



City of Richmond

Report to Council

To: Richmond City Council
From: Joe Erceg
Chair, Development Permit Panel
Date: April 21, 2015
File: 01-0100-20-DPER1-
01/2015-Vol 01

**Re: Development Permit Panel Meetings held on December 10, 2014,
January 14, 2015, March 10, 2015 and April 15, 2015**

Staff Recommendation

1. That the recommendation of the Panel to authorize the issuance of:
 - a) a Development Permit (DP 14-672823) for the property at 3471 Chatham Street; and
 - b) a Development Permit (DP 14-657872) for the property at 9055 Dayton Avenue (formerly 9051 and 9055 Dayton Avenue);be endorsed, and the Permits so issued; and
2. That the recommendation of the Panel to authorize the issuance of a Heritage Alteration Permit (HA 14-672825) for the property at 3471 Chatham Street be endorsed, and the Permit so issued.

Joe Erceg
Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:blg

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on December 10, 2014, January 14, 2015, March 10, 2015 and April 15, 2015.

DP 14-672823 – STEVESTON FLATS DEVELOPMENT CORP. – 3471 CHATHAM STREET
(December 10, 2014 and January 14, 2015)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a three-storey mixed-use building on a site zoned “Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU26) – Steveston Village” including 10 apartment housing units in the upper floors and approximately 319 m² (3,438 ft²) ground floor commercial space. A variance is included in the proposal to increase building height from 12.0 m to 14.75 m to allow elevator access to the roof deck level.

The application was considered at both the December 10, 2014 and January 14, 2015 Development Permit Panel meetings.

At the December 10, 2014 Panel meeting, Architect, Rob Whetter, of ZGF Cotter Architects Inc., and Landscape Architect, Johnny Zhang, of Maruyama and Associates Landscape Architects Inc., gave a brief overview of the proposed development regarding: (i) vehicle parking; (ii) urban design; (iii) architectural form and character; (iv) accessibility features; (v) conditions of adjacency; (v) the proposed building’s shadowing effect and setback; (vii) overlook from the balconies and deck; (viii) the roof deck; (ix) the salvaged artwork panels used for Public Art installation; (x) landscape design; and (xi) the landscaping and low picket fencing used to discourage loitering in the undeveloped lane on the west side of the site.

Staff supported the application and requested variance. Staff noted that: (i) a Servicing Agreement is required for laneway improvements and frontage improvements along 3rd Avenue and Chatham Street; and (ii) sustainability and energy efficiency features will be included.

Correspondence was submitted to the Panel meeting regarding the application.

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Whetter and Mr. Zhang provided the following information:

- A green buffer is planned for the laneway on the west side of the site, including a picket fence and low vegetation to discourage loitering while maintaining good visibility.
- Customers may use parking spaces along the street or on-site next to the laneway and walk to the shop entrances along the south side of the site. In order to shorten the travel distance for wheelchair access, there is a walkway connecting the accessible parking space and the sidewalk on the north side of the site.
- The rooftop deck will be wheelchair accessible via an elevator and be restricted to residents of the proposed development.
- Efforts to minimize the height of the elevator tower have been made and the elevator tower was relocated to a central location on the roof to minimize potential shadowing.
- Regarding the west side of the building and concerns related to privacy and potential overlook, the number of balconies was reduced from the original rezoning application design.

Also, with regard to privacy concerns, there are Evergreen trees on the neighbouring property and that the building wall setbacks would be further away behind the balconies.

- The neighbouring large Evergreen trees to the west are in good condition and cast shadows.
- Regarding accessibility to the rooftop and alternatives to using an elevator, the applicant has reviewed other options for access to the rooftop and that there could be opportunities to further reduce the height of the elevator tower.

In reply to Panel queries, staff advised:

- The laneway along the northern edge of the site will be upgraded with vehicle access and parking. The laneway along the western edge is currently unconstructed and will be enhanced with landscaping.
- Regarding the long term plan for the laneway network adjacent to the proposed development, there are currently no plans to open the laneway on the western edge of the proposed development and that staff have reviewed the proposed landscaping.
- Regarding the future potential closure of the lane on the western edge of the site, there is infrastructure underneath the laneway and that staff would need to examine the feasibility of closing the laneway.
- Concerns regarding the shadowing of the proposed development have been addressed at the rezoning process.

The Panel referred the application to the January 14, 2015 Development Permit Panel meeting to address: (i) potential alternatives for wheelchair access to the rooftop; (ii) measures incorporated into the proposed development to address potential privacy overlook concerns from west facing balconies; (iii) long term options for the laneway network adjacent to the site; and (iv) options to enhance the landscaping to improve the pedestrian flow throughout the site.

At the January 14, 2015 Panel meeting, Architect, Rob Whetter, of ZGF Cotter Architects Inc., gave a brief overview of the proposed development, including:

- Measures were incorporated into the proposed development to address potential privacy overlook concerns from west facing balconies.
- The laneway network was not anticipated to change adjacent to the site.
- The site's landscaping was revised to improve pedestrian flow at the rear parking area.
- Alternatives to elevator access to the rooftop of the proposed development were explored, but options such as incline and vertical lifts are less convenient and are usually restricted to single occupant use. Also, the installation of incline or vertical lifts would potentially require the redesign of the upper floors. An elevator installation is the best option for universal access to the rooftop.
- A different elevator design lowered the overrun by 2 ft. compared to the original design. As a result, the proposed height variance was reduced to 2.75 m and the overrun has a better design integration with the building.

Staff supported the Development Permit application and requested variance. Staff commented on the adjacent lane, west of the proposed development, noting that there is significant City infrastructure under the lane. Staff advised that staff recommends that no changes be made to the lane and that the lane remain as City property.

Neighbouring resident, Ralph Turner, addressed the Panel, making inquiries regarding the adjacent laneway and the proposed development's elevator.

Vince Miele, Richmond Centre for Disability, addressed the Panel speaking in favour of the proposed development and its accessible features. He advised that there are insufficient universally designed structures in the Lower Mainland and an elevator is the best option for access throughout the proposed development.

In reply to Panel queries, Mr. Miele noted that he has used other lift systems and alternatives to the elevator, such as stair lift systems, were less efficient and inconvenient.

Richmond resident, Charmis Deboer, addressed the Panel, commenting on the challenges of access for paraplegic individuals and spoke in favour of the proposed development's accessible design. Also, she spoke of the various challenges associated with other lift systems.

Richmond resident, Tony Beatty, addressed the Panel speaking in favour of using an elevator for rooftop access. He commented on the inefficiencies of switching between two (2) lift systems when accessing the roof, especially during emergency situations.

Richmond resident, Tom Parker, addressed the Panel, speaking in favour of the proposed development and supports the use of an elevator design for rooftop access.

No public correspondence was submitted to the Panel regarding the application.

In reply to Panel queries, Mr. Whetter provided the following information:

- In order to address privacy concerns, no cantilever balconies will be installed. Instead, balconies will be set into the building.
- Regarding the proposed development's west-facing balconies: (i) three (3) out of four (4) corners of the building will have identical design treatment with a standardized kitchen and living and dining areas are flanked by an 8 ft. deep patio; (ii) the west-facing balcony will be setback 7 ft. from the property line and adjacent living spaces will be pushed approximately 15 ft. from the property line; (iii) the closest distance between the building's balconies and a neighbouring balcony will be 100 ft.; (iv) Evergreen trees along the property line and an upstand wall on the patios will restrict views to the neighbouring property.
- The proposed development will include recessed bays; which break up the building into house sized elements, reducing apparent mass and shadowing effects.
- Landscaping was enhanced to improve pedestrian flow in the rear lane adjacent to the proposed development, which is a dead-end lane with little traffic, making it friendly for pedestrians. Landscaping was enhanced by removing curbs, maintaining greenery and providing bollards and wheel stops in the rear lane parking area.

- The proposal is the only market housing in the area with all universal design suites.
- The applicant worked with Richmond Elevator and consulted with other elevator companies on options for the lowest elevator profile possible. To achieve a lower profile, the elevator design used overhead hooks instead of a hoist beam.
- The applicant examined other elevator options available; such as an in-ground elevator, but found it was unsuitable for the site. He added that elevator alternatives; such as stair lifts, would require a redesign of the upper floors and are not universally accessible.
- The orientation of the balconies and the reduction of the number of balconies from the original design were reviewed. Currently, three (3) balconies face west and the living spaces are significantly setback to provide a breakdown in the building massing.

Staff were directed to confirm that the proposed elevator access for the proposed development uses the lowest elevator technology possible before the proposed application is presented to Council.

Subsequent to the Panel meeting, Professional Engineer, K.Y. Hur, of Richmond Elevator, confirmed that the design included an overhead height of 3.81 m; measured from the roof top level to the underside of the lowest obstruction at the top of the hoistway and that this is the lowest required overhead available for a full-size passenger elevator.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 14-657872 – YAMAMOTO ARCHITECTURE INC. – 9055 DAYTON AVENUE
(FORMERLY 9051 AND 9055 DAYTON AVENUE)
(January 14, 2015, March 10, 2015 and April 15, 2015)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of 23 two-storey townhouse units on a site zoned “Low Density Townhouses (RTL2).” No variances are included in the proposal.

The application was considered at the January 14, 2015, March 10, 2015 and April 15, 2015 Development Permit Panel meetings.

At the January 14, 2015 Panel meeting, Architect, Taizo Yamamoto, of Yamamoto Architecture, and Landscape Architect, Denitsa Dimitrova, of PMG Landscape Architects, gave a brief presentation, noting that: (i) the remaining portions of the perimeter hedging were proposed to be removed and replaced due to overgrowth pruning requirements and site pre-loading impacts; and (ii) the applicant has spoken with adjacent neighbours regarding options for the replacement of the perimeter hedges.

Staff supported the application and noted that: (i) the proposed development will be built to EnerGuide 82 standards; and (iii) the proposal includes an indoor amenity building.

Neighbour, Wilson Leung, addressed the Panel, expressing concern regarding potential flooding on his property as a result of pre-loading the subject site.

The Chair advised that City regulations require that storm water is managed on-site and that perimeter drainage is designed to capture runoff.

In response to Panel queries, Jackson Lee and Eric Sze of Jacken Homes and Mr. Yamamoto provided the following information:

- Portions of the perimeter hedging committed to be retained at rezoning would have to be removed for maintenance and servicing upgrades and the hedge would become asymmetrical.
- The perimeter hedge has been pruned and sections identified for removal at rezoning have been removed. Landscape professionals pruned without damaging the hedges.
- Adjacent properties were consulted door-by-door to propose perimeter hedging replacement and perimeter fencing installation. Neighbouring properties were provided with letters and landscape plans detailing the proposed replacement of the existing hedges. Approximately 14 properties are potentially affected by the proposal. No opposition was expressed to the proposed hedge removal and replacement with fencing installation.
- The proposed perimeter hedging and fence installation is intended to retain the privacy of the adjacent properties. The replacement hedges will be approximately 8 ft. to 10 ft. tall and a specific hedge species that is tall and narrow and easier to maintain.
- The existing hedges were not uniformly planted, and in some areas, were planted too far in from the property line and the applicant underestimated the effect of the existing hedges on the proposed development when they originally indicated they would be retained.

In response to Panel queries, staff noted:

- Correspondence was received from neighbours Kathy Stephens and Raymond Luetzen, expressing concern regarding the proposed removal of sections of the perimeter hedging.
- The townhouse properties adjacent to the proposed development have consented to the installation of new fencing and replacement of the perimeter hedging.
- There are letters from four (4) adjacent properties, opposing the proposed hedge removal.

The Chair expressed concern with regard to the lack of information associated with the proposed replacement of perimeter hedging and installation of new fencing.

The Panel referred the application back to staff to examine the proposal to replace existing perimeter hedging and install fencing along the property line.

At the March 10, 2015 Panel meeting, Mr. Yamamoto, and Landscape Architect, Patricia Campbell, of PMG Landscape Architects, provided a brief presentation, noting that: (i) the applicant met with adjacent property owners to propose options for screening, (ii) screening options include a 10 ft. tall hedge with a wood fence, a chain-link fence or no fence; and (iii) the proposed screening options are supplemented with trees.

Ms. Stephens, addressed the Panel, expressing concern regarding: (i) privacy matters; (ii) hedge retention; (iii) consultation and notification process; (iv) perimeter drainage; (v) potential negative impact to her tree; and (vi) flooding concerns and site preloading.

The Chair noted that: (i) the applicant will be required to provide perimeter drainage; (ii) the retention of the perimeter hedging was not a condition to the rezoning; (iii) a 2:1 tree replacement ratio was required for any tree removed; and (iv) the City holds security for one year to ensure landscaping is maintained.

Neighbour, Irene Webster addressed the Panel, expressing concern regarding: (i) historical flooding in the area from insufficient perimeter drainage; (ii) proposed hedges; (iii) potential impact to her trees; (iv) possible replacement of damaged trees; and (v) that the City should be accountable if the trees cause any damage in the future.

In response to Panel queries, staff advised that the trees on Ms. Webster's property are identified for protection in the proposed Tree Retention Plan.

Neighbour, Mike Thorne, addressed the Panel, expressing concern regarding possible flooding from the proposed development and retaining the existing hedges as habitat for wildlife.

In response to Panel queries, Ms. Campbell, Mr. Yamamoto, Mr. Lee and project Arborist, Kerin Matthews, of Mountain Maple Ltd., provided the following information:

- Options have been examined to retain the existing hedge.
- The applicant consulted with adjacent property owners with regard to privacy matters by going door-to-door and through written correspondence.
- The perimeter fence and hedges are proposed to be installed prior to construction and temporary fencing would be used during the installation of the new screening elements.
- The proposed fencing will be 6 ft. tall; the replacement hedges will be 10 ft. tall and will grow over a few years and provide dense visual screening.
- Drip irrigation will be installed for the new hedges, a landscape security will be provided as part of the Development Permit, and the future strata corporation will maintain the hedges.
- The existing hedge was not properly maintained and could not be trimmed back further, and as such, a heavy snow load could cause parts of the hedge to fail. The existing hedges have reached maturity and that new plants cannot be added without damaging the existing hedges.
- To maintain continuity and visual screening; replacement of the entire perimeter hedging is the recommended option instead of retaining sections of the existing hedge and installing new fencing. Due to its current state, the existing hedge would be difficult to maintain.
- The proposed heat pumps comply with noise bylaw guidelines. There will be heat pumps located between the townhouses and on the roof of the amenity building.

In response to Panel queries, staff advised that: (i) the future strata corporation will not be able to remove the proposed hedges and will be responsible for its maintenance; (ii) staff are aware of the local flooding concerns in adjacent properties; and (iii) perimeter drainage is required.

The Panel referred the application back to staff to examine: (i) privacy concerns of two (2) adjacent property owners; and (ii) a viable long-term perimeter hedge solution.

At the April 15, 2015 Panel meeting, Mr. Yamamoto and Ms. Campbell provided a brief presentation, noting that: (i) the existing perimeter hedge will be replaced with new hedges; (ii) 10 ft. tall replacement hedges and wood fencing will be used for most of the site's perimeter; (iii) some sections will be 15 ft. tall replacement hedges and a section will have hedges but no wood fence, (iv) new 5 ft. tall hedges will be provided along the driveways; and (v) a Tree Permit had been issued to a neighbour for the removal of three (3) trees from an adjacent property.

Ms. Stephens, addressed the Panel, expressing concern regarding: (i) privacy and screening; (ii) hedge trimming; and (iii) health of the hedges. She noted that neighbours have declined the offer to plant hedges within their property, compromising screening of her property.

The Chair advised that: (i) the Development Permit continues with the property and that hedges cannot be removed or altered below the height specified; (ii) a landscaping security is held for one year following the completion of the proposed development; and (iii) distressed hedges are required to be replaced before the landscape security expires.

Ms. Webster, addressed the Panel, noting that concerns regarding the removal of three (3) large trees on her property have been resolved.

In response to Panel queries, staff noted that: (i) options are available to extend the landscape security; (ii) 10% of the landscape security is withheld until one year following completion of the development; (iii) the applicants estimate that the hedges would be in place approximately one to two years prior to final occupancy; and (iii) it is possible to register a legal agreement on Title to maintain the perimeter hedges.

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Yamamoto, Ms. Campbell, Mr. Lee and Ms. Matthews noted:

- Regarding the applicant's commitment to retain the existing hedge at the rezoning application process, changes to the existing hedge were necessary due to its location along the property line and possible unsavoury appearance when trimmed.
- All of the existing hedge will be removed and replaced with new hedging that is anticipated to be 18 to 20 ft. tall at maturity. Some sections will not have a fence and will only have a hedge at the request of the adjacent property owners.
- The perimeter hedge and fence will be installed prior to construction of the proposed townhouses and that the hedges will be watered.
- The applicant would have no control over future hedge maintenance however; the applicant has made an offer to Ms. Stephens to locate additional hedges on her property.
- Strata Corporations typically only trim hedges approximately three years after planting due to limited budgets.

Mr. Lee addressed the Panel and advised that concerns from adjacent property owners regarding the pruning of the proposed perimeter hedges have been resolved.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.