



# City of Richmond

## Report to Council

---

**To:** Richmond City Council  
**From:** Joe Erceg  
Chair, Development Permit Panel  
**Date:** July 7, 2015  
**File:** 01-0100-20-DPER1-  
01/2015-Vol 01  
**Re:** Development Permit Panel Meetings Held on June 24, 2015, April 15, 2015,  
March 25, 2015 and July 16, 2014

---

### Staff Recommendation

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

1. A Development Variance Permit (DV 14-658670) for the property at 8180 Ash Street; and
2. A Development Permit (DP 14-657502) for the property at 11380 Steveston Highway;

be endorsed, and the Permits 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 June 24, 2015, April 15, 2015, March 25, 2015 and July 16, 2014.

DV 14-658670- HABITAT FOR HUMANITY SOCIETY OF GREATER VANCOUVER INC.  
- 8180 ASH STREET  
(March 25, 2015 and June 24, 2015)

The Panel considered a Development Variance Permit application to vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to vary minimum lot width and minimum lot frontage to permit subdivision into six (6) lots zoned "Single Detached (RS1/B)".

The application was reviewed at both the March 25, 2015 and June 24, 2015 Development Permit Panel meetings. At the March 25, 2015 meeting, Architect, Aaron Union, of Abbarch Architecture Inc. and Landscape Architect, Jeffrey Philips, of PWL Partnerships, provided a brief presentation, noting that: (i) Three (3) residences would front onto Ash Street and three (3) would front onto Dayton Court with a shared driveway; (ii) The residences would share common walkways, gardens, a barbeque area and a children's' play area; and (iii) One (1) residence is fully accessible.

Staff supported the Development Variance Permit application and advised that: (i) the applicants engaged in public consultation; (ii) the applicants worked with Transportation staff to facilitate shared access to Dayton Court; and (iii) the proposed variances were consistent with an application that was approved by Council in 2011 and lapsed.

A number of neighbourhood residents addressed the Panel expressing concerns, including:

- Opposition to the proposal and proposed variances.
- The public consultation process.
- Emergency access, site access, on-site parking, street parking and increased traffic.
- Proposed building height and privacy for adjacent properties.
- Site density, townhouse appearance and conforming to the character of the neighbourhood.
- The ownership of the units, maintenance and conflict resolution avenues.

Correspondence, including a petition, was submitted to the Development Permit Panel meeting regarding the Development Variance Permit application.

In response to Panel queries, Tim Clark, of Habitat for Humanity, advised:

- Habitat for Humanity intends to register private cross-access easement agreements to allow individual homeowners to have access to the shared amenity areas.
- The applicant will discuss perimeter privacy options with adjacent property owners.
- Habitat for Humanity is an international organization that helps low income families attain home ownership.

- Partner families must have an annual income of \$35,000 to 65,000 and contribute approximately 500 work hours or “sweat equity” towards construction of their home. Housing costs are reviewed and calculated with each partner family.
- Partner families are responsible for maintenance to Habitat for Humanity standards.
- The homes cannot be sold in the open market. Partner families that wish to relocate receive the balance of equity payments once the homes are returned to Habitat for Humanity.

In response to Panel queries, staff advised:

- BC Housing was the previous applicant for the site, the permit lapsed and options for selling were limited due to BC Housing’s affordability requirements for the site.
- The proposed building height conforms to the Zoning Bylaw and is similar to neighbours.
- The on-site parking complies with the Zoning Bylaw, and that Dayton Court fronting lots provide space for vehicles to manoeuvre on-site even when all carports are occupied.
- Prior to subdivision, a legal agreement is required; specifying design elements.

As a result of discussion, the application was referred back to staff to review: (i) community feedback and additional community consultation for the proposed development; (ii) the proposed architectural design of the proposed development; (iii) on-site vehicle visitor parking, site manoeuvring within the site and access to the site from Dayton Court; and report back to the Wednesday, April 29, 2015 Development Permit Panel meeting.

At the April 29, 2015 Development Permit Panel meeting, the application was referred to a future meeting.

At the June 24, 2015 Development Permit Panel meeting, Mr. Urion and Mr. David O’Sheehan, of Abbarch Architecture Inc., provided a brief presentation, including:

- Vehicles may enter, turn around and exit the lots fronting Dayton Court in a forward direction.
- One (1) visitor vehicle parking space was added for the lots fronting Dayton Court.
- Architectural elements in the surrounding neighbourhood were incorporated into the proposed design; including triangulated roofs.
- The project will use high quality building materials.
- The height of the proposed buildings will be below permitted levels.
- The lot’s grading was lowered; however, will meet the City’s flood protection standards.
- Adjustments were made to the proposed design in response to feedback from the community.

Stephani Samaridis and Doug Hamming, of Habitat for Humanity, noted that:

- Vehicles will be able to enter and exit the site in a forward direction.
- Vehicle parking concerns were addressed by adding a marked visitor vehicle parking on-site.

- Based on experience with Habitat for Humanity's other properties, it is anticipated that partner families with multiple vehicles will be unlikely.
- The proposal is not duplexes. They are single-family homes with secondary suites.
- The architectural form and character of the proposed development was revised to be consistent with the neighbourhood.

A number of neighbourhood residents addressed the Panel, expressing concerns including:

- Opposition to the proposal.
- Not complying with the Zoning Bylaw, interpretation of the Zoning Bylaw to define the proposed development as single-family dwellings and impact of secondary suites.
- The number of proposed dwellings.
- Garbage collection and emergency vehicle access to the proposed development.
- Potential increase in traffic and safety concerns for pedestrians and children.
- Community consultation process.
- Lack of street parking in the neighbourhood, potential increase in on street parking, the need for parking on-site and the dimensions of the visitor parking spaces.
- Design not integrating well with the neighbourhood.
- Proposal not exceeding the minimum technical requirements.

Correspondence was submitted to the Development Permit Panel meeting regarding the Development Variance Permit application.

In reply to Panel queries, Mr. Urion noted that each unit has garbage and recycling cart areas.

In reply to Panel queries, staff noted:

- Staff have reviewed the proposed application and are satisfied with the proposed modifications to the proposed development.
- Should the application proceed, a covenant will be registered on Title at the subdivision stage to ensure that the future buildings will comply with the architectural designs presented to the Panel.
- Environmental Programs staff are satisfied with the proposed garbage and recycling collection plans.
- There is a secondary emergency access to Dayton Court from Ash Street.
- The proposed development is considered to be single-family dwellings; with a secondary suite. The City's Zoning Bylaw provisions for secondary suites include measures such as; limiting the area to a maximum of 90 m<sup>2</sup> and 40% of the total floor area of the dwelling. Also, secondary suites cannot be subdivided or stratified. The proposed secondary suites comply with all Zoning Bylaw requirements and this would be reconfirmed at the Building Permit stage.

Discussion ensued with regard to: (i) the fact that the same variance was previously granted to the site; (ii) historical ownership of the site; (iii) improvements made to the proposed design; (iv) access to the site; (v) visitor vehicle parking; (vi) the potential to further enhance the neighbourhood by adding more families; (vii) encouraging the applicant to continue discussions with their neighbours; and (viii) the limited impact the proposed development would have on traffic in the neighbourhood.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 14-657502 – KASIAN ARCHITECTURE INTERIOR DESIGN AND PLANNING LTD. –  
11380 STEVESTON HIGHWAY  
(July 16, 2014 and April 15, 2015)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of an 882 m<sup>2</sup> addition and exterior renovation to the existing building on a site zoned “Industrial Community Commercial (ZC6) – Ironwood Area.” No variances are included in the proposal.

The application was reviewed at both the July 16, 2014 and April 15, 2015 Development Permit Panel meetings. At the July 16, 2014 meeting, Architect, Andrew Gordon, of Kasian Architecture Interior Design and Planning Ltd., and Landscape Architect, Florian Fisch, of Durante Kreuk Ltd., provided a brief presentation, noting that: (i) the parking layout will be updated to include small car spaces and an electric vehicle charging station; and (ii) a wide walkway with seating will be included.

Staff supported the Development Permit application and advised that staff have worked with the applicant on aspects of: (i) pedestrian and mobility access to the site; (ii) landscaping upgrades; and (iii) adding an electric vehicle charging station.

In reply to Panel queries, Mr. Gordon and Mr. Fisch advised:

- Renovation of other buildings in the site will be completed in stages.
- Renovations will include updates to the façade and overhang, addition of glazing and repainting parking space lines to accommodate new parking spaces.
- Accessibility and sustainability features will include: (i) widening of the sidewalk; (ii) increasing planting in the area; and (iii) installing an electric vehicle recharging station.

In reply to Panel queries, staff noted that the proposal meets the requirements for the number of parking spaces, as well as the ratio of small vehicle and regular vehicle parking spaces.

David Porte and Daniel Bar-Dayyan, of Porte Realty Ltd., submitted correspondence to the Panel from businesses in the area and addressed the Panel expressing concerns regarding:

- The proposal may restrict visibility of and connectivity to the adjacent buildings.
- The proposed design does not reflect the retail nature of the adjacent buildings.
- Visibility restrictions may negatively affect tenants of the adjacent building.

- The proposed design may restrict access, lead to traffic congestion, may restrict access to the adjacent loading bay and compromise pedestrian safety.

Alex Cairns, of Cushman and Wakefield, addressed the Panel, expressing concern that the proposal may restrict access to adjacent buildings and negatively impact traffic.

As a result of discussion, the application was referred back to staff to examine: (i) enhancements to urban design and architectural form and character that would improve integration with other buildings on the site and accessibility to neighbouring sites; (ii) changes to the location and ratio of small vehicle and regular vehicle parking spaces; and (iii) options to include the renovation of the entire site in the Development Permit.

At the April 15, 2015 Development Permit Panel meeting, Architect, Alan Nakaska, of Kasian Architecture, Mr. Fisch and Mr. Babul, provided a brief presentation, including:

- The revised design incorporates a similar architectural design and uses the same building materials and colour schemes as the existing development.
- The proposed building area was reduced, the north frontage was reduced by 8 ft., glazing was added along the south façade, and a glass canopy is proposed.
- 432 vehicle parking stalls are proposed and will include a more equitable distribution of small vehicle stalls throughout the site.
- The proposed public plaza has been enlarged and will be multi-functional.
- There would be a wide sidewalk and a landscape strip along the east side of the addition and landscaped screen along the south side of the addition.
- The applicant proposed way-finding signs and aligned drive aisles in order to address concerns expressed by the adjacent business owners however, no agreement was reached.

Staff supported the Development Permit application and thanked the applicant for their efforts in working with staff to address the urban design concerns.

Correspondence was submitted to the Development Permit Panel regarding the application.

Neighbouring business owner, Beth Lee, addressed the Panel expressing concern regarding: (i) visual obstruction of neighbouring businesses; (ii) increased truck traffic; and (iii) parking.

Neighbouring business owner, Johnny Ahmed, addressed the Panel expressing concern regarding available parking and business signage.

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Nakaska and Mr. Babul advised:

- Efforts were made to minimize visual obstruction to the adjacent property.
- The proposed loading area can be accessed entirely within the site.
- Historical bylaws at the time of design, as well as tenant preference, required specific dimensions for the proposed loading area. Due to the required dimensions, the area behind the proposed addition is the optimal location for the loading area.

- The applicant and Porte Realty Ltd. agree on the relocation of the access easement, however, are unable to agree on other aspects of the proposed application.
- Relocating the loading area and reconfiguring the proposed addition towards the west would result in loss of frontage and reduced exposure for future tenants.
- A hydro kiosk is located along the western property line and reconfiguring the drive aisle at to the loading area could reduce vehicle parking space for adjacent business owners.
- The applicant is willing to relocate the access easement and provide way-finding signs that meet City regulations at the applicant's cost.

In response to Panel queries, staff advised that: (i) the Zoning Bylaw does not require the loading area to be behind the building; (ii) the pedestrian connection is part of the Development Permit; (iii) way-finding signs are permitted and may be provided by the applicant; and (iv) staff can gather information with regard to the final agreement between the applicant and adjacent property owners prior to forwarding the application to Council.

The applicant was directed to consult with Porte Realty Ltd. on the relocation of the access easement and the installation of way-finding signs and the pedestrian connection.

Subsequent to the meeting, the applicant and adjacent neighbour reached an agreement to relocate the cross-access easement to provide a more direct access between the two (2) sites and to install way-finding signage. Accordingly, the applicant submitted revised Development Permit plans to identify the relocated easement and the location of the directional signage.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.