



City of Richmond

Report to Council

---

**To:** Richmond City Council  
**From:** Joe Erceg, MCIP  
Chair, Development Permit Panel  
**Date:** May 17, 2006  
**File:** 01-0100-20-DPER1-  
01/2006-Vol 01  
**Re:** **Development Permit Panel Meetings Held on December 14, 2005,  
January 11, 2006, 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 06-332699) for the property at 6080 River Road; and
  - ii) a Development Permit (DP 05-293524) for the property at 7360 Elmbridge Waybe endorsed, and the Permits so issued.

Joe Erceg, MCIP  
Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:blg

### Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on December 14, 2005, January 11, 2006, and April 26, 2006:

DP 06-332699 – CANNON DESIGN ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND –  
6080 RIVER ROAD

(April 26, 2006)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a two-storey with mezzanine multi-purpose sport facility (Richmond Oval) with underground parking.

Mr. Greg Scott, Director, Major Projects, and Mr. Larry Podhora, architect from Cannon Design, provided descriptions of the consultation review process and project design.

Staff stated that there were some specific requirements for the Olympics and that building programming and final site landscape design would be implemented after the 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.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Scott advised that no planting was shown on the waterfront as this area was designed to accommodate approximately 7000 to 8000 people during the Olympics. Mr. Scott also clarified that this Development Permit was for general form and character and that details of building materials and colour, and Public Art will be brought to Council for consideration separately.

There were no comments from the public on the proposal.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 05-293524 – LAWRENCE DOYLE ARCHITECT INC. – 7360 ELMBRIDGE WAY

(December 14, 2005 & January 11, 2006)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of three (3) high-rise residential buildings with approximately 309 dwelling units on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7). Variances to increase the maximum building height, to reduce the parking structure manoeuvring aisle and to permit tandem parking are included in the proposal. The proposal was originally presented at the Development Permit Panel meeting on December 14, 2005, but was referred back to staff due to a notification error associated with the proposed tandem parking variance.

At the December 14, 2005 meeting, the applicant, Mr. Lawrence Doyle, provided an overview of the project and described its relationship with the existing high-rise building to the east and future potential high-rise buildings to the south. At the January 11, 2006 meeting, Mr. Doyle provided information on the parking variance, parking structure design, moving truck loading areas, street parking and vehicle access to the parking structure. Staff advised that the proposal met the City's guidelines for building separation.

Five letters referencing concerns related to the loss of views, building separation, increased traffic congestion and the development density were submitted. Mr. Munson, 7380 Elmbridge Way, was also present to express concerns over traffic congestion in the area. In response to this concern, City Transportation staff advised that the proposal maintained adequate traffic site lines, that the tandem parking arrangement was supported and that the City has not received any complaints regarding tandem parking in high-rise residential projects. The applicant further advised that parking spaces were assigned as individual units were sold and agreed to register a Restrictive Covenant on title, prior to issuance of a Building Permit, to ensure that tandem parking spaces are assigned to only those units with two (2) or more bedrooms. Staff will ensure that the required Restrictive Covenant is registered prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.



## Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, May 10<sup>th</sup>, 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 Wednesday, April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2006, be adopted.*

**CARRIED**

### 2. Development Permit 05-315410

(Report: April 18, 2006; File No.: DP 05-315410) (REDMS No. 1701726)

APPLICANT: **P.J. Lovick Architect Ltd.**

PROPERTY LOCATION: **12060 Steveston Highway**

INTENT OF PERMIT:

To permit the construction of two (2) Commercial Retail buildings on a site zoned "Comprehensive Development District (CD/161)".

#### Applicant's Comments

Mr. P. Lovick, architect, 3707 First Avenue, Burnaby, advised that the proposal now being considered was for the construction of two commercial buildings on a 16,000 sq. ft. (16,684 sq.ft.) property as Phase 2 of the Sands Plaza complex at 12060 Steveston Highway.

Mr. Lovick then displayed previously approved artist renderings for the first phase, and advised that each building was just over 3,500 sq. ft. in size. He then referred to site plans for the development to explain the proposed building elevations and their relationship to the existing building elevations. Mr. Lovick advised that the 26 parking stalls to be provided complied with the City's requirement, and added that 2 handicapped parking stalls would be provided, as well as a bypass lane. With reference to the proposed landscaping, he stated that the landscaping would be a continuation of the phase 1 landscaping on Steveston Highway, and would add two pockets of landscaping on the east side of the property.

**Staff Comments**

None.

**Panel Discussion**

None.

**Correspondence**

None.

**Gallery Comments**

None.

**Panel Decision**

It was moved and seconded

*That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of two (2) Commercial Retail buildings at 12060 Steveston Highway on a site zoned "Comprehensive Development District (CD/161)".*

**CARRIED**

**3. Development Permit 05-320899**

(Report: April 24, 2006 File No.: DP 05-320899) (REDMS No. 1801433)

APPLICANT: **Wensley Architecture Ltd.**

PROPERTY LOCATION: **3060 No. 3 Road**

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To permit the construction of three (3) detached one-storey retail commercial buildings (approximate floor area of 1,312 m<sup>2</sup> (14,120 ft<sup>2</sup>)) at 3060 No. 3 Road on a site zoned Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6); and

2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:
  - a) Reduce the minimum setback from 3.0 m. (10 ft.) to 0 m. (0 ft.) for ten (10) parking stalls adjacent to the west property line;
  - b) Allow a trellis structure within the required 6 m. (20 ft.) setback to Sexsmith Road; and
  - c) Allow a portion of the garbage and recycling enclosure within the required 6 m. (20 ft.) setback to No. 3 Road and Bridgeport Road.

### **Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Jim Wensley, architect, #301 – 1444 Alberni Street, Vancouver, used site plans to explain the proposal to the Panel. He advised that the same materials and characteristics reflected in the recently developed Rona store would be carried through to the three new buildings. He further advised that a 25 foot wide area immediately adjacent to No. 3 Road along the western edge of the property was dedicated to the City during the Rona project, and that how this area would be landscaped would be addressed as part of a servicing agreement. Mr. Wensley referred to the proposed access/egress points and advised that these had been designed as a result of discussions with the City and the Ministry of Transport.

Mr. Wensley advised that a large retail building would back onto Bridgeport Road, and face into the subject property, while the two smaller buildings would back onto Sea Island Way. He then used additional site plans to explain the appearance of (i) the various building elevations; (ii) building signage; and (iii) other detailed features of the site.

Reference was made to the request for a variance to allow a portion of the garbage and recycling enclosure within the required setback at Bridgeport Road, and in response, Mr. Wensley advised that this enclosure would include wrought-iron work and a 3 metre wide landscaping strip.

### **Staff Comments**

The Director of Development, Jean Lamontagne, referred to the garbage and recycling enclosure and advised that the placement of this area on the west side of the property would allow the provision of a generous amount of landscaping around the area in question. He added that only a small corner of the garbage and recycling container at the north-west corner of the property would encroach into the required setback.

Mr. Lamontagne referred to the area located on the west side of the property on No. 3 Road, and advised that the applicant had agreed to providing funding for the placement of landscaping and a sidewalk within this No. 3 Road right-of-way.

Mr. Lamontagne referred to the conditions of rezoning listed at the end of the staff report, and advised that the figure shown for the amount of a Letter of Credit for treatment of the plaza area should read \$34,723 and not \$154,827.

### Panel Discussion

It was noted that the fronts of the stores occupying the large retail building would be facing into a courtyard in the middle of the property and that the back doors would be facing Bridgeport Road. The comment was made that back doors facing major roads were not attractive and that any extra effort to disguise the rear side of the building would be appreciated, with consideration being given to 'pedestrian friendliness'.

Questions were raised about the appropriateness of the location of the bicycle parking adjacent to the proposed Starbucks building, as it was felt that it was located too far away from the retail stores on the north side of the property. Concern was also expressed that any bicycles parked in the area may be vulnerable to damage by passing vehicles. In response, advice was given by a representative of the applicant that it was felt that the proposed location was one of the most central locations on the property and would be visible from many areas. Further advice was given that the location could be refined and a second bicycle parking area was located to the east of the large retail building on the north side of the property.

Reference was made to the garbage and recycling enclosure to be located at the north-west corner of the subject property, and in response to questions about the amount of landscaping which would be provided at this location, information was provided that a great deal of evergreen materials and shrubs would be planted around to a 4 to 6 foot mature height as well as vines and trees. Further advice was given that additional landscaping would be planted along the No. 3 Road right-of-way, depending on the outcome of the lane widening. It was noted that a conceptual landscape plan for this right-of-way was attached to the staff report as Attachment 4.

Further discussion took place on the location of the bicycle parking adjacent to Starbucks with questions being raised about whether this would be a logical site because of the location of the drive-thru on one side and the egress point on the other side. The suggestion was made that the bicycle parking could be located further away from the curb.

Questions were raised about how the architect intended to address the façade of the rear side of the northern most building, and information was provided on the landscaping which was to be provided. Advice was given that the proposed landscaping would be more than had been shown on the streetscape rendering board presented at the meeting.

### 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 three (3) detached one-storey retail commercial buildings (approximate floor area of 1,312 m<sup>2</sup> (14,120 ft<sup>2</sup>)) at 3060 No. 3 Road on a site zoned Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6); and*
2. *Vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:*
  - a) *Reduce the minimum setback from 3.0 m. (10 ft.) to 0 m. (0 ft.) for ten (10) parking stalls adjacent to the west property line;*
  - b) *Allow a trellis structure within the required 6 m. (20 ft.) setback to Sexsmith Road; and*
  - c) *Allow a portion of the garbage and recycling enclosure within the required 6 m. (20 ft.) setback to No. 3 Road and Bridgeport Road.*

**CARRIED**

#### **4. New Business**

Mr. Lamontagne referred to a Development Variance Permit approved by the Panel at its April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2006 meeting, for the construction of a barn on Westminster Highway, and advised that since that meeting, a second stop work order had been issued because the applicant had made further modifications without having obtained a building permit. He stated that staff were preparing a new report and recommendation for submission to a future meeting of the Development Permit Panel.

#### **5. Date Of Next Meeting: May 24, 2006**

#### **6. Adjournment**

It was moved and seconded  
*That the meeting be adjourned at 3:56 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, May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2006.

---

Joe Erceg, General Manager, Planning &  
Development  
Chair

---

Fran J. Ashton  
Executive Assistant, City Clerk's Office