



---

**To:** Richmond City Council **Date:** March 17, 2010  
**From:** Robert Gonzalez, P. Eng. **File:** 0100-20-DPER1  
Acting Chair, Development Permit Panel  
**Re:** **Development Permit Panel Meetings Held on March 10, 2010,  
December 16, 2009, April 29, 2009, and April 15, 2009**

---

**Panel Recommendation**

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

- i) a Development Permit (DP 08-429669) for the property at 10999 Steveston Highway (formerly 10911, 10931, 10951, 10971 and 10991 Steveston Highway);
- ii) a Development Permit (DP 09-505655) for the property at 6551 No. 3 Road;
- iii) a Development Permit (DP 06-333170) for the property at 8680 No. 3 Road;
- iv) a Development Variance Permit (DV 09-480570) for the property at 9700 No 3 Road;
- v) a Development Variance Permit (DV 09-504241) for the property at 5811 Cooney Road;
- vi) a Development Permit (DP 09-472843) for the property at 5571 and 5631 Parkwood Way;
- vii) a Development Permit (DP 08-441184) for the property at 13191 Princess Street; and
- viii) a Development Permit (DP 07-402052) for the property at 8140 and 8160 Park Road;

be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.

Robert Gonzalez, P. Eng.  
Acting Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:blg

### Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on March 10, 2010, December 16, 2009, April 29, 2009 and April 15, 2009.

DP 08-429669 – YAMAMOTO ARCHITECTURE INC. – 10999 STEVESTON HIGHWAY  
(FORMERLY 10911, 10931, 10951, 10971 AND 10991 STEVESTON HIGHWAY)  
(March 10, 2010)

The Panel considered an application to permit the construction of 25 townhouses on a site zoned “Town Housing (ZT68) – Steveston Highway/Shell Road”. No variances are included in the proposal.

Architect, Taizo Yamamoto, of Yamamoto Architecture Inc., and Landscape Architect, Pat Campbell, of DMG Landscape Architects, provided brief descriptions of the project.

- Individual residential unit entries oriented toward the street to enhance the pedestrian realm.
- Unit identity is expressed with: different materials, garage door styles, and varied colours.
- The subject site provides future access to a development site to the west, where the construction of townhouses is being requested; and a fire lane off Steveston Highway.
- The outdoor amenity space at the back of the site provides a visual link to the adjacent park.
- The outdoor amenity area and each back yard have lockable pedestrian gates to the park.
- Two (2) convertible units are located in the rear buildings, with future vertical lift potential.
- All townhouses include blocking in the bathroom walls for future installation of grab bars.
- A warm colour palette is proposed, highlighted with darker browns for accent.
- Garage doors vary to avoid a monotonous appearance and, to provide unit identity.
- The east half of the site will be screened from the park behind five (5) large existing Oak trees; three (3) new Oak trees will be planted for a consistent edge to the park.
- Sustainability measures include ALR buffer planting and increased permeability on the site.
- It is expected that older children living in the townhouses will play in the adjacent park, while younger children will take advantage of the play structure in the on-site amenity space.

In response to a query from the Panel, Ms. Campbell advised that the proposed new Oak trees are the largest ones commonly available for purchase.

In response to a further query regarding the nine (9) trees to be removed from the Steveston Highway boulevard where they are in conflict with the road and sidewalk configurations, staff advised that the Parks staff had reviewed the trees and recommended their removal.

Staff supported the Development Permit application, and that the applicant has responded well to the unique urban design issues presented by the site. The applicant has satisfactorily addressed comments made at the January, 2008 Public Hearing regarding the rezoning of the site. Staff remarked that the City has received a rezoning application for a townhouse development to the west of the subject site, which the subject development would provide a good transition to.

No public correspondence was received regarding the application.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 09-505655 – ONTREA INC. – 6551 NO. 3 ROAD  
(March 10, 2010)

The Panel considered an application to permit the alteration of the roof in association with interior renovations on a site zoned “Downtown Commercial (CDT1)” and “Gas & Service Stations (CG1)”. No variances are included in the proposal.

Architect, David O’Sheehan, of Abbarch Architecture Inc., representing the mall’s management company, Cadillac Fairview, provided a brief description of the project, including: Renovations are limited to the general area of interface between the building occupied by Sears and the mall’s adjacent one-story internalized building.

- One (1) of the internal storefront corridors will be re-aligned and the skylights relocated to centre over the new mall corridor and new central court.
- A Service and exit door will be introduced at the Sears Building loading area.
- Sustainability activities, such as recycling and energy efficiency improvements, will be introduced, to meet Cadillac Fairview’s commitment to long-term green initiatives.

Staff supported the Development Permit application for the renovation scheme.

No public correspondence was received regarding the application.

The Chair complemented the applicant and the architect on the sustainability commitment of the property management firm and elements of the proposed renovation.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 06-333170 – MATTHEW CHENG ARCHITECT INC. – 8680 NO. 3 ROAD  
(March 10, 2010)

The Panel considered an application to permit the construction of six townhouse units on a site zoned “Low Density Townhouse (RTL3)”. There are variances included in the proposal to: reduce the minimum lot size; reduce the landscaping lot coverage; and reduce the north side yard setback for a garbage/recycling enclosure.

Stella Chen, of Matthew Cheng Architect Inc., advised that the application had been referred back to staff at the January 13, 2010 Development Permit Panel Meeting to address:

- Explore architectural details to better integrate with the design of the project to the north.
- The status of trees on, and adjacent to, the site, including a rationale for the removal of trees.
- Tree-planting viability in the narrow strip of landscaping on the south property line.

Ms. Chen, and Landscape Architect, Pat Campbell, provided brief descriptions of the improvements made, including:

- Building “B” elevations have been revised with large gables, to integrate with the design of Building “A”.
- The project has been redesigned to better reflect the project to the north.
- Building masses have been broken up, on both the north and south elevations, by a series of (i) box windows, (ii) bays, and (iii) balconies with gable roofs;

- A mix of shingles and vertical siding articulate the windows, bays and balconies, against horizontal siding.
- The landscape strip along the south property line was improved. Trees would be planted in areas projecting into the drive aisle, and sustainable, porous pavers would allow the trees to root in the structural soil underneath the pavers, thereby ensuring that the trees survive.

Staff advised that the applicant had made significant improvements in detailing to better match, in appearance, the development to the north, and that staff was pleased with the design changes.

Staff noted that changes made to the planting strip along the south side were an improvement. There was discussion at the previous Development Permit Panel meeting regarding two (2) trees on the property to the north, that have now been identified as removable. Originally, the trees were saved as part of the development to the north, but since mid-January, 2010, one (1) of the trees have died, and the other has been significantly pruned, is in decline, and will not survive the construction phase. The applicant has asked for permission to remove the two (2) neighbouring trees at the edge of the development site and has the approval of the neighbour to the north. Staff is therefore, in support of the applicant's desire to remove the two (2) trees.

In response to Chair query regarding the neighbouring Hemlock tree, staff advised that no application has been made, but that a Tree Permit application for removal must be requested prior to forwarding the Development Permit application to Council for consideration.

In response to a query regarding accessibility in convertible units, Ms. Chen advised that the unit has a wider stairwell to accommodate a future chair lift, as well as blocking for the future installation of grab bars in the washroom.

No public correspondence was received regarding the application.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

Subsequent to the Panel Meeting, a Tree Permit for the removal of the Hemlock tree at 8660 No. 3 Road was issued.

DV 09-480570 – MATTHEW CHENG ARCHITECT INC. – 9700 NO. 3 ROAD  
(March 10, 2010)

The Panel considered an application to vary Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to increase the maximum lot coverage on a site zoned "Medium Density Townhouses (RTM1)" and that the proposed architectural and landscaping changes be considered in general compliance with approved Development Permit (DP 07-386208).

Matthew Cheng, applicant and Architect, advised that the application had been referred back to staff at the February 10, 2010 Development Permit Panel Meeting to review modifications to the landscape design. Mr. Cheng provided a brief description of the project and improvements made, including:

- There is dense planting with various types of trees, shrubs, and perennial ground cover along No. 3 Road with seasonal interest throughout the year.
- Drought tolerant shrubs visually soften the internal drive aisle.

- Planting along the east property line has been modified to address the issue of screening between the subject site and the site to the east.
- A service right-of-way (SRW) prohibits the planting of any trees along the property line, but the low growing shrubs in the initial plan have been replaced with tall growing Portugal Laurels, a potential hedge of up to 25 or 30 feet over a 15 to 20 year period.
- Seven (7) flowering trees were upsized to 8 cm calliper, one (1) in each unit back yard.

Staff advised that, as a result of the revised landscape design, staff supports the variance, and:

- The Panel's February 10, 2010 referral for modifications to the landscape design was a result of concerns expressed by neighbourhood residents, especially regarding the issue of screening between the subject development and single-family dwellings to the east.
- The amended proposal includes: (i) a row of tall growing Portugal Laurels along the east property line, and (ii) a 6 ft. wood fence.
- City Engineering staff reviewed the SRW along the common property line and determined that planting trees is not allowed in this area.
- The applicant has proposed upsizing the seven (7) trees to be planted outside the SRW.

In response to Panel queries, staff advised that:

- All new trees are to be planted outside the Statutory Right-of-Way.
- The requirement for 78 replacement trees was being satisfied with a mix of 61 new trees, and cash-in-lieu of the balance required replacement trees.

Staff provided a summary of public correspondence received regarding the application:

- A letter from a lawyer acting on behalf of Michael Chung, which stated that, during the construction period leading up to a development phase, his property had been damaged.
- A further letter from an insurance company determining that any driveway damage had not been sustained as a result of work done by the applicant at the subject site.
- A letter from neighbour Jon MacKay, accepting the applicant's landscaping offer of planting three (3) Maple trees on Mr. MacKay's property.

Mr. Wayne Ryan, Ryan Law Group, Barristers & Solicitors, spoke to the Panel and provided a letter. Mr. Ryan, representing Michael Chung, the owner of the property adjacent to the subject property, stated that his client opposes the application, and provided the following information:

- A variance to the maximum lot size coverage for buildings should be denied.
- Mr. Chung's home and driveway were damaged as a result of the demolition of the former homes on the subject site. At the February 10, 2010 Development Permit Panel Meeting, the applicant had agreed in writing that he would place \$50,000 in his lawyers trust account as security for the repairs. The applicant had not followed through on this offer.
- Pounding during construction was disturbing to the family, caused cracks in the drywall and driveway, and the applicant had ignored Mr. Chung's request to stop work.
- The letter from the insurance company did not take into consideration a report from an independent building inspector confirming that the damage done to Mr. Chung's home and driveway is a result of the work done by the applicant on the subject site.
- The applicant had demonstrated bad faith.
- It was requested that the variance be denied and the application be referred back to staff until such time as the applicant addressed the concerns of the neighbour.

In response to queries from the Chair, staff advised that:

- The issue before the Panel is form and character of the development and whether or not the variance makes planning sense, and that any other issues would be outstanding regardless of the applicant's request for a variance.
- Staff supports the request for variance, even though it resulted from the applicant's error.
- The applicant is proposing almost a 50% increase in permeable pavement treatment from the approved Development Permit (DP 07-386208).
- It is uncommon that an applicant makes an error in lot coverage calculations, and this applicant's error was discovered by Planning staff during the General Compliance review.

Mr. Ryan was granted permission by the Chair to address the Panel for a second time, and he acknowledged that a denial of the variance alone would not address his clients' complaints against the applicant.

A brief discussion took place between the Panel and staff and it was decided that there were no reasons, from a planning perspective, to delay the application.

The Chair stated that, while he understands Mr. Chung's concerns regarding the construction on the site, the Panel is charged with scrutinizing the form and character of proposed developments, including landscaping plans. It is not within the jurisdiction of the Panel to become involved in disputes that fall outside the areas of form, character and landscaping.

The Chair noted that Mr. MacKay had indicated his satisfaction with the proposed hedging and the applicant's offer to plant three Maple trees on his neighbouring property, and that Mr. MacKay's absence from the meeting could be seen as an indication of his satisfaction.

The Chair added that the City's Good Neighbour Program brochure outlines good neighbour practices, and he encouraged all parties to consider good neighbourliness.

In closing, the Chair advised Matthew Cheng that when a Development Permit application is considered by the Development Permit Panel and landscaping issues are important to the site's compatibility with adjacent properties, it is mandatory, not optional, that the landscape architect be in attendance.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DV 09-504241 – PRIORITY PERMITS LTD. – 5811 COONEY ROAD  
(March 10, 2010)

The Panel considered an application to vary the Sign Bylaw No. 5560 to permit two (2) freestanding signs closer than 30 m apart at 5811 Cooney Road.

Mr. Jordan Desrochers, representing the sign company hired by the landlord, provided a brief description of the application, which included a new sign to match the existing freestanding sign at the main building entrance on Cooney Road. Mr. Desrochers stated that the two (2) small signs were designed to assist in way finding for visitors to the building.

Staff supported the requested variance and the application. Staff advised that the current small sign could be replaced with one (1) large sign, but the overall appearance of the Cooney Road frontage achieved better balance with two (2) matching small signs.

Ms. Patricia Marshall, of Aldergrove, representing her mother who is a neighbouring resident, requested information regarding the content of the two (2) proposed signs.

In response, advice was given that each sign would list the buildings' tenants.

Mr. Tim Fisher, of Cooney Road, requested information regarding whether the total size of the two (2) requested signs would exceed the total size of one (1) large sign.

In response, advice was given that, taken together, the two (2) requested signs would be considerably smaller in size than the permissible size of one (1) larger sign.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 09-472843 – KASIAN ARCHITECTURE INTERIOR DESIGN AND PLANNING LTD.  
-- 5571 AND 5631 PARKWOOD WAY  
(December 16, 2009)

The Panel considered an application to permit the construction of a 6,404 m<sup>2</sup> Lexus automobile dealership on a site zoned "Vehicle Sales (CV)". A variance is included in the proposal to increase building height for the elevator.

Intern Architect, Scott Staniul, provided a brief description of the project, including:

- The proposed two-storey Lexus automobile dealership was at the Richmond Auto Mall.
- The two (2) proposed accesses from Parkwood Way is reduced from the existing four (4).
- The ground level includes show room and service facilities, the second level includes office space and employee amenities, and additional vehicle storage is on the roof.
- The building's exterior features a glazed curtain wall system accentuated with aluminium panels, columns and overhangs.
- The height variance applies only to the vehicle elevator located at the rear of the building.

A brief discussion took place between the Panel and Mr. Staniul regarding details of the vehicle elevator, and the following advice was provided:

- Staff, not customers, would operate the elevator. From time to time, customers, including the disabled, might use the elevator but only in the company of staff.
- Other car dealerships in the Lower Mainland use vehicle elevators, but the proposed Lexus elevator is the first of its kind at the Richmond Auto Mall.
- The proposed building includes a second regular elevator.

In response to a query from the Chair, staff advised that the height of the vehicle elevator is measured from the finished site grade that, for this site, lies below the slab of the structure.

Staff supported the Development Permit application and the variance. Staff remarked that the applicant has provided: (i) 24 trees and over 1,100 shrubs on-site, and (ii) a swale strip within the grassed area along the frontage of the property. These elements are in excess of bylaw requirements. Staff added that staff and the applicant explored options for increasing permeability and that increasing the size of the vegetation planting strips on-site was viable.

No public correspondence was received regarding the application.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 08-441184 – DAVID J. HO – 13191 PRINCESS STREET

(April 29, 2009)

The Panel considered an application to permit the construction of a new addition to the existing building on a site zoned “Light Industrial (IL)”. No variances are included in the proposal.

Landscape Architect, Fred Liu, of Fred Liu Associates Inc., provided a brief description of the project, including:

- The small addition is proposed at the northeast corner of the building, along Princess Street.
- The addition would improve the operational needs of the existing jerky manufacturing plant.
- Landscaping improvements were proposed along the Princess Street frontage to: improve the interface with newer residential properties, and screen the existing surface parking area.

Staff supported the Development Permit application. Staff advised that the existing jerky plant is in an area undergoing redevelopment. Staff noted that the proposal complies with the Official Community Plan (OCP) and that a Development Permit was required due to proximity to properties with residential zoning. Staff advised that the landscaping improvements were satisfactory for the scale of the proposal.

In response to Panel queries, staff advised that:

- There are two (2) industrial lots to the north; one (1) with an industrial building, the other with an existing non-conforming residential dwelling.
- Screening is typically provided adjacent to residential units
- The applicant would comply with the City’s Good Neighbour program regarding construction in proximity to residences.
- The Building Permit process includes a construction traffic and parking management plan.

A public letter was received from Ms. D. Cheng, expressing concerns regarding construction.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.



DP 07-402052 – ANDREW CHEUNG ARCHITECTS INC. – 8140 AND 8160 PARK ROAD  
(April 15, 2009)

The Panel considered an application to permit the construction of a mixed-use commercial and residential development consisting of a 14-storey tower with a total of 99 residential units, including eight (8) affordable housing units and approximately 457.8 m<sup>2</sup> (4,928 ft<sup>2</sup>) of retail/commercial space at street level on a site zoned "Downtown Commercial (CDT1)". Variances are included in the proposal to: reduce the parking rate for market and affordable housing dwelling units, and reduce the setback to Park Road.

Andrew Cheung, applicant and Architect, provided a brief description of the project, including:

- The mixed-use development included: a 14-storey residential tower, a 3.5 level parking podium, and four (4) two-level street fronting townhouse units designed for live/work uses.
- The importance of the "urban corner" of Park and Buswell is expressed with the tower placement, commercial component, and glass corner expression.
- The typical tower floor plan is 6,888 ft<sup>2</sup>, slightly larger than the guideline recommendation of 6,458 ft<sup>2</sup>.
- Indoor amenity space is located on the parkade second level and animates the corner façade.
- Eight (8) affordable units are located on the third floor.
- A large 13,000 ft<sup>2</sup> landscaped roof above the parkade, includes passive and active areas, including a children's play area.
- The architectural design employs linear, overhanging floor slabs, combined with glass window walls, to form a sleek and sophisticated expression.

Staff supported the Development Permit and the variances. Staff advised that the architectural design responds well to the corner condition, and the ground level commercial units will read like two-storey units. Staff noted that the requested parking reductions are consistent with those in the City Centre and those proposed for the parking strategy for residential use. There is no commercial parking variance. In addition, staff noted that two (2) additional spaces were proposed for commercial visitors to the live/work units.

In response to Panel queries, it was advised that:

- The applicant had been unsuccessful in efforts to purchase the lot to the west containing a two-story retail/office building. The applicant filed design drawings with staff demonstrating how a potential mid-rise building development on the lot could achieve capacity density.
- The parking podium is wrapped with other uses, accessed via the rear lane, and commercial parking was separated from the residential and visitor parking.
- The applicant had decided not to participate in the City's Public Art program due to substantial contributions being made toward the City's affordable housing goals.
- The corner of Park and Buswell would be animated with café seating and paving stones.
- The proposal included the required bicycle storage/parking spaces, and bicycle parking racks.
- The rooftop outdoor amenity space includes raised bed garden plots.
- The proposal takes advantage of the City's density bonusing program, with the result of eight (8) affordable housing units, including seven (7) one-bedroom units and one (1) studio/bachelor unit.

- The proposal includes two (2) accessible affordable housing units, and two (2) convertible units.

No public correspondence was received regarding the application.

In conclusion, the Chair commended the applicant for the attention to architectural detail in the project, and for the addition of the affordable housing units.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.