



To: Richmond City Council
From: Joe Erceg, MCIP
Chair, Development Permit Panel
Date: July 22, 2014
File: 01-0100-20-DPER1-
01/2014-Vol 01
Re: **Development Permit Panel Meeting held on December 12, 2013, January 15, 2014, June 11, 2014, and June 25, 2014**

Staff Recommendation

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

- i. a Development Permit (DP 12-617455) for the property at 6511 No. 2 Road (formerly 6471, 6491 and 6511 No. 2 Road);
- ii. a Development Permit (DP 13-641796) for the property at 10820 No. 5 Road;
- iii. a Development Permit (DP 13-650988) for the property at 4660, 4680, 4700, 4720, 4740 Garden City Road and 9040, 9060, 9080, 9180, 9200, 9260, 9280, 9320, 9340, 9360, 9400, 9420, 9440, 9480, 9500 Alexandra Road;

be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.



Joe Erceg, MCIP
Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:rg

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on December 12, 2013, January 15, 2014, June 11, 2014, and June 25, 2014.

DP 12-617455 – MATTHEW CHENG ARCHITECT INC. – 6511 NO. 2 ROAD (FORMERLY 6471, 6491 AND 6511 NO. 2 ROAD)
(December 12, 2013 and January 15, 2014)

At their December 12, 2013 and January 15, 2014 meetings, the Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of 15 townhouses on a site zoned “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)”. No variances are included in the proposal.

At the December 12, 2013 meeting, Architect Matthew Cheng, Matthew Cheng Architect, Inc., and Landscape Architect Denitsa Dimitrova, PMG Landscape Architects, provided a brief presentation of the proposal, including:

- The proposed rear yard setback exceeds the OCP Arterial Road Guidelines for Townhouses.
- The location of the internal drive aisle responds to the request of the neighbor to the north.
- 2 ½ storey end units step down the height of the three-storey buildings fronting No. 2 Road.
- The skirt roof at the second floor level fronting the street echoes the two-storey houses in the neighbourhood and the hip and gable roofs reflect the rhythm of the neighbouring roofs.
- Proposed neutral and warm colours harmonize with homes in the neighbourhood.
- The existing grade at the west property line will be maintained.
- The No. 2 Road frontage includes low aluminum fences with gates to individual townhouse unit yards with small shrub and grass planting and two (2) large trees.
- The outdoor amenity space features retention of the three (3) trees along the west property line; play equipment intended for children two (2) to five (5) years old; a bench for the children’s caregivers; and a rack for three (3) bikes.
- A hedge provides visual screening for the transformer along No. 2 Road.

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Cheng and Ms. Dimitrova provided the following information:

- The development permit application for the subject development was submitted prior to the adoption of the current Guidelines and was therefore based on the previous Guidelines (OCP Bylaw 7100) which allowed the end units to be stepped down to 2 ½ storeys instead of two- storeys.
- The outdoor amenity area features: (i) Fibar playground surface for the children’s play area, (ii) mulch for the area under the trees, and (iii) the proposed children’s play equipment is a spider web like climbing structure.

Staff supported the Development Permit application and advised that:

- Three (3) trees will be retained and incorporated in the outdoor amenity space.
- Two (2) specimen trees will be planted along the No. 2 Road frontage.
- One (1) convertible unit will be provided in the proposed townhouse development.

- A variance to increase the maximum ratio of tandem parking spaces from 50% to 60% was submitted prior to the adoption by Council of the Bylaw amendment on tandem parking. The proposed tandem parking variance comes with (i) the proposal to provide an additional visitor parking stall, and (ii) a restrictive covenant prohibiting the conversion of the garage area into habitable space.

Correspondence was submitted by the property owners of 6451 No. 2 Road expressing their concerns regarding (i) the requested variance on tandem parking, (ii) the potential conversion of the tandem parking space into habitable area, and (iii) the height of the proposed buildings fronting No. 2 Road, and (iv) the future development of their lot.

Neighbours Amy and Johnny Leung addressed the Panel, expressing their opposition to the proposed development and expressing concern regarding the requested variance on tandem parking spaces, noting the absence of justification for the proposed variance. The property owners were also concerned regarding the possibility that (i) the garage area might be converted into a habitable space, and (ii) the proposed buildings might cast shadows onto the south side of their property where their landscape plantings and house windows are located.

The Panel commented about the positive elements of the project such as the retention of some existing trees on-site; however, the Panel noted that (i) the massing of the two (2) buildings fronting No. 2 Road, i.e. Buildings A and B, need further design development, (ii) the design of the buildings is similar to the previous projects of the applicant, (iii) the end units of the two (2) street fronting buildings appear like three-storeys and do not comply with the current Guidelines, and iv) the stairwells should be redesigned and relocated. Also, the Panel noted the need to review the size and location of the outdoor amenity space and investigate the potential for additional play equipment.

The application was referred back to staff to: (i) review the design and massing of the buildings fronting No. 2 Road to ensure compliance with the current Arterial Road Guidelines for Townhouses (OCP Bylaw 9000) relating to the two-storey maximum height of the end units of the buildings; (ii) examine the design and location of the stairwells; (iii) investigate the potential for additional play equipment on the outdoor amenity area; and to report back on the January 15, 2014 meeting of the Development Permit Panel.

At the January 15, 2014 meeting, Architect Matthew Cheng, Matthew Cheng Architect, Inc., and Landscape Architect Denitsa Dimitrova, PMG Landscape Architects, Inc., provided a brief presentation regarding the proposal, including:

- The design was revised in response to the concerns raised by the Panel and owners of neighbouring properties.
- The height of the end units of the two (2) street-fronting buildings was reduced to two-storeys.
- Two (2) residential units were redesigned to reduce the tandem parking ratio, therefore the tandem parking variance requested earlier was no longer required.
- The stairs at the end units of the buildings facing the street were relocated to allow additional articulation on the side elevations of the buildings.

- Transom windows above eye level were used and the proposed deck on the end unit was eliminated to respect the privacy of neighbouring homes.
- The impact of shadowing on the adjacent property to the north would be minimal since the end units of the two (2) buildings on the north side are limited to two-storeys and are set back 3.0 meters and 3.5 meters respectively from the north property line.
- The children's play equipment was replaced with "Mushrooms", Arch Climber and Vine Climber play equipment to provide more social interaction opportunities for children and to develop their motor skills.

Staff supported the Development Permit application.

Neighbouring resident, [REDACTED], submitted correspondence to the Panel regarding the Development Permit application. Staff advised that the resident of the property adjacent to the south of the subject development, expressed concern regarding (i) the end unit elevation along the south side of the proposed development and (ii) the tandem parking variance previously sought by the applicant.

In response to Panel queries, staff commented that based on the letter dated December 16, 2013 (i) the correspondent's concerns were based on the original design of the project, (ii) the design changes proposed by the applicant have adequately addressed the concerns of the Panel and residents of the neighbouring properties, and (iii) staff are satisfied with the applicant's proposed changes to the landscaping, the play equipment on the outdoor amenity area, and the form and character of the buildings.

The Panel expressed appreciation for the significant changes to the project, particularly the height reduction of the end units and the changes to the design elements which address the privacy concerns of the neighbouring homes. The Panel also noted that the proposed changes have significantly improved the project and adequately responded to the concerns of the Panel.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 13-641796 – TOWNLINE GARDENS INC. – 10820 NO. 5 ROAD
(January 15, 2014)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a five-storey, mixed-use commercial and residential building (Building D – 'The Camellia') on a site zoned "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) – The Gardens (Shellmont)". The proposal includes a variance for a reduced parking rate for rental residential units.

Al Johnson, of DA Architects + Planners, and Tiffany Duzita, of Townline Group of Companies, provided a brief presentation regarding the proposal, including:

- Phase 2 of the overall development includes the U-shaped building (Building D) on the north end of the site located close to the corner of No. 5 Road and Steveston Highway.
- The underground parking garage is accessed from No. 5 Road.

- The indoor amenities for Building D are provided in Building A (Phase 1 of the overall development) include a multi-purpose gym, a meeting/fitness room, washrooms and change rooms and is currently under construction.
- The building construction is a hybrid, with two (2) lower levels of concrete and two (2) upper levels of wood.

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Johnson and Ms. Duzita provided the following information:

- Balcony depth has been increased as recommended by the Advisory Design Panel.
- The current proposal has a greater number and variety of units than the previous proposal.
- There is more articulation on the north elevation of the building than is shown in the model.
- Entry points to the commercial area on the south side and to the residential units on the north side of the building are accessible.
- Internal Road "A" is a privately-owned road but open for public use and provides access to the proposed underground parking in Building D. Parking is not allowed on this road.
- Parking spaces for users and visitors of commercial units in Building D (Phase 2) are provided in the underground parking in Building A (Phase 1). All commercial parking spaces are provided in Phase 1 and 29 commercial parking stalls in Phase 2 have been allocated for residential parking.

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

- There are three (3) fully accessible units in the project.
- The applicant's participation in the Public Art Plan was secured at rezoning.
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures secured at the time of rezoning include: (i) two (2) transit shelters, (ii) two (2) co-op parking stalls on the parking podium, and (iii) end-of-trip bike facilities in Building A.
- As an additional TDM measure, the applicant will provide 2-zone transit passes for all residential units in Building D for a period of one year.

In response to Panel queries, Staff provided the following information:

- The proposed residential parking rate variance has been supported by: (i) a parking study based on comparable existing rental housing projects in Richmond, and (ii) TDM measures.
- The rental tenure for both market and affordable housing units are secured by separate housing agreements with the City.
- There will be a covenant preventing the "stratification" of the proposed development.
- In response to a query from the Panel, Staff advised that so far, no service provider has expressed interest in the co-op parking.

Shellmont resident, Emily Emberson, submitted correspondence to the Panel regarding the Development Permit application expressing concern regarding the residential parking variance requested by the applicant to reduce the required parking for market rental housing of 1.5 stalls per unit to one (1) parking stall per unit. Staff advised that the parking study submitted by the applicant includes a detailed analysis of comparable rental housing projects in the City and demonstrates that the reduced parking rate is adequate.

The Panel agreed to support the proposed project, noting the significant number of proposed market rental and affordable housing units, the TDM measures proposed by the applicant, and the sustainability features of the proposed development.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 13-650988 – FIRST RICHMOND NORTH SHOPPING CENTRES LTD., (SMARTCENTRES) – 4660, 4680, 4700, 4720, 4740 GARDEN CITY ROAD AND 9040, 9060, 9080, 9180, 9200, 9260, 9280, 9320, 9340, 9360, 9400, 9420, 9440, 9480, 9500 ALEXANDRA ROAD
(June 11, 2014 and June 25, 2014)

At their June 11, 2014 and June 25, 2014 meetings, the Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a neighbourhood commercial centre on a site zoned "Neighbourhood Commercial (ZC32) – West Cambie Area". The proposal includes a variance for a reduced building setback to May Drive for Building N.

At the June 11, 2014 Development Permit Panel meeting, Architect Christopher Block, Chandler Associates Architecture Inc., and Landscape Architect Mary Chan Yip, PMG Landscape Architects, gave an extensive presentation of the proposal including:

- Incorporating a modern design of the buildings into the natural surroundings.
- Incorporating lantern elements into corner and entry locations and high quality materials.
- Using native plant cultivar species in the landscaping and providing an agricultural screen/buffer to the Garden City lands to the south.
- Installing a green deck above surface parking area for an open flex space.
- Incorporating a rain garden water feature that would detain and filter roof rain water from the proposed Walmart store.

In reply to Panel queries, Mr. Block and Ms. Yip provided the following information:

- Design features will include (i) additional glazing on the buildings; (ii) additional access to retail units; (iii) lantern elements along the entrance to the plaza; (iv) bicycle stalls; and (v) pedestrian access from the street.
- Building L will incorporate a similar design to other buildings in the proposed development, including the lantern elements. He added that the retail units will be single-sided.
- Recommendations from the Advisory Design Panel have been incorporated into the design.
- Building H could be occupied by a restaurant with glazing incorporated in the front and wrapped along the sides.
- Landscaping will help screen, but not completely restrict visibility of the buildings with a mix of evergreen and deciduous tree species. The landscaping will open up along the entrances to the plaza.
- The agricultural buffer landscaping will use native plant species and cultivars to prevent the spread of seeds and invasive plant species.
- The landscape design incorporates a natural design and complements the architectural design of the proposed development.

- There will be four (4) rows of plants and trees along the Garden City Road frontage, including the street tree and boulevard planting.
- A four-level parking garage along the Alexandra Road frontage will use tinted glass and perforated metal panels to screen the parking area, allowing for ventilation and feature softer lighting at night.
- A trellis structure will encapsulate the loading area of the proposed Walmart store, together with barriers to provide screening. There will be approximately 14 truck deliveries per week and staff will use hand carts to minimize noise. A solid roof was not feasible for the loading area due to fire suppression and ventilation equipment requirements.
- The planted deck flex space in the parking area will include (i) a graded slope; (ii) short plant species; (iii) irrigating elements; and (iv) parking under the deck. The deck could be used as a green space for shoppers and residents in the neighbourhood.
- The planted deck space will not include any natural play elements, however; it was noted that the planted deck will include lighting and will be maintained by the development.
- The bus stop will be located on the Garden City Road side of the site.
- The development will be rated as a Leed Silver equivalent development and will include (i) a district energy connection; (ii) a green roof system on the parking deck; (iii) reflective roofing surfaces; (iv) bicycle parking facilities; (v) accessible shower facilities; (vi) rain water recycling; (vii) permeable paving; (viii) low-flow washrooms; (ix) use of local building materials; and (x) use of low VOC paints.
- The location of the district energy connection on the subject site has not been finalized.

In reply to Panel queries, Mike Gilman, Senior Land Developer Manager, SmartCentres Inc., advised that he anticipates truck deliveries will occur during regular business hours.

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

- The western portion of the site will include a continuation of the Alexandra Road Greenway and will connect to other greenways in the area.
- There will be a 25% increase over the minimum bicycle parking space and storage requirement.
- A cash contribution for bus shelter upgrades in the area will be included.
- Four (4) electric vehicle charging stations will be included.
- Ten percent (10%) of the total parking spaces will have rough-in provisions for electric vehicle charging.

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

The application was referred to staff to examine: (i) design improvements to buildings A and L located along the Alderbridge Way and Garden City Road frontages, and the parking structure along Alexandra Road; (ii) design improvements and noise mitigation for the loading bay of the proposed Walmart store; (iii) the location for the district energy related infrastructure; and report back to the June 25, 2014 Development Permit Panel meeting.

At the June 25, 2014 Panel meeting, Architect Christopher Block, Architect, Chandler Associates Architecture Inc., and Landscape Architect Mary Chan Yip, PMG Landscape Architects, gave a brief presentation, including:

- The urban design, architectural form and character, and landscape design were improved.
- The design was enhanced for buildings A and L and the parking structure. Additional glazing, improved lighting elements and upgraded materials will be incorporated into the design.
- The loading bay design was enhanced by increasing the screening structure height to deflect noise and provide visual screening.

In reply to Panel queries, Mr. Block and Ms. Yip providing the following information:

- The DEU connection could possibly be placed on the (i) edge of the green deck; (ii) the roof of building B; or (iii) roof of building C. The design of the DEU connection is in the preliminary stages and that the location of the DEU will be finalized in later stages of the design process.
- The proposed green deck will replicate features of a shoreline and will incorporate elements such as logs and boulders. Also, native plant species will be incorporated onto the green deck. Thorny plants will be planted along the perimeter of the green deck as a safety feature to encourage children to stay away from the edges.
- The landscape plans were further refined to include more native species of plants in the proposed development.

Staff supported the Development Permit application and requested variance and advised that a general compliance may be needed in the future, pending on the proposed design for the DEU connection, although the potential DEU infrastructure locations will provide opportunities to ensure these facilities are integrated into the project design.

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

Panel expressed their appreciation for the revisions made on the proposed development.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.