



City of Richmond

Report to Council

To: Richmond City Council
From: Joe Erceg
Chair, Development Permit Panel

Date: June 19, 2013
File: 01-0100-20-DPER1-
01/2013-Vol 01

Re: Development Permit Panel Meeting Held on March 2, 2011

Staff Recommendation

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

- i. a Development Permit (DP 10-540948) for the property at 7491, 7531 and 7551 No. 2 Road;
- be endorsed, and the Permit 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 item at its meeting held on March 2, 2011.

DP 10-540948 – YAMAMOTO ARCHITECTURE INC. – 7491, 7531 AND 7551 NO. 2 ROAD
(March 2, 2011)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of 14 townhouses on a site zoned “Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3)”. Variances are included in the proposal for reduced front yard setback for portions of the upper floors, increased lot coverage, and reduced landscaped area. The project includes six (6) tandem parking spaces, which was initially identified as a variance, but no longer requires a variance under the current Zoning Bylaw.

Architect, Taizo Yamamoto, of Yamamoto Architecture Inc., and landscape architect, Allison Goode, of DMG Landscape Architects, provided a brief presentation, including:

- To address overlook and shadowing concerns raised at the November, 2010 Public Hearing, building height has been reduced to two-storey at the north and south interfaces, and the drive aisle is located at the north edge, providing a larger building setback. The decrease in building height results in the need for lot coverage variance.
- The outdoor amenity area is located at the south-west corner of the site, but a large Horse Chestnut tree in the area could not be preserved as it was in poor condition.
- Two (2) of the 14 units are convertible, and all other unit’s aging in place features, such as wood blocking in bathroom walls for grab bars and lever handles.
- The architectural character is reminiscent of row housing; and a combination of gables and hip roof forms lend articulation to the individual units.
- Building materials include: (i) wood batten; (ii) hardi plank shingles; and (iii) wood grain vinyl siding; a warm earth brown pallet unifies the development’s appearance.
- Trees are being retained on the west property line, and the 4 ft. high retaining walls are pulled back to protect trees on lots adjacent to the subject property.
- Soft plant materials cover approximately 24% of the site, and include a mixture of Evergreens, flowers, and perennials, and are in keeping with the single-family yard design.
- Permeable pavers are featured in: (i) several locations along the drive aisle; (ii) all of the visitor parking stalls; and (iii) adjacent to the mailboxes, garbage/recycling areas.
- A 6 ft. high Cedar fence is provided along most of the perimeter of the site to provide privacy for adjacent neighbours. A lower 4 ft. high fence will be used on top of the 4 ft. retaining wall.

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Yamamoto and Ms. Goode advised:

- The outdoor amenity area has a small paved area, benches, a picnic table, and an area for a small playhouse, appropriate for children aged 2 through 5 years of age.

- Head light glare from the drive aisle is mitigated by: landscaping elements; and 6 ft. high privacy fencing along the rear, and most of the two (2) sides of the site. The landscaping elements are placed as far east as possible, but when the strip of soil ends, the 6 ft. fence continues east, providing the maximum amount of privacy.

Staff supported the Development Permit application and requested variances. Staff noted that:

- The applicant responded to each of the concerns expressed by neighbours, including an increase in landscaping elements.
- With respect to the two-storey unit facing the neighbour living at 7475 No. 2 Road, the three (3) windows on the second floor of the proposed residential unit are not primary windows, but are a den window, a bathroom window and a secondary window. In addition, help to ensure the building separation from the wide driveway and the neighbouring home setback, any overlook issue is mitigated.

In response to Chair query, staff reported the reduction of the height of the proposed north end unit was undertaken to address the concern with density raised at the Public Hearing.

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

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.



City of Richmond

Report to Council

To: Richmond City Council

Date: June 20, 2013

From: Robert Gonzalez, P.Eng.
Chair, Development Permit Panel

File: 01-0100-20-DPER1-
01/2013-Vol 01

Re: Development Permit Panel Meeting Held on June 15, 2011

Staff Recommendation

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

- i. a Development Permit (DP 05-299968) for the property at 7560/7580 No. 2 Road;
be endorsed, and the Permit so issued.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. Gonzalez', written over a horizontal line.

Robert Gonzalez, P.Eng.
Chair, Development Permit Panel

SB:kt

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following item at its meeting held on June 15, 2011.

DP 05-299968 – HARCO HOMES INC. – 7560/7580 NO. 2 ROAD
(June 15, 2011)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of six (6) townhouse units on a site zoned Medium Density Townhouse (RTM1). A variance is included in the proposal for tandem parking. Two (2) other variances were identified in the staff report, but are now permitted under Zoning Bylaw 8500. These relate to a single-storey electrical closet projection into a side yard, and lot coverage for landscaping with live plant material.

Architect Matthew Cheng, Matthew Cheng Architects, and Landscape Architect David Rose, PD Group, gave a brief presentation on the proposal, including:

- Two-storey units are provided at the rear interface to single family homes, 3 three-storey units front onto No. 2 Road, and both end units stepping down to two-and-a-half storeys.
- Permeable pavers are used for all patios and the entire drive aisle.
- The site's existing grade is approximately 2 feet below the level of No. 2 Road, with the units' main floors set at approximately 0.3 metres above the Road.
- The architectural expression includes protruding bays, porches, and gables to match the single-family homes to the north.
- Hardie siding and Hardie shingles are featured materials.
- A tree located on the adjacent property to the east will be protected at its existing grade, with the retaining wall pulled back.
- Potential overlook to the south is minimized with retention of a significant amount of the existing hedge, at its existing grade, and 1.8 m privacy fencing.
- Visibility is provided for the public walkway with open fencing on top of a retaining wall.
- The existing tree at the main entrance to the site is old and in poor shape, and it will be removed.
- The outdoor amenity area features two children's play elements and a bench.

Staff supported the Development Permit application. Staff added that the application went to a Public Hearing in 2005, and that as a result of discussion at that meeting, the application had: (i) reduced the density; (ii) reduced the height of the rear townhouse units to two-storeys; (iii) increased the separation between townhouse units; (iv) preserved the existing hedges; and (v) responded well to the issue of massing and articulation.

The Panel expressed concern regarding the issue of visibility of the public walkway connecting Chatsworth Road with No. 2 Road. Mr. Rose advised that low lying shrubs and other low plants are proposed in order to maximize visibility, for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. Mr. Rose

added that the low plantings would be no more than 18 inches in height, and the visibility would ensure that drivers exiting the development's main entrance would be able to see pedestrians who were on the walkway.

Chatsworth Road neighbour, Ms. Wilma Poirier, stated her concern that the proposed retaining wall and fence adjacent to her back yard would shade her garden.

Discussion ensued between the Panel and the applicant, and advice was provided to the delegate that: (i) the fence would be erected on top of the 18 inch retaining wall; (ii) the fence would be 6 feet in height; and (iii) the fence would include a top lattice element that would bring the total height of the proposed fence to seven and a half feet.

The Panel noted that the proposed Cedar hedge along the east property line would grow, and that the applicant should work with staff to address the delegate's concern regarding shading prior to moving forward to Council.

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

Subsequent to the Panel meeting, the design was revised to address potential shading concerns along the east property line. The cedar hedging was changed to slower growing yew hedging and a lattice element was inserted into the top of the privacy fencings.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.