



City of Richmond

Report to Council

To: Richmond City Council
From: Joe Erceg
Chair, Development Permit Panel
Date: March 22, 2017
File: 01-0100-20-DPER1-
01/2017-Vol 01
Re: **Development Permit Panel Meetings Held on July 13, 2016, October 26, 2016
and November 30, 2016**

Staff Recommendation

1. That the recommendation of the Panel to authorize the issuance of:
 - a) A Development Permit (DP 16-727168) for the property at 7311 No. 5 Road; and
 - b) A Development Variance Permit (DV 15-717479) for the property at 10691 Bromfield Place;be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joe Erceg".

Joe Erceg
Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:blg

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on July 13, 2016, October 26, 2016 and November 30, 2016.

DP 16-727168 – PRITAM SAMRA – 7311 NO. 5 ROAD
(July 13, 2016 and November 30, 2016)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a single-family dwelling with an attached garage on a site with an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) designation and zoned "Agriculture (AG1)". No variances are included in the proposal.

The application was considered at the July 13, 2016 and November 30, 2016 Development Permit Panel meetings. At the July 13, 2016 meeting, Warren Appleton, Project Manager, Keystone Environmental Ltd., accompanied by Jaswinder Singh, designer for the proposed development, and Pritam Samra, property owner, provided a brief presentation, noting that:

- Approximately one-half of the subject site is designated as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA).
- Invasive plant species encroach on the ESA and some portions of the ESA are devoid of vegetation.
- The proposed development will encroach into the ESA to accommodate the construction of a house and driveway in addition to the replacement and upgrading of an existing septic field.
- The proposed ESA compensation scheme includes removal of invasive plant species within the ESA and planting enhancement to diversify the mix of native plants.

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

- Proposed new planting along the northern property line and the property frontage is intended to diversify native planting and provide a more suitable habitat for a wider variety of birds.
- The detached garage is proposed to be located at the rear of the site due to the location of the septic tank at the front of the property for easier maintenance.
- Portions of the ESA with higher value vegetation will be retained.
- The proposed planting enhancement at the rear of the site is intended to improve the quality of the retained ESA.

Staff noted that the proposed development's approach to areas retained for ESA is to enhance their quality.

The Chair noted that the design of the proposed development will significantly reduce the amount of ESA in the subject site, and was of the opinion that relocating the septic tank and garage and reducing the paved area within the subject site will lessen the impact to the ESA.

The application was referred back to staff to work with the applicant to consider redesigning the proposed development in order to lessen its impact to the ESA.

At the November 30, 2016 meeting, Jaswinder Singh, designer for the project, accompanied by Pritam Samra, property owner, provided a brief presentation, noting that:

- The ESA covered approximately one-half of the site.
- Proposed modifications made in response to the previous Panel referral include, among others, relocating the septic field out of the ESA to the maximum extent possible, and relocating a smaller sized garage from the rear to the front of the house.
- The proposed modifications will result in a significant reduction of the proposed development's encroachment into the ESA; from approximately 300 m² in the original proposal to 40.3 m² in the revised proposal.

Staff advised that: the revised site plan, house design, and septic field design have responded to the Panel's direction, and the project's encroachment into the ESA was substantially reduced.

In response to queries from the Panel, Mr. Singh acknowledged that: (i) the redesign of the house and septic field will result in minimal impact to the ESA; and (ii) lot coverage is 20 percent for the whole lot and 37 percent excluding the ESA.

The Panel expressed support for the project, noting that the proposed modifications to the original proposal have significantly improved the project.

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

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DV 15-717479 – SU WANG – 10691 BROMFIELD PLACE

(October 26, 2016)

The Panel considered a Development Variance Permit application to vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to reduce the minimum required rear yard under the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" zone from 6.0 m to 3.0 m, in order to allow retention of a non-conforming deck for the single-family dwelling located at 10691 Bromfield Place.

Ms. Lee, the applicant's realtor, accompanied by Mr. Wang, the applicant's husband, spoke on behalf of the applicant, noting that: (i) the applicant knew about the existing non-conforming construction only after the applicant had entered into the contract for the house purchase; (ii) the new owners wanted to retain the existing deck due to its quality and safety; (iii) no complaints have been received from owners of neighbouring properties regarding the deck; and (iv) the applicant contacted City staff to comply with requirements for retaining the existing deck.

Staff acknowledged that the City does not typically consider Development Variance applications after an unauthorized construction had been undertaken; however, staff were willing to consider the subject application, as the applicant has provided letters of support from all five adjacent property owners and a significant hedge screens the deck from views of neighbouring properties.

March 22, 2017

- 4 -

In addition, staff advised that: (i) a restrictive covenant will be registered to ensure the retention and maintenance of the existing hedge; and (ii) the proposed setback variance is specific to the existing deck only and precludes future extensions or improvements to the deck.

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

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.