



Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, May 14, 2008

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

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, April 30, 2008, be adopted.

CARRIED

2. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT DP 07-391424

(Report: April 23, 2008 File No.: DP 07-391424) (REDMS No. 2442888)

APPLICANT: Stanley Paulus, Architect

PROPERTY LOCATION: 10251 St. Edwards Drive

INTENT OF PERMIT:

To permit the alteration of the St. Edwards Drive facades of the building and the construction of a restaurant patio at 10251 St. Edwards Drive on a site zoned Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6).

Applicant's Comments

Stanley Paulus, Architect, stated that the owner, Northwest properties, had purchased the resort complex (built in the early 1960s) in 2005. The proposed scheme is a renovation improvement to the existing one-storey St. Edwards Drive building facades. The design would enhance the appearance of the façade by (i) the introduction of windows in the concrete block façade, (ii) the installation of a window box entry structure, (iii) the addition of a canopy, and (iv) a service yard adjacent to the main entry would be renovated into a restaurant patio.

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, May 14, 2008**

Mr. Paulus advised that the on-site health club's main entrance would include a curtain wall window box with an angled roof, and would continue with high quality materials, such as a steel and glass canopy, windows and bracket details. He further advised that a restaurant, sited beside the health club, would have a different façade treatment so that the two spaces would be differentiated. The two separate facades would be integrated into the design of the existing building. Mr. Paulus stressed that the goal is for the enhanced façade to add to the St. Edwards Drive streetscape.

In concluding his remarks, Mr. Paulus reported that a study of the existing parking layout, and the drive aisles, had been accomplished. The property line is located in the parking lot and the parking area extends out into Ministry of Transportation (MOT) land, and that the applicant has been told by the MOT to expect a letter before the end of May, 2008, that will confirm an agreement with MOT.

Staff Comments

Brian Jackson, Director of Development, stated that staff recommends in favour of issuing a development permit. He remarked that the proposed scheme would enhance the St. Edwards Drive façade, and that the applicant had responded to staff's requests for improvements to the vehicle access areas.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

Karen Henrikson, 10351 Caithcart Road stated that she was not concerned with the applicant's plan to change the St. Edwards Drive façade, but she voiced concern regarding an empty area on Caithcart Road that the applicant uses for access to the resort site, although the area is zoned residential. She noted that the applicant had covered the vacant area with gravel without constructing a retaining wall on either side of the area. In addition the elevation of the vacant area is higher than the lots on either side and as a result moisture would flow from the gravel surface, against the fences of the homeowners on either side of the area, creating rot and erosion of the fences. Ms. Henrikson stated that the affected homeowners would have to replace their fencing in the future, due to the actions of the applicant.

The Chair stated that during the Panel Discussion, the matter of the empty area would be addressed and that the Panel would ask the applicant to describe any long term plans for the Caithcart Road side of the resort property.

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, May 14, 2008**

Ron Davis, 10380 Caithcart Road stated that the empty residential area had, under the former owner of the resort, been nicely landscaped, but that the new owner had eliminated landscaping elements on the vacant area, had used gravel to cover the area, and used the area as a route for delivery trucks accessing the resort site. Mr. Davis further stated that he had entered into an email discussion with City staff regarding his concerns with the appearance and the use of the vacant area, and that the City had arranged to have concrete barriers erected to stop vehicle access.

In response to a query from Mr. Davis regarding the status of the vacant residential area, Mr. Jackson advised that the City is exploring having the area sub-divided and that, if the lot requires rezoning, a sign would be erected on the area, thereby informing the neighbours of the rezoning application process.

The Chair added that if Mr. Davis or other residents on Caithcart Road had further questions with regard to the vacant area, Mr. Jackson would be able to keep them informed.

Jim Males, 10420 Caithcart Road voiced concern that the resort's dumpsters, garbage trucks, recycled oil containers and other services would have to be relocated to accommodate the planned restaurant, and he questioned where these would be moved to. Mr. Males stated that the applicant and the architect appeared to have addressed only those elements on site that concern the resort's patrons, and had failed to address such concerns as staff's need to access the resort, to park, and to come and go throughout night shifts.

Donna Brkich, 10200 Caithcart Road outlined three concerns: (i) the resort's three restaurants would be staffed with shift workers and it was unclear if they would access the site from Caithcart Road or St. Edwards Drive, and the location of their parking stalls; (ii) Caithcart Road residents' homes and yards may face the resort's garbage bin area if the applicant plans to place all bins behind the resort; and (iii) the formerly landscaped vacant area, now covered in gravel, looks like a location to dump garbage and affects the appearance of the neighbourhood.

William Wong, 10168 Caithcart Road expressed the following concerns: (i) plans for three restaurants on site would mean more garbage bins and yet it is unclear where the service courtyard would be located; (ii) large trucks already service the now-open Cucumber Café and as the trucks access the site each morning he can feel his house shake; (iii) the architect did not mention the need for additional exterior lighting and Mr. Wong is concerned that more exterior lighting will be added on the site, in addition to the Café's neon light that is visible from his home and stays on throughout the night; and (iv) if outdoor patios are planned for the site, he is concerned that no mention of sound barriers, to prevent noise from patios migrating to his and his neighbour's yards and homes, was made.

The Chair invited Mr. Paulus, as well as the owner Bob Gagliardi to address the Panel and to discuss the five issues presented by the gallery speakers:

- (1) How the side of the resort property fronting onto Caithcart Road interfaces with existing residences:

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, May 14, 2008**

Mr. Paulus stated that of the two hi-rise towers on site, the North Tower is the one located closest to Caithcart Road homes. The laundry facility has been relocated to the north tower. There are interior vacant areas and an existing service area near the base of the north tower that the applicant plans to use to service the restaurant. The restaurant patio faces St. Edwards Drive. In the past the indoor tennis facilities, the fitness facilities and the parking lots have backed onto the Caithcart Road neighbourhood, and the applicant plans no change to this design.

- (2) The displacement of some service courtyard areas that currently exist on site, where they are to be relocated, and the impact on existing homeowners on Caithcart Road:

Mr. Paulus advised that the garbage bins and the loading area would remain to the north-east of the North Tower and that the area will not be unsightly.

In response to the Chair's query with regard to whether the applicant plans to apply for a separate development permit, to upgrade the rear of the property facing the residences along Caithcart Road, Mr. Paulus responded that he did not know if a separate application would be made.

Mr. Paulus further advised that the applicant was advised they could not use the vacant area, currently zoned residential, as additional parking, and for this reason he had applied to the City for a sub-division to create a lot. Mr. Paulus explained that should the sub-division application be successful, it would represent an opportunity to landscape the property lines and to create buffers between the vacant area and the residences on either side.

- (3) Filling the vacant residential area without installing retaining walls:

Mr. Gagliardi stated that the initial plan was to use the area as additional parking, but that City planners had advised that this was not an option for an area zoned Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E). As a consequence, he had the landscaping and topsoil removed, and had gravel placed on the area. He remarked that he was unaware that the elevation is higher than the adjacent properties.

In answer to a query from the Chair, Mr. Gagliardi responded that he did not believe the vacant area has a drainage issue. He added that the road accessing the service courtyard area near the North Tower has been repaved, that curbs and gutters have been added, and that cedar trees were planted.

In reply to a further query from the Chair, Mr. Gagliardi stated that the gravel on the vacant area does extend up to the neighbours' fences on either side.

- (4) Would the parking located behind the resort complex on Caithcart Road side be earmarked for patron or for staff parking:

Mr. Gagliardi advised that the parking spaces backing onto homes on Caithcart Road are not limited to staff, and that both staff and patrons would be using the spaces. The resort runs a program whereby people travelling out of the City are allowed to park their vehicles at the resort for up to a week. He added that parking for patrons of the restaurant is situated on the St. Edwards Drive side of the resort and not on the Caithcart Road side.

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, May 14, 2008**

- (5) The prospect of additional exterior lighting and its impact on existing homes:

Mr. Paulus advised that only after the Shark Club is developed would new exterior lighting be installed and he assured the Panel that the Club's proposed lighting would not face the homes of Caithcart Road residents.

The Chair stated that changes to lighting, as well as changes to garbage and loading areas, could trigger the necessity of a future development permit, and he advised the applicant that if the Panel supports DP 07-0391424, as presented, the surrounding residents must be assured that nothing outside the presented scheme would change without the application of: (i) a future development permit application, and (ii) another Panel hearing.

Panel Discussion

In response to a query regarding the number of parking spaces on the resort site, staff advised that the number of parking spaces exceeds the bylaw requirement. In addition, Transportation staff have worked with Planning staff to ensure that the improvements to vehicle accesses are acceptable.

In response to an inquiry, Mr. Paulus stated that the restaurant's outdoor patio was formerly the site of a service courtyard area, but that an arcade is planned so that patrons can park under the new arcade and proceed on foot into the restaurant area.

The Chair inquired whether the agreement with MOT would be forthcoming soon, and the applicant advised that the Ministry had indicated that a letter confirming the agreement would be sent to the applicant before the end of May, 2008.

With regard to the idea of the applicant enhancing the appearance of the rear of the resort site (facing Caithcart Road), the Chair stated that maintenance and upgrades, such as painting, repairing existing surfaces and structures, etc., could be done without the City issuing a Development Permit. He suggested that the applicant speak with neighbouring residents. The applicant responded that: (i) he would be happy to visit with residents, (ii) to respond to any calls regarding outstanding issues, and (iii) that it was not his intent to be a bad neighbour.

With respect to the sub-division application, the Chair requested that the Director of Development ensure that the applicant meet with those living in the neighbourhood to address the issues raised at the Panel meeting, as the issues are relevant to the sub-division application. The Chair encouraged the applicant to think not just about the façade renovation fronting St. Edwards Drive, but to also think of the interface on the Caithcart Road side, as well as the south interface.

In response to a query from Mr. Paulus, the Chair advised that, with regard to Phase II of the redevelopment of the resort site, and the applicant's plan to add a Shark Club (not part of Development Permit Application 07-391424), the Chair stated that the Director of Development would advise the applicant and architect with regard to the process.

Mr. Jackson advised that staff had not seen details regarding the proposed Shark Club. He stated that if the proposed scheme for exterior design elements exceeded \$50,000 a development permit application was required.

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, May 14, 2008**

In response to the Chair's comment, Mr. Paulus stated that it was not the applicant's intent to break down work on the resort site in a series of small sections, but that the applicant was eager to open the restaurant in the near future as the North Tower is open for business and there is no restaurant to service guests.

The Chair requested that the applicant investigate the renovation requirements for the proposed Shark Club, including landscaping elements, and to bring all required improvements forward for: (i) staff review and (ii) Panel's review.

In response to the request Mr. Gagliardi explained that the first phase of the development of the resort was to complete the South Tower, then to move onto the North Tower, which is serviced by the Cucumber Café, then to renovate the two-storey hotel room wings. According to this timetable, the applicant would propose to develop the Shark Club in 2009. He stressed that it was imperative to the business that a food facility be operating on site, and for that reason he applied to the City for a Building Permit for the restaurant interior.

The applicant repeated his commitment to meet with the residents living on Caithcart Road and to consider the stated concerns regarding: (i) landscaping, (ii) paving, (iii) and (iii) gravel elevation. He further stated that there are no plans to construct other buildings on the resort site, and that the planned Shark Club renovations are all interior upgrades. He concluded his remarks by stating that being good neighbours to Caithcart Road residents is motivation enough.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the alteration of the St. Edwards Drive facades of the building and the construction of a restaurant patio at 10251 St. Edwards Drive on a site zoned Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6).

CARRIED

The Chair directed staff to ensure that the applicant host a meeting with neighbourhood residents as a part of the subdivision or rezoning process for the vacant Caithcart area, and that the meeting take place before the sub-division and possible rezoning application is determined to ensure that residents who neighbour the resort site are aware of the applicant's overall vision for the whole site, and what is proposed to achieve that vision.

The Chair stated that the timing of the meeting would be left up to the applicant, but that the meeting should not be held prematurely, but held only when the applicant has all the necessary information assembled and ready for presentation to the neighbours.

3. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT DP 07-395965

(Report: April 16, 2008 File No.: DP 07-395965) (REDMS No. 2342324)

APPLICANT: Am-Pri Construction Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 7420, 7426, 7440 & 7480 Garden City Road and
9031, 9051 & 9071 General Currie Road

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, May 14, 2008**

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. To permit the construction of 45 townhouses with vehicle access from Turnill Street on a site zoned "Comprehensive Development District (CD/128)"; and
2. To vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:
 - a) reduce the minimum public road setback to General Currie Road from 6.0 m to 5.6 m for the southwest Building No. 4;
 - b) increase the permitted porch projection into the Public Road setback to Turnill Street from 1.0 m to 1.2 m for the northeast Building No. 1; and
 - c) reduce the minimum Public Road setback to Turnill Street from 2.0 m to 0.3 m for a pedestrian gateway structure.

Applicant's Comments

Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architecture Inc. commented that the design and location of the outdoor amenity space had been dictated by the location of the significant Oak tree on site.

He stated that to respect the existing single-family homes to the north of the site, an increased setback on the north side was provided, and that the setback variances were minor and intended to: (i) animate the façade and (ii) create more depth.

Mr. Yamamoto mentioned that a trellis open structure was situated where an earlier plan showed a building for the garbage and the recycling service area. Curbside garbage collection is planned, and a future garbage dumpster is accommodated.

The primary materials for the project include Hardi-plank siding, Hardi board and batten in two colours, and horizontal vinyl siding for base walls.

In concluding his remarks Mr. Yamamoto noted that the one adaptable unit was provided and could be converted to be fully accessible.

Staff Comments

Mr. Jackson recommended that the permit be issued. After review by the Advisory Design Panel and at the January 21, 2008 Public Hearing, the applicant had applied an acceptable design response. In addition, the applicant's landscaping design detailed the retention and replacement of existing trees. Mr. Jackson concluded his remarks by stating that staff supports the proposed variances.

Correspondence

Ying Wang (attached as Schedule 1 to these Minutes)

Sara Badyal, Planner 1, advised that upon receipt of the letter, Transportation staff had investigated the parking issue on Turnill Street, as raised by the correspondent. She reported that Turnill is currently a 'half road' and that it will be widened to a full road as a condition of the development. The City has installed no parking signs on the narrowed stretch to ensure that parking does not occur on both sides of Turnill. Ms. Badyal assured the Panel that the concern raised by the correspondent had been addressed.

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, May 14, 2008**

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

In response to a query, staff advised that along the north property line, the site will meet the grade of the adjacent lots that houses two existing single-family residences, and that a 1.8 metre fence will be installed in order to heighten privacy and to mitigate headlight glare into the adjacent homes.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *Permit the construction of 45 townhouses at 7420, 7426, 7440 & 7480 Garden City Road and 9031, 9051 & 9071 General Currie Road with vehicle access from Turnill Street on a site zoned "Comprehensive Development District (CD/I28)"; and*
2. *Vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:*
 - a) *Reduce the minimum public road setback to General Currie Road from 6.0 m to 5.6 m for the southwest Building No. 4;*
 - b) *Increase the permitted porch projection into the Public Road setback to Turnill Street from 1.0 m to 1.2 m for the northeast Building No. 1; and*
 - c) *Reduce the minimum Public Road setback to Turnill Street from 2.0 m to 0.3 m for a pedestrian gateway structure.*

CARRIED

4. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:50 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, May 14, 2008.

Joe Erceg
Chair

Sheila Johnston
Committee Clerk