

Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Time:

3:30 p.m.

Place:

Council Chambers

Richmond City Hall

Present:

Joe Erceg, Chair

Dave Semple, General Manager, Parks and Recreation

Jeff Day, General Manager, Project Development & Facilities Services

The meeting was called to order at 3:31 p.m.

1. Minutes

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, March 2, 2011, be adopted.

CARRIED

2. Development Permit 09-504462

(File Ref. No.: 09-504462 (REDMS No. 3156726

APPLICANT:

Gerry Blonski

PROPERTY LOCATION:

11111 and 11131 Cambie Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

- 1. Permit the construction of 12, two and three-storey townhouse units at 11111 and 11131 Cambie Road, zoned "Low Density Townhouses (RTL3)"; and
- 2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - a) Reduce the required front yard setback from 6.0 m to 4.50 m;
 - b) Reduce the minimum required lot width requirement from 50.0 m to 45.0 m;
 - c) Reduce west side yard setback from 3.0 meters to 0.0 meters to allow for a self-containing garbage/recycling enclosure and mail area; and
 - d) Permit resident parking to allow a tandem parking configuration for 6 units (12 stalls).

Applicant's Comments

Applicant Gerry Blonski, Architect, 12468 82nd Avenue, Surrey, made the following remarks regarding the proposed 12 unit townhouse project located within the East Cambie neighbourhood:

- the proposed development includes a mixture of units in three separate building clusters, with one 6-unit cluster fronting Cambie Road, and two 3-unit clusters toward the rear of the property, thus reducing the scale of the project;
- access to the site is from Cambie Road, along the western side of the site;
- the site is raised to be at grade, or higher, than the adjacent road so that all drainage is maintained on the subject site;
- the outdoor amenity area is located at the entry of the site, and includes a gazebo, an open patio, benches, and a lawn play space for children aged two to five years;
- the two buildings toward the rear of the property are designed to provide a stepping down feature to minimize the potential for shadowing of adjacent residences;
- the majority of townhouse units face Cambie Road, thereby providing a street presence;
- building materials include: (i) horizontal vinyl siding along the bottom of the building's face; (ii) grey vertical vinyl siding along the top; (iii) stone clad columns; (iv) a fence in front of the property in the same stone material; (v) traditional gables; and (vi) the roof finished with black asphalt;
- the palette includes a combination of mellow colours to create interest;
- six of the proposed townhouse units have conventional side-by-side parking stalls, and the remainder of the units have tandem parking stalls; and
- stone patio space is a feature of some of the proposed townhouse units.

In response to a query from the Chair, Mr. Blonski advised that the upper storey vertical vinyl cladding is tan coloured, and the gable Hardi-panels are brown, with light sandy coloured trim.

Clark Kavolinas, Landscape Architect, CJK Landscape Architecture, Abbotsford, described the following landscape details:

- hard and soft landscaping features are provided in and around the patio spaces;
- a Cedar hedge is used along the perimeter of the subject site;
- 14 new trees are to be planted on the subject site;
- the play structure in the outdoor amenity space is to be fenced off;
- four street trees facing Cambie Road are to be retained and will provide street presence; and
- a hedge on the outside of the fence around the perimeter provides for a better street appearance.

Panel Discussion

A discussion ensued between the Panel, Mr. Blonski and Mr. Kavolinas, regarding the amenity area, and the following advice was provided:

- the outdoor amenity area includes a gazebo, benches, a grassed area, and a hard surface area; and
- for small children, a play area will be adjacent to the hard surface area and will include a rubber mat surface, a "bouncy" feature, and a small slide.

Mr. Blonski advised that the play structure specification does not appear in the staff report but that he is prepared to work with City staff to make these design arrangements.

In response to a query regarding the trees that face Cambie Road, Mr. Kavolinas advised that four City trees already exist at the Cambie side of the subject site, and that four new trees, plus a Cedar hedge, are to be added onsite at the Cambie side, providing a double row of trees, to enhance the buffer to the subject site.

In response to a further query regarding the provision of features for aging-in-place, Mr. Blonski advised that the design scheme includes one adaptable suite, and that the scheme could easily include the provision of grab bars and lever handles. He stated that he is willing to include these features in each of the proposed townhouse units.

The Chair queried what design changes had occurred as a result of concerns raised by two Mellis Drive residents when the rezoning application for the project went to the June 20, 2009 Public Hearing. In response Mr. Blonski explained that:

- there are now three separate building clusters, and the height of the end units for each building cluster was stepped down, from 3 stories, to 2 stories, to address any overlook concerns from adjacent single-family home residents;
- the larger windows in the proposed townhouse units face toward the internal drive aisle and not toward the adjacent single-family home residences; and
- the garbage and recycling enclosure, located close to the entry of the complex, is lower than the height of the fence that is to run along the perimeter of the subject site.

Staff Comments

Brian J. Jackson, Director of Development, advised that staff supports the application, and noted that all of the requested variances were identified when the Planning Committee considered the rezoning application.

Mr. Jackson stated that during the rezoning application phase, the applicant was asked if he would consider buying the single-family properties to the east and the west of the subject site, and that the current owners of those single-family properties had indicated their disinterest in selling at this time. Mr. Jackson added that there are cross access easements with these neighbouring properties.

Mr. Jackson provided the following additional information:

- since the original application was submitted by the applicant, the configuration of the rear units has changed, and now features two structures at the rear of the subject site;
- the new configuration covers approximately 50% of the site along the rear, leaving approximately 50% open space for the Mellis Street residents along the rear, and the earlier configuration covered between 80 and 90% of the space;
- there is no height variance requested as the buildings are lower than permitted and stepped down to two storey along the rear; the second storey of these units includes only limited overlook from two bedrooms; and
- a Cedar hedge, and other landscaping of the side yards of the two two-storey units along the rear, would create privacy for the single-family home residents; in addition, the private patio space for the two 2-storey units are to the side, not the back, of the subject site.

Mr. Jackson concluded that the applicant has responded to concerns raised by Mellis Drive neighbours by making design changes.

In response to a query from the Chair regarding whether a specific request had been made of the applicant at the July, 2009 Public Hearing to redesign the project, Mr. Jackson advised that no specific request by Council of that nature had been received by the applicant. The applicant had responded to the two written submissions from Mellis Drive residents.

Gallery Comments

Ron Trenkel, 11148 Mellis Drive advised that he had concerns related to: (i) shadows falling across his property as a result of the neighbouring townhouse units; (ii) the difference in grade, and the potential for rain run off from the subject site pooling on his property; and (iii) the types of trees to be planted on the subject site and whether they will become overgrown due to a lack of maintenance. He noted that, since the applicant had redesigned the project, privacy provision for the surrounding residents was better.

With regard to the issue of shadowing and shading, Mr. Blonski advised that: (i) there would be no shadows in summer; and (ii) a maximum of 41 to 45 degrees of shadows would fall at the height of summer, but only within the perimeters of the subject site.

With regard to the drainage issue, the Chair advised that all site drainage would be maintained on the applicant's property, and that City bylaws require a retaining wall, to have perimeter drainage collect all drainage from the site on the site. He advised Mr. Trenkel that the subject site would not shed water onto his Mellis Drive property.

With regard to trees and tree maintenance, Mr. Kavolinas advised that: (i) trees chosen for back yards were Yellow Flowering Magnolia, a smaller tree variety, as well as a small Red Maple that would hold its columnar shape. He added that he would look at the landscape design scheme to determine if the Maple should stay, or if there should be three Magnolias.

The Panel commented that residents usually provide tree maintenance because it is in their best interest to not allow trees to become too large, and it was noted that a regular maintenance program on the subject site's trees would have to be done.

The Chair advised Mr. Trenkel that the applicant had stated willingness to look again at the landscape design, with regard to adjustments.

Correspondence

Mr. Jackson advised that there were three pieces of correspondence received as a result of notification of the Development Permit Panel meeting, as well as two pieces of correspondence received as a result of notification of the July 20, 2009 Public Hearing.

Mr. Jackson itemized the correspondence:

- Anne Lerner, 12633 No. 2 Road (Schedule 1) addressed:
 - (i) adherence of minimum lot width; and (ii) potential for crowding the sidewalk if the reduced front yard setback was granted.

Mr. Jackson advised that all variances, including lot width and set backs, were identified during the rezoning application process. He noted that the applicant had responded in an appropriate fashion to similar concerns raised during the July, 2009 Public Hearing. And he added that the applicant had offered to purchase the properties to the east and to the west of the subject site.

- <u>Letter signed by:</u> Felix Kam Chun Tam, Cecilia Yuen Ching Ngai, Clara Kar Kei Tam, 11120 Mellis Drive (Schedule 2) addressed:
 - (i) the potential for the proposed townhouse units to block one third of the view from the Mellis Road back yards; (ii) the reduction of the front yard set back; and (iii) noise created during the construction phase.

Mr. Jackson advised that the construction phase has not started, but that the subject site has been pre-loaded. The applicant and the contractor will be given copies of the City's Good Neighbour Policy, and advised to be considerate of the neighbours and to adhere to the City's permitted hours of operation.

Mr. Jackson noted that if the applicant and contractor distributed business cards, complete with telephone numbers, to the neighbours, anyone concerned with noise or vibrations during the construction phase, could then call those directly involved with the project to lodge a complaint.

Ken Sodhi, 6885 Rockford Place, Delta, advised the Panel that he was the project's contractor, and that before the pre-load, he had met with, and distributed his business card to, Cambie Road residents adjacent to the subject site, but had not met with Mellis Drive residents.

The Chair advised that the Panel expected that the City's bylaws be adhered to, with respect to such details as hours of construction. He reiterated that the applicant and contractor would be supplied with the Good Neighbour Policy so that residents have access to project personnel, as well as access to City staff.

- Letter signed by: Ron Trenkel, 11148 Mellis Drive, Mr. Tam, 11120 Mellis Drive,
 G. Ten-Pow, 11140 Mellis Drive, Mrs. Garg, 11128 Mellis Drive, and D. Pooransingh, 11160 Mellis Drive (Schedule 3) addressed:
 - (i) potential for casting shadows onto Mellis Drive properties; (ii) the potential for pooling water on neighbouring sites if the subject site is above their grade; and (iii) requested set backs.

Mr. Jackson advised that the applicant has responded to the issue of building height by lowering the height of the end units for each building cluster. He noted that Mr. Blonski had paid attention to the shading issue and that no shadowing would occur during the summer months.

Mr. Jackson noted that with regard to the issue of water run off, City bylaws require a retaining wall around the perimeter of the subject site to have perimeter drainage to keep all drainage on the subject site, not neighbouring sites.

Mr. Jackson stated that: (i) setbacks are being reduced in the front yard, and there is no setback relief being sought at the back of the property; and (ii) setbacks are being reduced on the west side to allow for the garbage/recycling enclosure, and the mail area, but no setback relief is being sought on the east side of the subject site.

- Ron Trenkel, 11148 Mellis Drive (submitted prior to the July, 2009 Public Hearing) addressed:
 - (i) the appropriateness of a 12 unit townhouse complex when there are fairly new single detached dwellings along the street; (ii) grade difference, and drainage issues onto adjacent properties; and (iii) proximity of townhouses to the property, and the proposed height of the townhouses, and whether they pose a risk of privacy to the rear yards of the immediate neighbours;

Mr. Jackson noted that these concerns had been discussed earlier when Mr. Trenkel addressed the Panel.

- Ms. Whitley Ten-Pow, 11140 Mellis Drive (submitted prior to the July, 2009 Public Hearing) addressed:
 - (i) the distance between the proposed building and the shared property line; (ii) grade increases and the risk of drainage flowing onto adjacent properties; and (iii) buildings should be no more than two stories, as taller ones would be out of line with adjacent dwellings.

Mr. Jackson stated that: (i) there is a minimum distance of ten feet from the property line from the side of the townhouses that back onto the backyards of Mellis Drive neighbours; and (ii) since the July 2009 Public Hearing, the applicant had made design changes to the proposed project.

Panel Discussion

The Chair requested that, before the development application goes forward to a Council meeting, the applicant provide specification for:

- the proposed play equipment;
- the proposed aging-in-place features in each of the townhouse units; and
- the review of landscaping elements in rear yards with adjacent neighbours.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

- 1. Permit the construction of 12, two and three-storey townhouse units at 11111 and 11131 Cambie Road, zoned "Low Density Townhouses (RTL3)"; and
- 2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - a) Reduce the required front yard setback from 6.0 m to 4.50 m;
 - b) Reduce the minimum required lot width requirement from 50.0 m to 45.0 m;
 - c) Reduce west side yard setback from 3.0 meters to 0.0 meters to allow for a self-containing garbage/recycling enclosure and mail area; and
 - d) Permit resident parking to allow a tandem parking configuration for 6 units (12 stalls).

CARRIED

3. New Business

It was moved and seconded

That the Development Permit Panel meeting tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, March 30, 2011 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, April 13, 2011.

CARRIED

4. Date Of Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 13, 2011

5. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:09 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, March 16, 2011.

Joe Erceg Chair

Sheila Johnston Committee Clerk Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on Wednesday, March 16, 2011.

10.0000	mahittetti	r satimit La u
Date: //	AR.1	6,2011
Item #	2	
Re: Of	09-	504467
		•

Hage 1 of 1

DW.

GJ KY

DB

INT

CityClerk

From:

anne lerner [annel200@yahoo.com]

Sent:

March 15, 2011 4:01 PM

To:

CityClerk

Subject:

Development Permit Panel Meeting March 16

Categories: UCRS CODE / FILE NUMBER: 08-4105-20-DP 2010 504462

DP 10-504462

Please include my comments at the hearing. My concern is with precedence of the council's relevance and control in Richmond becoming diminished by actions of developers such as this.

It appears that the developer already has drawn up architectural plans that contravene the permitted city guidelines. To ask permission after the fact seems a ploy to pressure council to concede to the request. This is commonplace and erases the reasoning and thoughtfulness given to creating zoning guidelines. It's become a free-for-all for the developers. Where is council's backbone? 'No' must be brought back to your vocabulary.

The developers assume (based on historical evidence) that they need only bring their completed plans to council to be granted whatever variances they wish to maximize their profits at the expense of the city's appearance and function.

In this instance, the council should insist on maintaining the minimum lot width requirement. The loss of 5 meters (15feet) contributes to the (growing Richmond) appearance of a crowded (future) slum.

Council also should deny the reduced front yard setback. (Same reason as above. Buildings crowding the sidewalk, reducing the sky view, and give the appearance of crowded 'tenement' housing.

If tandem parking was deemed unacceptable, why concede this now?

Thank you for accepting this communication from me.

A. Lerner 12633 No. 2 Road Richmond, V7E 6N5



Schedule 2 to the Minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on Wednesday, March 16, 2011.

To Development Permit Panel
Date: March 16, 7011
Item # 2
Re: DP 09-504462
er determinent proportion en topologiste vice de region de se de region
Control of

11120 Mellis Drive Richmond; BC V6X 1L7 (604) 278-0381

March 11, 2011

Director
City Clerk's Office
City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Dear Director,

Re: <u>Development Permit DP 10-504462</u> (DP 09-504462) (File Ref. No.: DP 10-504462) (REDMS No. 3156726)

Since we will not be available to attend the Permit Panel meeting on March 16, we are writing this letter to express our concerns. We oppose to the proposed development from Mr. Gerry Blonski to obtain a permit for the construction of the 12 townhouses at 11111 and 11131 Cambie Road, and to vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500.

Firstly, as residents of the lot at 11120 Mellis Drive, the new proposed townhouses are going to block one third of the view, the east and south sides, from our back yard, and the sunlight that entering into our home.

Secondly, this is an outrageous request having to move the west side yard setback to 0 meters. When the self-containing garbage enclosures will introduce pest and bad smell, placing them so close to the edge of their lot could negatively affect the cleanliness of our neighbours' and our homes. Also, reducing the measurements of the front yard setback, the lot width and the west side yard setback would make the surroundings looking so cramped. This could result in the whole area to looking so crowded and affect the harmony of the neighbourhood.

Thirdly, the noise that was created during the construction will affect our daily lives as it did last year when they started the construction at the above site. The construction workers started their work before 7am for 6 days a week. During the construction, not only that the noise was very loud, the vibration created also shook our house like having earthquakes. This happened EVERY DAY for 6 days a week when they worked on the site. This seriously disturbed us as this affected our health and added stress to our lives.

Furthermore, having found several cracks appeared in our house after they finished the last construction, we suspect these cracks might be caused by the construction. As this is going to

MAR 1 4 2011

held on Wednesday, March 16, March 14, 2011 2011.

Schedule 3 to the Minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting

To Development	Permit Panei
Date: 17ABCH	16,2011
Item #	(1/ >
Re: DP 09-	504462

Richmond City Hall, Planning and Development Dept.,

We the undersigned have some major concerns regarding the proposed construction of the townhouse units at 1111 and 11131 Cambie Road. (Development Permit #10-504462)

- 1. We are aware of the configuration of the units, but still find having three story units will cast a shadow on our properties, 11120, 11128, 11140, 11148, 11160 Mellis Drive and leave us in the shade for a better part of the day.
- 2 Grade difference will certainly cause drainage issues onto adjacent properties. We have some issues now with pooling water after some prolonged rain.
- 3. If there is a grade difference a retaining wall be erected on the north property line to keep sand and gravel contained.
- 4. Set backs should not be reduced, we feel there should be proper spacing and breathing room between our homes and the townhouse development. We feel the enjoyment and privicy of our properties are being enfringed upon by the excessive height and encroachment to the property lines of this development.

Mrs. Garg 11128 Mellis Drive

D. Pooransingh 11160 Mellis Drive

be a big construction of 12 townhouses, we are worried that these cracks would be worsened, and will cause severe structural damages to our house.

Last but not least, these townhouses are going to change the view of the neighbourhood landscape, and in addition to the blocking of the view, it is going to cause the depreciation of the value of our home and the overall neighbourhood.

In conclusion, we are strongly against this proposal of granting Mr. Gerry Blonski the permit of the construction, and permitting the modifications of the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 as the harm that caused by the building of these townhouses outweigh the benefit for the environment, our neighbourhood and our house.

We truly hope you would take our major concerns seriously in making your decision for Mr. Blonski's requests, and we look forward to hearing your feedback.

Thank you very much for your time.

Regards,

Felix Kam Chun Tam

Cecilia Yuen Ching Ngai

year Mun Ely

Clara Kaf Kei Tam

Residents of 11120 Mellis Drive