessment and during his initial assessment he had not see any trees that were worth saving. He stated that he talked to planning staff several times about saving trees and they made it clear that they should save as many as possible. In response to a question from the Chair, Mr. Lamontagne then confirmed that seven trees had indeed been removed from the site.

In response to a question from the Chair, the developer's representative advised that they took ownership of the property in December 2005 and that the trees had already been removed and the site had been pre-loaded.

The Chair stated that the Official Community Plan guidelines state that for every major tree removed from a site, two are to be planted with a minimum 15 cm calliper, and he asked if the applicant was prepared to commit to increase the calliper of 14 of the 26 trees they were proposing to plant on the site to 15 cm minimum. The Chair stated that the community was concerned about tree retention. The developer's representative expressed the opinion that the site maybe too small to accommodate such large trees, and Mr. Lui stated that practical considerations should be given, since not many of the types of trees they were proposing to plant would be available in 15 cm calliper size. He noted that in the past a compromise had been reached where the dollar value of larger trees not able to be incorporated on a site had been spent on additional landscaping.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Decision

The Chair stated that he had received much feedback about the weak commitment given to tree retention and noted that a tree bylaw had recently been introduced to deal with this issue. He stated that it was not acceptable for the owner, even though it may have been the previous owner of the site, after Public Hearing to remove seven trees without permission from the City.

It was moved and seconded

That Development Permit DP 05-293065 for property at 8431 and 8451 No. 2 Road be referred to the next meeting of the Development Permit Panel, to be held in the Council Chambers on Wednesday, April 26th, 2006 at 3.30 p.m., in order to allow the applicant to review the landscape plan with staff in order to work on meeting the requirements of the Official Community Plan for replacement of trees on this property.

CARRIED

5. Development Permit 05-297678

(Report: March 20, 2006 File No.: DP-05-297678) (REDMS No. 1709690)

APPLICANT: Fortune Venture Enterprises Ltd

PROPERTY LOCATION: 8228 Westminster Highway (formerly 8200 and 8220 Westminster Highway)

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To permit the construction of a 12-storey mixed-use commercial and residential building consisting of 43 dwelling units, 345 m² (3,715 ft²) of ground floor commercial space and 63 off-street parking spaces on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7); and
2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to
 - a) Reduce the Westminster Highway setback from 3 m to 1.18 m;
 - b) Reduce the Buswell Street setback from 3 m to 0 m;
 - c) Allow a portion of the building to have a 0.92 m setback at the corner of Westminster Highway and Buswell Street;
 - d) Reduce the required residential parking from 65 to 52; and
 - e) Reduce manoeuvring aisle width from 7.5 m to 6.7 m.

Applicant's Comments

Matthew Cheng, architect for the project, was in attendance and stated that the application was for a 12-storey, high-rise apartment building. He advised that the Advisory Design Panel had asked that the corner of the podium be straightened but this had not been possible because of the location of the traffic lights and so there was still a 45-degree cut at the corner.

Mr. Cheng noted that there had been comments from the Advisory Design Panel on the transparency of the podium and advised that it was proposed to make it all translucent, and the only louvers would be around the windows on the lane side. He added that an accessible unit had been provided on the 4th floor and the parking for disabled relocated close to the elevator. The columns had been relocated closer to the building to increase room for pedestrian circulation. The corner parapet had been lowered so that it would not block the view of the 4th floor residents.

Mr. Cheng further advised that there would be a security gate on the top of the parking area with visitor and commercial parking outside the gate, which would increase security for the residential parking. He stated that because of the context of the site, the parking requirements were less than required but the developer had made a Transit Oriented Development contribution of \$160,000 to the City as compensation for the shortage of parking spaces. He explained that the loading area turning radius had been redesigned to accommodate moving trucks. Bicycle and recycling areas were being provided for use of both residents and commercial users.

Alison Conde, landscape architect, advised that there would be a roof top garden and at street level there would be the 3 existing trees, which had been boarded and protected. As well there would be another 2 or 3 trees along Westminster Highway. The roof top garden was a combination of evergreens and fall colour shrubs around the perimeter of the roof as well as a year round running track and small playground area. The rest of the landscaping would be deciduous trees, evergreens and perennials. She noted that all accesses would be wheelchair accessible, and the landscaping would be raised rather than having a series of retaining walls.

Staff Comments

Jean Lamontagne advised that staff had agreed to the variances because they felt it created a better interface to Westminster Highway. Staff confirmed that a parking study had been undertaken and traffic projections were in line with road network capacity.

Panel Discussion

In response to a question from the Panel, Mr. Cheng advised that the bike parking on the ground floor was accessible for seniors riding scooters. He also advised that an accessible unit had been provided.

Correspondence

Dan Wong, #802 – 6191 Buswell Street (Schedule No. 1)

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *Permit the construction of a 12-storey mixed-use commercial and residential building consisting of 43 dwelling units, 345 m² (3,715 ft²) of ground floor commercial space and 63 off-street parking spaces on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7); and*
2. *Vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:*
 - a) *Reduce the Westminster Highway setback from 3 m to 1.18 m;*
 - b) *Reduce the Buswell Street setback from 3 m to 0 m;*
 - c) *Allow a portion of the building to have a 0.92 m setback at the corner of Westminster Highway and Buswell Street;*
 - d) *Reduce the required residential parking from 65 to 52; and*
 - e) *Reduce manoeuvring aisle width from 7.5 m to 6.7 m.*

CARRIED

6. Development Permit 05-302533

(Report: March 7, 2006 File No.: DP-05-302533) (REDMS No. 1750805)

APPLICANT: Charan Sethi

PROPERTY LOCATION: 9791 Granville Avenue

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To permit the construction of a 7-unit townhouse development at 9791 Granville Avenue on a site zoned "Comprehensive Development District (CD/155)"; and
2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to reduce the minimum east side yard setback from 3 m to 2.7 m for a ground floor electrical closet.

Applicant's Comments

Tom Yamamoto, architect, and Charan Sethi, applicant, were in attendance. Mr. Yamamoto described the project as a small property located next to the school and consisting of a 3 storey unit at the front and a two storey unit at the rear of the property to interface with the existing single-family homes. A cross-access agreement for the benefit of the adjacent duplex located to the east (6971 and 6991 No 4 Road) had been obtained.

Mr. Yamamoto noted that because of the small size of the property there was little room available for amenities but a seating area had been provided with a walkway to the street. He explained that the variance was to accommodate a one-storey projection for an electrical closet. He added that the three-storey main building was set back 3.4 m., which was more than required. He advised that there would be one handicapped adaptable unit

Staff Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

In response to a question from the Chair, Mr. Yamamoto confirmed that there was no play equipment provided because there was not enough space for such an amenity.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

- 1. Permit the construction of a 7-unit townhouse development at 9791 Granville Avenue on a site zoned "Comprehensive Development District (CD/155)"; and*
- 2. Vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to reduce the minimum east side yard setback from 3 m to 2.7 m for a ground floor electrical closet.*

CARRIED

7. Development Permit 05-304533

(Report: March 7, 2006 File No.: DP-05-304533) (REDMS No. 1704258)

APPLICANT: Am-Pri Construction Ltd

PROPERTY LOCATION: 7071 Bridge Street

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To permit the construction of 17 townhouse units at 7071 Bridge Street on a site zoned "Comprehensive Development District (CD/35)"; and
2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to reduce the front yard setback from 6 m to 2.1 m for a recycling enclosure and a garbage enclosure.

Applicant's Comments

Tom Yamamoto, architect, stated that there had been 3 large trees on the property which they had originally tried to save, however, the root systems had been damaged during the demolition of the house last summer, and their arborist had said these trees could not be preserved. He advised that they were providing some large calliper trees as well as a contribution towards tree planting in the community park. The amenity space had been relocated to the centre of the project. The variance being requested related to enclosures for recycling and garbage as there would not be curbside garbage pick-up in this small development.

Mr. Masa Ito, landscape architect, referred to the tree replacement proposal and stated that, although the trees were intact, the root system was damaged, and in the opinion of the arborist they were not suitable for retention. He advised that the landscaping plan included three 15cm calliper trees plus three 5 metre high conifers (conifers are classified by height rather than calliper of the trunk) and this size would be equivalent to or greater than a 15 cm calliper tree. In addition there would be a number of trees suited to small areas. The difference in the estimated value between the existing trees and the proposed replacement trees for the site was approximately \$3,000, which was paid in cash to the City's Park Development Fund. In response to a question from the Panel, staff advised that the trees were damaged by machinery working too close to the root system when the house was demolished. The Chair commented that through the rezoning process, members of the community had expressed concern about the way the streets in the neighbourhood were being changed by development, and the City had been relying on this applicant's commitment to protect the trees on this property as well as design the open space on the site to provide a benefit to the community. He noted, however, that the trees had been damaged, and the site reconfigured to the benefit of the future residents rather than of the existing residents of the community, which put the City in a difficult situation.

Staff Comments

Mr. Lamontagne advised that the current project was different than the one presented to the Public Hearing in March 2005 in which the larger trees were to be preserved. He noted that the FAR had been increased from .55 to .60 with the intent to retain the trees on Bridge Street. However, since this was not possible, the applicant had agreed to provide a contribution to the City's affordable housing fund.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

In response to a question from the Chair on whether or not the trees had been protected during demolition of the house, information was provided by the applicant's representative that demolition was done in July last year, and he would do whatever he could to compensate for this damage.

Panel Decision

The Chair stated that while he acknowledged the applicant's contribution to the affordable housing fund, he could not support the application today. He expressed the opinion that this issue went beyond the value of the trees. The community had made it clear at the public hearing that they wanted the trees and open space adjacent to the street, but the trees had been damaged and the open space internalized. He stated that he would like a design closer to the original proposal for this site and appropriate compensation for the damaged trees; this could include replanting of the damaged trees with mature replacements to preserve the original streetscape concept. He added that it was incumbent on the applicant to develop a suitable proposal to address these issues.

In response to further questions from the Chair, the architect advised that the amenity space had been relocated because of the removal of the trees, and to comply with design guidelines which indicated that play spaces should be located internally for safety reasons. The Chair commented that these guidelines had been superseded by the conditions of the rezoning to a higher density for this site in order to allow for the retention of the trees and the open space located next to the public domain.

Ms. Carlile expressed concern about locating the play area close to the street. Mr. Day was supportive of the Chair's position that there was an expectation in the community for a certain street character.

It was moved and seconded

That Development Permit 05-304533 for property located at 7071 Bridge Street be referred to staff for further discussion with the applicant.

CARRIED

7. Development Variance Permit 05-312499

(Report: March 14, 2006 File No.: DV 05-312499) (REDMS No. 1756008)

APPLICANT: Sergei Agafontsev

PROPERTY LOCATION: 16500 Westminster Highway

INTENT OF PERMIT: To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to reduce the west side yard setback of the "Agricultural District (AG1)" from 4.5 m (14.76 ft.) to 0.0 m (0.00 ft.) in order to permit the construction of a barn.

The applicant was not in attendance.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That DVP 05-3312499 for property at 16500 Westminster Highway, be referred to the next meeting of the Development Permit Panel to be held in Council Chambers on Wednesday, April 26th, 2006 at 3.30 p.m.

CARRIED

3. Development Permit 04-278011

(Report: March 20, 2006 File No.: DP 04-278011) (REDMS No. 1681847)

APPLICANT: W.T. Leung Architects Inc.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 6311 and 6331 Cooney Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To permit the construction of a 12-storey residential building containing 47 dwelling units on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7); and
2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:
 - a) reduce the number of required parking stalls from 80 to 72;
 - b) reduce the manoeuvring aisle from 7.6 m to 6.7 m; and
 - c) allow an entry canopy to project 1.9 m into the Cooney Road setback

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Wing Leung, architect, apologized for arriving late to the meeting. He stated that the applicant could abide by all the conditions that staff had provided, and were prepared to meet the parking requirements, and noise mitigation requirements.

Staff Comments

Mr. Lamontagne advised that correspondence had been received from residents who had not been living in the area when the rezoning application was considered at the Public Hearing, and they were concerned about noise from the airport. Ms. Cecilia Achiam, Senior Planner, added that the residents were concerned that the open space would be subjected to noise from the airport and it was their opinion that the City should not support open space in this area.

In response to questions from Ms. Volkering Carlile on the proposed public art gallery space, Ms. Achiam advised agreements had been drafted for the operation and access, and the applicant would finish the space with the same finishes as the tower lobby. She explained that the city was responsible for utilities, was not responsible for strata fees and the developer was leasing the space to the city for \$1 per year for 99 years. The City is free to lease the space out to artists or non-profit art groups. The rent will off set the operational costs. Ms. Achiam advised that commercial signage to promote the gallery would be possible because of the zoning of the site.

In response to further questions from the Chair Ms. Achiam responded that due to the location of the existing neighbouring tower and limited land assembly, tower separation for a future tower to the south would not meet city guidelines and that the proposed floor plate meets the city guideline. The floor plate is skinnier in configuration to reduce shadowing impact on the existing four-storey building behind and to provide the min. 24 m separation from the existing residential tower to the north.

Correspondence

S. Wang, wangswd@hotmail.com (schedule No. 2)

Gallery Comments

Mr. Lam Sha Lu, 8088 Spires Gate, expressed the opinion that the developer should only be allowed to build to the height of the existing buildings on the site. The Chair explained that the Panel was only considering design and that the density had already been addressed through the rezoning process. He noted that the subject site was part of the City Centre and the community plan allowed for such redevelopment.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

- 1. Permit the construction of a 12-storey residential building containing 47 dwelling units on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7); and*
- 2. Vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:*

- a) *reduce the number of required parking stalls from 80 to 72;*
- b) *reduce the manoeuvring aisle from 7.6 m to 6.7 m; and*
- c) *allow an entry canopy to project 1.9 m into the Cooney Road setback.*

CARRIED

8. New Business

There was no new business.

9. Date Of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Development Permit Panel will be held on Wednesday, April 26th, 2006 in Council Chambers.

10. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:50 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, April 12th, 2006.

Joe Erceg,
General Manager, Urban Development
Chair

Valerie Wilmot
Executive Assistant, Corporate Services
Department

April 12/06

Director,
City Clerk's Office
Richmond City Hall

Re. Application for a Development Permit

DP 05-297678

Hearing Wed. April 12
3:30 pm

Dear Sir,

In regard to the above permit application
I strongly object to the permit being granted.
The area is already very congested, adding
another highrise will further ~~problems~~ create
traffic problems. The applications to
reduce set back from Westminster Hwy +
Buswell St., & reduce manoeuvring
aisle widths will definitely add to
congestions of the area.



2.

I feel that to maintain the present characters of this area & for the ease of traffic flow, the above application

for permit should not be granted. The developer should not ~~be~~ be allowed to

build on to city sidewalk areas!

Thank you,

Dan Wong

802-6191 Suswell St.
Richmond, BC

Permit Panel
'12, 2006

Re: DP. 04-278011

Re: Item No. 2

Thanks your coming down to explain today.

As the re-zoning project was filed April 2004, when the current under-constructing Canada Line has not decided for its detail, conditions are changed much since then. We neighbor folks feel below points for the proposal of alter the DP 04-278011

- 1) Most of current residents in the surrounding area have not attended the public hearing of April 2004, or even not aware of such project.
- 2) Province Government newly issued "Provincial Gateway" program which the project might violated with its livable criteria. I reviewed many new restriction issued by GVRD board.
- 3) The site is so close to the projected terminal and commuter loop zone of Canada Line, in the future, within the short radius of the Canada Line terminal, the open land will very rare for potential public use such as public parking building or green open yard for emergency rescuer etc.

If the applicant will not change the intent of building a 12 stories high rise apartment, which authority would you like us to make further appeal to ?

Upon your advice, we might first write to Mayor Malcolm Brodie or inquiry for further opposition

Regards

S.Wang, wangswd@hotmail.com ;Tel: 1-604-2414983; Fax:1-604-2414984