



City of Richmond

Report to Council

To: Richmond City Council
From: Joe Erceg, MCIP
Chair, Development Permit Panel
Date: September 7, 2011
File: 0100-20-DPER1
Re: **Development Permit Panel Meetings Held on August 24, 2011, July 27, 2011
and February 16, 2011**

Panel Recommendation

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

- i) a Development Variance Permit (DV 11-581634) for the property at 11120 Silversmith Place; and
- ii) a Development Variance Permit (DV 10-542375) for the property at 8180 Ash Street;

be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.

Joe Erceg, MCIP
Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:blg

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on August 24, 2011, July 27, 2011, and February 16, 2011.

DV 11-581634 – CTA DESIGN GROUP – 11120 SILVERSMITH PLACE
(August 24, 2011)

The Panel considered an application to vary the maximum building height within the Industrial Business Park (IB1) zone for the widening of an existing fabrication tower and the construction of a new fabrication tower at 11120 Silversmith Place.

The applicant, Ciaran Deery, Partner, CTA Design Group, provided a brief presentation, noting that Layfield Plastics was making a significant investment to bring in new technology to diversify its operations, and required the requested variances to accommodate the new machinery in their film fabric manufacturing facility.

Staff supports the development variance application and the expansion of a thriving industry in Richmond. Staff added that existing tanks will block views of the proposed tower expansion and staff had received a telephone call from residents living on the west side of the manufacturing facility who complained of the noise coming from the said facility.

The Panel discussed the proposal and the following information was provided:

- The proposed towers are east of the canal ESA, limiting any shading to morning hours;
- The noise is generated by the transfer of plastics from the silos into the building. The applicant will meet with the area residents to discuss the noise issue;
- The industrial noise level coming from the manufacturing facility meets the City's bylaw requirements and that noise bylaw staff have not received any noise complaints; and
- No pipes or mechanics that generate noise external to the enclosures are being planned.

Correspondence was received from Ben and Betty Baerg. Ms. Baerg also addressed the Panel with the following comments:

- She made a previous noise complaint when the facility expanded several years ago;
- The noise is not limited to the ground level and can be heard throughout their property;
- She is concerned that additional silos will increase the noise level and suggested that the applicant make an enclosure or a building configuration to mitigate the noise; and
- She has talked with a representative of Layfield Plastics who was willing to work with the residents regarding the noise issue.

The Panel reiterated that the applicant should discuss the noise issue with the residents and maximum efforts should be made to mitigate the noise coming from the manufacturing facility.

Subsequent to the Panel meeting, Mr. Lauren Walker, Director of Corporate Engineering, Layfield Plastics met with Mr. & Mrs. Baerg and committed to making reasonable measures to locate and reduce the noise from the plant with the help of the appropriate professionals.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DV 10-542375 – PROVINCIAL RENTAL HOUSING CORPORATION – 8180 ASH STREET
(July 27, 2011 and February 16, 2011)

The Panel considered an application to vary minimum lot width and minimum lot frontage to permit subdivision of 8180 Ash Street into six (6) lots zoned “Single Detached (RS1/B)” for the purpose of developing affordable single-family dwellings.

Retired architect, Julio Gomberoff and Naomi Brunemeyer, Manager, Regional Development, B.C. Housing Management Commission, provided brief presentations of the proposal, including:

- The size of the six (6) proposed lots exceeds the zoning bylaw requirement;
- The application was originally presented to the Panel in February 2011, and was revised to address concerns regarding the original driveway design. The new hammerhead driveway arrangement addresses the manoeuvring issue, allowing vehicles to turn around and exit the common driveway by driving forward, not backing out;
- Single-family residences would better suit the neighbourhood’s needs. The application presents an affordable home ownership opportunity for families and individuals with low to moderate incomes, defined as a household income of slightly below \$65,000 annually, and purchasers would qualify for an external mortgage;
- Income from tenants in small rental suites would help the owners’ finances;
- Research shows that it is usually young families who take advantage of affordable housing ownership opportunities such as those offered by the applicant, and that the owners are willing to spend more time living in their affordable homes;
- On-site parking was revised to be more generous in the current design scheme;
- BC Housing hosted a public Open House on June 21, 2011; and
- Building drawings could be reviewed by area residents before construction began.

The Chair noted that efforts had been made to address the issues of access, parking and manoeuvring of vehicles on-site that arose at the February 16, 2011 Panel meeting, and that the modified plans, including the hammerhead driveway design, appeared to be a good one.

In response to a query from the Chair, Mr. Gomberoff advised that the proposal exceeds the parking requirements with each Dayton Court lot accommodating four (4) vehicles outside of the on-site manoeuvring area.

Staff supports the development variance application and noted that:

- The proposed variances would facilitate subdivision of the subject site to accommodate six (6) single-family homes;
- There was no increase to building height; the single family houses would be built at the same density as other houses on Dayton Court, and the lot coverage was significantly less;
- The applicant had revised the plan since first presenting it to the Panel in February, 2011 in response to concerns from neighbours;
- Financial security will ensure the installation of landscaping in the emergency access; and

- The applicant is willing to submit the Building Permit information for review.

Mr. Bob Harrison addressed the Panel and complimented the architect on the design scheme and then stated that he thought four (4) or five (5), not six (6) structures were planned for the subject site. In conclusion he remarked that he wanted to: (i) see a proposal outlining how the proposed development would be sold; and (ii) hear an admission that the project was 'experimental'.

Mr. Henry Lim addressed the Panel with concern that the two (2) proposed structures adjacent to his residence would 'dwarf' his home. He questioned whether the height of the proposed structure is the same height as the residence across the lane, and queried how safe the alley would be for emergency vehicles using the lane.

In response to discussion with the Panel, staff provided the following information:

- The height of the proposed structures meet the zoning bylaw requirement;
- The requested variances allowed six separate lots at the subject site, but the density of structures is based on the floor area ratio, or square footage;
- A typical structure on Dayton Court is allowed to cover 45% of the lot, and in the case of this application, the structures on Dayton Court are proposed to cover between 26% and 33% of the lot, thereby providing more green space than does a typical Dayton Court lot;
- Due to the north/south orientation, the stepped down end of the proposed structure abutting the lane would face the lane; and
- The lane is for emergency vehicles only.

The Panel commented that the applicant had offered to submit building drawings for review by area residents to provide assurance, and the Chair requested that staff take note of the offer.

Ms. Janet Yeung addressed the Panel stating two concerns: to reduce the minimum lot frontage from 6 m to 0.38 m represented a large variance, and she questioned the veracity of the zoning bylaw; and although the scheme allows for cars to drive forward, not back out, onto the cul-de-sac, the subject site might accommodate 12 cars, and this number represents a safety issue for children in the neighbourhood who play street hockey, and other games, in the cul-de-sac.

The Chair explained that the City's zoning bylaw effectively addresses minimum lot frontage, but that the bylaw standards do not fit this case due to the limited amount of frontage on Dayton Court, making it difficult for this application to meet the bylaw requirement. The choice was between fewer lots to accommodate larger homes, versus a greater number of lots to accommodate smaller homes. He added that the built square footage of the structures would achieve the same density, regardless of the number of lots created.

Ms. Arzina Hamir spoke in support of the proposal and provided the following comments:

- There are some troubling issues regarding affordability of homes in the neighbourhood. The price for a home in her neighbourhood averaged \$700,000, and that families with young children find it difficult to afford such homes, and that declining enrolment in the area's public school attests to the lack of new families moving into the area;

- The lot use was creative with smaller size of the proposed residences and resulting size of green space;
- She wanted to see fruit trees included in the landscaping scheme;
- The neighbourhood has distinctive architecture, and expressed the hope that the applicant would design the proposed new residences to reflect the current architectural expression; and
- There are traffic issues in the area due to families having up to four (4) cars each, creating busy traffic on a cul-de-sac that features 35 homes, and she asked if a speed bump could be added, especially at the end of the cul-de-sac, where drivers are more likely to speed.

The Chair advised that before the City commits to the placement of a speed bump, Transportation staff assess the speed and volume of traffic at specific locations to ascertain if traffic calming is warranted. The Chair directed that Ms. Hamir's comment be provided to Transportation Department staff.

Correspondence was received regarding the application. In response to concerns expressed by the correspondents staff advised that: the proposed driveway apron allows cars to drive forward, not back out, onto the cul-de-sac, thereby improving safety in the neighbourhood; and (ii) each residential unit's one bedroom secondary suite would measure approximately 800 square feet.

The Chair provided the following information:

- Since presenting the earlier design iteration to the Panel in February 2011, the applicant had met with the community to participate in dialogue regarding the proposal;
- The project design was significantly improved with solutions for access, on-site parking, and manoeuvring vehicles from the hammerhead driveway design forward onto the cul-de-sac;
- The size and character of the proposed houses were more in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood, than larger homes on fewer lots; and
- The six (6) proposed residences provide advantages, such as landscaping elements, that four (4) larger residences may not provide.

The Chair requested that a Building Scheme for house design be registered at the time of subdivision, and that the applicant share design information with the neighbourhood.

Subsequent to the Panel meeting, Transportation staff contacted Ms. Hamir and will conduct a speed study in October 2011. If the results of the speed study confirm that speeding of vehicle is an issue, a neighbourhood survey will be carried out to solicit their feedback on the installation of any traffic mitigation measures. In the meantime, staff suggested to Ms. Hamir that police enforcement could be requested through RCMP via. 604-278-1212.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.