



City of Richmond

Report to Council

To: Richmond City Council
From: Dave Semple
Chair, Development Permit Panel

Date: November 6, 2013
File: 01-0100-20-DPER1-
01/2013-Vol 01

Re: Development Permit Panel Meeting Held on August 28, 2013

Staff Recommendation

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

- i. a Development Permit (DP12-615584) for the property at 7180 Gilbert Road;

be endorsed, and the Permit so issued.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'DS' or 'Semple'.

Dave Semple
Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:blg

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following item at its meeting held on August 28, 2013.

DP 12-615584 – FOUGERE ARCHITECTURE INC. – 7180 GILBERT ROAD
(August 28, 2013)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of 14 three-storey townhouses on a site zoned Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1). Variances are included in the proposal for reduced lot width and side yards.

Architect, Wayne Fougere, of Fougere Architecture Inc., and Landscape Architect, Daryl Tyacke, of Eckford Tyacke & Associates, gave a brief presentation and advised that the Monkey Puzzle tree to be retained on the site will be moved approximately 15 ft. south of its current location.

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Fougere provided the following additional information:

- The garbage disposal and emergency vehicles will be using the drive aisle and east end hammerhead for access.
- The current access easement will be retained for the purpose of the hammerhead turn-around.
- Electric vehicle parking spaces are spread throughout the buildings.
- Many options were explored regarding the location of the visitor parking stalls; with the consensus that those shown on the drawings were the best locations given the limited space.
- The project was designed with a modern architectural view using horizontal elements with bay windows and a combination of feature materials such as brick, wood, and stucco.

Staff supported the Development Permit application and requested variances and advised:

- The property had zoning in place for the development; therefore, a rezoning application and Public Hearing were not required.
- With regard to the variances requested (i) the reduction in lot width is a technical variance given the site's existing zoning entitlement; (ii) the minimum 0.0 m side yard setback is for the mid-block garbage enclosure; (iii) the applicant has discussed the north side yard setback of 3.1 m for Building 3 with the property to the north; and (iv) the minimum south side yard setback to projections of 3.0 m is consistent with ground-oriented townhouse zoning, whereas the subject site has a higher density entitlement requiring the greater side yard setback.
- The developer will provide cash-in-lieu of indoor amenity space and a voluntary contribution to the Public Art program.
- There is one (1) convertible dwelling unit proposed in the development.
- The sustainability features include 20% of the vehicle parking stalls being electric vehicle ready.

- The Monkey Puzzle tree will not be relocated as shown on the drawings, but will be located along the Gilbert Road frontage which will provide a greater opportunity for the tree to thrive with a larger growing area.
- The site protects off-site trees in close proximity to the property line and, as well, four (4) large Maple trees will be planted on site.

Gail Fanslau addressed the Panel, expressing concern with the removal of the trees from the property and questioned the size of the replacement trees. She also was concerned with privacy and noise issues for the property to the south.

Gary Sharp addressed the Panel and questioned whether the development would require pre-loading and when occupancy could be expected.

Anne Lerner addressed the Panel, expressing concern with the developer requesting variances to maximize the profit return, and is opposed to any developer requesting large variances which reduce large trees on sites, the caliber of replacement trees, and providing cash-in-lieu-of amenity space. In her opinion, the City should make development decisions in favour of the City and not the developer.

Dana Protti addressed the Panel, expressing concerns related to visitor parking and noise from the outdoor amenity space.

In response to the delegations, the following information was provided:

- The limited space on the site dictated the size of the replacement trees, but that 12 cm Maple trees, 6 cm Beech trees and smaller Magnolia trees are proposed.
- An Arborist Report was required with the application. The report has been reviewed by the City's Arborist and, of the 23 existing trees on the property, only one (1) will be retained. The 22 trees being removed will be replaced by a total of 38 new trees, plus an additional cash contribution to the City for future planting elsewhere. A utility right-of-way (ROW) runs approximately 2/3 of the way along the south property line which limits the ability to plant large trees in this area, given the potential impact to the maintenance of the City utilities.
- Pre-load would be required to a height of 1 m above the slab height of 1.4 m. A two year construction period would be reasonable for the development.
- The setbacks requested are consistent with ground-oriented townhouses. The existing zoning on the site required a larger setback as it allows for a larger density, should the site have a larger area (e.g. 3-4 storey apartment building).
- There are 38 new trees being planted and none include hedging material. With respect to the size of the trees being planted, four (4) 12 cm caliper trees are proposed. The rationale for not planting a substantial number of larger trees is for optimal survival rate, City staff review of landscape plans, and to choose tree species and sizes based on the best potential survivability. The developer is required to provide cash security to ensure that the trees survive and in the event they do not survive they are replaced.

- A cash contribution was required in lieu of the developer providing an indoor amenity space. Where a multi-family development does not provide an indoor amenity space, they are required to pay funds to the City to improve City facilities.
- The proposed development conforms to the Zoning Bylaw with respect to residential and visitor parking. The residential parking exceeds the zoning requirements and provides three (3) visitor parking spaces.
- The outdoor amenity space will have landscaping along the south property line in conjunction with the installation of a 6 ft. Cedar fence.

In response to a Panel query, staff advised that no variance would be required if the residential parking for unit 14C2 and the visitor parking space adjacent to the unit were swapped. The change could be made through direction to staff.

The Panel supported the development with recommendations to (i) introduce two (2) additional special treatment areas to break-up the long drive aisle; (ii) introduce an informal walkway along the south edge of the drive aisle; (iii) swap the two (2) parking stalls at the east end; and (iv) soften the architecture.

Subsequent to the Panel meeting, the applicant: added the requested special pavement treatment and informal walkway, swapped the parking stalls, and the architecture is softened by the proposed landscaping.

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

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.