



City of Richmond

Report to Council

To: Richmond City Council
From: Joe Erceg, MCIP
Chair, Development Permit Panel
Date: May 2, 2006
File: 01-0100-20-
DPER1-01/2006-
Vol 01
Re: **Development Permit Panel Meetings Held on April 12, 2006 and
April 26, 2006**

Panel Recommendation

1. That the recommendations of the Panel to authorize the issuance of:
 - i) a Development Permit (DP 05-293065) for the property at 8431 and 8451 No. 2 Road; and
 - ii) a Development Variance Permit (DV 05-309577) for the property at 10800 Palmberg Road;be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.

2. That the revisions to the landscape plans at 6333 Katsura Street (formerly 6440 Garden City Road and 9071, 9111, 9131, 9151, 9171, 9191 and 9211 Alberta Road) be deemed to be in general compliance with the Development Permit (DP 04-272603) issued for that property.



Joe Erceg, MCIP
Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:blg

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on April 12, 2006 and April 26, 2006:

DP 05-293065 – PARMJIT S. RANDHAWA – 8431 AND 8451 NO. 2 ROAD
(April 12, 2006 & April 26, 2006)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of ten (10) townhouse units on a site zoned Townhouse District (R2 – 0.7). Variances to reduce the Colville Road setback, to reduce the north side yard setback and to increase the site coverage are included in the proposal. The proposal was originally presented at the Development Permit Panel Meeting on April 12, 2006 and was referred to the April 26, 2006 Panel Meeting 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 (OCP) for replacement of trees on this property.

At the April 12th Development Permit Panel Meeting, the architect, Mr. Matthew Cheung, and landscape architect, Mr. Fred Liu, provided brief descriptions of the project. The Chair 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 (7) trees without permission from the City.

At the April 26, 2006 Development Permit Panel Meeting, Mr. Liu advised that the seven (7) trees removed from the property would be replaced with 14 specimen size trees (15 cm dbh).

There were no comments or correspondence from the public on the proposal at either meeting.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DV 05-309577 – SILVER STAR STABLES – 10800 PALMBERG ROAD
(April 26, 2006)

The Panel considered a Development Variance Permit application to reduce a side yard setback to bring a constructed horse riding enclosure into compliance with zoning requirements.

The owner, Ms. Pat Diamond, provided a brief description of the project, stating that a contractor had built the horse riding enclosure without applying for a Building Permit as they had stated that one was not required. When asked by the Chair, Ms. Diamond confirmed that they were not avoiding a Building Permit; they had received the wrong information from their contractor.

There were no comments from the public on the proposal.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

GENERAL COMPLIANCE RULING (DP 04-272603) – CHANDLER KATSURA DEVELOPMENTS – 6333 KATSURA STREET (formerly 6440 Garden City Road and 9071, 9111, 9131, 9151, 9171, 9191 and 9211 Alberta Road)
(April 26, 2006)

The Panel considered an application for a General Compliance ruling to accommodate a required outdoor play area and fence enclosure for a proposed licensed group childcare facility.

Ms. Sheryl Lim, from the developer's office, provided a brief description of the landscaping changes. In response to a query from the Chair, Ms. Lim advised that 12 pieces of Public Art would be placed throughout the development and adjacent public park and that the comments from Vancouver Coastal Health childcare licensing had been incorporated.

Staff advised that the proposed fencing was visually permeable and complied with zoning requirements.

There were no comments from the public on the proposal.

The Panel recommends that the changes be deemed to be in general compliance with the Development Permit (DP 04-272603) issued.



Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, April 26th, 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 3:30 p.m.

1. Minutes

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on April 12th, 2006, be adopted.

CARRIED

2. Development Permit 05-293065

(Report: March 14, 2006 File No.: DP 05-293065) (REDMS No. 1706255, 180749) (Referred from April 12th 2006 Development Permit Panel Meeting)

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
 - b) Increase the maximum permitted site coverage from 40% to 42%.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Fred Liu, landscape architect, was in attendance and referred to the last Panel meeting when the applicant had been requested to replace seven trees, which had been removed from the site, with fourteen, 15 cm calliper trees. Mr. Lui advised that he had worked with staff to develop a scheme to locate all fourteen trees on the site, and with the aid of a drawing he described their location, noting that they had also changed the tree types since the original design. Three of the new trees (Red maples) would be located on City property on Colville Road, and within the property on Colville Road and No. 2 Road trees would include five Gleditsia Sunburst as well as six Magnolias.

Staff Comments

Mr. Jean Lamontagne, Director of Development, advised that three of the 15 cm calliper trees would be on the City boulevard and the Parks staff were in agreement with this proposal which would provide a two for one for the replacement.

Panel Discussion

None.

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 10 townhouses at 8431 and 8451 No. 2 Road on a site zoned "Townhouse District (R2 - 0.7)"; and*
2. *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%.*

CARRIED

3. Development Variance Permit - DV 05-312499

(Report: March 14, 2006 File No.: DV 05-312499) (REDMS No. 1756008) (Referred from April 12th 2006 Development Permit Panel Meeting)

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

Please see Page 6 of these minutes for action taken on this matter.

4. GENERAL COMPLIANCE - REQUEST BY CHANDLER KATSURA DEVELOPMENTS INC. FOR A GENERAL COMPLIANCE RULING

(Report: April 3, 2006 File No.: DP 04-272603) (REDMS No. 1794651)

APPLICANT: **Chandler Katsura Developments Inc.**

PROPERTY LOCATION: **6333 Katsura Street (formerly 6440 Garden City Road and 9071, 9111, 9131, 9151, 9171, 9191 and 9211 Alberta Road)**

Applicant's Comments

Cheryl Lim, the applicant's representative was in attendance, and she explained that the project was located at the corner of Garden City Road and Cook Road, consisting of two towers with about 5,000 sq.ft. of commercial space fronting on Garden City Road. She stated that a childcare operator would like to occupy the space but required outdoor play space. In order to accommodate this, the applicant proposed to change the original mini plaza to outdoor children's play space surrounded by a required 6-foot fence.

In response to a question from the Chair, Ms. Lim advised that there would be public art installations located throughout the project as well as some being located within the adjacent park.

Staff Comments

Mr. Lamontagne commented that no variance was required for the height of the fence. He advised that the proposal would provide good visual surveillance throughout the site and staff believed it would be very safe at this corner.

Gallery Comments

None.

Correspondence

None.

Panel Discussion

Ms. Carlile asked if there would be a water play area in the space, and Ms. Lim responded that there would be a hose for wash-down but no water feature for play was proposed.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That the proposed changes to a portion of the outdoor space at the southwest corner of the site at 6333 Katsura Street (formerly 6440 Garden City Road and 9071, 9111, 9131, 9151, 9171, 9191 and 9211 Alberta Road) to accommodate a child care facility play area be deemed to be in General Compliance with the Development Permit (DP 04-272603).

CARRIED

5. Development Variance Permit - 05-309577

(Report: March 28, 2006 File No.: DV 05-309577) (REDMS No. 1775514)

APPLICANT: **Silver Star Stables**

PROPERTY LOCATION: **10800 Palmberg Road**

INTENT OF PERMIT: To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to reduce the north side yard setback of the "Agricultural District (AG1)" from 4.5 m (14.76 ft.) to 1.76 m (5.80 ft.) in order to permit the construction of a horse riding enclosure.

Applicant's Comments

Ms. Pat Dymond, owner of the subject property and representing the applicant, was in attendance. Ms. Dymond explained that when she and her family purchased the property five years ago, the drainage had been very poor and they had done extensive work to improve this. In addition, they had built a covered arena to allow more time to ride the horses, and, at that time, were informed that a building permit was not required. Approximately four years later, they were advised that they did need a building permit. They had asked the builder to construct the building 3 metres from the property line, however, he built it too close. They had been informed that it would be very expensive to move it and so they would like it to remain in its existing location. Additionally, if it were to be moved, it would cover the drainage area and it would not be possible to move the tractor in and out. If it were moved to the pasture, extensive work would need to be done at a cost of about \$25,000 to \$30,000.

In response to a question from the Chair as to who advised them they did not require a building permit, Ms. Dymond advised that she believed the builder had advised her husband.

Staff Comments

Mr. Lamontagne advised that the building was a temporary type of structure, and there was an agreement between the applicant and the neighbour to the north to the effect that, if the neighbour wished to make improvements on their property and the subject structure would make them in non-compliance, the structure would be moved.

Panel Discussion

The Chair stated that he had noticed the property was for sale when he drove by today, and he questioned how they were advising prospective purchasers and how this would affect the new buyer if Council did not approve the application. Ms. Dymond responded that the informational signage onsite advised prospective purchasers of the situation. In response to further questions, she stated that the arena was meant to stay but, if need be, the prospective buyer would have to move it. If the owners of the property to the north were to build something on their property, which would be affected by the arena, it (the arena) would have to be moved. She added that the neighbouring property was rented, and that the owners lived overseas.

The Chair noted that the City had repeatedly sent letters to the applicant, and there were still some outstanding building permit issues, and asked if these matters would be resolved prior to the sale of the property. Ms. Dymond responded that they were having problems getting their consultants to deliver their report but that it was in process.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Decision

The Chair stated that he looked at the property and the structure was not very visible and he had no trouble supporting the application.

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Variance Permit be issued which would vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to reduce the north side yard setback of the "Agricultural District (AG1)" from 4.5 m (14.76 ft.) to 1.76 m (5.80 ft.) in order to permit the construction of a horse riding enclosure located at 10800 Palmberg Road.

CARRIED

3. Development Variance Permit - DV 05-312499

(Report: March 14, 2006 File No.: DV 05-312499) (REDMS No. 1756008) (Referred from April 12th 2006 Development Permit Panel Meeting)

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.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Sergei Agafontsev, the applicant, was in attendance. He explained that through a series of errors, the barn had been constructed too close to the property line.

Staff Comments

Mr. Lamontagne advised that the barn was adjacent to No. 7 Road, which was mostly used as a service road and not used on a regular basis. He added that there was a fairly large ditch adjacent to the barn.

In response to a question from the Chair on why construction was not undertaken in accordance with the building permit, Mr. Lamontagne stated that a building permit was requested and issued for a building of a different size than was on the site. After further inspection it was found that the building was being built not in accordance with the permit, and so the applicant applied for a revised building permit to allow for a larger barn. Subsequently, a survey requested by the building inspector indicated that the barn was encroaching into the side yard setback. In response to a further question from the Chair regarding the setbacks shown on the second building permit, staff advised that the minimum required 4.5 m setback was noted on the Building Permit although the plan attached to the building permit did not show the setbacks. Mr. Day expressed the opinion that a release of liability should be obtained to safeguard the City's interests and staff confirmed that such an agreement would be obtained although it was not mentioned in the staff report.

The Chair questioned why the applicant had built a larger structure than his building permit allowed, and he replied that he was self-contracting the building and required it. In response to questions from the Panel, the applicant stated that he was farming the property, growing blueberries, and the barn was used for storage of farm equipment and cold storage for blueberries.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Decision

Mr. Day commented that although he had some concerns about the applicant not having built according to the terms of the building permit, he would support the variance because it was not affecting the neighbours and there was a release of liability for the City. The Chair stated that he did not appreciate the way the applicant built the barn but he would support the application because the property was being farmed and the building supported farming.

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Variance Permit be issued which would 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 located at 16500 Westminster Highway.

CARRIED

6. Development Permit 06-332699

(Report: April 11, 2006 File No.: DP 06-332699) (REDMS No. 1794885)

APPLICANT: **Cannon Design on behalf of the City of Richmond**

PROPERTY LOCATION: **6080 River Road**

INTENT OF PERMIT: To permit the construction of two-storey with mezzanine multi-purpose sport facility (Richmond Oval) with underground parking at 6080 River Road on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/157).

Applicant's Comments

Greg Scott, Director, Major Projects, introduced representatives from Cannon Design, and Mr. Larry Podhora, architect, provided a detailed overview of the proposal to construct the Richmond Oval. Mr. Podhora spoke briefly of the consultation review process involved in the development of the design, and stated that every aspect of the building touched on some fundamental meaning of the City and the community. The inspiration for the building was reliving three qualities – flight, fusion and flow. Flow referred to the river, flight was reflected in the natural habitat – birds and the estuary, as well as the closeness to the airport where there was a different kind of flight. Fusion referred to the consolidation and integration of these into the building.

Referring to the site design, Mr. Podhora provided the following information:

- River Road would be relocated to the south side of the building and a new intersection would be created at River Road and HollyBridge Way, which would be the introduction to a completely new precinct. From here the east elevation would be seen.
- In the foreground there would be a public plaza bounded by water works, which would be a water feature, which retains storm water run-off in a water pond that is situated along the northeast corner of the building..
- The Plaza will lead to the entrance lobby. The Plaza extends to the west along the south edge of the building.
- The massing of the building was broken down with the use of special materials – glazing on the two lower floors and polycarbon. These would be extremely important surfaces and the design team recognized their importance by working closely with a prominent west coast artist who would help establish a colour palette for the polycarbon.
- Landscaping would be introduced on the site, including landscaping between the oval and parcel six, which would be used as a staging area during the Olympics by VANOC. This would lead to the west side of the building which was the service side and the way the parking would be approached from River Road. Parking would be available in the southwest corner of the building.
- One of the most important features of the building was the north side and the plaza was an important part of how residents and users of the building would be engaged in the site.
- There would be a gentle slope to the dyke and over a distance of about 60 m there would be two cascading features.
- The area north of the building was protected by a series of feathered roof spans, which created porches to serve as outdoor space.
- Immediately north of this area was a large parcel of land which would be lawn (Fitness Fun) and would be available for special functions and would accommodate special seating.
- The building would have three levels – the street level, activity level and the mezzanine level, with the street level being accessible directly from the street.
- There would be a customer help desk at the three-storey entrance lobby, and from the lobby there would be unobstructed views of the two levels above.
- The lower level would consist of approximately 438 parking stalls. The parkade would be ringed on the west side by the services area and on the north side by the refrigeration plant room, chiller and boiler room. The remainder of the floor would be for sport and health opportunities, change rooms and team rooms. The rest of the area on the south was intended for community space, offices, washrooms and tenant space for sport related uses.

- The activity level which would be very near the level of the plaza on the north side would be 2 m. above the dyke providing an extension of the outside on the north side. It would contain a great hall which would be about 200 m long by 100 m wide.
- The legacy uses proposed were ice uses, basketball, walking and jogging tracks, a field house which would have a 200 m track.
- The mezzanine level would be used for fitness.
- The great hall would be used for the speed skating track during the Olympics.

Mr. Podhara concluded his presentation by saying that the design team were very proud of the way they had developed this facility into an amazing solution both architecturally and structurally. The technology of spanning 100m had been very challenging.

Staff Comments

Mr. Lamontagne stated that there were some specific requirements for the Olympics and that site design would not be implemented until post Olympics. Mr. Scott added that the existing drawing was what would be seen after construction in 2008 but for parcels 5 and 6 it was hoped to have a developer on board to build on these.

Panel Discussion

Ms. Carlile asked why no plantings were shown on the waterfront, and Mr. Scott advised that this area had to accommodate approximately 7000 to 8000 people during the Olympics so it was not possible. In response to further questions from the panel, the following information was provided:

- Feature A and B were meant for significant installations of public art in the future.
- Pedestrian circulation was provided on the north, east and south sides of the building.
- There were windows on the east side of the building.
- The loading bays on the services side of the building were for transport trucks, staging etc.
- There had been no changes to the colour palette since the last presentation made to Council.
- The Advisory Design Panel was concerned about how the buttresses land on the ground and the design team would be working on this issue and would report on it.
- There will be a more detailed landscape plan provided in the future.
- No colours had been chosen for the polycarbon yet.
- The gable ends would have glulam arch on top but the base would be metal cladding.

- The soffits were being reviewed.
- The lobby would be approximately 15 m deep by approximately 32 m wide and rises 2.5 storeys.
- There would be stairs up to all three levels for the public to use.
- Certain features would be illuminated, i.e. the bridge and walkways and there would also be bollards.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of a two-storey with mezzanine multi-purpose sport facility (Richmond Oval) with underground parking at 6080 River Road on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/157).

CARRIED

3. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:45 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 26th, 2006.

Joe Erceg,
General Manager, Urban Development
Chair

Valerie Wilmot
Executive Assistant, Corporate Services
Department