



# City of Richmond

## Report to Council

---

**To:** Richmond City Council

**Date:** October 3, 2012

**From:** Joe Erceg  
Chair, Development Permit Panel

**File:** 01-0100-20-DPER1-  
01/2012-Vol 01

**Re:** Development Permit Panel Meeting Held on May 30, 2012

---

### Staff Recommendation

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

- i) a Development Permit (DP 11-592266) for the property at 4151, 4171 and 4191 No. 4 Road;  
be endorsed, and the Permit so issued.

Joe Erceg  
Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:blg

### Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following item at its meeting held on May 30, 2012.

DP 11-592266 – Kraftsmen Holdings Ltd. – 4151, 4171 and 4191 No. 4 Road  
(May 30, 2012)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of 25 three-storey townhouse units on a site zoned Town Housing (ZT67). Variances are included in the proposal to reduce the minimum lot size and to reduce the north side yard setback for a garbage and recycling enclosure.

The architect, Taizo Yamamoto, of Yamamoto Architecture Inc., provided a brief presentation, including:

- The proposed architectural form reflects the adjacent development, to the north, to create a strong streetscape along No. 4 Road;
- The three-building fronting No. 4 Road feature steps up to the yard and steps up to the front entries, thus creating some animation and some vertical articulation of the units;
- The neighbouring school is allowing a footpath connection from the subject site, through a locked gate, allowing residents to access the school and use the school field and play equipment;
- The outdoor amenity space features play equipment including a “mushroom” type table with stools, and a climbing structure;
- Permeable pavers will cover a large portion of the site to create textural interest and to distinctly indicate the site’s entry;
- There is one (1) detached convertible unit and all units having aging-in-place features;
- Central air conditioning is incorporated, due to aircraft noise, and residents will have cooling and heating without having to open windows; and
- The proposed colour palette includes greys, with “punch out” colour applied to entry doors.

In response to Panel discussion, staff, Mr. Yamamoto and landscape architect, Marlene Messer, of PMG Landscape Architects Inc., provided the following information:

- One (1) of the retained trees is located on the adjacent property to the south, and the other is located on the adjacent property to the west;
- The applicant will ask the School District for permission to install stone pavers on the school property to connect to the existing walkway to the school;
- Access to the subject site is completely on the site to the north. The single shared driveway access is sufficient and was part of the overall plan when the site to the north was under discussion;
- The survey conducted by the arborist indicated the sidewalk elevation, and the proposed change in grade precluded the likely survival of the on-site trees;

- The architectural character is similar to the neighbouring townhouse development to the north, but reverse gables, stripped of decorative brackets, is one way to distinguish the two (2) sites; and
- The school playground is approximately 60 m northwest of the subject site.

Staff supported the Development Permit application and the requested variances. Staff advised that there were 52 bylaw-sized trees on-site, and the three (3) in good condition, were unlikely to survive the change in grade. Planting 46 replacement trees on-site is proposed, including four (4) large trees.

Neighbouring residents Shing Tak Mak, Alvin Cheung, and Mr. Kwong, addressed the Panel and expressed the following concerns:

- The existing driveway is inadequate to be shared with the proposed townhouse units;
- The variance to reduce the minimum lot size would result in increasing the density to higher than the existing townhouse development;
- The variance to reduce the north side yard setback would bring the proposed garbage collection space too close to neighbouring residents, who would be adversely impacted by garbage smells;
- Garbage was collected from individual units at the neighbouring townhouse development, avoiding the issue of garbage smells, and this was recommended for the proposal as well.

Correspondence was submitted to Panel objecting to the Development Permit application from residents in 19 units of the neighbouring townhouse development.

In response to queries regarding garbage collection, Mr. Yamamoto advised that: door-to-door collection could be considered and the proposed location was chosen to minimize truck travel.

In response to concerns raised and Panel queries, staff provided the following information:

- In response to construction hour concerns raised at the September, 2011 Public Hearing, a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan was submitted by the applicant, and approved by the Transportation Department;
- Council can, through the rezoning process, address density, but the Development Permit Panel does not have the ability to change density;
- The difference in density between the two (2) sites is very small, due to the different lot sizes, and the proposed site may appear more dense due to the provision of the driveway;
- Both the subject site and the neighbouring site to the north are zoned the same, with similar variances;
- The garbage and recycling enclosure has a roof and doors, and the same design as the enclosure in the development directly north of the subject site; and
- The requested variance would allow the garbage and recycling enclosure to encroach into the north side yard, and the two (2) buildings are approximately 10 m apart.

The Chair explained that, in terms of density, the difference in density was so small as to be unnoticeable. He added that the developer of the site where the delegates live, sought, and received, almost the same lot size variance the applicant is seeking. The floor area ratio is the same.

The Chair remarked that the proposed development is laid out well, and that the concerns of density, are beyond the scope of the Panel. He noted that the proposed garage and recycling enclosure arrangement is a common one throughout the City, and that this common arrangement is not problematic at other locations.

The Panel expressed support for the proposed development.

The Panel recommends the Permit be issued.