



Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, June 15, 2011

Time: 3:30 p.m.
Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall
Present: Robert Gonzalez, Chair
Dave Semple, General Manager, Parks and Recreation
Victor Wei, Director of Transportation

The meeting was called to order at 3:34 p.m.

1. Minutes

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, May 11, 2011, be adopted.

CARRIED

2. Development Permit 05-299968

(File Ref. No.: DP 05-299968) (REDMS No. 3060378)

APPLICANT: Harco Homes Inc.
PROPERTY LOCATION: 7560/7580 No. 2 Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of six (6) townhouse units at 7560/7580 No. 2 Road on a site zoned Medium Density Townhouse (RTM1); and
2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - a) reduce the south side yard setback from 3.0 m to 2.43 m for a single-storey electrical closet attached to the front building;
 - b) reduce the lot coverage for landscaping with live plant material from 30% to 25%; and
 - c) allow a total of eight (8) tandem parking spaces in four (4) townhouse units.

Applicant's Comments

Matthew Cheng, Matthew Cheng Architects, advised that David Rose, Landscape Architect with PD GROUP, accompanied him. Mr. Cheng then gave a brief presentation on the proposed six townhouse units on No. 2 Road and drew the panel's attention to the following details:

- the unit layout plan has two rows of units, with 2 two-storey units at the back, with a minimum 4.5 metre rear yard setback, adjacent to single family homes to the east of the subject site, and 3 three-storey units, and both end units stepping down to two-and-a-half storeys;
- front yard setback is 6.0 metres to accommodate a 3-storey building, and the rear yard setback is 4.5 metres to better interface with the adjacent single-family dwellings to the east;
- the south side yard setback of 2.43 metres accommodates a single-storey electrical closet in the 3.0 metre required side yard;
- the 6.7 metre width of the central drive aisle is a generous width for a proposed development of this size;
- the entire drive aisle features permeable pavers;
- the site's existing grade is approximately two feet below the level of No. 2 Road, with the units' main floors set at approximately 0.3 metres above the Road;
- a fence is proposed for the top of the retaining wall along the north property line parallel to the adjacent public walkway;
- to the south the existing hedge will be retained to minimize overlook onto the neighbour's property;
- at the east property line is a statutory right-of-way, that dictates an 18 inch maximum height for the retaining wall;
- a tree located on the adjacent property to the east will be protected as its existing grade, with the retaining wall pulled back;
- lot coverage for landscaping has been maximized by reducing the lot coverage for buildings to 34% from 40%, and a variance is requested to reduce the lot coverage for landscaping with live plant material from 30% to 25%;
- the architectural expression includes protruding bays, porches, and gables to match the single-family homes to the north; and
- Hardie siding and Hardie shingles are featured materials.

Landscape Architect David Rose added the following comments:

- a significant amount of the existing hedge on the south property line is being preserved at its existing grade;
- a hedge plus fence of approximately 6 feet in height are proposed to screen the development from the properties to the south;

Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, June 15, 2011

- a retaining wall on the north property line, plus a railing and pilasteres will allow visibility for the public walkway;
- the arborist report confirmed that one tree located at the main entrance to the site is old and in poor shape, and it will be removed;
- two children's play equipment elements are proposed for the outdoor amenity area, as well as a bench; and
- all patios will be covered with permeable pavers.

Staff Comments

Brian J. Jackson, Director of Development, advised that staff supports the application and that two of the variances (reduction of the south side yard setback and reduction of the lot coverage for landscaping with live plant material) would not be required if, after discussion by Council, changes to Zoning Bylaw No. 8500 are adopted.

Mr. Jackson added that the application went to a Public Hearing in 2005, and that as a result of discussion at that meeting, the application had: (i) reduced the density to approximately 0.5; (ii) reduced the two back townhouse units to two storeys from two and a half storeys; (iii) increased the separation between townhouse units; (iv) preserved the existing hedges; and (v) responded well to the issue of massing and articulated massing.

Panel Discussion

The Panel expressed concern regarding the issue of visibility of the public walkway connecting Chatsworth Road with No. 2 Road. Mr. Rose advised that low lying shrubs and other low plants are proposed in order to maximize visibility, for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. Mr. Rose added that the low plantings would be no more than 18 inches in height, and the visibility would ensure that drivers exiting the development's main entrance would be able to see pedestrians who were on the walkway.

Gallery Comments

Wilma Poirier, 6380 Chatsworth Road, stated her concern that the proposed retaining wall and fence between her back yard and the proposed development would throw too much shading onto her garden.

Discussion ensued between the Panel and the applicant, and advice was provided to the delegate that: (i) the fence would be erected on top of the 18 inch retaining wall; (ii) the fence would be six feet in height; and (iii) the fence would include a top lattice element that would bring the total height of the proposed fence to seven and a half feet.

The Panel noted that the proposed Cedar hedge along the east property line would grow, and that the applicant should work with staff to address the delegate's concern regarding shading prior to moving forward to Council.

Correspondence

None.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *Permit the construction of six (6) townhouse units at 7560/7580 No. 2 Road on a site zoned Medium Density Townhouse (RTM1); and*
2. *Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:*
 - a) *reduce the south side yard setback from 3.0 m to 2.43 m for a single-storey electrical closet attached to the front building;*
 - b) *reduce the lot coverage for landscaping with live plant material from 30% to 25%; and*
 - c) *allow a total of eight (8) tandem parking spaces in four (4) townhouse units.*

CARRIED

3. Development Permit 11-578116

(File Ref. No.: DP 11-578116) (REDMS No. 3214350)

APPLICANT: Balandra Development Inc.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 10531 Springhill Crescent

INTENT OF PERMIT:

To permit the construction of a single family dwelling at on a property at 10531 Springhill Crescent that partially encroaches into the 15m Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) buffer strip adjacent to the West Dike canal.

Applicant's Comments

Clive Alladin, President, Balandra Development Inc., advised that he proposed to develop a new single-family residence adjacent to the west dike, and provided the following details:

- the site encroaches approximately 15 metres into an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) buffer strip adjacent to the ditch canal that runs along the inside of the west dike;
- there are a number of other lots in the area of the west dike that also encroach into the ESA;

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, June 15, 2011**

- a number of features minimize the impact of the encroachment, including: (i) planting native plants in a 600 square feet area between the western property line and an existing retaining wall adjacent to the dike ditch canal; (ii) planting 100% native species within the Riparian Management Area of the site; (iii) all shrubs to be planted within the front boulevard conform to the City's Boulevard Maintenance Regulation Bylaw; and (iv) overall plant site coverage of 41%.
- the arborist report recommends the removal of two trees in the back yard of the subject site, due to improper pruning techniques;
- the two removed trees will be replaced by five trees, with two of the replacement trees located in the rear yard and three trees located in the front yard; and
- the applicant plans to use: (i) a geothermal system; (ii) energy efficient appliances; and (iii) energy efficient heating and air conditioning systems.

Staff Comments

Mr. Jackson advised that staff supports the application, and he noted that it was submitted in May, 2011, and the applicant had responded quickly to aspects of the proposed development as identified by staff.

Mr. Jackson added that the applicant has ensured the use of native plants and trees.

In response to a query from the Chair, Mr. Jackson advised that the proposed residence's setback is consistent with setbacks in the neighbourhood.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Semple commended the applicant on responding to the unique environment of the subject site.

Correspondence

Larry and Annemarie Biggar, 10471 Springhill Crescent, Richmond (Schedule 1)

Mr. Jackson advised that the letter from the Biggars was in support of the application.

Kelly Knutsen, 10520 Springhill Crescent, Richmond (Schedule 2)

Mr. Jackson advised that the correspondent's concern was with the impact on the ESA, and that staff will open the files regarding the proposed development to the correspondent, and advised that the applicant has responded well to the encroachment in the ESA.

Gallery Comments

None

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, June 15, 2011**

Panel Discussion

The Chair commented favourably on the application and stated that he hoped more builders would take the lead on this type of environmentally sound development project.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of a single family dwelling at on a property at 10531 Springhill Crescent that partially encroaches into the 15m Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) buffer strip adjacent to the West Dike canal.

CARRIED

4. New Business

None.

5. Date Of Next Meeting: Wednesday, June 29, 2011

6. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:01 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 15, 2011.

Robert Gonzalez
Chair

Sheila Johnston
Committee Clerk

Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the
Development Permit Panel meeting
held on Wednesday, June 15, 2011.

Mayor and Councillors

To Development Permit Panel
Date: <u>June 15, 2011</u>
Item # <u>3</u>
Re: <u>11-578116</u>

From: Larry Biggar [Larry@gobiggargohome.com]
Sent: June 13, 2011 11:34 AM
To: Mayor and Councillors
Cc: Brownlee, David
Subject: development permit

Categories: UCRS CODE / FILE NUMBER: 08-4105-20-2011578116

Mayor and Councillors and Mr. D. Brownlee:

We live at 10471 Springhill Cres. Richmond which backs onto the West Dyke and is 2 homes to the North of the Development Permit application by Balandra Development Inc. at 10351 Springhill Cres. We wish to express our support for the application put forth by Balandra since we believe the new home will be a welcome addition to our street and the encroachment will not impact the environmentally sensitive zone which we are all familiar with on that side of the street.

Thank you for recording our support in this matter.
Sincerely:

Larry Biggar and Annemarie Biggar

Schedule 2 to the Minutes of the
Development Permit Panel meeting
held on Wednesday, June 15, 2011.

10520 Springhill Crescent
Richmond, BC
V7E 1K6

To Development Permit Panel	
Date:	<u>JUN 15, 2011</u>
Item #	<u>3</u>
Re:	<u>11-578116</u>

June 13, 2011

City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC
V6Y 2C1

Attn: David Weber, Director, City Clerk's Office

Re: **Notice of Application for Variance**
Development Permit DP 11-578116 Refers

I am presently aware of an on-going and contentious issue by Balandra Development Inc. to request a variance in relation to a dwelling they wish to construct at 10531 Springhill Crescent, Richmond, BC.

I strongly oppose this application as I feel it is in direct contravention of numerous planning principles. This may include the degradation and removal of green space within the City of Richmond. The OCP clearly defines green space as being a priority and this enhances overall quality of life benefits. It appears evident to me that Balandra Development Inc. is clearly looking at this as a business venture, while the citizens of Richmond are being impacted by forfeiting their parks and green space.

As you may be aware, the West Dike canal is enjoyed by thousands of people yearly and by having this structure encroach onto the ESA, it only minimizes the importance of these protected areas. Has anybody completed an environmental study to determine if any impact exists in relation to this variance application? These ESA areas were designed for a purposes and I would wish that these would be respected, not only now, but for the benefit of future generations.

Respectfully,

Kelly Knutsen
Kelly Knutsen

