



Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, January 25, 2012

Time: 3:30 p.m.
Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall
Present: Joe Erceg, Chair
Robert Gonzalez, General Manager, Engineering and Public Works
Dave Semple, General Manager, Parks and Recreation

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

1. Minutes

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, January 11, 2012, be adopted.

CARRIED

2. Development Permit 10-545013

(File Ref. No.: DP 10-545013) (REDMS No. 3362494)

APPLICANT: Western Dayton Homes Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 8540 No. 3 Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of eight (8) townhouse units at 8540 No. 3 Road on a site zoned Medium Density Townhouses (RTM2); and
2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - a) reduce the minimum lot width from 30 m to 27.6 m;
 - b) reduce the minimum exterior (north) side yard setback along Bowcock Road from 6.0 m to 3.0 m for Building 1 and from 6.0 m to 4.6 m for Building 2;
 - c) reduce the minimum interior side yard setback from 3.0 m to 2.09 m for the single storey garages along the south property line; and
 - d) to allow tandem parking spaces in four (4) of the townhouse units and five (5) small-car parking stalls in five (5) of the townhouse units.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Fougere, Fougere Architecture, Inc., spoke on behalf of the applicant and provided the following details regarding the proposed eight townhouse units at 8560 No. 3 Road, near Bowcock Road.

Using an iPad, Mr. Fougere drew the Panel's attention to: (i) a view of the exterior of the proposed townhouse units from the east, along Bowcock Road; (ii) a view looking west, and including the individual entrances of the units; and (iii) a view of the units taken from the standpoint of the No. 3 Road bus stop.

Mr. Fougere then noted the following details: (i) the two-storey building form includes a gable end to address the half-storey; and (ii) there is a window on the half-storey tucked into the roof form, where the attic family room is located.

Panel Discussion

Discussion ensued between the Panel and Mr. Fougere, and especially with regard to:

- the roof design is sloped but the architectural rendering perspective indicates a steeper slope than the roofs will have when they are completed;
- the fenced children's play area is adjacent to the sidewalk and includes: (i) play equipment for children aged two to six years old; (ii) a bench; (iii) an open grass area that is fenced; and (iv) includes a 'fall zone';
- fences, some planting material and a sidewalk separate the proposed development's structures from the single-family residence to the east of the subject site;
- the subject site is at a higher elevation than the surrounding sites, but the design includes stepping the grade up and does not include a change in grade at the property line;
- the applicant agreed to erect a new fence along the property lines, and not just refurbish existing fencing; and
- the design includes: (i) a side-by-side double car garage in each of the end units; (ii) an additional outdoor tandem parking space in front of four of the townhouse units; and (iii) four small-car parking stalls in five of the townhouse units.

The Chair commented that the play area's location at the north perimeter appeared to be hemmed in between the proposed development with just a fence separating it from the sidewalk. Discussion ensued with regard to the play area's location, and when asked if an alternative location was considered, Mr. Fougere remarked that in an earlier iteration of the design, the play area was sited at the back of the subject site, but the design had been changed to relocate it to its present location to address neighbour concerns.

Discussion continued regarding whether there was enough width for some landscaping elements to buffer the sidewalk from the play area, and advice was provided that the 'fall zone' precluded any landscaping.

Staff Comments

Brian J. Jackson, Director of Development, stated that staff supports the application, and the variances. He noted that the application is a small townhouse project, and that the architect has taken into account the concerns raised at the September, 2011 Public Hearing where the rezoning of the site was discussed.

Regarding the location of the play area, Mr. Jackson advised that the move to the north side of the subject site met with staff's support, and that perhaps a trellis with climbing vines could be incorporated at the edge of the play area.

With respect to the requested parking variance, Mr. Jackson noted that the request is reasonable, especially in light of the small size of the proposed development. In addition, two significant trees are being retained on the site.

Mr. Jackson remarked that the applicant has worked hard on how the project appears, from a No. 3 Road vantage point, and that the units' appearance is appropriate, given the character of the area.

The Chair commented that Mr. Jackson's idea to incorporate a trellis, with climbing vine, into the edge of the play area, was something the Panel would like to see.

In response to a query regarding the design of the play area, Mr. Jackson advised that the piece of active play equipment included in the design requires the inclusion of a fall zone, and that if the applicant had chosen a 'touch element' play area not an active play area, there was no requirement for the fall zone.

Gallery Comments

None.

Correspondence

Four residents, 8600 No. 3 Road (Schedule 1)

Mr. Jackson advised that the authors of the letter: (i) stated their desire that the tree at the corner of No. 3 Road and Bowcock Road be retained, and that the applicant will be retaining that tree; and (ii) requested that Smart Meters not be located along the subject site's southern boundary, but that the location of Smart Metres is out of the control of the City and the applicant. Mr. Jackson added that the City and the applicant, through the building permit process, would do what they could, so that the metres are situated in a location other than that addressed by the variances.

Panel Discussion

The Panel agreed that the active play area is preferable to a 'touch element' play area, and staff were asked to investigate provision of a landscaping treatment or vine planting with the applicant to lessen the exposure of the play area to the sidewalk, prior to proceeding to Council.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *Permit the construction of eight (8) townhouse units at 8540 No. 3 Road on a site zoned Medium Density Townhouses (RTM2); and*
2. *Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:*
 - a) *reduce the minimum lot width from 30 m to 27.6 m;*
 - b) *reduce the minimum exterior (north) side yard setback along Bowcock Road from 6.0 m to 3.0 m for Building 1 and from 6.0 m to 4.6 m for Building 2;*
 - c) *reduce the minimum interior side yard setback from 3.0 m to 2.09 m for the single storey garages along the south property line; and*
 - d) *to allow tandem parking spaces in four (4) of the townhouse units and five (5) small-car parking stalls in five (5) of the townhouse units.*

CARRIED

3. Development Permit 11-584276
(File Ref. No.: DP 11-584276) (REDMS No. 3361487)

APPLICANT: Southarm Lands Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 8691, 8711, 8731, 8751, 8771 and 8791 Williams Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of 31 townhouse units at 8691, 8711, 8731, 8751, 8771 and 8791 Williams Road on a site zoned Medium Density Townhouses (RTM2); and
2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to allow 30 tandem parking spaces in 15 of the 31 townhouse units.

Applicant's Comments

Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architect Inc., advised that the subject site is surrounded by single-family dwellings to the north, the east and the west, and that the architectural design of the proposed 31 townhouse units on Williams Road is in response to this context. He provided the following design details:

- the two-storey duplex units are proposed on the northern portion of the site, in recognition of the adjacent existing single-family rear yards, to minimize privacy and overlook concerns;
- roof form on the townhouse units along the back edge is a 'hip form', to minimize shadowing on surrounding single-family dwellings;
- upgrading of the buffer along the rear property line includes a line of fence/trellis, to protect the privacy to the neighbouring homes to the north;

Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, January 25, 2012

- tree preservation, including a large Cherry tree, will guide the amenity area strategy; the amenity area enjoys a central location;
- at the northwest corner of the subject site, there is a cluster of red Cedar, along with large deciduous trees;
- the whole entry feature has been unified as one permeable paved area;
- the central drive aisle creates an open feeling at the entry; there is some depth, as well as the introduction of some trees;
- there is potential for development to the east, and a garage feature at that end of the site provides cross-access, to minimize the number of people coming onto and leaving the subject site;
- a quiet open play area includes a slide and a climbing element, with mature trees as a backdrop to the area;
- there are two convertible units incorporated into the design;
- accessibility features that allow for aging in place have been incorporated into all units in the proposed development;
- energy efficient appliances and low water use plumbing fixtures are incorporated to conserve energy and water;
- materials include Hardi-Plank siding, not vinyl siding, and Hardi-Plank cement; and
- a rhythm of identity to the project is achieved by each unit having its own defined entrance.

Panel Discussion

In response to queries, Mr. Yamamoto provided the following information:

- retention trees include a cluster on the west side of the subject site in a passive amenity area, including Cedar, Maple and Weeping Birch, a transplanted Japanese Maple tree located along Williams Road, a large Cherry tree in the active amenity space, and a Norwegian Spruce tree in the northeast of the site;
- the play area includes permeable paving, as well as benches on the perimeter; and
- to create a buffer along the rear property line, a five metre rear yard, a fence, an added trellis, hedge and spot tree planting will be employed.

The Chair noted that the applicant had addressed the subject of privacy concerns, raised at the June, 2011 Public Hearing.

Staff Comments

Mr. Jackson noted the tight nature of the subject site and commended the architect for having done everything possible to address privacy concerns expressed by neighbours. The roof form was lowered and a generous five metre rear yard setback was provided.

Mr. Jackson stated that the size of the outdoor amenity area is double the required size, as outlined in the Official Community Plan requirements.

He noted that there are three locations where mature trees are to be retained on the subject site, and added that instead of the required 32 replacement trees, the applicant is providing 64 replacement trees.

Gallery Comments

Mr. Tsang, resident of Pigott Road, asked if neighbours would have a say in whether the construction permit would be issued to the applicant. He stated his concern with the same issues that had been raised at the June 2011 Public Hearing, such as townhouse construction, shadowing, noise, and setback between the proposed townhouse units, and residences on Pigott Road.

The Chair advised that: (i) the decision to permit townhouse units had been made during the rezoning process; (ii) the Development Permit Panel was charged with issues related to architectural character and form; and (iii) the bylaw requirement for a minimum three metre setback had been exceeded, with some proposed townhouse units sited at a five metre setback, and other units exceeding that distance.

Ms. Jen Chao, 8740 Pigott Road, expressed her concern with the 30 tandem parking spaces in 15 of the proposed townhouse units, and queried whether an exception was being made for the applicant.

The Chair advised that each townhouse unit has two parking spaces, some tandem, some side-by-side, in addition to seven visitor parking stalls provided throughout the site, and that these numbers meet the requirements of the bylaw.

Ms. Chao expressed concern that the proposed townhouse units would create more traffic in the neighbourhood.

Correspondence

None.

Panel Discussion

The Panel acknowledged concerns raised by neighbours and extended appreciation to staff and the architect, and in addition expressed support for the design, and noted that the architect and applicant had responded to the concerns raised during the Public Hearing. Support was also expressed for the way the rooflines were oriented, how the buildings were pulled back from shared property lines, and the plans for fencing to ensure the privacy of neighbours.

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, January 25, 2012**

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *Permit the construction of 31 townhouse units at 8691, 8711, 8731, 8751, 8771 and 8791 Williams Road on a site zoned Medium Density Townhouses (RTM2); and*
2. *Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to allow 30 tandem parking spaces in 15 of the 31 townhouse units.*

CARRIED

4. Development Permit 11-584282

(File Ref. No.: DP 11-584282) (REDMS No. 3414815)

APPLICANT: AM-PRI Construction Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 9811 Ferndale Road (formerly 9791 & 9811 Ferndale Road and 6071, 6091 & 6131 No. 4 Road)

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of 24 Townhouse Units at 9811 Ferndale Road (formerly 9791 and 9811 Ferndale Road and 6071, 6091 and 6131 No. 4 Road) on a site zoned "Medium Density Townhouses (RTM2)"; and
2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - a) reduce the required side yard setback along the north property line from 3.0 meters to 2.69 meters to allow the projection of an electrical room outside Unit C1b; and
 - b) permit resident parking to be provided in a tandem parking configuration for 15 units (30 stalls).

Applicant's Comments

Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architect Inc., advised that the proposed 24 townhouse units are on a left over corner of Ferndale Road and No. 4 Road, and that they are surrounded by single-family detached dwellings to the east, and multi-unit townhouse developments to the north, south and west. He provided the following design details:

- originally, access to the subject site was provided by access from the townhouse unit complex to the west, at 9751 Ferndale Road, but through the public process, residents of the complex to the west expressed a desire that residents of the proposed townhouse unit complex not use this access; the architect created as robust a buffer as possible between the two sites to provide some meandering, and to allow large plants and some depth;

Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, January 25, 2012

- the planned three-storey townhouse units are stepped down to two stories to respond to the lower density single-family residents to the east, across No. 4 Road;
- the tight nature of the subject site dictated different unit styles, thus allowing some affordability, and with some units allowing parking for only one vehicle;
- one of the proposed two-storey units is adaptable, with living areas closer to grade;
- all proposed townhouse units have aging-in-place measures;
- the overall architectural character is that of a subdued appearance, mirroring a similar form of the residences across the street, including more of a hip roof;
- the entry area is increased by allowing paving; the public space is located at the centre of the subject site, at the intersection of the drive aisle;
- a seating area with permeable paving and a climbing structure is also located at the centre of the subject site;
- each unit has a patio, trees, some lawn space where possible, and sun exposure;
- easy pedestrian access to the No. 4 Road transit stop is provided; and
- materials include Hardi-Board siding for the first floor and the intermix of vinyl siding and Hardi-Plank panels for the upper floors;

Panel Discussion

In response to Panel queries, Mr. Yamamoto provided further information:

- the end unit facing No. 4 Road has gables that address the street, large wrap porches to provide depth, and a bay window starting at the second story that comes down to ground level, and each unit facing No. 4 Road has a punched-in entry; and
- the amenity area at the northwest corner of the subject site is paved, includes benches, includes a small climbing play structure for children aged two through six years, as well as a lawn area on its south side, and some trees along its west side.

Staff Comments

Mr. Jackson advised that staff supports the application, and the applicant's request for variances. He stated that the application:

- respects the Agricultural Land Reserve to the east of the subject site, by providing a six metre setback and quite dense landscaping, which was reviewed and supported by the City's Agricultural Advisory Committee;
- in terms of architectural form, it provides low pitched roof forms that are low in profile;
- in terms of the central location of the amenity space it provides "eyes" on the play space and play equipment; and

- in terms of the proposed development's relation to the neighbour to the west, it provides landscaping buffering that breaks down what could have been an unattractive "bowling lane" design.

Mr. Jackson summarized his remarks by saying that the architect has done much to address issues of adjacencies, and for this, and the other listed reasons, the best term to apply to the proposed design is "respectful".

In response to the Chair's query regarding whether staff is advising applicants with regard to Council's preference to see side-by-side parking stalls in townhouse unit developments, Mr. Jackson advised that staff promotes that idea over tandem stalls, and attempts to steer applicants and architects in the direction of side-by-side stalls for new development applications.

Gallery Comments

None.

Correspondence

None.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *Permit the construction of 24 Townhouse Units at 9811 Ferndale Road (formerly 9791 and 9811 Ferndale Road and 6071, 6091 and 6131 No. 4 Road) on a site zoned "Medium Density Townhouses (RTM2)"; and*
2. *Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:*
 - a) *reduce the required side yard setback along the north property line from 3.0 meters to 2.69 meters to allow the projection of an electrical room outside Unit C1b; and*
 - b) *permit resident parking to be provided in a tandem parking configuration for 15 units (30 stalls).*

CARRIED

5. New Business

It was moved and seconded

That the Development Permit Panel meeting tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, February 15, 2012 be cancelled, and that the next meeting of the Development Permit Panel be tentatively scheduled to take place in the Council Chambers, Richmond City Hall, at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, February 29, 2012.

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, January 25, 2012**

6. Date Of Next Meeting: Wednesday, February 29, 2012

7. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Wednesday, January 25, 2012.

Joe Erceg
Chair

Sheila Johnston
Committee Clerk

January 16, 2012

To: Edwin Lee
Planning Department,
Richmond City Hall,
6911 No 3 Rd, Richmond, BC,
V6Y 2C1, Canada

**Schedule 1 to the Minutes of
the Development Permit
Panel Meeting of Wednesday,
January 25, 2011.**

To Development Permit Panel
Date: <u>JAN. 25, 2012</u>
Item # <u>2</u>
Re: <u>DP 10-545013</u>

Concerns on the Smart Power Meter House at 8540 No.3 Road

Hi Edwin,

Thank you for the info that you gave to me on the development of development at 8540 No.3 Road.

we ^{are} writing to you to address the concerns of the power meter house, or so called smart meter house. I am really concern about its radioactive leak. Please **do not** put these power meter house along its southern boundary which is the too close to its neighbours at 8600 No.3 Road.

Thank you for your help!

Best Regards,

- ① please keep the tree cut ^{big} No.3 Road of Bowcook (pine tree)
- ② the new townhouse is too close to 8600 town house (at least 3 metre rather than 2.09 metre)

16 *Al*

13 *Colin*

14 *James*

17 *[Signature]*

