City of Richmond

Minutes

Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, October 16th, 2002

Time: 3:30 p.m.

Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall

Present: David McLellan, General Manager, Urban 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, September 25, 2002, be adopted.

CARRIED

2. Development Permit 02-202790

(Report: September 19/02 File No.: DP 02-202790) (REDMS No. 727644)

APPLICANT: Tom Yamamoto

PROPERTY LOCATION: 7611, 7651, 7691 and northerly portion of 7731 Heather Street and 7600 Turnill Street

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To allow the construction of 60 townhouse units at 7611, 7651, 7691 and the northerly portion of 7731 Heather Street and 7600 Turnill Street on a property zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/126); and

2. To vary the regulations in the Zoning and Development Bylaw to:

   (a) permit two mailbox/recycling enclosures within the 6 m (19.685 ft) road setback on Heather Street;

(b) permit Building 3 to encroach a maximum of 1 m (3.281 ft) into the 6 m (19.685 ft) road setback at the corner of Keefer Avenue and Turnill Street; and

(c) reduce the number of visitor parking spaces from 12 to 11.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Tom Yamamoto, architect, with the aid of elevations, an artists' renderings, a site plan, and a model, reviewed the existing developments adjacent to the subject property and noted that an elementary school and City park would be located on Heather Street. Also reviewed by Mr. Yamamoto were the existing trees on Heather Street, which had been assessed by both a City and a private arbourist; the 3 storey height; the decrease in the number of units per building to reduce the appearance of massing; the location of the open space across from the open space on Heather Street; the benches located in the entry arbour; and the lack of provision of a covered amenity area due to the close proximity of the neighbouring open space.

A public passage right-of-way is to extend through the development from Jones Road to Heather Street. The existing character of Heather Street is to be maintained, with less density proposed for Heather Street than for Turnill Street. Mr. Yamamoto reviewed the requested variances.

Staff Comments

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, said that this was one of several developments underway in McLennan South. The importance of the site in its relation to the completion of the ring road from Jones Road to Heather Street was noted. Mr. Erceg also said that staff supported the proposed design of the project; the requested variances were common; and, that the reduction to visitor parking by one stall would be offset by on-street parking.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Yamamoto reviewed the visitor parking locations; confirmed that the right-of-way was open to public passage; and that provision of internal sidewalks would enhance pedestrian safety.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

The Chair said that this was a well thought out project and that he appreciated the good response of the applicant to the comments received during the process. In addition, Mr. McLellan said that he agreed with the comments of Mr. Erceg regarding the reduction to visitor parking.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued that would:

1. ***Allow the construction of 60 townhouse units at 7611, 7651, 7691 and the northerly Development District (CD/126); and***
2. ***Vary the regulations in the Zoning and Development Bylaw to:***
   - ***(a) permit two mailbox/recycling enclosures within the 6 m (19.685 ft) road setback on Heather Street;***
   - ***(b) permit Building 3 to encroach a maximum of 1 m (3.281 ft) into the 6 m (19.685 ft) road setback at the corner of Keefer Avenue and Turnill Street;***
   - **(c) *reduce the number of visitor parking spaces from 12 to 11.***

CARRIED

3. Development Permit DP 02-205116

(Report: September 13/02 File No.: DP 02-205116) (REDMS No. 848595)

APPLICANT: Am-Pri Construction Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 7691 No. 3 Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

To allow the development of 25 townhouse units on one (1) lot containing a total floor area of 2,933.596 m^2 (31,578 ft^2); and

To vary the provisions of Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to permit the following:

1. The projection of the unit floor space and balconies for the A4 and A5 units on Abercrombie Drive, along the north and south property lines, to a maximum of 1.6 m (5.249 ft.) into the 6.0 m (19.685 ft.) setback;
2. The projection of the pedestrian gate on No. 3 Road, along the east property line, to a maximum of 5.639 m (18.5 ft.) into the 6.0 m (19.685 ft.) setback;
3. The projection of bay windows for the units on No. 3 Road along the east property line, to a maximum of 0.762 m (2.5 ft.) into the 6.0 m (19.685 ft.) setback;

4. The projection of second floor balconies for the units along the north and south property lines, to a maximum of 1.55 m (5.085 ft.) into the 6.0 m (19.685 ft.) for both side yard setbacks;
5. The projection of third floor bays for the units along the north and south property lines, to a maximum of 0.5 m (1.640 ft.) into the 6.0 m (19.685 ft.) for both side yard setbacks; and
6. Allow tandem vehicle parking for twenty-one (21) of the townhouse units.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Tom Yamamoto, architect, with the aid of a site plan, elevations and a model, provided the information that the development site was the last vacant property on No. 3 Road; the last section of an existing right-of-way would provide access through the property; pedestrian access only would be permitted from No. 3 Road; the exposure to No. 3 Road had been minimized; four units had been oriented toward Abercrombie Place and those units had been provided with front porch entries and balconies; and, that the open space had been combined to maximize the amenity area. Mr. Yamamoto then reviewed the variances requested.

Staff Comments

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, said that this was an infill project in an established neighbourhood. In addition, Mr. Erceg said that a number of changes had been made by the applicant in response to comments received from the Advisory Design Panel and staff, and that the variances requested were reasonable. Advice was given by Mr. Erceg that a contribution of $25,000, as yet unallocated, would be made to the City in lieu of a developed amenity area.

Correspondence

Mrs. B. Gordon, 103 – 7500 Abercrombie – Schedule 1.

Mr. and Mrs. Saunders, #51 Abercrombie Drive – Schedule 2.

Gallery Comments

Mr. Ross Cleveland, 7820 Abercrombie, submitted a petition signed by twenty-one owners from Abercrombie Place and Champagne Court, both of which are adjacent developments. The petition is attached as Schedule 3 and forms a part of these minutes. Mr. Cleveland said that although he was pleased the property was being developed he was opposed to the setback variances being approved. Mr. Cleveland felt that the proposed 3 storey height was not consistent with the neighbourhood and would box in Champagne Court. Further to this, Mr. Cleveland said that the subject property was not much wider than that of Champagne Court, which contained 11 units as compared to the 25 units proposed for the subject property.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr. Cleveland said that Abercrombie Place and Champagne Court units did not have 2nd floor balconies, and that the setbacks from the property line was 10 ft., as opposed to the 15 ft. setbacks of the subject development.

The Chair provided the comment that, as compared to regular windows, the balconies proposed for the main living area would break up the views out. A further comment on the benefits of landscape screening was also made.

Mr. Yamamoto provided a diagram which clarified the projections in the setbacks and the effects of shadowing. In response to a question, Mr. Yamamoto said that the landscape plan did not include large trees due to the impact they would have on the living space. In addition to this, Mr. Brian Guzzi, Planner, said that a combination of small to medium trees were proposed with a 4 to 1 replacement of existing trees that required removal. Mr. Guzzi also said that the screening would not be effective initially but that partial screening, with gaps on the north and south property lines to allow view corridors, could be expected in the future. Mr. Guzzi considered that the applicant would modify the landscape plan if requested to do so.

Panel Discussion

The General Manager, Public Works and Engineering, Jeff Day, acknowledged the concerns of the delegate but noted that the required setbacks were more substantial than those of the existing developments. Mr. Day agreed with an earlier comment of the Chair that balconies would reduce the views out, and said that he would support the recommendation.

The Chair said that he concurred with the reasons provided by Mr. Day, and that he would support the recommendation.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued for 7691 No. 3 Road on a site zoned Townhouse and Apartment District (R3), which would allow the development of 25 townhouse units on one (1) lot containing a total floor area of 2,933.596 m² (31,578 ft²); and

Vary the provisions of Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to permit the following:

1. ***The projection of the unit floor space and balconies for the A4 and A5 units on Abercrombie Drive, along the north and south property lines, to a maximum of 1.6 m (5.249 ft.) into the 6.0 m (19.685 ft.) setback;***
2. ***The projection of the pedestrian gate on No. 3 Road, along the east property line, to a maximum of 5.639 m (18.5 ft.) into the 6.0 m (19.685 ft.) setback;***

3. ***The projection of bay windows for the units on No. 3 Road along the east property line, to a maximum of 0.762 m (2.5 ft.) into the 6.0 m (19.685 ft.) setback;***
4. ***The projection of second floor balconies for the units along the north and south property lines, to a maximum of 1.55 m (5.085 ft.) into the 6.0 m (19.685 ft.) for both side yard setbacks;***
5. ***The projection of third floor bays for the units along the north and south property lines, to a maximum of 0.5 m (1.640 ft.) into the 6.0 m (19.685 ft.) for both side yard setbacks; and***
6. ***Allow tandem vehicle parking for twenty-one (21) of the townhouse units.***

CARRIED

4. Development Variance Permit DV 02-209505

(Report: September 16/02 File No.: DV 02-209505) (REDMS No. 850691)

APPLICANT:	Christopher Bozyk Architects
PROPERTY LOCATION:	11828 Machrina Way
INTENT OF PERMIT:	To vary the maximum floor area allowed for a caretaker suite from 75 m^2 (807.32 ft^2) to 122.44 m^2 (1318 ft^2) for a new industrial building at 11828 Machrina Way.

Applicant's Comments

The applicant was not present.

Staff Comments

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, had no additional information to that provided in the report.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

The Chair said that he did not anticipate any problems arising from the approval of the variance.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Variance Permit be issued that would vary the maximum floor area allowed for a caretaker suite from 75 m² (807.32 ft²) to 122.44 m² (1318 ft²) for a new industrial building at 11828 Machrina Way.

CARRIED

5. Development Variance Permit DV 02-210089

(Report: September 13/02 File No.: DV 02-210089) (REDMS No. 843525)

APPLICANT:	John & Louise Varley
PROPERTY LOCATION:	7460 Lucas Road
INTENT OF PERMIT:	To vary the minimum width requirement in the Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E) zone from 18m (59.055 ft) to 17.29m (56.73 ft) in order to permit a two lot residential subdivision.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Duncan Innes, realtor, and Mr. Jack Varley were present. Mr. Innes said that he was in agreement with the information contained in the staff report and that he was present to answer questions.

Staff Comments

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, said that there was no additional information to that provided in the report.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

The Chair said that the result of approving the requested variance would be consistent with the existing neighbourhood.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Variance Permit be issued for 7460 Lucas Road that would vary the minimum width requirement in the Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E) zone from 18m (59.055 ft) to 17.29m (56.73 ft) in order to permit a two lot residential subdivision.

CARRIED

6. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting be adjourned at 4:13 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, October 16, 2002.

David McLellan
Chair

Deborah MacLennan
Administrative Assistant

SCHEDULE 1 TO THE MINUTES
OF THE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT
PANEL MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2002.

Re:- City of Richmond
6911 # 3rd.
Richmond BC, V6Y 2C1 DP02-205116.

We shall all miss the open-vista this vacant lot has afforded these past years! The residents facing the lot from Bentley Wind (spelling?) will not be too pleased to see a building instead of a green-open-space as they look out of their windows!
But let us face facts, here as in Tsawwassen where I lived for 18yrs, and before that in Vancouver, you have a vacant lot you have a GARBAG-DUMP!

I would have no idea how the property will look on completion, I leave that to people who are paid to attend to such matters but would understand that it will not be any more over powering than the property already in the area.

I take it that Abercrombie would be completed to form the half-circle. If this is a fact perhaps when the "No Exit" signs come down on the corners of 'N.S.' Abercrombie a 'slow' sign go up (will anyone read it) and a speed deterent go in the area of the 'proposed' new development!
People need to cut their speed coming off Minoru as it is.
Some of us are walkers and children do live in the area!

Thank you for your consideration
B.I. Gordon (Mrs)
103-7500 Abercrombie
Richmond B.C.
V6Y 3J9.

phone (604) 2071766.

CITY OF RICHMOND
DATE
OCT 16 2002
RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

SCHEDULE 2 TO THE MINUTES
OF THE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT
PANEL MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2002.

Re: Development Application Permit

If this development has 25 townhomes I feel there should be adequate parking, plus Guest Parking stalls for all 25 units.

As there is "no parking" on Abercrombie Drive S., will City Hall ensure that this restriction be applied on the entire Abercrombie Dr.? As the street is narrow, how will cars and emergency vehicles be able to pass each other if parking IS allowed.

Thank you

Mr. & Mrs. F. Saunders
#51 Abercrombie Dr. S.

	INT
JRM	
DW	DW
KY	
AS	
DB	
WB	

To Development Permit Panel
Date:
Item #
Re:

CITY OF RICHMOND
DATE
OCT - 8 2002
RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

SCHEDULE 3 TO THE MINUTES
OF THE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT
PANEL MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2002.

October 11, 2002

City Clerk
City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, B.C. V6Y 2C1

To Whom It May Concern:

SUBJECT: SUBMISSION ON THE NOTICE OF APPLICATION FOR A DEVELOPMENT PERMIT DP 02-205116

The residents of Champagne Court and Abercrombie Place, adjacent North and South respectively to the proposed development site would like to make the following submission in respect of the subject development permit DP 02-205116.

We are all very concerned about the impact that this new development will have on our neighbourhood. Each item in the subject's proposal to vary the R3 Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 provisions will be responded to separately below:

Item 1. Opposed. The variance to project the balcony and floor space past the 6.0 m (19.685 ft.) setback would make this building too close to the existing complexes. Abercrombie Place, for example, is just over 15 feet from the fence. Both Champagne Court and Abercrombie Place are two-storey units and the addition of a three-storey unit in between will be extremely imposing.

Item 2. Opposed. This proposed extension would likely impact on the existing trees. The trees should not be removed as they provide some baffling of the noise from No. 3 road. The gate should be along the same boundaries as that of the existing complexes.

Item 3. Opposed. The extension of the bay windows east would probably not appear correct if the rest of building had no extensions or bay windows. This variance would be supported if it could be demonstrated that the appearance of the building would not be a detriment to the aesthetics of the neighbourhood.

Item 4. Opposed. Again, the addition of a three-storey complex in between two-storey is both a detriment to the aesthetics of the neighbourhood. Any increase in size past the setback would be very imposing on the adjacent units. Abercrombie Place, in particular, will be severely impacted as all of its yards are North facing. Instead of looking at the sky the only view will be a three-storey building less then 30 feet from our sliding doors. Privacy will be an issue as well as the continuing enjoyment of our private property.

Item 5. Opposed. There should be no projection past the setback due to the closeness of these properties.

Item 6. Supported. The additional parking spots will hopefully ease the pressure on Abercrombie Drive. There are already a number of vehicles that park on the undeveloped part of Abercrombie Drive. With this development, and the likelihood that the no parking zone would be extended there, would mean that these cars would have nowhere to park. There should be a requirement made of the development to widen Abercrombie Drive at that point to allow for parking similar to the one just north of the site. There is also

concern that there are not enough parking spots on the premises. Abercrombie Place, for example, has only 14 units and has 9 visitor spots.

The addition of 25 townhouse units to our neighbourhood will greatly increase the congestion already felt by most along south Minoru. The parking problems already experienced will only increase and cause more stress to those already struggling to find safe parking. None of us are opposed to progress, however, allowing the projection of a probably very imposing development will not be progress.

Respectfully,

Signatories:

Print name	Signature	Address
HUGO DAVID MADEIRA		13-7820 ABERCROMBIE PL
RICHARD FARNWORTH BESWICK		#4-7820 ABERCROMBIE PLACE
MARGARET L HAN		#9-7820 ABERCROMBIE PL RICHMOND B.C
KITTY C.C. TSOU		2-7820 Abercrombie PL Richmond. BC
PHYLLIS PETERSON	P. Peterson	1-7820 ABERCROMBIE PLAC RICHMOND, B.C.
Peter Lee		11-7820 Abercrombie Pl Richmond V6Y 3T2

2/84

October 11, 2002

Print name	Signature	Address
ISAO YUNG YUNG CHANG	Isao Yung Kang Chang	14-7820 ABERCROMBIE PL
GILBERT TAI		7-7820 Abercrombie Pl
Cissie Yung		6-7820 Abercrombie Place
EDWARD CHENG	Edward Cheng	10-7820 ABERCROMBIE PL
CHRISTINE KOO		#8 7820 Abercrombie Pl.
YIP-LAM-CHAN-CHRISTINE CHEUNG		#3-7820 Abercrombie Pl
Ross & Ruth Cleveland		12-7820 Abercrombie Pl.

3/3/4

October 11, 2002

Print name	Signature	Address
Fiona McHugh	FMcHugh	9-7660 Abercrombie Drive
KENT CHEN	Kent Chen	1-7660 ABERCROMBIE DRIVE
KWAN Yee.		#11-7660 Abercrombie Dr.
Carla McHugh	CMcHugh	9-7660 Abercrombie Dr.
JOHN C. LING		320-7500 Abercrombie Dr.
MARION LING	Marion Ling	320-7500 ABERCROMBIE RICHMOND. B.C.
JOAN LEE	Joan Lee	8-7660 Abercrombie Dr.

4/54