### **Minutes**



# Development Permit Panel Wednesday, June 13, 2018

Time:

3:30 p.m.

Place:

Council Chambers

Richmond City Hall

Present:

John Irving, Chair

Victor Wei, Director, Transportation

Peter Russell, Senior Manager, Sustainability and District Energy

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

### **Minutes**

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on May 30, 2018 be adopted.

CARRIED

### 1. Development Permit 16-728670

(REDMS No. 5828465)

APPLICANT:

Anwer Kamal

PROPERTY LOCATION:

6571 No. 4 Road (formerly 6571/6573 No. 4 Road)

### INTENT OF PERMIT:

Permit the construction of six townhouse units at 6571 No. 4 Road on a site zoned "Town Housing (ZT60) – North McLennan (City Centre)".

### **Applicant's Comments**

Eric Law, Eric Law Architect, Inc., noted that the subject development permit application was previously endorsed by the Development Permit Panel; however, the Western Red Cedar tree at the southwest corner of the site that was to be retained was accidentally damaged during the site preparation stage, which necessitated its removal and a change in the previously proposed site lay-out and landscaping plan for the project.

Mr. Law further noted that a significant change in the site lay-out includes the removal of one surface parking stall adjacent to the northeast corner of the internal drive aisle to allow for the relocation of the BC Hydro kiosk.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Wayne Craig, Director, Development, confirmed that the project was endorsed by the Panel to proceed to Council on September 13, 2017; however, it did not advance to Council for Development Permit issuance due to the landscaping issues that had occurred.

Jenny Liu, JHL Design Group, Inc., briefed the Panel on the main landscaping features of the project, noting that the large Western Red Cedar tree that was damaged will be removed and replaced with an equally large tree of the same species and will be located at the northeast corner of the site. Ms. Liu further noted that the trees adjacent to the replacement tree as well as on-site shrubs and perennials will be upsized.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Ms. Liu acknowledged that City staff had advised the applicant that the size of the replacement tree should be similar to the damaged Western Red Cedar tree.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Craig advised that the City will be requiring the applicant to provide a landscape security and withholding 20 percent of the security for a two-year period which is double the typical maintenance period.

In reply to a query from the Panel regarding the potential impact of locating the replacement tree close to the north property line, Ms. Liu confirmed that the applicant had not consulted with the residents of the neighbouring townhouse development to the north of the subject site.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Craig advised that (i) consultations are not normally required based on on-site landscaping, and (ii) residents of the neighbouring townhouse development to the north would have received notification for the Panel's consideration of the subject development permit application.

In reply to queries from the Panel, Ms. Liu acknowledged that the (i) the large replacement tree would be located as far away as possible from the adjacent townhouse building; however, its canopy could encroach into the neighbouring property to the north, (ii) the proposed location of the replacement tree is the northeast corner of the site, (iii) finding a suitable location for the large replacement tree is challenging due to the constraints of the site, and (iv) as an option, the applicant could install a smaller replacement tree and upsize the three adjacent on-site trees.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Craig advised that (i) the landscaping plan submitted by the applicant is largely conceptual and there is some flexibility on the exact location of trees proposed to be installed on site, and (ii) the applicant could consider relocating the replacement tree to the south side of the site adjacent to the outdoor amenity space or the visitor parking stall.

In reply to a query, Ms. Liu acknowledged that relocating the replacement tree from the northeast corner to the south side could be considered by the applicant.

In reply to a query from the Panel regarding the sustainability features of the project, Mr. Law confirmed that the project will comply with current City requirements for the provision of electric vehicle charging in residential parking spaces.

### **Gallery Comments**

None.

### Correspondence

None.

#### **Panel Discussion**

The Chair commented that with the proposed landscaping presented by the applicant, he could not support the project moving forward to Council, noting that the proposed location of the replacement tree at the northeast corner of the site is problematic as it would encroach into the neighbouring property to the north. He advised that the applicant consider the proposal to relocate the replacement tree along the south property line and determine its exact location.

In addition, it was suggested that the applicant consider either relocating the replacement trees farther away from the north property line to avoid blocking the southern sun exposure into the adjacent townhouse development to the north and disturbing the existing fence, or relocating the trees along the south property line adjacent to the existing green patch along the school driveway directly to the south of the subject site.

### **Panel Decision**

It was moved and seconded

That Development Permit application 16-728670 be referred back to staff and brought forward for consideration at the Panel's June 27, 2018 meeting, to be held at 3:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, City Hall, in order for the applicant to work with staff in considering options for relocating the proposed replacement trees along the north property line including locating the replacement trees along the south property line and identifying exactly how the root ball and drip line sizes of replacement trees would fit into the proposed landscaping design.

CARRIED

### 2. Development Permit 17-782861

(REDMS No. 5746584)

APPLICANT:

Konic Development

PROPERTY LOCATION:

5660, 5680 and 5700 Williams Road

#### INTENT OF PERMIT:

Permit the construction of six back-to-back duplexes at 5660, 5680 and 5700 Williams Road on a site zoned "Two-Unit Dwelling (ZD5) – Steveston/Williams".

### **Applicant's Comments**

Jiang Zhu, Imperial Architecture, provided background information on the proposed development, noting that (i) six duplex lots are proposed for the project, with each duplex lot containing a street-fronting and a rear duplex unit for a total of 12 duplex units, (ii) the duplex units have been designed to resemble a single-family home to fit into a predominantly single-family neighbourhood, (iii) the proposed setbacks, height and massing of the duplex units will not result in significant shadowing to neighbouring properties, (iv) the design of the duplex buildings has been revised to achieve variation in appearance, and (v) the existing Monkey Puzzle tree will be retained and relocated on site.

Meredith Mitchell, M2 Landscape Architecture, reviewed the main landscaping features of the project with respect to (i) increased permeability of the site, (ii) fencing design details, (iii) the proposed retention and relocation of the Monkey Puzzle tree, (iv) identification of pedestrian crossings and pathways through variation in surface paving treatment, and (v) choice of proposed planting materials on site.

In addition, Mr. Zhu noted that (i) three convertible duplex units are proposed, and (ii) the project has been designed to achieve EnerGuide 82 rating by providing, among others, air source heat pump units and introducing other sustainability features.

In reply to queries from the Panel, the design team confirmed that (i) the western duplex buildings are setback from the fence along the west property line by four feet, (ii) the applicant would consider the suggestion to extend the pedestrian walkways in the middle portion of the internal drive aisles northward to connect with the curvy walkways, (iii) Scotch Moss, a shade tolerant and low groundcover, is proposed to be planted in spaces between the property lines of duplex lots, and (iv) there are currently no back doors provided in the garages to access the condenser units but the applicant would consider adding back doors in the garages.

### **Gallery Comments**

Dan Rusen, 10079 Lawson Drive, expressed concern that the subject site, which is contiguous to his property, is unsightly as it is overrun with weeds, bushes and invasive plant species. He noted that the overgrowth of plants and trees in the subject site has damaged his backyard fence. He acknowledged that upon his request, the developer has cut down the plants and trees; however, they have survived and resumed growth. Considering the current condition of the subject site, he is requesting the developer, through the Panel, to completely clean up the site which is being inhabited by small wild animals.

In closing, Mr. Rusen highlighted the need for the developer to promptly act upon his request as the current condition of the subject site has devalued his property.

In response to the concern, the Chair advised Mr. Rusen to coordinate with staff so that the matter could be brought up with and addressed by the developer.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Ms. Mitchell advised that the developer could engage the services of a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) to oversee and monitor the proper removal of invasive species in the subject site. Ms. Mitchell further advised that as an alternative, she could oversee the removal of the invasive species as she is also the arborist for the project.

In reply to the same query, Mr. Craig noted that staff would work with the applicant to address the matter.

### Correspondence

None.

#### Staff Comments

Mr. Craig noted that there is a Servicing Agreement associated with the project for frontage improvements along Williams Road and site services connections.

#### **Panel Discussion**

The Panel expressed support for the project, noting that the applicant should work with staff to (i) consider providing back doors in garages to facilitate the maintenance of condenser units at the back of garages, (ii) consider extending northward the pedestrian walkways on the middle portion of the internal drive aisles to connect with the curvy walkways, and (iii) address the removal of invasive species in the subject property.

#### **Panel Decision**

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of six back-to-back duplexes at 5660, 5680 and 5700 Williams Road on a site zoned "Two-Unit Dwelling (ZD5) – Steveston/Williams".

**CARRIED** 

### 3. Date of Next Meeting: June 27, 2018

### 4. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:21 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, June 13, 2018.
John Irving Chair	Rustico Agawin Committee Clerk