



To: Richmond City Council
From: Joe Erceg
Chair, Development Permit Panel
Date: January 10, 2018
File: 01-0100-20-DPER1-
01/2018-Vol 01
Re: Development Permit Panel Meetings Held on March 29, 2017, July 12, 2017,
August 9, 2017, November 29, 2017 and December 13, 2017

Staff Recommendation

1. That the recommendation of the Panel to authorize the issuance of:
 - a) A Development Permit (DP 16-740024) for the property at 3755 Chatham Street;
 - b) A Development Permit (DP 17-760368) for the property at 9240, 9248 and 9260 Cambie Road;
 - c) A Development Permit (DP 17-771210) for the property at 23100, 23120 and 23140 Westminster Highway; and
 - d) A Development Variance Permit (DV 15-704583) for the property at 10455 Bridgeport Road;

be endorsed, and the Permit so issued.

Joe Erceg
Chair, Development Permit Panel
(604-276-4083)

SB:blg

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on March 29, 2017; July 12, 2017; August 9, 2017; November 29, 2017; and December 13, 2017.

DP 16-740024 AND HA 16-744661 – TIEN SHER CHATHAM DEVELOPMENT LTD.
– 3755 CHATHAM STREET
(March 29, 2017)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a three-storey mixed use development containing 16 residential units on a site zoned “Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU32) – Steveston Village”. A variance is included in the proposal for increased maximum building height.

Architect, Ken Chow, of Interface Architecture; developer, Charan Sethi, of Tien Shier Group; and Landscape Architect, Meredith Mitchell, of M2 Landscape Architecture, provided a brief presentation, including:

- Four distinct building facades correspond to historic lot lines and are inspired by four identified heritage resource buildings in the Steveston Village Heritage Conservation Area.
- Modern cladding materials; such as hardie narrow board lap siding, shingle siding, and fiber cement/wood trim are proposed.
- The zero lot line adjacency on the east and west side yards and narrow gap between the subject building and adjacent buildings on both sides are addressed by continuing the cladding treatment on both sides of the elevation, infilling with hardie trim, installing a metal flashing to cover the top of the narrow gap, and incorporating a movable wood panel at the base of the gap on the west side.
- A public pedestrian access is provided from the lane at the back to retail and commercial frontages along Chatham Street through the indoor parking area and secured by gates.
- The proposed rooftop amenity area is located at the center to minimize visibility from the street and can be accessed by a full-size elevator and stairs.
- An existing neighbouring tree at the back is proposed to be retained and protected.
- Special sidewalk paving treatment is proposed, matching the architecture of the building.
- The rooftop amenity area is programmed to create a “room” feel for the active and passive spaces, and storage space for garden tools will be provided for rooftop garden users.

In response to Panel queries, the design team advised that: (i) usable space under the mansard roof could be utilized for installation of cubbie shelves for storage of garden tools; (ii) barrier-free access is provided from the handicapped parking space to the commercial and retail frontages; (iii) the proposed public pedestrian access through the parkade is not enclosed, is well-lit, and will be provided with signage to address potential safety and security issues; and (iv) relocating the elevator and stairs closer to the centre of the building would result in an inefficient building design.

Staff noted that: (i) the project was reviewed and supported by the Richmond Heritage Commission and Advisory Design Panel; (ii) the proposed development includes 16 basic universal housing units; (iii) significant sustainability features of the project include meeting Energuide 82 standards; (iv) the two stair access structures are approximately 1 m above the 12 m maximum permitted building height; and (v) the elevator overrun exceeds the maximum building height by 2.75 m.

In response to a Panel query, staff advised that the proposed building height variances are consistent with the height variances granted to similar projects with rooftop access through elevator and stairway.

Mr. Ralph Turner addressed the Panel, noting that four developments in Steveston Village have been granted height variances and questioned the rationale for allowing the height variances.

In response to Mr. Turner's query, the Chair stated that the Development Permit Process provides for height variances to be considered on a case-by-case basis and subject to the merits of the variance request.

Ms. Jeannethe Root addressed the Panel, expressing concern regarding westward extension of the existing lane at the back of the subject property; which will terminate at the west end of the proposed development, and not continue all the way through to Second Avenue. She noted that the proposed location of the parking entrance off the future lane extension will cause traffic congestion in the already busy lane due to the location of the medical building, Steveston United Church and child care in the area.

In addition, Ms. Root noted that: (i) the lane is currently used for vehicular parking by medical building clients; (ii) visitor and employee parking has increased on the streets surrounding the proposed development due to hourly restrictions on street parking in downtown Steveston Village and lack of parking spaces for stores and offices in the area; and (iii) the proposed public pedestrian access through the ground floor parkade of the proposed development could pose potential security issues.

In response to Panel queries, staff advised that: (i) the proposed number of visitor, commercial and residential parking spaces for the subject development complies with the Zoning Bylaw; (ii) further westward extension of the lane up to Second Avenue will happen when neighbouring lots to the west of the subject site will be redeveloped in the future; and (iii) the project provides a vehicle turn-around area on the dead end lane.

Correspondence was submitted to the Panel regarding the Development Permit application. In response to the questions and concerns raised by Ms. Root in her letter, staff noted that: (i) the consideration of the subject Development Permit Application is in keeping with the typical development process; (ii) the subject application will not advance to Council until the rezoning is in place; (iii) on-site tree removal was considered at the rezoning stage; (iv) fully enclosed garbage and recycling bins are provided at the rear of the development and accessed off the lane; and (v) the proposed on-site parking complies with the City's Zoning Bylaw.

In response to the concern raised by Ms. Root regarding the current location of garbage dumpsters used by the medical building and United Methodist Church at the end of the existing lane, the Chair noted that they are required to be kept on private property. Also in response to the same concern, staff advised that the issue has been forwarded to the City's Community Bylaw Department and will be followed up by staff.

In response to Panel queries, staff noted that: (i) the City's Transportation Department had reviewed the project and commercial and visitor parking stalls could be shared; and (ii) the proposed City lane extension treatment will be the standard 5.4 m wide asphalt driving surface with rolled curb and gutter and street lighting.

The Panel expressed support for the project and commended the design team and staff for: (i) the building design with four distinct components; (ii) a well thought-out project and provision for adequate parking; (iii) the design and location of the rooftop structures which minimize their visibility from the street; and (iv) accessibility of the rooftop amenity area for people in wheelchairs.

Subsequent to the Panel meeting, after working with the property owners, Community Bylaw staff confirmed that the garbage bins have been relocated onto the medical building private property and the United Methodist Church private property.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 17-760368 – WESTMARK DEVELOPMENTS (CAMOSUN) LTD. – 9240, 9248 AND 9260 CAMBIE ROAD
(July 12, 2017)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a 59-unit townhouse project on a site zoned "Town Housing (ZT79) - Alexandra Neighbourhood (West Cambie)". A variance is included in the proposal for increased maximum lot coverage for buildings.

Architect, Ken Chow, of Interface Architecture Inc.; and Landscape Architect, Jonathan Losee, of Jonathan Losee Ltd. Landscape Architecture, provided a brief presentation on the proposal, including:

- The subject site fronts onto Cambie Road and the future Dubbert Street extension and will be bisected by the future east-west McKim Way extension.
- Separate outdoor amenity areas are proposed for the northern site and the southern site, including an open air covered gazebo, children's play structures, benches and tables.
- The rear yards of townhouse units adjacent to the east and south property lines of the subject site will be raised to approximately the same height of an apartment parking podium to provide a reasonable interface with future adjacent developments.
- A neo-Victorian rowhouse character is proposed for the project and end units fronting the street are well articulated to provide visual interest.

- Three convertible units are proposed and two additional units will be provided with wider stairs to allow future installation of stair mounted chairlifts.
- Formal landscaping consistent with the English garden concept is proposed, including wood picket fences, arbours, and entry gates are proposed for street frontages, complemented with neat layers of planting with variation in sizes and colours.

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Losee and Mr. Chow advised that: (i) separate mailboxes are provided for the northern and southern portions of the development; (ii) stamped concrete is proposed for the visitor parking stalls as opposed to permeable pavers due to potential maintenance issues if permeable pavers are installed on a high traffic area; and (iii) installing permeable pavers on visitor parking stalls could be considered by the applicant.

Staff noted that: (i) the original amenity building at the northern outdoor amenity area proposed at rezoning has been removed as per Advisory Design Panel (ADP) recommendation and the applicant will provide cash-in-lieu for indoor amenity space as per Council Policy; (ii) the proposed development will be connected to the Alexandra District Energy Utility (DEU); (iii) the project has been designed to achieve the City's aircraft noise acoustical standards; (iv) the proposed variance to increase the maximum lot coverage of buildings is related to the installation of DEU equipment in the project; and (v) the increase in building lot coverage is offset by a reduction of lot coverage for hard surfaces.

In response to a Panel query, staff confirmed that: (i) the Zoning Bylaw allows a maximum of 70 percent non-porous surfaces for developments; and (ii) the subject development falls below the maximum permitted amount of impermeable surfaces.

Correspondence was submitted to the Panel regarding the Development Permit application. In response to the concerns expressed, staff noted that: (i) the proposed project is a three-storey townhouse development and potential shadowing impacts on the north side of Cambie Road would be limited; (ii) there will be a minimal increase in the subject site's elevation relative to Cambie Road, as the average finished site grade for the northern portion of the subject site is approximately 2.4 m as opposed to the 2 m elevation of Cambie Road; and (iii) dust control will be monitored by the City's Building Approvals and Community Bylaws during the construction stage of the project.

In response to the same concern, the applicant advised that a construction barrier and other dust control measures will be provided to control the dust generated from construction activities.

The Panel expressed support for the proposed development, noting that the use of permeable paving could enhance the permeability of the project's surface areas.

Subsequent to the Panel meeting, the applicant revised the design to include permeable paving areas in the drive aisles.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 17-771210 – TRELIS SENIORS SERVICES LTD. – 23100, 23120 AND
23140 WESTMINSTER HIGHWAY
(August 9, 2017)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a 135-unit senior's care facility on a site zoned "Senior's Care Facility (ZR11) – Hamilton Village (Hamilton)". Variances are included in the proposal for reduced minimum parking aisle width and increased maximum permitted projections into the rear yard, north interior side yard and south interior side yard.

Mary McDougall, Trellis Seniors Services Ltd., introduced the project, noting that: (i) the proposed 135-bed seniors care facility complements the future assisted and independent living facilities across the New Road; (ii) the project has been designed to provide quality of life care to residents mostly with cognitive and physical impairments; and (iii) the project prioritizes energy and environmental sustainability and offers economic benefits to the area.

Architects, Mitch Vance and Pat Wheeler, of Derek Crawford Architects Inc. and Landscape Architect provided a brief presentation regarding the proposal, including:

- The proposed three wings of the building; which have a more residential than an institutional feel, create two enclosed courtyards.
- All three floors of the building are provided with covered decks and a south-facing sun deck above the port cochere is proposed on the third floor adjacent to a multi-purpose room.
- The contemporary architecture of the building is consistent with its site context.
- High quality materials are proposed to reinforce the residential character of the building. The colour palette is neutral and wood accents help provide a residential feel to the building.
- The well-articulated building façade visually breaks up the mass of the building and breaks in building materials at key places add visual interest to the building.

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Vance advised that the wood-screened generator and transformer at the southeast corner of the site near the main entrance to the building could not be located on the parkade due to the City's flood bylaw requirements.

In response to queries from the Panel, Landscape Architect, Travis Martin, of van der Zalm + Associates Inc., acknowledged that: (i) the north courtyard is not totally shaded and the portion with sun exposure will be planted with Evergreen and flowering plants; (ii) the two internal courtyards are enclosed and can only be accessed from inside the building; and (iii) residents with family members will have to exit the building through the main entrance to access the greenway.

In response to further queries from the Panel, the design team advised that the applicant will consider: (i) redesigning the indented curb in the loading area at the southeast corner of the site adjacent to the temporary placement of garbage and recycling bins to provide more sidewalk

space for the greenway entry; and (ii) installing heating elements on the curved and steep driveway to the parkade to enhance the safety of vehicles during snowy conditions in winter.

Staff noted that: (i) there is a Servicing Agreement for frontage improvements along Westminster Highway, the New Road portions on the subject site, and the north-south greenway; (ii) the applicant is proposing LEED Gold equivalency for the project; (iii) proposed plantings on the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) along the northern and western edges of the subject site were developed in consultation with a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP); and (iv) the applicant's maintenance obligations for ESA plantings will be subject to a legal agreement.

No correspondence was submitted to the Panel regarding the Development Permit application.

The Panel expressed support for the project, noting that the building massing has been nicely broken down visually through the incorporation of balconies and variation of materials. Also, the Panel reiterated its recommendation for: (i) redesigning the curb at the northeast corner of the site to provide more space to the greenway entry; and (ii) installing heating elements on the driveway to the parkade.

Subsequent to the Panel meeting, the applicant revised the design to: (i) increase the width of sidewalk at the greenway entry by moving the roadway curb southward; and (ii) include hydronic heating at the parking access ramp.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DV 15-704583 – MATILDE ABELLA – 10455 BRIDGEPORT ROAD
(November 29, 2017 and December 13, 2017)

The Panel considered a Development Variance Permit application to permit the retention of an existing non-conforming addition to the single-family dwelling on a site zoned "Single Detached (RS1/D)". Variances are included in the proposal for a reduced rear yard setback and reduced landscaping in the required front yard.

Designer, Adison Xavier, of Kalypso Kreations – Design and Drafting, provided a brief presentation of the proposal, including:

- The two proposed variances are requested to allow the retention of the non-conforming house addition at the rear of the dwelling and provide one vehicle parking stall for the proposed secondary suite in addition to the required two parking stalls for the principal dwelling;
- The existing additions and alterations to the house made by the previous owners without a Building Permit encroach into the required minimum rear yard setback.
- The existing landscaped area for the overall site is minimal and the proposed landscaping scheme will achieve the required 30 percent lot coverage for live landscaping.
- The new City minimum requirement for live landscaping in the front yard would not be achieved due to the provision of parking stalls.

- New fencing will be installed at the front and rear of the property to provide screening to the parking stalls and the rear addition.

In response to Panel queries, Ms. Zavier advised that: (i) increasing the size of proposed trees and shrubs would be considered; (ii) there was no disclosure from the previous property owner to the current owner at the time of purchase regarding the non-conforming house addition; and (iii) relocating the proposed parking stalls to reduce the paved area in the front yard would be considered.

In response to Panel queries, staff noted that: (i) the subject site fronts an arterial road; (ii) staff had worked with the applicant to reduce the paved area in the front yard as much as possible while providing adequate space for vehicle turn-around on-site; and (iii) staff has not conducted an exhaustive review of whether a reorganization or reorientation of the proposed parking stalls will result in further reduction of the paved area in the front yard.

Staff acknowledged that the subject application is difficult, as staff normally takes a dim view on proposed variances which legitimize construction conducted without a Building Permit. However, staff noted that: (i) the applicant has provided letters of support from all three neighbouring property owners; and (ii) through the staff review, the landscaping for the site has been increased to conform with the overall landscape objectives for the subject property.

The application was referred back to staff with direction to: (i) explore the reduction of the size of the paved area in the front yard; (ii) increase the landscaped area; and (iii) address the Panel's concern regarding the type and size of proposed planting.

At the Panel meeting held on December 13, 2017, Ms. Zavier provided a brief presentation of the revisions made to the landscape plan, including:

- Proposed landscaping in the required front yard was increased in area from 29 to 36 percent.
- The remaining three parking stalls were shifted north, separated from Bridgeport Road.
- The original plant list has been revised to include new tree and shrub species Western Red Cedar, Pyramid Cedar and Hick's Yew with increased size of planting and additional screening of the rear addition and vehicle parking area.

In reply to a Panel query, Ms. Matilde Abella, property owner, acknowledged that the real estate agent who facilitated the sale of the property did not inform her about the non-conforming house addition when she purchased the property and she had been unable to contact him after the sale.

Staff advised that different parking configurations had been explored and the proposed design maximizes the front yard landscaping while still allowing on-site vehicle maneuvering.

In reply to a Panel query, Ms. Zavier acknowledged that there is an existing neighbouring hedge abutting the east property line of the subject site so no new planting will be introduced there.

No correspondence was submitted to the Panel regarding the Development Permit application.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.