



City of Richmond

Report to Council

To: Richmond City Council
From: Joe Erceg
Chair, Development Permit Panel
Date: July 6, 2016
File: 01-0100-20-DPER1-
01/2015-Vol 01
Re: **Development Permit Panel Meetings Held on April 13, 2016, April 27, 2016 and June 15, 2016**

Staff Recommendation

1. That the recommendation of the Panel to authorize the issuance of:
 - a) A Development Permit (DP 15-700370) for the property at 9560 Alexandra Road; and
 - b) A Development Permit (DP 14-662341) for the property at 6900 Pearson Way;be endorsed, and the Permit so issued.


Joe Erceg
Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:rg

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on April 13, 2016, April 27, 2016 and June 15, 2016.

DP 15-700370 – YAMAMOTO ARCHITECTURE INC. – 9560 ALEXANDRA ROAD
(April 13, 2016 and April 27, 2016)

At the Panel meetings held on April 13, 2016 and April 27, 2016, the Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of 20 three-storey townhouse units on a site zoned “Town Housing (ZT67)”. No variances are included in the proposal.

At the Panel meeting held on April 13, 2016, Architect, Taizo Yamamoto, of Yamamoto Architecture, Inc., and Landscape Architect, Denitsa Dimitrova, of PMG Landscape Architects, provided a brief presentation, noting that:

- A 20 m wide area along the northern edge of the subject site will be provided for the east-west greenway which extends to the townhouse development to the east.
- The project is designed to achieve EnerGuide 82 rating and pre-ducted for solar hot water.
- One (1) convertible townhouse is provided and all townhouses will have aging-in-place features.
- The proposal includes a 4 m wide ESA strip with native vegetation along Alderbridge Way and a 20 m greenway with retention of existing trees along Alexandra Road.
- The outdoor amenity space includes a children’s play area, play equipment, structural and natural play surface areas, a bench and a bicycle rack.

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Yamamoto advised that:

- The proposed west interface with the adjacent future City-owned park includes a west edge walkway level with the townhouses for accessibility, and a 4 ft. tall fence on top of an approximately 4 ft. tall retaining wall.
- The proposed retaining wall adjacent to the park includes lock blocks with varied textures and patterns to provide visual interest.

In response to Panel queries, staff advised that: (i) the final design of the future City park is yet to be determined; (ii) the height of the fence on top of the retaining wall was minimized and the fencing design was transparent; (iii) the developer has agreed to provide a cash contribution for planting within the park to soften the western edge of the site; (iv) existing grade in the future park needs to be maintained to preserve existing trees; and (v) Parks Department staff has reviewed the proposal and the contribution for planting in the future park.

Staff commented that: (i) the proposal provides a 4 m wide ESA strip planted with native trees and shrubs along the Alderbridge Way frontage similar to the approach taken by adjacent townhouse development applications to the east; and (ii) the proposal is designed to achieve the City’s aircraft noise mitigation standards and EnerGuide 82 rating for energy efficiency.

The Panel expressed concern regarding the interface of the subject development's west side with the future City-owned park. The application was referred back to staff to:

1. Provide more details on the design of the future City-owned park adjacent to the western property boundary of the subject site.
2. Investigate ways to minimize the proposed retaining wall and review the proposed fencing on top of the retaining wall along the western perimeter of the subject development to provide a softer transition to and better interface with the adjacent park.
3. Minimize the cost for the City to provide landscape screening within the park and adjacent to the retaining wall along the western property boundary of the subject site.
4. Report back to the April 27, 2016 Development Permit Panel meeting.

At the April 27, 2016 Panel meeting, Mr. Yamamoto stated that, in response to the April 13, 2016 referral, the following revisions improved the interface with the future City-owned park:

- The majority of the western edge of the site was redesigned to limit the grade change along the common property line with the future City park. Enhancements were made to the proposed grading on the development site and the proposed landscaping approach to be provided in the park.
- The developer will construct a 3 m wide planting bed of soil. It will be 0.6 m high and gently sloping back down to grade along the east edge of the park, in addition to the contribution towards the landscape screening in the east edge of the park adjacent to the subject site.
- Terraced 2 ft. high wood retaining walls screened with planting would be provided along the majority of the west property line, similar to the condition at the north edge.

In response to Panel queries, Ms. Dimitrova and Mr. Yamamoto advised that:

- The future strata will be responsible for maintenance of landscaping along the west edge; including 1 m high Evergreen shrubs and trailing plants to screen the tiered retaining walls.
- The originally proposed vertical allan block retaining wall will be retained for a small portion of the site (approximately 12 m wide) to support the visitor parking space and drive aisle end.

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

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 14-662341 – HOLLYBRIDGE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP (INTRACORP) – 6900
PEARSON WAY
(June 15, 2016)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a high-rise, mixed use development comprised of 300 dwellings (including 31 affordable housing units) and 6,657.0 m² (71,655 ft²) of retail, restaurant, and office uses on a site zoned "Residential/Limited Commercial (RCL3)". No variances are included in the proposal.

David Jacobson, of Intracorp, provided a brief presentation, noting that:

- The project is the second in a two-phase mixed-use project in the City Centre's Oval Village.
- The project provides 269 market units in two (2) towers, a mid-rise building and townhouses and 31 affordable housing units in a stand-alone building.
- The proposal responds to future redevelopment of the City-owned Richmond Winter Club with retail, residential and office uses and a single-parkade entry.
- The project provides 38,000 ft² of ground-oriented retail space, 542 parking spaces, electric vehicle (EV) charging equipment, 35,000 ft² of above-grade office space and 20 percent of the residential units, including all 31 affordable housing units meet the Basic Universal Housing (BUH) design standards.
- The affordable housing units have been designed in partnership with the non-profit owner and operator. Two (2) additional larger affordable housing units have been provided in addition to the number originally proposed at rezoning without increasing the building footprint.
- Significant frontage improvements include the realignment of Hollybridge Way.
- The total area of the outdoor amenity space is approximately 30 percent larger than the OCP minimum requirement. The podium outdoor amenity space is intended for shared use by market and affordable housing residents.
- The total area of indoor amenity space is approximately 70 percent larger than the OCP minimum requirement, including two (2) guest suites for short-term use by residents' visitors.
- The two (2) towers look different from each other. The east tower has a horizontal expression with an earthier colour palette while the west tower emphasizes its verticality, has a cool, green marina architectural expression and a curving wall providing a "gateway" feel.
- Approximately \$1.5 million is being contributed for community amenities, i.e., for child care, public art and community planning.

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Jacobson and Jeffrey Mok, of IBI/HB Architects advised that:

- The proposed treatments to the various building entrances are cohesive yet distinct, using signage and materials, to assist in wayfinding. The two (2) entries to market residential units have water features. The entry to the affordable housing units is modest in terms of size, and the applicant will consider the recommendation of the potential operator of the affordable housing building regarding the treatment of the affordable housing lobby.
- The proposed affordable housing indoor amenity room will use acoustical materials for noise control in consideration of the adjacent affordable housing unit.
- Tenants of affordable housing units will have their own indoor amenity space and have access to the entire podium rooftop outdoor amenity space and children's playground.
- The proposed affordable housing indoor amenity space is about 30 percent larger than the OCP's minimum requirement and the potential operator would need to consider higher operating costs if additional indoor amenities were provided.

- At future Building Permit stage, retail spaces might either be consolidated or subdivided by future tenants and an additional elevator may be introduced to access some office spaces.
- The slopes in the underground parkade are designed to be accessible.
- One 2-bedroom unit and one 3-bedroom unit have been added to the original number of affordable housing units proposed at rezoning, bringing the total to 31.

In response to Panel queries, staff advised that:(i) the proposed stand-alone affordable housing building predated Council's direction for affordable housing units to be dispersed throughout a proposed development, (ii) the subject development was the last development in the City to be approved at the rezoning stage with a consolidated affordable housing building, and (iii) the indoor amenity space proposal for the affordable housing was identified at the rezoning stage.

Robert Brown, of Catalyst Community Development, the future operator of the affordable housing building, addressed the Panel, stating that:

- Operating cost is an important consideration as it impacts on the rental rates.
- The operator is responsible for maintaining the indoor amenity for affordable housing and the operator is comfortable with the proposed size of the indoor amenity spaces for affordable housing tenants and their access to the rooftop outdoor amenity spaces.
- The housing agreement does not include use by affordable housing tenants of indoor amenity spaces for market residential housing and the operating cost of indoor amenity spaces for market residential units may be passed on to affordable housing tenants if used by them.
- Based on their study, affordable housing units dispersed throughout the development absorb more maintenance costs for amenities provided for the entire development, thus have a higher operating cost compared to affordable housing units contained in one (1) building.

Staff noted that the proposed development (i) will be connected to the District Energy Utility (DEU) facility, (ii) will provide significant electric vehicle charging equipment, (iii) will meet the City's aircraft noise standards in terms of building design, (iv) will provide 60 Basic Universal Housing units, and (v) has extensive green roofs on portions of the site.

Correspondence was submitted to the Development Permit Panel regarding the application. Staff noted that two (2) letters expressed support for the project while the other two (2) letters expressed concerns regarding (i) potential increase in traffic and congestion in the area and (ii) noise during construction of the project.

In response to a Panel query, staff confirmed that (i) Transportation Department has reviewed the project and noted its compliance with all City Bylaws, (ii) a Construction and Traffic Management Plan will be submitted by the applicant prior to Building Permit issuance, (iii) some of the road improvements in Phase 2 are tied to Phase 1 which is currently under construction, and (iv) the project will be subject to the City's construction noise requirements.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.