



**To:** Richmond City Council

**Date:** July 17, 2023

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

**File:** DP 19-866690

**Re:** **Development Permit Panel Meeting Held on May 27, 2020**

---

### Staff Recommendation

That the recommendation of the Panel to authorize the issuance of Development Permit (DP 19-866690) for the property located at 5491 No. 2 Road, be endorsed and the Permit so issued.

Joe Erceg  
Chair, Development Permit Panel  
(604-276-4083)

## Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following item at its meeting held on May 27, 2020.

### DP 19-866690 – GBL ARCHITECTS – 5491 NO. 2 ROAD (May 27, 2020)

The Panel considered a Development Permit (DP) application to permit the construction of a six-storey building containing approximately 80 purpose-built residential rental tenure units at 5491 No. 2 Road on a site zoned “High Rise Apartment and Congregate Housing (ZHR3) - Dover Crossing”. A variance is included in the proposal to (i) reduce the minimum building setback from No. 2 Road from 6 m to 5 m, (ii) increase the maximum building height from 18.0 m to 20.3 m for the west portion of the building, and (iii) reduce the number of required parking spaces from 87 to 46. Consideration was also given to authorize the Chief Administrative Officer and General Manager, Engineering & Public Works, to execute a servicing agreement with the owner of 5900 River Road, to install road works and utility works along No. 2 Road City land and to relocate eight City trees from the No. 2 Road boulevard to a City Park.

The architect, Emily Brett, of GBL Architects and Landscape Architect, Daryl Tyacke, of ETA Landscape Architecture Inc., provided a brief visual presentation on the project, noting the following:

- The subject site is a 10 minute bus ride to the Brighthouse Canada Line station.
- A right-in and right-out vehicle entry/exit to/from the site is provided off the service road adjacent to No. 2 Road.
- The existing multi-use path to the south provides a connection to Dover Park.
- A portion of the building along No. 2 Road is raised to provide a gateway character.
- The architectural form and character of the proposed building fits well with neighbouring developments.
- The project incorporates several sustainability features and is required to achieve Step 2 of the BC Building Code; however, the applicant is targeting the higher Step Code 3.
- Several Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures are proposed to support the reduced resident parking.
- The proposed building setback variance from No. 2 Road will allow an efficient building layout on Level 1.
- The proposed building height variance is for the west portion of the building.
- All housing units incorporate Basic Universal Housing (BUH) features and four units are fully wheelchair accessible and are all located on the ground floor.
- The proposed 80 housing units have different affordability rates and includes some subsidized rental units.
- Proposed affordable housing unit types includes studio and one to three-bedroom units.
- The shadow study indicates minimal shadowing impacts on neighbouring developments.
- The west elevation has been visually broken down to provide an appropriate interface with the adjacent development to the west.

- Proposed cladding materials include, among others, cement panels with different textures.
- Two separate outdoor amenity areas are proposed for the project.
- Play structures are proposed for the children's play area on the north side to provide active play opportunities.
- The outdoor amenity area on the west side includes, among others, a large gathering space and an urban agriculture which is accessible to a resident in a wheelchair.
- Outdoor bicycle racks are located close to the lobby at the southeast corner.
- Street trees along No. 2 Road will be relocated to a City Park.
- Oak trees are proposed to be planted along the east-west multipurpose pathway.
- Planting will be installed to screen ground floor units.
- Low-level lighting will be installed to avoid light pollution, particularly to the adjacent development to the west.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Ms. Brett acknowledged that the proposed material and colour palette for the project will fit well with neighbouring developments.

Staff noted that (i) there are two separate Servicing Agreements associated with the project: the applicant is responsible for site services and minor frontage works and the adjacent property owner to the north is responsible for the relocation of eight street trees to a City park, (ii) the proposed development is being designed to meet the City's aircraft noise sensitive development criteria, and (iii) there will be a series of housing agreements registered on the property to secure the rental rates and tenant eligibility criteria.

In reply to a query from the Panel, staff advised that the timing of works in the Servicing Agreements will be coordinated with the construction schedule of the project.

In reply to queries from the Panel, staff advised that (i) the No. 2 Road improvements will improve the road geometry and enhance traffic safety of the proposed site access and on-ramp to No. 2 Road, (ii) the road works will improve existing conditions, (iii) the proposed number of resident parking stalls for the project are comparable to those provided by five similar developments referenced in the parking and traffic study, (iv) there is a comprehensive package of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures proposed by the applicant, and (iv) there is no relaxation to the required visitor parking spaces.

Peter Clayton, 702-5860 Dover Crescent, delegated to the Panel and expressed concern regarding limited parking in the area, which could be aggravated by the reduced number of on-site resident parking spaces on the proposed development.

In reply to Mr. Clayton's query, staff noted that (i) based on the study of the parking requirements of five residential developments in different locations having similar numbers and types of units as the proposed development, it was concluded that the proposed number of resident parking spaces for the subject development will be adequate, and (ii) the proposed number of visitor parking stalls for the subject development fully complies with the City's Zoning Bylaw and will not be reduced.

The Panel received several pieces of written correspondence. Correspondence was received from (i) Derek, (ii) Bev Turick, 5880 Dover Crescent, (iii) Andre Lo, (iv) Peter Clayton, 702-5860 Dover Crescent and (v) Laura Miller, 5880 Dover Crescent expressing concerns related to parking and driveway location.

In reply to these concerns, staff stated that concerns related to parking and driveway location in the proposed development have already been extensively discussed in the meeting.

Kate Ward, 126-5880 Dover Crescent, submitted correspondence expressing concerns related to vehicle access, setbacks, on-site parking, tree relocation and seismic safety.

In response to these concerns, staff advised that (i) vehicle access and parking have been discussed in the meeting, (ii) the proposed building setback variance from No. 2 Road is sufficient and the building will be designed to meet Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) internal noise standards, (iv) the eight street trees along No. 2 Road will be relocated to City parkland, and (v) seismic safety of the building will be addressed via the Building Permit.

A resident of 5880 Dover Crescent, submitted correspondence expressing concerns related to traffic safety, construction noise disturbance, and the general landscaping of the site.

In response to the concerns noted, staff advised that (i) traffic concerns have been discussed in the meeting, (ii) construction is regulated by the City's Noise Bylaw which specifies construction hours, (iv) a construction traffic and parking management plan is required to be submitted by the developer, and (iv) landscaping for the project has been discussed by the landscape architect.

A Richmond resident submitted correspondence expressing concerns related to site access, transit service, construction activity, existing trees, emergency services response, general safety and potential building shading.

In response to these concerns, staff stated that (i) the proposed development will be required to comply with all BC Building Code provisions including firefighting access, (ii) the No. 2 Road improvements will improve overall safety and sightlines in the area, (iii) potential shading impacts of the proposed building were included in the applicant's submission and staff report, and (iv) other concerns have been discussed in the meeting.

Fanny Yan, 407-5880 Dover Crescent, submitted correspondence expressing concerns related to traffic and a potential increase in criminal activity.

In response to Ms. Yan's concerns, staff commented that (i) the subject development has been designed in accordance with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) provisions, (ii) there is passive surveillance in all outdoor amenity areas, and (iii) the building will increase passive surveillance along its south and east frontages.

Karen Cho, Richmond resident, submitted correspondence expressing concerns related to the proposed variances for building height and parking.

In response to Ms. Cho's concerns, staff noted that (i) the proposed building height variance and shadow analysis were included in the applicant's presentation, and (ii) parking-related concerns have been discussed in the meeting.

A Richmond resident submitted correspondence expressing concerns related to parking, vehicle traffic, crime and safety, and tenant selection.

Staff noted concerns regarding traffic and potential crime have been discussed and commented that tenant selection process is outside of Panel's mandate.

Colin A. Lowndes, Colin S. Lowndes, Donna Z. Lowndes, Vincenza J. Lowndes (nee Nardiello), 516-5860 Dover Crescent, submitted correspondence expressing concerns related to removal of street trees, potential impacts on their views, building density, population density, and property values

Staff commented that street trees along No. 2 Road will be relocated to a City Park and that the other concerns mentioned are outside Panel's mandate.

The Panel expressed support for the project, noting that (i) the Panel appreciates the applicant's presentation, (ii) the project is well designed, (iii) although there is a height variance, the project will fit well with its surrounding neighbourhood as shown by the model, (iv) the project is consistent with Council policy to address affordable housing needs, (v) the Panel appreciates the proposed mix of unit types, (vi) the outdoor amenity areas enhance the livability of the proposed development, and (vii) the Panel supports the protection and relocation of existing street trees along No. 2 Road.

Subsequent to the Panel meeting the street trees along No. 2 Road were relocated to the Brighthouse Neighbourhood School Park.

The Panel recommends the Permit be issued.