

## City of Richmond

## **Report to Council**

To:

Richmond City Council

Date:

November 8, 2005

From:

Joe Erceg, MCIP

File:

0100-20-DPER1-

····

Chair, Development Permit Panel

01/2005-Vol 1

Re:

Development Permit Panel Meetings Held on October 26, 2005 and

**September 14, 2005** 

## **Panel Recommendation**

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

- i) a Development Permit (DP 04-278285) for the property at 11511 Steveston Highway;
- ii) a Development Permit (DP 05-297766) for the property at 8280 Lansdowne Road; and
- iii) a Development Permit (DP 05-298114) for the property at 7751 Acheson Road;

be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.

Joe Erceg, MCIP

Chair, Development Permit Panel

WC:blg

## Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on October 26, 2005 and September 14, 2005:

# <u>DP 04-278285 – FIVE AND STEVESTON DEVELOPMENT LTD. – 11511 STEVESTON HIGHWAY</u> (October 26, 2005)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a 27-unit townhouse complex on a site zoned Townhouse District (R2-0.6). A variance to permit a mailbox and recycling cart enclosure in the front yard setback is included in the proposal. The architect, Mr. Tom Yamamoto, provided a project overview including specific details on site ingress/egress, on-site resident and visitor parking, building height and overall form and character. Staff advised that the proposal attempts to address the concerns raised through the site rezoning process and that eight (8) units have adaptive floor plans. In response to queries from the Panel, staff indicated that the site entrance would be limited to right-in/right-out only and there was no mid-block pedestrian crossing. The architect and landscape architect provided additional information on the exterior building materials and the amenity area in response to additional Panel queries. There were no comments from the public on the proposal.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

# <u>DP 05-297766 – TOYU LANSDOWNE DEVELOPMENTS LTD. – 8280 LANSDOWNE ROAD</u> (October 26, 2005)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a mixed-use commercial/residential complex consisting of a 12-storey building and a 16-storey building on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7). Variances to permit tandem parking and to reduce the parking structure manoeuvring aisle width are included in the proposal. The architect, Mr. Tom Bell, provided an overview of the project design and variances. Staff advised that the applicant worked with staff to try and address the concerns raised by the residents of the Richmond Towers complex (8240, 8246 and 8248 Lansdowne Road).

A petition, from 79 Richmond Towers owners, and a separate letter from a Richmond Towers resident stating concerns over the proposed building location, the loss of sunlight exposure and privacy, increased traffic and potential construction impacts were provided. Mr. Lawrence Yu, representing the Richmond Towers Strata Council, and another Richmond Towers resident, Ms. Suzanne Young, were present to reiterate these concerns and advise that the Strata Council would be hiring a geotechnical engineer to monitor construction. In response to Panel queries, staff advised that the applicant was unsuccessful in their attempts to partner with the adjacent site to the east and that the proposed design responded to the adjacency and view concerns. The architect provided further details on the site landscaping and advised the applicant would retain a geotechnical consultant to monitor construction activities. The Panel Chair acknowledged the Richmond Towers resident concerns and commended the applicant for the sensitive project design and recognition of the geotechnical concerns.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

# <u>DP 05-298114 – TIMOTHY TSE/WOODRIDGE DEVELOPMENTS – 7751 ACHESON ROAD (September 14, 2005)</u>

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of four (4) dwelling units (two (2) dwelling units per lot) on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/120). Included in the proposal are variances to reduce the minimum lot size required for each of the proposed lots, to reduce the side yard setback for garages located along the common property line and to permit portions of the buildings to project beyond the residential vertical envelope. The applicant, Mr. Timothy Tse, provided an overview of the project including how the project fit the site context and how land dedication requirements resulted in some of the variances. In response to a query from the Panel, Mr. Tse advised that site constraints resulted in replacement tree planting being provided on a 1:1 ratio with a cash contribution provided in lieu of meeting the City's 2:1 tree replacement goal. In response to a query from the Panel, staff advised that a Chestnut tree at the front of the site was being retained and that the permanent entrance from Acheson Road would be shared with the adjacent site to the west. There were no comments from the public on the proposed development.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.



## **Development Permit Panel**

# Wednesday, October 26th, 2005

Time:

3:30 p.m.

Place:

Council Chambers

Richmond City Hall

Present:

Jeff Day, General Manager, Engineering and Public Works, Chair

Mike Kirk, General Manager, Human Resources

Cathryn Volkering Carlile, General Manager, Parks, Recreation and Cultural

Services

The meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.

## 1. Minutes

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2005, be adopted.

**CARRIED** 

It was moved and seconded

That the agenda be varied to hear Item No. 2 after Item 4.

CARRIED

## 3. Development Permit DP 04-278285

(Report: October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2005; File No.: DP 04-278285) (REDMS No. 1647845)

APPLICANT:

Five and Steveston Development Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION:

11511 Steveston Highway

## INTENT OF PERMIT:

- 1. To permit the construction of 27 townhouse units at 11511 Steveston Highway on a site zoned "Townhouse District (R2 0.6)"; and
- 2. To vary the Zoning & Development Bylaw No. 5300 to reduce the front yard setback from 6 m to 1 m for a mailbox and recycling cart enclosure.

## **Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Tom Yamamoto, Architect, representing the applicant, advised that in order to address the concerns of the neighbourhood, the Official Community Plan bylaw had been revised to prevent ingress/egress to the site through the rear lane, access to the site was off Steveston Highway. The buildings in the development were sited to compliment the surrounding development. A two-storey building height was proposed along site edges and the three storey units would be placed at the entrance to the site to form a gateway into the project. All units had 2 side by side parking stalls. Extra visitor parking was provided to address neighbourhood concerns.

#### **Staff Comments**

Mr. Holger Burke, Acting Director of Development, advised that the rezoning of this site was a lengthy process. He stated that the design of the development attempts to respond to neighbourhood concerns. 8 units were easily adaptable for accessibility. In response to queries from the Panel, Mr. Burke advised that entrance into the complex was right in /right out only and that there was no mid-block pedestrian crossing.

In response to a query from the Panel, Mr. Yamamoto advised that the façade of the buildings consisted of woodgrain vinyl, wood baten, decorative wood brackets and asphalt roof shingles.

In response to a query from the Panel, Mr. Ito, Landscape Architect, advised that the play space in children's amenity area consisted of peat gravel, the remainder of the surface was grass.

#### Correspondence

None.

## **Gallery Comments**

None.

#### Panel Discussion

On behalf of the Panel, Chair congratulated the applicant on doing such a good job responding to the neighbourhood's concerns.

#### Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

- 1. Permit the construction of 27 townhouse units at 11511 Steveston Highway on a site zoned "Townhouse District (R2 0.6)"; and
- 2. Vary the Zoning & Development Bylaw No. 5300 to reduce the front yard setback from 6 m to 1 m for a mailbox and recycling cart enclosure.

CARRIED

## 4. Development Permit DP 04-287631

(Report: October 4th, 2005; File No.: DP 04-287631) (REDMS No. 1677025)

APPLICANT: Hancock Bruckner Eng. & Wright Architects

PROPERTY LOCATION: 7371 Westminster Highway

#### INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To permit the construction of three (3) residential towers with approximately 285 dwelling units and 486 off-street parking spaces in a 3-storey parkade at 7371 Westminster Highway on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7); and

- 2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:
  - a) Vary the front yard (Westminster Highway) setback for a portion of the south façade of Tower B (architectural fin extensions) from 3.0 m to 2.4 m;
  - b) Reduce the manoeuvring aisle width in the parking structure from 7.5 m to 6.7 m;
  - c) Increase the small car ratio from 30% to 32%; and
  - d) Permit 55 tandem parking spaces.

## **Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Jim Hancock, representing the applicant, advised that this development consisted of 3 residential towers. He stated that the variances requested were minor and standard for development of this type. The setback required on Westminster Highway was for architectural fins to enhance the project. He noted that the massing of the building was broken to accent vertical elements.

## **Staff Comments**

Mr. Holger Burke, Acting Director of Development advised that staff supported this development permit application. The variance requested on Westminster Highway was for an architectural fin to provide design articulation, the manoeuvring aisle variance was one commonly requested, and that Transportation staff supported the variance for more small cars and for tandem parking spaces which would service the parking needs of the larger units in the complex.

In response to a query from the Panel, Mr. Hancock advised that pedestrians on Westminster Highway would see a water feature, a spa and the front entrances of townhouses when looking into the site.

#### Correspondence

None.

## **Gallery Comments**

None.

#### Panel Discussion

The Chair advised that he liked the design of the project.

#### Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

- 1. Permit the construction of three (3) residential towers with approximately 285 dwelling units and 486 off-street parking spaces in a 3-storey parkade at 7371 Westminster Highway on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7); and
- 2. Vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to
  - a) Vary the front yard (Westminster Highway) setback for a portion of the south façade of Tower B (architectural fin extensions) from 3.0 m to 2.4 m;
  - b) Reduce the manoeuvring aisle width in the parking structure from 7.5 m to 6.7 m:
  - c) Increase the small car ratio from 30% to 32%; and
  - d) Permit 55 tandem parking spaces.

CARRIED

## 2. Development Permit DP 03-249328

(Report: October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2005 File No.: DP 03-249328) (REDMS No. 1435463)

APPLICANT:

Chris Dikeakos Architects Inc.

PROPERTY LOCATION:

8120 Lansdowne Road

## INTENT OF PERMIT:

- 1. To permit the construction of two 16-storey high-rises and a 9-storey mid-rise residential building containing a total of approximately 255 residential dwelling units with 416 parking spaces located in a 2 ½-storey parkade at 8120 Lansdowne Road on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7); and
- 2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:
  - a) Vary the residents parking from 383 to 365;
  - b) Vary the maximum height from 45 m to 47 m;
  - c) Vary some of the manoeuvring aisles from 7.5 m to 6.7 m; and
  - d) Permit tandem parking for 88 parking spaces.

## **Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Dikeakos, Architect, representing the applicant, advised that the request for a reduction in parking was done in an effort to move towards lessening the use of vehicles. The variance in height was made to accommodate the elevator shaft. The variance in the reduction of the manoeuvring aisles was standard in most municipalities and would help achieve a more compact parkade plan. The tandem parking variance was requested in order to maximize parking on the site. He stated that the project would have extensive brickwork at street level to tie in better with the landscape. The tower would be stepped back to break up the mass. There was extensive hard and soft landscape between towers as well as trellis work.

#### Staff Comments

Mr. Burke, Acting Director of Development apologised for not including the elevation drawings in the agenda package. He stated that the applicant had done a shade study which indicated that shadows would be cast onto the street.

In response to a query from the Chair, Mr. Dikeakos advised that there was a lay by on Lansdowne Road which could be used for a drop off and pick up area. He also stated that shadowing did not affect residents to the east.

## Correspondence

Petition (signed by 70 owners) from the Strata Council of Richmond Towers, 8240, 8246 and 8248 Landsowne Road. (attached as Schedule 1 and forms a part of these minutes)

## **Gallery Comments**

Mr. Lawrence Yu, 8248 Lansdowne Road, #502, on behalf of Strata Council, spoke in opposition to the development. He stated that if the height variance was granted the tower would be higher than the Richmond Towers. He also stated that signage for the development of the site had not been erected until recently. In response to this allegation, Mr. Burke advised that the signage was erected on site but that this may have been inadvertently knocked over since the application has been in process since 2003.

In response to a query from the Panel, Mr. Dikeakos advised that the height variance was requested to accommodate the elevator shaft.

## Panel Discussion

None.

#### Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

- 1. Permit the construction of two 16-storey high-rises and a 9-storey mid-rise residential building containing a total of approximately 255 residential dwelling units with 416 parking spaces located in a 2 ½-storey parkade at 8120 Lansdowne Road on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7); and
- 2. Vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:
  - a) Vary the residents parking from 383 to 365;
  - b) Vary the maximum height from 45 m to 47 m;
  - c) Vary some of the manoeuvring aisles from 7.5 m to 6.7 m; and
  - d) Permit tandem parking for 88 parking spaces.

**CARRIED** 

## 5. Development Permit DP 05-297766

(Report: October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2005 File No.: DP 05-297766) (REDMS No. 1623891)

APPLICANT:

TOYU Lansdowne Developments Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION:

8280 Lansdowne Road

#### INTENT OF PERMIT:

- 1. To permit the construction of a mixed-use commercial and residential complex consisting of a 12-storey building and a 16-storey building containing a total of approximately 182 residential dwelling units, 310 parking stalls and 1,217 m<sup>2</sup> of commercial space at 8280 Lansdowne Road on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7); and
- 2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:
  - a) Permit tandem parking for 34 parking stalls; and
  - b) Reduce the internal manoeuvring aisle from 7.5 m to 6.7 m.

#### **Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Tom Bell representing the applicant advised that the variance for tandem parking was requested in order to provide adequate parking for the larger units in the development, and noted that the request for manoeuvring aisle reduction was standard. He stated that the project was of minimalist design to fit the site.

#### Staff Comments

Mr. Holger Burke, Acting Director of Development, advised that the applicant was aware of Richmond Tower's concerns. He stated that staff supported this development permit application and noted that both staff and the applicant had tried to address the concerns of the residents of Richmond Towers.

## Correspondence

Petition (signed by 79 owners) from the Strata Council – Richmond Towers, 8240, 8246 and 8248 Lansdowne Road (attached as Schedule 2 and forms a part of these minutes).

David Wong, resident of Richmond Towers (attached as Schedule 3 and forms a part of these minutes).

## **Gallery Comments**

Mr. Lawrence Yu, 8248 Lansdowne Road, #502, representing the Strata Council of Richmond Towers, spoke in opposition to the closeness of this development to the Richmond Towers buildings, the lack of privacy, and the blockage of sunlight this would cause. He stated that the Strata Council was also concerned that the foundation of their buildings would be affected during the construction phase of this project and noted that the Council would hire a geotechnical engineer to monitor damages during construction.

In response to a query from the Panel, Mr. Burke advised that this was a long narrow lot. He stated that the applicant had tried to partner with an adjacent property at 8380 Lansdowne Road but was not successful. He noted that Richmond Towers was located quite close to the eastern property line and that the applicant had tried to move his buildings as far away from the Towers as possible. The applicant had designed a lower building for the front of the site in order to address view line concerns.

Mr. Bell advised that the applicant was fully aware of the soil conditions in the City and would hire a geotechnical engineer to monitor the project during its construction phase, and any damage would be the responsibility of the applicant. In response to a query from the Panel, he stated that the courtyard of the development would be fully landscaped and there would also be landscaping along the edges between Richmond Towers and this development.

Ms. Suzanna Young, 8240 Lansdowne Road, 1202, spoke in opposition to this application, stating her concerns about the buildings being too close, the lack of privacy this would cause, of the construction damage and the noise during construction.

#### Panel Discussion

Chair stated that to some extent, he understood the concerns of the residents about the closeness of the building, and the loss of sunlight. He advised that the Panel was impressed with the steps that the applicant had taken to minimize the impact of the development. Steps such as lowering the building height, as well as, the landscape treatment between the buildings which would be of benefit to Richmond Towers residents. With respect to the foundations, he noted that this would be closely monitored by the applicant for problems during construction.

#### **Panel Decision**

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

- 1. Permit the construction of a mixed-use commercial and residential complex consisting of a 12-storey building and a 16-storey building containing a total of approximately 182 residential dwelling units, 310 parking stalls and 1,217 m<sup>2</sup> of commercial space at 8280 Lansdowne Road on a site zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7); and
- 2. Vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:
  - a) Permit tandem parking for 34 parking stalls; and
  - b) Reduce the internal manoeuvring aisle from 7.5 m to 6.7 m.

CARRIED

## 6. Development Permit DP 05-298454

(Report: October 11<sup>th</sup>, 2005 File No.: DP 05-298454) (REDMS No. 1542385) (See letter from Anthony Cowley)

APPLICANT:

Townline Homes

PROPERTY LOCATION:

Eastern portion of 7560 Acheson Road

## INTENT OF PERMIT:

- 1. To permit the construction of four (4) dwelling units on the eastern portion of 7560 Acheson Road on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/28); and
- 2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:
  - a) Permit 0.9 m building projections into the front yard setback;
  - b) Permit 0.4 m fireplace projections into the side yard setbacks;
  - c) Permit 0.6 m building projections into the rear yard setback; and
  - d) Permit no provision for visitor parking.

## **Applicant's Comments**

Mr. Rod Lynde, representing the applicant, stated that the design responded to the concerns of both the neighbourhood and staff. Each unit had its own private yard. He advised that Townline Developments had agreed to contribute funds in lieu of amenity space. He also advised that the variances were consistent with those requested in the city centre.

#### Staff Comments

Mr. Holger Burke, Acting Director of Development, advised that the lack of visitor parking was unusual, however, a precedent had been set in other duplex developments in the Acheson/Bennett Sub-Area, where no visitor parking had been provided. He noted that there was street parking on Minoru Boulevard and additional parking at Richmond High School which could potentially be used by visitors.

In response to a query from the Panel, he advised that staff did not encourage parking at the Richmond High School, and that he was not aware of time-sensitive parking on Minoru Boulevard. He advised that information would be provided on parking on Minoru Boulevard as well as on Acheson Road, when this application was brought to Council for approval.

In response to a query from the Panel, Mr. Lynde advised that there may be opportunity for visitors to park on the drive aisle, and that the garages were fairly large and there was potential for parking if the garage door was opened.

### Correspondence

Mr. Anthony Cowley, 7251 Minoru Boulevard (Schedule 4).

Claire P. Fanning, 7360 Minoru Boulevard, #8 (Schedule 5)

## **Gallery Comments**

None.

#### **Panel Discussion**

On behalf of Panel, Chair advised that they liked the design of the project.

#### **Panel Decision**

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

 Permit the construction of four (4) dwelling units on the eastern portion of 7560 Acheson Road on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD/28); and

- 2. Vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:
  - a) Permit 0.9 m building projections into the front yard setback;
  - b) Permit 0.4 m fireplace projections into the side yard setbacks;
  - c) Permit 0.6 m building projections into the rear yard setback; and
  - d) Permit no provision for visitor parking.

**CARRIED** 

## 7. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded That the meeting be adjourned at 4:25 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 26<sup>th</sup>, 2005.

Jeff Day, General Manager, Engineering and Public Works, Chair

Desiree Wong Committee Clerk Schedule 1 to the minutes of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2005.

October 26, 2005

Development Permit Panel City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Rd., Richmond, B.C. V6Y 2C1

Dear Sirs/Madams:

Re: Notice of Application For a Development Permit

No. DP 03-249328

Property Location: 8120 Lansdowne Road

We are the Strata Council of Richmond Towers, Strata Plan LMS-1798, which is located at 8240, 8246 and 8248 Lansdowne Road, Richmond.

We have received a Notice of Application For a Development Permit DP 03-249328 for a proposed development on 8120 Lansdowne Road.

We would like to make a written submission to oppose the granting of this development permit because of the following reasons:

- 1. They proposed to vary their maximum height from 45 m to 47 m, and by doing so, their height will be higher than our building, Richmond Towers.
- 2. We would also like to complain about the developer who has not put up sign showing the development permit application around the site during the last three years until we received this development panel letter.

We have received letters from many owners of Richmond Towers supporting our position and copies of these letters are attached for your records.

It would be much appreciated if the Development Permit Panel would take into consideration of the opinions of these owners of Richmond Towers when reviewing the application of the above-noted development permit.

Yours truly,

Strata Council of Strata Plan LMS-1798

represent 70 owners, who oppose the development

October 26, 2005

Schedule 2 to the minutes of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, October 26th, 2005.

Development Permit Panel City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Rd., Richmond, B.C. V6Y 2C1

Dear Sirs/Madams:

Notice of Application For a Development Permit Re:

No. DP 05-297766

Property Location: 8280 Lansdowne Road

We are the Strata Council of Richmond Towers, Strata Plan LMS-1798, which is located at 8240, 8246 and 8248 Lansdowne Road, Richmond.

We have received a Notice of Application For a Development Permit DP 05-297766 for a proposed development on 8280 Lansdowne Road.

We would like to make a written submission to oppose the granting of this development permit because of the following reasons:

- The proposed development is too close to our building and we will be greatly disturbed 24hrs 1. during the course of construction - noise, dust, vibration, construction debris etc.
- 2. The proposed development will block the view of our building.
- Due to the proximity of this proposed development to our building, we have a great 3. concern that the structure and foundation of our building will be affected during their construction. Our buildings were built ten years old and we don't know how it were built

We have received letters from many owners of Richmond Towers supporting our position and copies of these letters are attached for your records.

It would be much appreciated if the Development Permit Panel would take into consideration of the opinions of these owners of Richmond Towers when reviewing the application of the above-noted development permit.

Yours truly,

Strata Council of Strata Plan LMS-1798

represent 74 Owners, who oppose the dovelopment

October 25, 2005

Schedule 3 to the minutes of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2005.

Director,
City Clerk's Office
City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road,
Richmond,
B.C. V6Y 2C1

Dear Sirs and Madams of the Development Permit Panel,

Re: Notice of application For a Development Permit

No. DP 05-297766

Property Location: 8280 Lansdowne Road

I am a resident of Richmond Towers, Strata Plan LMS-1798, which is located on 8248 Lansdowne Road. I received a Notice of Application For a Development Permit DP 05-297766. I hereby oppose the permit for TOYU Lansdowne Developments Ltd to construct a mixed-use commercial and residential complex on 8280 Lansdowne Road.

#### Reasons

The third clause in Conditions of Adjacency is ambiguous and does not seem to make sense regarding the "substantial separation" between TOYU's proposed buildings and Richmond Towers. To state that the separation "is considered adequate and in compliance with the intent of OCP" (p. 5) indeed fits the third objective of "achieve a compact metropolitan area" (p. 6, Official Community Plan, <a href="http://www.gvrd.bc.ca/growth/lrsp/rcs/Richmond-RCS.pdf">http://www.gvrd.bc.ca/growth/lrsp/rcs/Richmond-RCS.pdf</a>). The original intention of OCP is good, but placing two more buildings in a relatively small lot and right next to Richmond Towers would only be overestimating the usage of land and the tolerance of our living standard. To maintain liveability, people also need space.

After reviewing the position and orientation of the TOYU's proposal with reference to Richmond Towers on A-1.01, A-1.03, A-1.05, A-2.01, A-2.02, A-3.01, A-3.02, A-3.03, those of who live at the Southeast and Northeast corners of the two towers will have their panoramic (including mine) completely blocked. This will contradict with the second clause in Conditions of Adjacency, especially with the proposed design of the "long, slim 12-storey building". Based on the

drawings, I can imagine the slim, long building acting like a wall blocking our view to the eastern side of Richmond and beyond.

The two buildings affect not only the view, but also the sunlight penetration to the lower floors of the two buildings. The same goes for TOYU's proposed buildings. Those of who live on the west side of the complex will get minimal sunlight because Richmond Towers will be blocking during most of the sunset period. It is an irony to claim a city as a garden city while only limited sunlight exposure is allowed.

Privacy will become a huge issue. The residents will most likely want to shut the blinds to prevent anyone on either side to take a look (even if it's an accidental one) at our private lives. This will surely lower the interest of those of who seek privacy in a home. If we can see through the windows of the used-to-be CompuCollege (now a business school) and Pacific Business Centre, the section of Architectural Form and Character (page 6) will only be viewed as having no considerations for a typical resident.

I do not know much about geology and architecture, but I understand the fact that whatever items inserted into Richmond's water-saturated sediments (also known as liquid sand), it will affect its surrounding soil to some extent. It will be our concern when the construction company begins to install foundations into the ground that is located right next to our residence.

With considerations of the current road conditions, unless remove all the trees in the middle of the road, otherwise, there is no way for Lansdowne Road to cope with the huge increase of traffic. Of course, taking down the trees between No. 3 Road and Cooney will prove to be beneficial as well as raising credibility that you are fulfilling the OCP's objectives. What will actually result afterwards, that is for you experts to find out.

#### On other issues

Aside from the above, I would like to take this chance in sharing my feelings towards the rapid development.

I find that the rapid development has gone too fast, to the point where everything seems to be saturated. Traffic jam becomes a lot worse during peak hours. I observed more accidents. Commune time took a lot longer than two years ago. The street got even more dangerous because of more people trying to do jaywalking.

First of all, after briefly reading the OCP, I strongly agree that Richmond should really develop. However, I am disappointed with the seemingly randomness of residential/commercial complex mid-rise buildings being put along the major routes without even considering the impact.

How much extra resource is Richmond willing to spend in educating the new immigrants on emergency preparedness? (Speaking of which, how come I was not aware of the tsunami siren back in July 2005?) How much extra resource is Richmond willing to put in improving and adding public services such as community centres, firefighters and police officers? Will the rapid transit line be able to solve the problem of No. 3 Road's traffic jam? Instead of adding portables, what are you planning to do as more children live in Richmond? How will you be able to lower the pollution and manage the increase of population at the same time?

## Lastly...

I have lived in this neighbourhood for almost a decade and I love to be in such a peaceful and quiet neighbourhood while I am actually living in the midst of downtown. While Richmond continually works hard to strive for the OCP's objectives and prepares for the 2010 Olympics, please remember not just to put economic benefits and business opportunities as priorities. In the long run, there will still be people living in Richmond in years to come and even after 2010.

Please enter my letter into the meeting record and forward to the Development Permit Panel for their consideration. Thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

Yours truly.

David Wong

Resident of Richmond Towers

To Development Permit Panel
Date: Oclober 36th 2005
Item # 6
Re: Eastern Portron
J 7560 Acheson Rd

City of Richmond
Director, City Clerk's Office

317-7251 Minoru Blvd. Richmond, BC V6Y 3P5

14th October, 2005

	L		L.			Ш	N٦	
	L		ØΝ	N			_	_
ĺ	2	1	G			2	7	=
I		I	G. KY	,	1	$\leftarrow$		-
I		I	DA	N	1	_	_	_
l		I	DB		1			_
L		Ī	WE	}	Ť			
L		Γ		_	T			1
					Γ	_	_	1
				_			_	1
_			_			_	_	1
_	7			7	_			
_		_						ľ

Dear Sirs,

Development Application Permit DP 05-298454 - Townline Homes

With reference to the above application, a copy of which was received today, 14<sup>th</sup> October 2005, I will be unable to attend the meeting on Wednesday October 26, 2005. However I note, under item 2.d, there is no provision for visitor parking.

As a resident and council member of the Renaissance at 7251 Minoru Blvd. which is almost directly opposite to the proposed development, I would like to voice my objection to this omission. I have lived at the Renaissance for some 19 years and have noticed the increased pressure for parking in the area and particularly in front of the Renaissance on the west side of the boulevard.

Despite the new parking facilities on site at the Richmond High School pressure comes from parking by students as well as business service vehicles during the day, and from owners & guests etc. to the Renaissance and other close by dwellings, especially overnight.

The provision of no visitor parking for the 7560 Acheson Rd. development will only increase competition for these few spots and may force owners and our guests to have to seek parking further away. This will be particularly hard on seniors and others who may have mobility problems.

As a result I respectfully request that the Development Permit Panel refuse the permit if no visitor parking is provided, or alternatively require Townline Homes to provide such in order to receive a permit.

Yours Truly

Anthony Cowley

Schedule 4 to the minutes of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2005.



Schedule 5 to the minutes of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2005.

Clare P. Fanning #8 - 7360 Minoru Blvd. Richmond, B.C. V6Y 3L3

October 26, 2005

To: Townline Homes

As you can see by my address, our property line borders the back portion of (DP-05-298454) the 7560 Acheson Road site. Our town homes face forward, overlooking this new development.

Previously, I had concerns with how four dwelling units, including resident parking would tit onto that property, as well as the esthetic effect on the neighborhood.

The other day, I dropped into City Hall and with the kind help of a gentleman in the Urban Development Division, I was able to view the plans in detail and have my questions answered, including details on roof height and landscaping. The architectural aspect of the development is amazing. Classic elegance with an inner courtyard dividing the buildings, is a concept which adds beauty to the neighborhood and an ingenious plan for urban development. I think it is a work of excellence.

Thank you for all of the thought and talent you have demonstrated; it is truly appreciated.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Clare P. Fanning

Please submit my letter to the City of Richmond (City Hall).

C, Fanning

C. Fann