City of Richmond

Report to Council

To:	Richmond City Council	**Date:**	June 7, 2006
From:	Joe Erceg, MCIP Chair, Development Permit Panel	**File:**	01-0100-20-DPER1-01/2006-Vol 01
Re:	**Development Permit Panel Meetings Held on April 12, 2006 and May 24, 2006**		

Panel Recommendation

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

   i) a Development Permit (DP 05-304533) for the property at 7071 Bridge Street; and

   ii) a Development Permit (DP 05-302533) for the property at 9791 Granville Avenue

   be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.

2. That the revisions to the landscape and architectural plans at 7171 Steveston Highway be deemed to be in general compliance with the Development Permit (DP 04-287638) issued for that property.

3. That CLCO (Canada Line representatives) be requested to incorporate the design changes outlined in the May 24, 2006 memo from the Director of Development (Attachment 1) and the revised memo (May 24, 2006) from the Project Manager, Major Projects Team (Attachment 2) into the Operations and Maintenance Centre (OMC) design.

Joe Erceg, MCIP
Chair, Development Permit Panel

Att. 3

SB:blg

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on May 24, 2006 and April 12, 2006:

DP 05-304533 – AM-PRI CONSTRUCTION LTD. – 7071 BRIDGE STREET
(April 12, 2006 & May 24, 2006)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of 17 townhouse units on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/35). A variance to reduce the front yard setback for recycling and garbage enclosures is included in the proposal. The proposal was originally presented at the Development Permit Panel meeting on April 12, 2006 and was referred to staff for further discussion with the applicant.

At the April 12th meeting, the architect, Mr. Tom Yamamoto, and landscape architect, Mr. Masa Ito, provided brief descriptions of the project. There had been three (3) large Evergreen trees on the property which were to be saved, however, the root systems had been damaged during demolition in the Summer of 2005, and their arborist had advised that these trees could not be preserved. The amenity space had been relocated to the centre of the project. The estimated value of the damaged trees was allocated to replacement trees and a cash contribution to the City's Park Development Fund for tree planting in the neighbourhood park.

Staff noted that the floor area ration (FAR) had been increased from 0.55 to 0.60, 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.

The Chair stated that the community made it clear at the Public Hearing that they wanted the trees retained and open space adjacent to the street, but the trees had been damaged and the open space internalized. He further stated that he would like a design closer to the original proposal for this site and appropriate compensation for the damaged trees.

At the May 24th meeting, Mr. Yamamoto reported that the design was revised to include an increased Bridge Street setback for the northeast unit, close to the original scheme, while maintaining a children's play area in a central location away from the street.

Mr. Ito reported that the revised landscape plan provided for five (5) new substantial specimen size trees in the Bridge streetscape to replace the Evergreen frontage image. The landscape plan included six (6) new large specimen trees, deciduous and Evergreen to replace the three (3) damaged trees.

There were no comments from the public on the proposal.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 05-302533 – CHARAN SETHI – 9791 GRANVILLE AVENUE
(April 12, 2006)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of seven (7) townhouse units on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/155). A variance to reduce the side yard setback is included in the proposal.

The architect, Mr. Tom Yamamoto, provided a brief description of the project. 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.

There were no comments from the public on the proposal.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

GENERAL COMPLIANCE RULING (DP 04-287638) – PATRICK COTTER ARCHITECT INC. – 7171 STEVESTON HIGHWAY
(May 24, 2006)

The Panel considered an application for a General Compliance ruling to accommodate revised entries, dormer roof elements, back yard fences and berm retaining walls facing Steveston Highway.

Mr. Patrick Cotter, architect, provided a brief description of the architectural and landscaping changes. In response to a query from the Chair, Mr. Cotter advised that the changes were being requested as a result of the project being pushed forward on the site towards Steveston Highway during the development application process, the desire for sound attenuation for the two (2) streetscape back yards, and to not have sloped interior ceilings.

Staff advised that the dormers were being added to the north and south edges of buildings 12 and 16 and would not directly affect the neighbouring properties.

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 04-287638) issued.

PRESENTATION BY CLCO (CANADA LINE REPRESENTATIVES) – CANADA LINE – OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE CENTRE ON VAN HORNE WAY
(May 24, 2006)

The Panel received a presentation on the proposed Canada Line – Operations and Maintenance Centre (OMC) on Van Horne Way as part of the Canada Line Design Advisory Process (DAP).

Staff advised that the design of the OMC falls outside the regular City of Richmond Design review process. The Richmond Access Agreement (RAA) exempts the Canada Line project from the normal City of Richmond Development and Building Permits process.

Mr. Edward LeFlufy, Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc., Mr. Chris McCarthy, architect, InTransit BC, Mr. Kevin Hanvy, architect, Omicron and Mr. Masa Ito, landscape architect, provided a presentation of the project.

The Chair summarized the concerns of the Panel as follows:

- The outside design presentation of the Operations and Maintenance Centre (OMC) building, as well as other parts of site have not received enough thought;
- The prominent gateway site will present in an unattractive way when viewed from the Oak Street Bridge or the Canada Line train;
- There is not enough landscaping throughout the site and there is an opportunity to do more;

- Much technical build construction information has been presented, but crucial details of the project design and landscaping are missing;
- Despite all the design work involved to date, there are critical elements of this project that should be considered further; and
- If this project was going through the City's regular process, he would not support the project, as proposed, to Council.

Staff from the Major Projects Office and Development Applications Division expressed concerns regarding:

- Consistency of building design throughout site;
- Lack of landscaping throughout site to break up the ballast surface areas;
- Insufficient tree planting in site's employee/visitor parking lot which could be accommodated with the incorporation of small car parking stalls;
- Placement and screening of roof-top mechanical systems; and
- Use of chain link fence with barbwire at the top along the front portion of the OMC building, along Van Horne Way.

There were no comments from the public on the proposal.

Since the Development Permit Panel Meeting, staff have continued negotiations with Canada Line representatives regarding design concerns. Representatives of Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. have provided a written response to the issues raised by the Panel and staff in the attached letter of May 31, 2006 (Attachment 3), however the changes that have been agreed to are considered by staff to be minor and insufficient. Based on this response, the following design issues remain:

- The site is located in a prominent gateway location with the site highly visible on both sides from the Oak Street Bridge. There are opportunities to soften the visual impact of the building's working face and works yard with architectural form and massing, the use of colours, materials and landscaping.
- Design integration of family of buildings on site. The current submission contains information on only the main operation and the maintenance facility; the other buildings on the site should have similar architectural language and material treatment;
- Landscaping along Van Horne Way and in the vicinity of the employee/visitor parking lot. Perimeter chain link and barbwire security fencing around the parking lot is discouraged. Tree planting could be accommodated in the site's employee/visitor parking lot, with the incorporation of small car parking stalls; and
- Lack of landscaping within the works yard area to break up the ballast surface areas.

While the Panel has not had a regularly scheduled meeting since receipt of the above letter, the Panel members have discussed the matter and unanimously agree with staff's assessment. The Panel is of the opinion that if this project was subject to the City's regular process, it would not be supported by the Panel to Council.

City of Richmond
Planning and Development Department

Memorandum

To:	Development Permit Panel	**Date:**	May 24, 2006
From:	Jean Lamontagne Director of Development	**File:**	10-6525-07-04-03/2006-Vol 01

Re: **Canada Line Submission - Operations and Maintenance Centre**

Here is a list of items that are to be addressed by the applicant:

1. The context is important. Currently there are 5 buildings on the site plus the control antenna. The current submission contains only information on the main operation and maintenance facility. The other buildings on the site should have similar architectural language and material treatment.

2. The train yard had a series of additional fences and areas which should be looked at with the intent of adding landscape treatment to break up the ballast surface areas.

3. At ADP, the oak street bridge was discussed, apparently there is a need for some protective fencing along the sidewalks of the bridge to protect the train yard below. There is no details of the proposed treatment of that fencing in the current submission. We understand the bridge is not of municipal jurisdiction however this is a gateway to Richmond and Vancouver, special treatment should be done to that fencing (if required).

4. In the employee/visitor parking lot, there is opportunities for additional landscape treatment as per the DP guidelines. Small car parking stalls should be introduced along with additional landscape areas.

5. There is no detailed landscape plans with list of plant material and proposed plant sizes.

6. The roof plans shows no mechanical systems. Is this correct? If not, there should be a roof plan indicating location and size of mechanical systems and what screening treatment is proposed.

7. The fence design for the front portion of the OMC building along Van Horne Way is shown as being chain link fence with barbwire at the top. This should be a more decorative type of fencing for that portion of the side (as mentioned by ADP).

City of Richmond
Administration

Memorandum

To:	Development Permit Panel	**Date:**	May 24, 2006
From:	Joyce Chang Project Manager, Major Projects Team	**File:**	10-6525-07-04-03/2006-Vol 01
Re:	**Canada Line – Operations and Maintenance Centre Memo to Development Permit Panel for May 24, 2006**		

The design of the Operations and Maintenance Centre (OMC) is scheduled for presentation to the Richmond Development Permit Panel on May 24, 2006. The Design Advisory Process (DAP) identified within the Richmond Access Agreement (RAA) exempts the Canada Line project from the normal City of Richmond Development and Building Permits process. The DAP identifies an 8 step process with a 16 week timetable that involves 2 public open houses, 1 presentation to the Richmond Advisory Design Panel (ADP) and 1 presentation to the Richmond Development Permit Panel (DPP) by Canada Line representatives (CLCO).

Richmond cannot require the Canada Line project to comply with the City's preferences regarding the design of fixed facilities for the rapid transit project but the Canada Line project will attempt to address Richmond suggestions and requests. Furthermore, Richmond has agreed to abide by a 16 week review process for proposed fixed facilities within the City in order for the Canada Line project to proceed on schedule.

In general, the design information provided by CLCO, InTransitBC and TransLink regarding the proposed fixed facilities in Richmond (i.e. OMC, Park-n-Ride Facility, Bridgeport, Aberdeen, Lansdowne and Brighouse Stations) does not provide an equivalent level of design development or detail that is normally provided by all other applicants as part of the normal development review process in the City of Richmond. With the above qualification, Richmond staff have addressed the 4 questions for the OMC that are the subject of this DPP meeting on May 24, 2006.

Operations and Maintenance Centre (OMC)

1. How does the Operations and Maintenance Centre (OMC) design comply with the Vision adopted by Council for the line at the Council workshop of April 2005?

   a) Issue: Achievement of Richmond's Best and Final Offer (BAFO) Design Guidelines:

   Comment: Experience has shown that the operation of other transit maintenance facilities is of interest to many individuals and the OMC is an opportunity to encourage and welcome connection with Richmond residents. However, there is no opportunity to view the train yard activities from the perimeter of the site. Provision of a visitors centre or viewing gallery within the OMC is another missed opportunity that would promote the Canada Line project within the community.

   b) Issue: Transit Plaza Design

   Comment: The proposed maintenance building is huge in scale with little variation of facade materials and an expensive roof with very subtle articulation. Since it is suspected

that this large relatively flat roof will be visible from the Highway 99 viaduct, concern has been expressed that it will attract birds and quickly become an unsightly maintenance issue.

c) Issue: Site Planning

Comment: Chain link fencing with either barred or razor wire is unacceptable as a perimeter treatment and more sophisticated security provisions should be incorporated into the design. The design of the OMC does not provide for a continuous, perimeter landscape treatment and frontage improvements along adjacent road are minimal. The majority of this 7-acre site is to be covered in ballast material (i.e. gravel) and little attention has been given to aesthetic appearance and treatment of the ground plane. The OMC main entry and arrival sequence should consider visitors as well as employees and provide for significant tree planting, landscaped parking areas, pedestrian walkways and bicycle connections to the facility.

2. What OMC design changes have already been made by CLCO and InTransitBC, as result of discussions with Richmond staff?

- Straddle Bents have been eliminated in the West Bridgeport Area.
- Dual guideway has been restored between Bridgeport and Cambie Stations.
- InTransitBC has engaged a landscape architect for the OMC.
- CLCO has realigned the CPR rail line east of Great Canadian Way around the OMC site, which will eliminate the need for the CPR tracks to extend across Great Canadian Way in the future once the spur line to Ebco Industries is retired after 2010.
- CLCO/InTransitBC has transplanted all affected street trees in the West Bridgeport Area or will provide 2 new trees for each tree that is removed.

3. What changes are Richmond staff still seeking to improve the OMC design that could be accommodated easily?

Issues	City of Richmond Specific Requests
1. Viewing Area	• Provide an elevated, outside vantage point to view train activities complete with benches, visitor parking spaces and a handicapped accessible route to the location.
2. Perimeter Fence	• Provide higher quality perimeter fence such as a heavy gauge welded wire mesh fence in combination with surveillance cameras and security patrols in lieu of barred or razor wire. • Also consider a continuous perimeter landscape treatment that incorporates layers of plant material as screening to the rail yard.
3. Ground Plane	• Consider the introduction of grass in lieu of gravel ballast where possible in the train yard.
4. Landscape Plan	• Ensure the landscape plan provides the appropriate amount of tree planting in the parking lots according to the City of Richmond design guidelines (i.e. 1 tree per 2 parking stalls).

4. What changes are Richmond staff still seeking to the OMC design that may be more difficult to accommodate?

Issues	City of Richmond Specific Requests
1. Façade Materials	• Label the elevation renderings with the intended siding materials. • Examples of acceptable siding could be glazing, metal siding in combination with pour in place concrete (i.e. tilt-up panels) would be an acceptable method. • Pay greater attention to the composition of façade materials on the sides of the building that have visibility from fronting streets.
2. Roof	• Provide more architectural details in the design of the roof since this will be highly visible from the Highway 99 Viaduct, which is an important gateway to the City of Richmond. • Consider a 'shed roof' form with multiple dormers to add visual interest to the roof.
3. Viewing Centre	• Provide a visitor centre or viewing gallery overlooking the train barn. This would provide a public amenity of significant value to the community and help to promote and popularise the Canada Line project.

Joyce Chang
Project Manager,
Major Projects Team
(247-4681)

JC:bg

Attachments

ATTACHMENT 3

CANADA LINE

Reference: 1019-02-08

31 May 2006

Via Fax

City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1
Attention: Ms. Joyce Chang

Dear Ms. Chang

Re: Development Permit Panel – Operations and Maintenance Centre

Ref: City of Richmond Memo (10-625-07-04-03/2006-Vol 01), dated 24 May 2006
City of Richmond Memo (10-6525-07-04-03/2006-Vol 01), dated 24 May 2006

In response to the 24 May 2006 Development Permit Panel meeting and the two City of Richmond memos referenced above, the memos were forwarded to InTransitBC for review; attached please InTransitBC's response. You will note that InTransitBC has already incorporated some of the proposed items into its plans; some further items will be incorporated, some are still under review, and some can not be implemented due to safety and security concerns.

We anticipate further response on the items under review on or before 07 June 2006 and will forward any updated material upon receipt.

Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to call me directly or Edward LeFlufy at the CLCO offices.

Yours truly,
Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc.

Jeff Hewitt
Senior Vice President, Engineering

cc: Jean Lamontagne
Brian Guzzi
Greg Scott

1019-02-08

InTransit British Columbia GP Ltd.
1020 - 1075 West Georgia Street, Vancouver, BC V6E 3C9 Phone: 604-605-5950 Fax: 604-605-5999

May 31st, 2006

Mr. Jeff Hewitt
Senior Vice President, Engineering
Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc.
1650 – 409 Granville Street
Vancouver, BC V6C 1T2

Our Ref.: IT/RAVCO-066

Dear Mr. Hewitt:

Re: ***City of Richmond Development Permit Panel Memos Regarding the OMC***
CLCO Letter References: 1019453 and 1019468

To support CLCO staff requests to provide an early response to issues raised in the two letters as reference above, we are submitting a preliminary response. Please be advised that we are still conducting our detailed review of these issues and that a further final response will be provided on or before the date noted in your letters.

Given that many of the issues in the correspondence are repeated in both letters, we have chosen to distil the information in to what we interpret as the main points and present these in a tabulated format. The table, which is attached to this letter, provides our written response to City of Richmond's staff comments.

Yours truly,

InTransit British Columbia GP LTD, as general partner
of InTransit BC Limited Partnership

Jean-Marc Arbaud
President & CEO

JMA\mz

Enclosure

DoR Letter Reference	Issue Description	Response
Site Related Issues		
Lamontagne (Item 2) Chang (Item 1c – partial extract) Chang (Item 3.3)	**Landscaping within the working yard area:** The train yard had a series of additional fences and areas which should be looked at with the intent of adding landscape treatment to break up the ballast surface areas The majority of this 7 acre site is to be covered in ballast material (i.e. gravel) and little attention has been given to the aesthetic appearance and treatment of the ground plane. Consider the introduction of grass in lieu of gravel ballast where possible in the train yard	The yard is a working facility with stringent technical, safety and operational requirements. The majority of the yard will be used for train storage/circulation and equipment storage/laydown. This will necessitate a granular base for the track bed to protect against ponding of water. Landscaping of interstitial spaces in the yard would create a fire hazard and risk to the trains and therefore is not a consideration. As the system is electrified, there is a concern that arcing at the power rail could spark a fire of any nearby landscaping
Lamontagne (Item 3)	**Fencing on the Oak Street Bridge:** At ADP, the Oak Street bridge was discussed, apparently there is some need for some protective fencing along the sidewalks of the bridge to protect the train yard below. There are no details of the proposed treatment of that fencing in the current submission. We understand the bridge is not of municipal jurisdiction however this is a gateway to Richmond and Vancouver, special treatment should be done to that fencing (if required).	A protective fence will not be placed along the Oak Street Bridge. However, an open mesh protective cover may be placed around the yard and mainline tracks below the bridge in lieu of fencing along the bridge.
Lamontagne (Item 4) Chang (Item 1c – partial extract) Chang (Item 3.4)	**Landscaping around car park and Van Horne Frontage:** In the employee/visitor parking lot, there are opportunities for additional landscape treatment as per the DP guidelines. Small car parking stalls should be introduced along with additional landscape areas. . . . The design of the OMC does not provide for a continuous, perimeter landscape treatment and frontage improvements along adjacent roads are minimal. . . . The OMC main entry and arrival sequence should consider visitors as well as employees and provide for significant tree planting, landscaped parking areas, pedestrian walkways and bicycle connections to the facility. Ensure the landscape plan provides the appropriate amount of tree planning in the parking lots according to the City of	The perimeter of the OMC is approximately 1100m long, of which slightly over 700m of the site is bounded by CP Rail track or located behind other property that front public streets. For the 400m of site that front River Road and Van Horne Way a perimeter landscape scheme has been developed in response to ADP comments and as shown on the landscape concept plan. The landscaping will provide screen planting along the fence consisting of ivy trained on the fence, trees, shrubs and ground cover. The main entry to the facility was modified to pull the fence line back from Van Horne Way and introduce more landscaping. A minimum of 48 trees will be planted within and along the perimeter of the site along the Van Horne frontage in order to meet City of Richmond DP guidelines for the portion of parking that is fronting Van Horne. The revised landscape concept plan has added a landscaped area in the parking area adjacent to the south site entrance.

Cmte Letter Reference	Issue Description	Response
Chang (item 3.2)	Richmond Guidelines Also consider a continuous perimeter landscape treatment that incorporates layers of plant material as screening to the rail yard	
Lamontagne (item 5)	**Landscape details** There are no detailed landscape plans with a list of plan material and proposed plan sizes	The plant list is included in the landscape drawings that were submitted on May 19th as part of the technical package for the DPP presentation. See sheet 2 of the landscape drawings
Lamontagne (item 6) Chang (item 1c – extract) Change (item 3.2)	**Perimeter security fence design and site security measures:** The fence design for the front portion of the OMC building along Van Horne Way is shown as being chain link fence with barbed wire at the top. This should be more decorative type of fencing for that portion of the side (as mentioned by ADP). Chain link fencing with either barred or razor wire is unacceptable as a perimeter treatment. More sophisticated security provisions should be incorporated into the design. . . . Provide a higher quality perimeter fence such as a heavy gauge welded wire mesh fence in combination with surveillance cameras and security patrols in lieu of barbed or razor wire	It is essential to protect the OMC site against unauthorized intrusion as the site will contain live power rails with high voltages. This is a matter of public safety and designed to keep out vandals. One of the strongest deterents against unauthorized intrusion is a secure perimeter. For this reason, a heavy gauge chain link fence with 3 strands of barbed wire at the top is considered to be an essential safety and security requirement. In addition to fencing, several additional security measures will be provided at the OMC site. There will be eight surveillance cameras to provide broad coverage of the site, a gatehouse that will be manned during the day and site night illumination. Given the high degree of safety and security that is necessary at the OMC, the chain link perimeter fence with barbed wire can not be eliminated along the front portion of the building. To soften the edge of the site, the fence will have ivy plantings trained on the fence
Chang (item 1a – partial extract) Chang (item 3.1)	**Viewing train yard activities from beyond the perimeter fence:** Experience has shown that the operations of other transit maintenance facilities is of interest to many individuals and the OMC is an opportunity to encourage and welcome connection with Richmond residents. However, there is no opportunity to view the train yard activities from the perimeter of the site Provide an elevated outside vantage point to view train activities complete with benches, visitor parking spaces and a handicapped accessible route to the location.	Design of the landscape screen along the perimeter fencing for the segment that faces onto Van Horne Way and River Road will consider opportunities to provide views into the site and the working yard. This will have to be balanced against CoR's competing desire to screen the site versus provide views of the interior. Dedicated parking and disabled accessible parking in support of a single vantage viewpoint point is not contemplated. It is noted that the train fleet will be fully deployed during the day and so activity in the train yard will be minimal. Thus the approach to providing viewing opportunities into the yard is based on supporting the casual passer by rather than establishing a formal viewing facility.

CoR Letter Reference	Issue Description	Response
Building Related Issues		
Lamontagne (item 1)	**Common architectural treatment of other buildings on OMC site:** The context is important. Currently there are five buildings on the site plus the control antenna. The current submission contains only information on the main operation and maintenance facility. The other buildings on the site should have a similar architectural language and material treatment	The other four buildings on the site to the OMC building include the traction power substation, wheel lathe building, guard house and radio huts. The wash bay facility which may have been interpreted as a building is an open structure. The traction power substation will be a concrete block structure consistent with other TPS facilities on the Expo and Millennium Lines. The remaining structures are much smaller in scale than the OMC building and maybe likely be pre-engineered buildings. The extent to which a common architectural language and/or materials can be accommodated will have to be assessed through the detailed design phases.
Lamontagne (item 6)	**Roof top mechanical systems:** The roof plan shows no mechanical systems. Is that correct? If not, there should be a roof plan indicating location and size of mechanical systems and what screening treatment is proposed	Roof mounted mechanical equipment is anticipated but is located and screened by the two linear walls along grid lines C and D. This was explained at the DPP presentation. Detailed design drawings will identify the location and size of these units
Chang (item 1a – extract) Chang (item 4.3)	**Viewing Gallery/Visitors Centre within the OMC Building:** Experience has shown that the operation of other transit maintenance facilities is of interest to many individuals and the OMC is an opportunity to encourage and welcome connection with Richmond residents. . . . Provision of a viewing centre or viewing gallery within the OMC is another missed opportunity that would promote the Canada Line project within the community. Provide a visitor centre or viewing gallery overlooking the train barn. This would include a public amenity of significant value to the community and help promote and popularise the Canada Line Project	The operations and control centre is a highly secure facility. Every person on site is either authorized personnel or is escorted at all times when visiting. Visitors are not permitted to even enter the site without a prior appointment and without being met at the gate house by a member of staff. This is consistent with current SkyTrain practice. While tours from time to time are anticipated around the facility, these will be small groups typically with a special interest, and as such a viewing gallery is not required for this use. Furthermore, consideration of a viewing gallery would have significant capital and operational cost impacts, that are not anticipated under the project scope definition.
Chang (item 1b – extract)	**Building Roof form and Expanse:** The proposed maintenance building is huge in scale with little variation of façade material and an expensive (expansive?) roof with very subtle articulation. Since it is suspected that this large relatively flat roof will be visible from Highway 99 viaduct, concern has been expressed that it will attract birds and quickly become an unsightly maintenance issue.	Overall massing of the OMC building has been significantly developed since the commentary received from the Design Advisory Panel. The scheme as presented at the Development Permit Panel addresses the issue of roof form and material. We note that compared to other industrial facilities in the area that exhibit large flat roofs, that the OMC is less than half the area of its counterparts.

DOE Letter Reference	Issue Description	Response
Change (item 4.2)	• Provide more architectural details in the design of the roof since this will be highly visible from Highway 99 viaduct, which is an important gateway to the City of Richmond • Consider a shed form roof with multiple dormers to add visual interest.	
Chang (item 4.1)	**Building Elevations and Renderings** • Label the elevation renderings with the intended siding materials • Examples of acceptable siding could be glazing, metal side in combination with pour in place concrete would be acceptable • Pay greater attention to the composition of the façade material on the sides of the buildings that have visibility from fronting streets	The types of materials were explained at the DPP presentation as they appeared on the coloured elevations. In addition technical drawings provided as part of the submission package in support of the coloured presentation materials clearly identify the types of materials.

City of Richmond

Minutes

Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, May 24, 2006

Time: 3:30 p.m.

Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall

Present: Joe Erceg, Chair
Jeff Day, General Manager, Engineering and Public Works
Mike Kirk, General Manager, Corporate 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 May 10, 2006, be adopted.

CARRIED

2. Development Permit 05-304533

(Report: May 1, 2006 File No.: 05-304533) (REDMS No. 1826979, 1704258 (Attachment 2))

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, reported that he has revised the design to include an increased minimum Bridge Street setback of 11 m for the northeast unit and that he has generally improved the project proposal to have a character close to the original scheme while maintaining a children's play area in a central location away from the street.

Masa Ito, landscape architect, reported the revised landscape plan has been provided to compensate for the trees that were damaged during demolition. Five new substantial specimen size trees in the Bridge streetscape are to replace the evergreen frontage image. The landscape plan includes six new large specimen trees, deciduous and Evergreen to replace the three removed trees.

Staff Comments

Jean Lamontagne, Director of Development, advised that the revised plan is more in line with the rezoning application, specifically the open space along the street, and the slightly reduced children's play area is maintained in a central location away from the street. He further advised that the proposed replacement trees are in accordance with the OCP guidelines.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

The Chair stated that the project had been improved and commended the Applicant and staff for their work. It was thought that it was better to have the play area in an internal location.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded
That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. ***Permit the construction of 17 townhouse units at 7071 Bridge Street on a site zoned "Comprehensive Development District (CD/35)"; and***

2. ***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.***

CARRIED

3. General Compliance - Request By Patrick Cotter Architect Inc. For A General Compliance Ruling At 7171 Steveston Highway

(Report: April 25, 200 6 File No.: DP 04-287638) (REDMS No. 1804028)

APPLICANT: **Patrick Cotter Architect Inc**

PROPERTY LOCATION: **7171 Steveston Highway**

MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the revised plans be considered to be in General Compliance with Development Permit DP 04-287638 for a 50-unit townhouse development at 7171 Steveston Highway that generally covers the following changes:

1. Revise front elevations of Buildings 14 & 15;
2. Add dormers on Buildings 12 & 16; and
3. Revise landscaping/berming along Steveston Highway.

Applicant's Comments

Patrick Cotter, architect, advised that the architectural issues included the street frontage. He advised that as construction advanced it was clear that the original idea for berming along Steveston Highway was compromised by the final sidewalk location which reduced the grade transition space. The result is a nearly full flight of stairs at the entrance of the end units facing Steveston Highway. He proposed enhancing the elevation with the addition of a small dormer porch element, supported by two columns on a stone-clad landing in buildings 14 & 15 flanking the development entrance. Mr. Cotter assured the panel that the proposed modifications maintain the basic form and character of the development. In buildings 12 & 16, there was a roof height issue resulting from interior sloped ceilings. The addition of small dormer roof elements was requested to provide full height interior ceilings.

Masa Ito, landscape architect, addressed the proposal of an alternate landscape and fence treatment along the Steveston Highway frontage to provide sound attenuation for the back yards. Mr. Ito reported that a retaining wall would maintain the character of the street appearance of a berm and that at the west and east ends of the project site, a solid wood fence would be atop the retaining wall in the back yards. The total height would be 6 feet measured from the patio.

In response to questions from the Chair, Mr. Cotter advised that the General Compliance request was prompted by the discovery during construction that the grading along Steveston Highway had to be adjusted to meet Engineering Department sidewalk design requirements. The result is the proposed flight of stairs and retaining walls. The retaining walls will provide for additional berming in front of the units between the street and buildings, and landscaping will be maintained in front of the walls and fences.

Staff Comments

Jean Lamontagne clarified that the dormer additions are located on Buildings 12 and 16, at both the north and the south ends, and would therefore not directly affect the neighbours or the character of the development.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

None.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That the revised plans be considered to be in General Compliance with Development Permit DP 04-287638 for a 50-unit townhouse development at 7171 Steveston Highway that generally covers the following changes:

1. ***Revise front elevations of Buildings 14 & 15;***
2. ***Add dormers on Buildings 12 & 16; and***
3. ***Revise landscaping/berming along Steveston Highway.***

CARRIED

4. Canada Line – Operations And Maintenance Centre (OMC)

(REDMS No. 1814143, 1893272)

PROPERTY LOCATION: Van Horne Way

Edward LeFlufy, Canada Line Rapid Transit Inc. spoke briefly about site issues which include the edge treatment and fencing; about building issues, which include the roof form and building materials; and about other issues, including viewing opportunities and site security.

Mr. Chris McCarthy, Architect, InTransit BC, stated that work on the functional design of the OMC started in 2005, and that detailed design work is about to begin, with construction to start in July, 2006 and completion scheduled for December, 2007. The site would be used for train storage and deployment. The site contained electrified guideways and needed to be secured for public safety. The land assembly resulted in excess land. Three parcels north of Van Horne Way would be sold for development.

In describing the building, Mr. McCarthy noted the following:

- the building will be prominent and seen from the guideway structure as well as from the Oak Street Bridge and the Fraser River;
- Security fencing was initially proposed on the Oak Street bridge and upon review has been eliminated;
- A landscape architect had been retained and trees were being relocated, fitting in with city objectives.

In describing the building, Mr. Kevin Hanvy, architect, Omicron, noted the following:

- The project was a two storey building
- the project was a two storey building with the main feature of a two storey train hall and supporting facilities;
- the roof is a shallow curve arcing up to the west, and the roof structure of the train hall is a framework of steel trusses;
- to the north of the train hall is a 2-storey space running east to west; the ends of this structure contain the main building entry (east end) and the train entry to the maintenance bay (west end);
- the OMC is predominately a metal skinned facility; three different cladding profiles with three different colours are proposed in an effort to vary the profile and the orientation to reinforce the design concept.

In response to a question from the Panel, Mr. Hanvy advised that after presentation to the Advisory Design Panel design changes had been made to the roof form and building materials. The roof was south facing, mono and low pitched with metal cladding. The roof had been broken up, a raised element introduced, and membrane roofs used. Although the building would be metal clad, a variety of profiles were introduced to articulate the different uses and building mass components.

In answer to a question from the Panel, Mr. Hanvy confirmed that the west side of the site will be most visible from the Oak Street Bridge. Discussion ensued regarding the visual impact the OMC would make as transit riders approach the site with concern being expressed that the OMC will not present well because the least attractive building elevations are the most visible.

Masa Ito, Landscape Architect, advised the Panel of the following points:

- the fence line will be set back approximately 10 feet into the property along River Road, allowing for tree planting and landscaping in front of the fencing in this area;
- the parking layout has been modified to gain more landscape area;
- trees will be planted within the Van Horne Road right of way to enhance the site.

The Chair commented that the proposed landscaping leaves a large part of the huge site untreated, with most of the landscaping on the east side of the site. He described the chain link and barbed wire fencing as inappropriate and noted that the entire site is fenced. He further stated that with more thought the design team could look at creating more pockets of green throughout the site to provide a more appropriate gateway presentation.

Mr. McCarthy responded that the facility is a working yard and that discussions with operations and maintenance personnel identified the majority of the site will be used for laydown, storage, and long-term maintenance. In terms of screening and edge treatment, an effort has been made to deal with public facings, but the fence's primary function is security.

Discussion ensued regarding details of the fencing in general and the fencing of the parking lot and building entrance. The Chair then summarized the Panel's concerns:

- the outside design presentation of the OMC building as well as other parts of site have not received enough thought;
- the prominent gateway site will present in an unattractive way when viewed from the Oak Street bridge or the Canada Line train;
- there is not enough landscaping throughout the site and there is an opportunity to do more;
- much technical build construction information has been presented, but crucial details of the project design and landscaping are missing;
- despite all the design work involved to date, there are critical elements of this project that should be considered further;
- if this project was going through the City's regular process, he would not support the project, as proposed, to Council.

Staff Comments

Joyce Chang, Project Manager, Major Project Team spoke briefly, and referred to her memo to the Panel, dated May 24, 2006, explaining why the design of the OMC falls outside the regular City of Richmond process to review projects of this kind:

- the Design Advisory Process (DAP) identified within the Richmond Access Agreement (RAA) exempts the Canada Line project from the normal City of Richmond Development and Building Permits process;
- the DAP identifies an 8 step process with a 16 week timetable that involves 2 public open houses, 1 presentation to the Richmond Advisory Design Panel (ADP) and 1 presentation to the Richmond Development Permit Panel (DPP) by Canada Line representatives (CLCO)

Jean Lamontagne, referring to his memo to the Panel, dated May 24, 2006, raised the following points:

- the current submission contains information on only the main operation and the maintenance facility; the other buildings on the site should have similar architectural language and material treatment;
- the train yard has a series of additional fences and areas which should be looked at with the intent of adding landscape treatment to break up the ballast surface areas;
- in the site's employee/visitor parking lot there are opportunities for additional landscape treatment, as per the Development Permit guidelines; small car parking stalls and additional landscape areas should be introduced;

- the roof plans show no mechanical systems; there should be a roof plan indicating location and size of mechanical systems, including proposed screening treatment;
- the fence design for the front portion of the OMC building, along Van Horne Way, is shown as being chain link fence with barbwire at the top; this should be a more decorative type of fencing for that portion (as was mentioned at ADP);
- there are no detailed landscape plans with an accompanying list of plant material and proposed plant sizes.

In response, Mr. McCarthy advised that 4 to 6 roof top mechanical units would be located and screened behind the curved parapet of the train like building element.

In response to the final point, Masa Ito reported that a detailed list of landscape plans, complete with plant material and proposed plant sizes, is being prepared.

It was moved and seconded
That CLCO (Canada Line representatives) be requested to incorporate the design changes outlined in the May 24, 2006 memo from the Director of Development and the revised memo (May 24, 2006) from the Project Manager, Major Projects Team into the Operations and Maintenance Centre (OMC) design.

CARRIED

5. Date Of Next Meeting: June 14, 2006

6. 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, May 24, 2006.

Joe Erceg
Chair

Sheila Johnston
Committee Clerk

SCHEDULE 1 TO THE MINUTES OF
THE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL
OF WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 2006.

City of Richmond
Administration

Memorandum

To:	Development Permit Panel	**Date:**	May 24, 2006
From:	Joyce Chang Project Manager, Major Projects Team	**File:**	10-6525-07-04-03/2006-Vol 01
Re:	**Canada Line – Operations and Maintenance Centre Memo to Development Permit Panel for May 24, 2006**		

The design of the Operations and Maintenance Centre (OMC) is scheduled for presentation to the Richmond Development Permit Panel on May 24, 2006. The Design Advisory Process (DAP) identified within the Richmond Access Agreement (RAA) exempts the Canada Line project from the normal City of Richmond Development and Building Permits process. The DAP identifies an 8 step process with a 16 week timetable that involves 2 public open houses, 1 presentation to the Richmond Advisory Design Panel (ADP) and 1 presentation to the Richmond Development Permit Panel (DPP) by Canada Line representatives (CLCO).

Richmond cannot require the Canada Line project to comply with the City's preferences regarding the design of fixed facilities for the rapid transit project but the Canada Line project will attempt to address Richmond suggestions and requests. Furthermore, Richmond has agreed to abide by a 16 week review process for proposed fixed facilities within the City in order for the Canada Line project to proceed on schedule.

In general, the design information provided by CLCO, InTransitBC and TransLink regarding the proposed fixed facilities in Richmond (i.e. OMC, Park-n-Ride Facility, Bridgeport, Aberdeen, Lansdowne and Brighouse Stations) does not provide an equivalent level of design development or detail that is normally provided by all other applicants as part of the normal development review process in the City of Richmond. With the above qualification, Richmond staff have addressed the 4 questions for the OMC that are the subject of this DPP meeting on May 24, 2006.

Operations and Maintenance Centre (OMC)

1. <u>How does the Operations and Maintenance Centre (OMC) design comply with the Vision adopted by Council for the line at the Council workshop of April 2005?</u>

   a) Issue: Achievement of Richmond's Best and Final Offer (BAFO) Design Guidelines:

      Comment: Experience has shown that the operation of other transit maintenance facilities is of interest to many individuals and the OMC is an opportunity to encourage and welcome connection with Richmond residents. However, there is no opportunity to view the train yard activities from the perimeter of the site. Provision of a visitors centre or viewing gallery within the OMC is another missed opportunity that would promote the Canada Line project within the community.

   b) Issue: Transit Plaza Design

      Comment: The proposed maintenance building is huge in scale with little variation of facade materials and an expensive roof with very subtle articulation. Since it is suspected

that this large relatively flat roof will be visible from the Highway 99 viaduct, concern has been expressed that it will attract birds and quickly become an unsightly maintenance issue.

c) Issue: Site Planning

Comment: Chain link fencing with either barred or razor wire is unacceptable as a perimeter treatment and more sophisticated security provisions should be incorporated into the design. The design of the OMC does not provide for a continuous, perimeter landscape treatment and frontage improvements along adjacent road are minimal. The majority of this 7-acre site is to be covered in ballast material (i.e. gravel) and little attention has been given to aesthetic appearance and treatment of the ground plane. The OMC main entry and arrival sequence should consider visitors as well as employees and provide for significant tree planting, landscaped parking areas, pedestrian walkways and bicycle connections to the facility.

2. What OMC design changes have already been made by CLCO and InTransitBC, as result of discussions with Richmond staff?

- Straddle Bents have been eliminated in the West Bridgeport Area.
- Dual guideway has been restored between Bridgeport and Cambie Stations.
- InTransitBC has engaged a landscape architect for the OMC.
- CLCO has realigned the CPR rail line east of Great Canadian Way around the OMC site, which will eliminate the need for the CPR tracks to extend across Great Canadian Way in the future once the spur line to Ebco Industries is retired after 2010.
- CLCO/InTransitBC has transplanted all affected street trees in the West Bridgeport Area or will provide 2 new trees for each tree that is removed.

3. What changes are Richmond staff still seeking to improve the OMC design that could be accommodated easily?

Issues	City of Richmond Specific Requests
1. Viewing Area	• Provide an elevated, outside vantage point to view train activities complete with benches, visitor parking spaces and a handicapped accessible route to the location.
2. Perimeter Fence	• Provide higher quality perimeter fence such as a heavy gauge welded wire mesh fence in combination with surveillance cameras and security patrols in lieu of barred or razor wire. • Also consider a continuous perimeter landscape treatment that incorporates layers of plant material as screening to the rail yard.
3. Ground Plane	• Consider the introduction of grass in lieu of gravel ballast where possible in the train yard.
4. Landscape Plan	• Ensure the landscape plan provides the appropriate amount of tree planting in the parking lots according to the City of Richmond design guidelines (i.e. 1 tree per 2 parking stalls).

4. What changes are Richmond staff still seeking to the OMC design that may be more difficult to accommodate?

Issues	City of Richmond Specific Requests
1. Façade Materials	• Label the elevation renderings with the intended siding materials. • Examples of acceptable siding could be glazing, metal siding in combination with pour in place concrete (i.e. tilt-up panels) would be an acceptable method. • Pay greater attention to the composition of façade materials on the sides of the building that have visibility from fronting streets.
2. Roof	• Provide more architectural details in the design of the roof since this will be highly visible from the Highway 99 Viaduct, which is an important gateway to the City of Richmond. • Consider a 'shed roof' form with multiple dormers to add visual interest to the roof.
3. Viewing Centre	• Provide a visitor centre or viewing gallery overlooking the train barn. This would provide a public amenity of significant value to the community and help to promote and popularise the Canada Line project.

Joyce Chang
Project Manager,
Major Projects Team
(247-4681)

JC:bg

Attachments

SCHEDULE 2 TO THE MINUTES OF
THE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL
OF WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 2006.

City of Richmond
Planning and Development Department

Memorandum

To:	Development Permit Panel	**Date:**	May 24, 2006
From:	Jean Lamontagne Director of Development	**File:**	10-6525-07-04-03/2006- Vol 01

Re: **Canada Line Submission - Operations and Maintenance Centre**

Here is a list of items that are to be addressed by the applicant:

1. The context is important. Currently there are 5 buildings on the site plus the control antenna. The current submission contains only information on the main operation and maintenance facility. The other buildings on the site should have similar architectural language and material treatment.

2. The train yard had a series of additional fences and areas which should be looked at with the intent of adding landscape treatment to break up the ballast surface areas.

3. At ADP, the oak street bridge was discussed, apparently there is a need for some protective fencing along the sidewalks of the bridge to protect the train yard below. There is no details of the proposed treatment of that fencing in the current submission. We understand the bridge is not of municipal jurisdiction however this is a gateway to Richmond and Vancouver, special treatment should be done to that fencing (if required).

4. In the employee/visitor parking lot, there is opportunities for additional landscape treatment as per the DP guidelines. Small car parking stalls should be introduced along with additional landscape areas.

5. There is no detailed landscape plans with list of plant material and proposed plant sizes.

6. The roof plans shows no mechanical systems. Is this correct? If not, there should be a roof plan indicating location and size of mechanical systems and what screening treatment is proposed.

7. The fence design for the front portion of the OMC building along Van Horne Way is shown as being chain link fence with barbwire at the top. This should be a more decorative type of fencing for that portion of the side (as mentioned by ADP).