



**CITY OF RICHMOND
ADMINISTRATION**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Richmond City Council
FROM: Jim Bruce
Acting Chair, Development Permit Panel
DATE: September 1, 2000
FILE: 0100-20-DPER1-01
RE: Development Permit Panel Meeting Held on August 30, 2000

PANEL RECOMMENDATION

1. That the recommendation of the Panel to authorize the issuance of a Development Permit (DP 00-085462) for the properties at 4771 and 4791 Williams Road and a portion of 9711 Geal Road be endorsed, and the Permit so issued.
2. That the removal of an existing tree and the planting of two (2) replacement trees be deemed to be in general compliance with Development Permit DP 98-148980, for property located at 6640-6680 Granville Avenue.


for Jim Bruce
Acting Chair, Development Permit Panel

JWB:Imm

PANEL REPORT

On August 30, 2000, the Development Permit Panel considered: a Development Permit application; a General Compliance application, and a Development Variance Permit. The Development Variance Permit application was referred to the next Development Permit Panel meeting, so that the applicant could be in attendance.

DP-00-085462 – SUNCOR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION-4771 AND 4791 WILLIAMS ROAD AND A PORTION OF 9711 GEAL ROAD

The proposal to develop 26 affordable townhouse rental units funded by the Greater Vancouver Housing Corporation on a site located on Williams Road directly to the west of Geal Road did not generate in comments from the neighbours at the August 30th Development Permit meeting. As part of the application, three variances were requested and supported by the Panel including a reduction in parking requirements from 50 to 49 stalls; the inclusion of tandem parking stalls to accommodate 14 vehicles, and the siting of a small recycling enclosure within the 6m front setback along Williams Road. Given the time restraints associated with this application, and the fact that the applicant has made changes to address most of the City's guidelines and the Design Panel's comments, the Panel supported the application. However, the Panel also requested that the applicant work with staff prior to proceeding to Council on the possibility of improving the landscaping on the site particularly along the internal road, and relocating the disabled visitor parking stall to a more central location on the site plan. The Panel indicated that all the landscaping enhancements should be completed to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Applications, and that no delays in proceeding to Council should occur as a result.

The Panel recommends that the Development Permit be issued.

DP-98-148980 – MAEDA DEVELOPMENT LTD. – 6640 AND 6680 GRANVILLE AVENUE

The proposal for a General Compliance for revisions to the landscape plan of a 19-unit townhouse project located on Granville Avenue did not generate any comment from the neighbours. The need for the General Compliance arose from a surveying error where an existing tree (*Cedrus "atlantica"*) which was to be retained is actually located within the center of the project's internal road. In order to address this error, the applicant offered to supply and install a new 3 metres high tree on the site. After discussing the issue, the Panel suggested that the applicant supplies and installs two new trees to compensate for the existing tree which will need to be removed. The applicant agreed to do so.

The Panel recommends that the General Compliance be issued.

JWB:Imm



MINUTES

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL

Wednesday, August 30th, 2000

Time: 3:30 p.m.
Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall
Present: Jim Bruce, General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services, Chair
Ms. Lauren Melville, Manager, Policy & Research
Mr. Barry King, Manager, Sewerage & Drainage

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.

The Chair advised that the following matter would be added to the agenda as an additional item:

- Application by Maeda Development Ltd. for a General Compliance at 6640-6680 Granville Avenue.

1. **MINUTES**

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, August 16th, 2000 be adopted.

CARRIED

2. **DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT DV 00-174210**
(Report: August 8/00, File No.: DV 00-174210) (REDMS: 164266)

APPLICANT: Opus Building Corporation

PROPERTY LOCATION: 12033 Riverside Way

INTENT OF PERMIT: To vary the parking requirements from 177 to 136 parking spaces and allow for a maximum of 40% of these spaces as small stalls for a proposed three-storey restaurant and office development.

The applicant was not in attendance, and the Panel proceeded to deal with Item 3.

The applicant was still not present after the Panel had dealt with the additional matter (Item 4), and as a result, the following **referral** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That the application for Development Variance Permit (DV 00-174210), for property at 12033 Riverside Way be referred to the meeting of the Development Permit Panel to be held at 3:30 p.m., on Wednesday, September 13th, 2000, in the Council Chambers, Richmond City Hall, 6911 No. 3 Road.

CARRIED

3. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT DP 00-085462

(Report: August 14/00; File No.: DP 00-085462) (REDMS: 175027)

APPLICANT: Suncor Development Corporation

PROPERTY LOCATION: 4771 and 4791 Williams Road and a portion of 9711 Geal Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To permit the construction of 26 townhouse units on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/114); and
2. To vary the regulations in the Zoning and Development Bylaw to:
 - allow up to 14 vehicles to be parked in tandem;
 - reduce the parking requirement from 50 stalls to 49; and
 - allow a recycling enclosure within the 6m street setback

APPLICANT'S COMMENTS

Mr. Tom Bell, of Gomberoff Bell Lyon Group of Architects Inc., 1012 Balfour Avenue, Vancouver, reviewed the project with Panel members. With the use of site plans, he indicated that the properties to the north and south were single-family developments, to the east was the parking lot for the Beth Tikvah Synagogue as well as a single-family lot, and to the west was the parking lot for the St. Joseph the Worker Church.

Mr. Bell explained that the proposal was to construct a 26 unit, 2 and 3 storey, townhouse project for the Greater Vancouver Housing Corporation (GVHC). He advised that with the exception of the amenity room, the development would be predominantly 3 storey, but graduated down to 1 storey fronting Williams Road. He added that the construction materials would include asphalt roof shingles and vinyl siding.

Mr. Bell then reviewed the variances being sought by the applicant. The first variance, to allow up to 14 vehicles to be parked in tandem, was being requested because of the concerns by adjacent residents that sufficient on-site parking be provided. The second variance to reduce the parking requirement from 50 stalls to 49 is a result of calculations being rounded up to the next number by City staff. Mr. Bell advised that the parking requirements initially arrived at by the GVHC were 1.88 per unit, however, during the planning process, the requirement was rounded up to 1.9, which resulted in 50 parking stalls being required, rather than 49. He stated that because of the size of the subject property, there was simply no space to accommodate another parking stall on-site. The final variance being sought is to allow the placement of a recycling enclosure within the 6 metre street setback. Mr. Bell explained that because of the lack of room to manoeuvre large vehicles, staff were concerned about bringing the recycling trucks into the property and creating a dangerous situation for residents when the drivers of these vehicles attempted to turn around or back their trucks out of the property. Therefore, the applicant was proposing to locate an 8 x 6 foot (approximate) recycling structure in the street setback, with a distance to the property line of 14 feet. Mr. Bell noted that the building had been incorporated into the design of the project.

STAFF COMMENTS

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, stated that the zone for the subject property had been designed to accommodate the social housing project proposed by the GVHC. He indicated that staff's review of the development had concluded that it generally complied with the City's Development Permit guidelines, and as a result, staff were recommending that the permit be issued. Mr. Erceg further stated that the proposed variances were minor in nature and could be supported. He advised that 'tandem parking' was common and existed in a number of existing developments; that the parking variance was essentially the result of a rounding of figures when the CD zone was prepared; and that the variance for the recycling was also a common request.

Development Planner Brian Guzzi advised that he was satisfied with the project. He noted that the staff report contained comments about the width of the internal road. He stated that staff were of the view that the ideal situation would be to stagger the blocks of townhouse units, however this would require a reduction in the internal road width and a substantial redesign of the site plan. Mr. Guzzi expressed the view that a reasonable compromise had been reached with the design now being considered without unduly impacting the applicant. In response to questions about whether a narrower road width would create problems for a garbage truck, Mr. Guzzi advised that the size of a garbage truck was less than that of a recycling truck. He added however that the configuration of the T-intersection within the complex would have to remain the same as it now was proposed to allow garbage trucks to have sufficient room to turn within the property. In response to further questions, he confirmed that the requirement for the sidewalk, grass boulevard and the planting of street trees would be part of the landscaping treatment.

PANEL DISCUSSION

The Manager, Sewerage & Drainage, Barry King, questioned the steps which would be taken to protect the existing trees located around the perimeter of the subject property. Landscaping architect Masa Ito explained that the developer would be requested to erect 'snow fencing' around these trees prior to any other site work being commenced. He added that some of the smaller trees would be relocated to other areas of the property. Mr. Ito also confirmed that the trees to be planted on Williams Road would be maple trees.

In response to further questions from Mr. King, Mr. Ito and Mr. Bell provided the following information:

- the internal roadway would be well lit by lighting mounted on the exterior walls of the units
- some preloading would be placed on the subject property
- the containment of water runoff would be addressed during the preload process.

Questions were raised about the availability of parking for the disabled, and information was provided that visitor 'disabled' parking was located immediately north of the northerly unit in Block 1. Concern was expressed about the fact that this stall was not more centrally located within the development, and the suggestion was made that if sufficient space was available, that the parking stall be relocated north to the area between Units A/6 and A/7.

GALLERY COMMENTS

None.

CORRESPONDENCE

None.

PANEL DECISION

Ms. Melville referred to the proposed landscaping for the project, and stated that she would like to see the landscaping enhanced. She suggested that there was sufficient room along the internal roadway for additional landscaping to be provided; however, she wanted assurance that adjusting the road to include the additional landscaping would not result in the garbage area being relocated to the front of the site.

In response, Mr. Bell stated that many of the concerns raised by the Panel about the landscaping were also those of all who were involved in the project, however, because of a combination of factors, including safety and security, the end result was the proposal now being considered. Mr. Ito added that he had been restricted by fire regulations or the width of the driveway, and he voiced the opinion that there was insufficient room on the site to add further landscaping.

Discussion continued briefly on this issue, as a result of which, the following resolution was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That the following recommendation be forwarded to Council for adoption, SUBJECT to the enhancement of the landscaping plan to the satisfaction of the Manager, Development Applications, prior to the proposal being submitted to Council for approval:

That a Development Permit (DP 00-085462) be issued for property at 4771 and 4791 Williams Road and a portion of Geal Road, which would:

1. ***Permit the construction of 26 townhouse units on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/114); and***

2. **Vary the regulations in the Zoning and Development Bylaw to:**
- **allow up to 14 vehicles to be parked in tandem;**
 - **reduce the parking requirement from 50 stalls to 49; and**
allow a recycling enclosure within the 6m street setback.

The question on the motion was not called, as the request was made that consideration be given to the addition of landscaping adjacent to the existing parking lot (east side of the subject property).

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

4. **GENERAL COMPLIANCE - MAEDA DEVELOPMENT LTD., 6640 - 6680 GRANVILLE AVENUE (DP 98-148980)**

Mr. Stacey Maeda, of 5511 Moncton Street, advised that because of a surveying error, a tree (a 0.24m Cedrus) which was to have been retained as part of the new development, was now located within the proposed internal roadway. He asked that, because it was not reasonably possible to correct the situation, he be permitted to remove the tree and replace it with a 3.0 metre Evergreen, such as a Fraser Fir, Noble Fir or Serbian Spruce.

Mr. Erceg confirmed that because of a plotting area by the applicant's surveyor, the tree in question was now located within the middle of the main driveway through the development. He advised that staff were at ease in recommending that the tree be removed. Mr. Erceg added that an agreement had been reached with Mr. Maeda that he would replace the tree with not one but two trees.

In response to questions, Mr. Maeda stated that while he would prefer to provide only one replacement tree, he would plant two trees, one in the original area, and the second at a location on the property of the City's choosing.

It was moved and seconded

That the removal of an existing tree and the planting of two (2) replacement trees be deemed to be in general compliance with Development Permit DP 98-148980, for property located at 6640-6680 Granville Avenue.

CARRIED

5. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING:** September 13, 2000

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:10 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 30th, 2000.

Jim Bruce
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant