



**CITY OF RICHMOND**

**REPORT TO COUNCIL**

**TO:** Richmond City Council

**DATE:** August 23, 2000

**FROM:** David McLellan  
Chair, Development Permit Panel

**FILE:** 0100-20-DPER1

**RE:** Development Permit Panel Meeting Held on August 16, 2000

**PANEL RECOMMENDATION**

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

- i) a Development Permit (DP 00-086315) for the property at 8433 Bennett Road;
- ii) a Development Permit (DP 00-175113) for the property at 4991 No. 5 Road;

be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'David McLellan'.

David McLellan  
Chair, Development Permit Panel

**PANEL REPORT**

The Development Permit Panel considered two development permits and one development variance permit at its meeting held on August 16, 2000. The development variance permit was referred to the Advisory Design Panel for review prior to further consideration by the Panel.

**DP 00-086315 – JAN TIMMER – 8433 BENNETT ROAD**

The proposal to alter the previously approved design of a large residential project at the south east corner of Granville Ave. and St. Albans Road generated only minor comment from one of the neighbours. The new design allows for independent development of lots fronting on St. Albans Road which was well received by the neighbours and the Panel. The open space along Bennett road was not compromised in the alteration of the townhouse units at the south end of the site, in fact, the reduced height of these buildings should be a real improvement. The floor area of the apartment areas increased without impacting further on the northerly neighbours. The Panel found the design to be a significant improvement to the original development permit.

The Panel recommends that the permit be issued.

**DP 00-175113 – SPORTSTOWN BC HOLDINGS LTD. – 4991 NO. 5 ROAD**

The proposal to redevelop the Western Indoor Tennis Centre to a multiple sport complex did not generate any comment from the neighbours. It was initially indicated that a variance to parking requirements would be necessary to accommodate the redevelopment, however, the proponent submitted new plans that had the parking requirement in compliance with the bylaw, so a variance is not necessary. Landscaping on the site will be improved through the redevelopment proposal.

The Panel recommends that the permit be issued.

DJM:djm



MINUTES

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL

Wednesday, August 16, 2000

- Time: 3:30 p.m.
- Place: Council Chambers  
Richmond City Hall
- Present: David McLellan, General Manager, Urban Development, Chair  
Chuck Gale, General Manager, Engineering and Public Works  
Jim Bruce, General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services

The meeting was called to order at 3:39 p.m.

The Chair introduced the members of the Development Permit Panel to the audience and explained the procedures.

1. MINUTES

It was moved and seconded

*That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, July 26, 2000 be adopted.*

CARRIED

2. DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT DV 00-084968

(Report: July 24/00, REDMS: 140059)

APPLICANT: David J. Ho on behalf of the Roman Catholic Archbishop

PROPERTY LOCATION: 12011 Woodhead Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To vary the rear yard setback at the north property line from 7.5 m (24.606 ft.) to 4.88 m (16.0 ft) for the proposed new parish complex;
2. To vary the road setback on Woodhead Road from 6 m (19.685 ft.) to 0 m (0.00 ft.) for a new porte cochere entrance;
3. To vary the maximum height for a structure from 12 m (39.37 ft.) to 20.42 m (67.0 ft.) for a new bell tower and cross;

4. To vary the off-street parking setback from 3 m (9.84 ft.) to 2.25 m (7.39 ft.) along Woodhead Road, 1.5 m (5.0 ft.) to 0.42 m (1.38 ft.) along the east property line, and 1.5 m (5.0 ft) to 1.02 m (3.35 ft.) for three parking spaces and 0.67 m (2.20 ft.) for two additional spaces along the north property line;
5. To vary the parking drive aisle from 7.5 m (24.606 ft.) to 6.7 m (22 ft.) for the easterly north/south drive aisle only; and
6. To vary the requirement for relocating the existing sidewalk and adding a grass boulevard with street trees on Woodhead Road and No. 5 Road.

#### **APPLICANT'S COMMENTS**

With the aid of drawings Mr. David Ho gave a brief summary of the project and the requested variances. When questioned by the Chair as to the lack of a scale model Mr. Ho replied that his understanding was that a model was not required for church buildings.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS**

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, explained that this essentially is a replacement of the existing church. A considerable amount of work was required of staff as it was a challenge to achieve the number of setbacks required, most of which are on the north and east side.

#### **GALLERY COMMENTS**

None

#### **CORRESPONDENCE**

None

#### **PANEL DISCUSSION**

The discussion opened with the Chair noting that the proposed building is significantly larger than has historically been on this site and yet the Church recently sold 3 adjacent lots. Mr. McLellan was further concerned that this proposal has not been before the Advisory Design Panel as the proposed design appears, especially in light of the lack of a model, to need a stronger esthetic presence. Mr. Ho explained that cost was a determining factor in the functional approach to the design.

Mr. McLellan said he would like to see less fence in the treatment around the building as it creates a barrier to reasonable use of the land. Mr. Ho had security concerns in this regard. Mr. Ho confirmed for the Chair that brick would be the exterior treatment on the building and that area residents had been given an opportunity to review the proposal.

Mr. McLellan questioned staff as to whether the unfinished classrooms had been taken into consideration when parking was being addressed, the answer being yes.

Mr. Gale asked Mr. Ho to clarify the rationale of the sidewalks and grass boulevards. Mr. Ho responded that Woodhead to McNeely already complied with the City standard. After answering a question regarding the total number of parking spaces, 130, Mr. Ho was asked what changes, due to the staff of the Development Applications Design

Planning consideration that the proposed porte cochere was not appropriate, have been made to the porte cochere. Mr. Ho's answer was that no change has been made.

Mr. Gale questioned the Chair as to the appropriateness of referring this item to the Advisory Design Panel.

Mr. Ho and then staff were asked, with respect to the security aspect of the proposed fencing, if the police had had any involvement at this point. It was advised that the Advisory Design Panel provides this resource. Mr. Gale then recommended that the fencing, chain link with cedar hedge, be enhanced by a black fabric treatment.

Mr. Bruce asked for an explanation on the parking variance, to which Mr. Ho responded that space had to be found for larger vehicles. It was also clarified that there are two proposed handicapped parking stalls.

Mr. Gale concluded that while the majority of variances are reasonable he questioned the lack of involvement of the Advisory Design Panel, especially as the site is adjacent to a park. His recommendation would be for the Advisory Design Panel to review the proposal.

Mr. McLellan agreed as that would also allow input from the RCMP and the RDA.

**PANEL DECISION**

It was moved and seconded

***That Development Variance Permit DV 00-084968 be referred to the Advisory Design Panel for their consideration.***

**CARRIED**

**3. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT DP 00-086315**

(Report: July 20/00, REDMS: 163650)

APPLICANT: Jan Timmer

PROPERTY LOCATION: 8433 Bennett Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To permit the re-distribution of apartments and townhouses on the overall site as per a new phased master plan;
2. To permit the development - in the current phase - of a townhouse complex of 29 units; and
3. To vary the regulations in the *Zoning and Development Bylaw* to:
  - Reduce the setback to Bennett Road (for one building) from 19.8 m (64.685 ft.) to 6 m (19.685 ft.), and to 0 for a garbage/recycling/mail enclosure;
  - Reduce the setbacks from the east and west property lines from 6 m (19.685 ft.) to 3 m (9.843 ft.); and
  - Allow up to 23 tandem parking stalls

### **APPLICANT'S COMMENTS**

Mr. Timmer, Architect, with the benefit of two scale models, evidenced the changes incurred in the second proposal. These were a much wider park facing Bennett Road, 29 instead of 31 units, a smaller, lower scheme, and more green areas.

### **STAFF COMMENTS**

The Manager, Development Applications, also summarized the changes by noting the number of units and lower appearance, and the openness on Bennett Road. Mr. Erceg said that an application has been received undertaking to improve Bennett Road allowing for more access for the development of four lots.

Mr. Gale questioned the fencing, and Mr. Masa Ito, Ito and Associates Landscape Architects, responded by referring to the Advisory Design Panel request for a physical boundary between Bennett Road and the park. Mr. Ito and Mr. Timmer also verified the park will have public access.

### **GALLERY COMMENTS**

A gentleman spoke on behalf of the interest of the owner of 7120 St. Albans, 2<sup>nd</sup> lot from the north side. He expressed his concern about the economics of the length of time involved in this process as no decision can be made on the St. Albans property until the question of access to St. Albans is addressed. Other than the question of access to St. Albans he is happy with the proposed plans submitted by Mr. Timmer. He also confirmed for the Chair that an application pertaining to the St. Albans property has not been submitted to date.

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

A letter was received from Chang Wai Ngor, 1209 – 7080 St. Albans Road and is attached as Schedule 1 to these Minutes.

### **PANEL DISCUSSION**

The Chair asked staff if any provision had been made for costs to be charged back to the developer. Mr. Erceg responded that the intent was to require a right of way to access St. Albans, the costs being borne by the developer. A short term access to the 4 lots was looked at. It was originally believed that the four lots might be consolidated, but this has not happened yet.

Mr. Gale asked if the construction of the right of way would be bonded – yes – and thought that the timing on the bond would address the concerns of the owner of the St. Albans lot.

Mr. McLellan was concerned about this issue, noting there were ways to sort out temporary access for the interim. The Chair also said he supported the staff recommendation as it allows for a lot of flexibility and a superior product.

**PANEL DECISION**

It was moved and seconded

***That a Development Permit be issued for a property zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/73) at 8433 Bennett Road that would:***

- 1. Permit the re-distribution of apartments and townhouses on the overall site as per a new phased master plan;***
- 2. Permit the development - in the current phase - of a townhouse complex of 29 units; and***
- 3. To vary the regulations in the Zoning and Development Bylaw to:***
  - Reduce the setback to Bennett Road (for one building) from 19.8 m (64.685 ft.) to 6 m (19.685 ft.), and to 0 for a garbage/recycling/mail enclosure;***
  - Reduce the setbacks from the east and west property lines from 6 m (19.685 ft.) to 3 m (9.843 ft.); and***
  - Allow up to 23 tandem parking stalls.***

**CARRIED**

**4. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT DP 00-175113**

(Report: August 2/00, REDMS: 170679)

APPLICANT: Sportstown BC Holdings Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 4991 No. 5 Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

To allow a building addition of 3,586.59 m<sup>2</sup> (38,607 ft<sup>2</sup>) to the existing Western Indoor Tennis Club for a combined total gross area of 7,370.59 m<sup>2</sup> (79,339 ft<sup>2</sup>); and

To vary the parking requirements of the Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 from 181 spaces to 148 spaces.

**APPLICANT'S COMMENTS**

Mr. Daryl Epp, Architect, gave a brief summary of the Development Permit request. He said that additional enclosed recreation space would be provided by converting the area currently used for outdoor tennis. This would require some relocation of facilities within the current building. The Dewsbury perimeter tree line will be extended, providing a good screen for those residents. The neighbours have expressed no concern over this proposal. No parking variance is required as parking would remain within City requirements.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

Mr. Erceg confirmed that no variance was required.

**GALLERY COMMENTS**

None

**CORRESPONDENCE**

None

**PANEL DECISION**

It was moved and seconded

***That a Development Permit be issued for 4991 No. 5 Road on a site zoned School and Park Use District (SPU) which would:***

- ***Allow a building addition of 3,586.59 m<sup>2</sup> (38,607 ft<sup>2</sup>) to the existing Western Indoor Tennis Club for a combined total gross area of 7,370.59 m<sup>2</sup> (79,339 ft<sup>2</sup>).***
- ***Vary the parking requirements of the Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 from 181 spaces to 148 spaces.***

**CARRIED**

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded

***That the meeting be adjourned at 4:29 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, August 16, 2000.

---

David McLellan  
Chair

---

Deborah MacLennan  
Recording Secretary



SCHEDULE 1 TO THE MINUTES OF  
THE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL  
MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY,  
AUGUST 16, 2000.

#1203-7080 St. Alban Road,  
Richmond BC  
V6Y 4Z6

	IRM	IN
✓	DW	
	KY	
	AS	
	DB	
	SF	
✓	Debra	

Aug 11, 00

TO : CITY OF RICHMOND

ATTN: MR. J. RICHARD MCKENNA

RE: DEVELOPMENT PERMIT DP00-086315

DP00-086315

Sorry, I am unable to attend the Development Permit panel meeting on Aug 16, 2000 at Council Chambers, Richmond City Hall. and I am written submissions on the proposed development noted above mentioned (DP00-086315).

Thank you for your kind attention and cooperation.

Best Regards,  
Chang Wai Ngoo.

