Minutes



Development Permit Panel Wednesday, July 15, 2020

Time:

3:30 p.m.

Place:

Council Chambers

Richmond City Hall

Present:

Joe Erceg, Chair

Cecilia Achiam, General Manager, Community Safety Peter Russell, Director, 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 June 24, 2020 be adopted.

CARRIED

1. GENERAL COMPLIANCE - REQUEST BY HAMILTON HIGH STREET HOLDINGS CORP. FOR A GENERAL COMPLIANCE RULING AT 23100 GARRIPIE AVENUE

(File Ref. No.: DP 15-716274 Xr: DP 19-880533) (REDMS No. 6442201 v. 7)

APPLICANT:

Hamilton High Street Holdings Corp.

PROPERTY LOCATION:

23100 Garripie Avenue

INTENT OF PERMIT:

To consider the attached plans involving changes to the design of the proposed building and landscaping be considered to be in General Compliance with the approved Development Permit (DP 15-716274).

Applicant's Comments

Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects, with the aid of a visual presentation (copy on file, City Clerk's Office), briefed the Panel on the historical background of the proposed changes to the approved Development Permit (DP 15-716274) and provided an overview of the proposed changes, noting that (i) there will be soft and hard landscape changes in some areas of the site, (ii) minor changes are proposed for storefront windows on Level 1, (iii) the location of the HandyDART parking along the new road (Garripie Avenue) will be changed, and (iv) changes along the Westminster Highway frontage include, among others, the removal of the approved elevated paved walkway and addition of stairs.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Rob Howard, New Coast Lifestyles, advised that the removal of the elevated walkway that fronts Westminster Highway is proposed due to changes in traffic conditions which pose a safety concern for memory ward patients.

In reply to queries from the Panel, the project design team, including Ryan Broadfoot, HAPA Collaborative, noted that (i) there will be an opportunity for tree planting on the new landscaped berm on the courtyard, and (ii) the subject development complies with the City's previous sustainability requirement.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Wayne Craig, Director, Development, noted that the subject development would have been required to achieve LEED Silver Equivalency at the time of its rezoning application a number of years ago.

Staff Comments

Mr. Craig noted that (i) the applicant's presentation regarding the proposed changes to the approved Development Permit is comprehensive, (ii) from a public realm perspective, the proposed landscape change along Westminster Highway will improve the amount of landscaping and helps soften this edge, and (iii) the removal of the elevated paved walkway will not be a concern as there are alternative pedestrian routes available.

Gallery Comments

None.

Correspondence

None.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That the attached plans involving changes to the design of the proposed building and landscaping be considered to be in General Compliance with the approved Development Permit (DP 15-716274).

CARRIED

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 18-820689

(REDMS No. 6469416 v. 4)

APPLICANT: Integrated Construction

PROPERTY LOCATION: 1600 Savage Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

Permit the construction of a warehouse building at 1600 Savage Road on a site zoned "Light Industrial (IL)" and partially designated as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA).

Applicant's Comments

Wade Lundquist, representing the applicant, Integrated Construction, provided a historical background on the project, including events which resulted in the City's issuance of a stop work order to prohibit further construction on the site. In addition, Mr. Lundquist noted that the project has been designed to serve the operational needs of the business of the property owner.

Chris Lee, Aqua Terra Environmental Ltd., briefed the Panel regarding the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) on the subject site, noting that (i) non-native plant species are found on the small polygon-shaped central ESA which is surrounded by paved areas and separated from the larger contiguous northern ESA, (ii) the central ESA has a low habitat value, and (iii) the northern ESA has more opportunities for enhancement to increase its habitat value due to its larger size, contiguousness with adjacent off-site ESAs, and proximity to the Fraser River.

In reply to queries from the Panel, Mr. Lee acknowledged that (i) the proposed ESA enhancement scheme for the northern ESA would result in a net gain in habitat area with a gain-loss ratio of 2:1, and (ii) no changes have been made to the ESA enhancement plan previously presented to the Panel.

Larry Podhoral, Larry Podhoral, Architecture Inc., briefed the Panel regarding the alternative site plan that would allow for the retention of the central ESA, noting that (i) pulling the building to the south would significantly reduce the lot coverage and building floor area, (ii) the turning radius for vehicles would be negatively affected, (iii) the alternative site plan and building design and orientation would not be consistent with good planning and architectural practice, and (iv) the alternative site plan would not serve the functional needs of the business of the property owner.

In reply to queries from the Panel, Mr. Podhoral confirmed that the alternative site plan would (i) reduce the amount of vehicle parking area, (ii) result in conflicts with the shared access between the subject site and the adjacent property to the south, and (iii) increase the visibility of vehicle loading to the street.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Adrian Botez, property owner, stated that (i) he owns two separate business companies that will be located in the proposed building, (ii) the two companies have different operational requirements and would require two separate loading bays for efficiency and safety reasons, and (iii) the alternative site plan would result in an irregular shape for the building, reduce usable floor space, and not accommodate the operational needs of the businesses.

In reply to further queries from the Panel, the applicant and property owner noted that (i) stacking the spaces for window manufacturing and storage operations on two levels within the same building would not be feasible due to the floor space required for each business and the operational and height requirements associated with the manufacturing process, (ii) the net gain in habitat area as a result of the proposed ESA compensation scheme exceeds the minimum requirement, and (iii) the additional ESA on the northern ESA would more than compensate for the loss of the central ESA.

Staff Comments

Mr. Craig noted that (i) the applicant's proposed site plan, which provides cross access immediately to the south of the subject site, is the most efficient use of the site and provides the most environmental benefit, (ii) in response to a Council referral item, the Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) for the project has confirmed that the removal of the English Ivy from affected areas, including the ivy climbing the trees, will be part of the ESA compensation, (iii) all invasive species removal and ESA restoration work will be supervised by the project QEP on-site, and (iv) the project QEP has reviewed the planting palette for enhancement of the northern ESA and recommended that Lodgepole Pines not be included due to concerns regarding their survivability and limited growth potential on the northern ESA.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Craig confirmed that (i) the proposed expansion of the northern ESA by 305 square meters would more than compensate for the removal of the 198-square meter central ESA, and (ii) there will be a three-year monitoring period for ESA enhancements to be conducted annually by the QEP.

Gallery Comments

None.

Correspondence

None.

Panel Discussion

The Panel expressed support for the project, noting that (i) the applicant has reviewed the site plan previously presented to the Panel and considered an alternative site plan, and (ii) the proposed site plan and building design is appropriate for the manufacturing and storage uses by the property owner.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of a warehouse building at 1600 Savage Road on a site zoned "Light Industrial (IL)" and partially designated as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA).

CARRIED

3. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 18-835533

(REDMS No. 6397573 v. 6)

APPLICANT:

Mosaic No. 3 Road and Williams Limited Partnership

PROPERTY LOCATION:

9900 No. 3 Road and 8031 Williams Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

- 1. Permit the construction of a four-storey mixed use building containing 638 m2 (6,867 ft2) of non-residential uses on the ground floor and 33 secured market rental apartment units at 9900 No. 3 Road and 8031 Williams Road on a site zoned "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU44) Broadmoor"; and
- 2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to reduce the setbacks to No. 3 Road and Williams Road for the southwest corner of the building from 2.0 m to 0.0 m.

Applicant's Comments

Ben Nielsen, Proscenium Architecture and Interiors, Inc., with the aid of a visual presentation (copy on file, City Clerk's Office), provided background information on the proposed development, including its site plan and context, proposed architectural design for the building, exterior cladding materials, and building floor plans.

In addition, Mr. Nielsen highlighted the following:

- the siting of the project conceals the surface parking area and limits its overlook and shadowing on neighbouring properties;
- the four-storey mixed use development is located at the prominent No. 3 Road and Williams Road intersection and provides four commercial units at ground level and 33 secured market rental dwelling units on three storeys above;
- 42 percent of the rental units have two or more bedrooms that are suitable for families with children;
- 30 percent of the rental units have been designed with basic universal housing (BUH) features and all units have aging-in-place features;
- 28 of the units will be provided with Juliet balconies;

- a four-storey white brick corner tower element is proposed at the No. 3 Road and Williams Road intersection; and
- a right-in/right-out vehicle circulation is proposed.

Alexa Gonzalez, Durante Kreuk, Ltd., briefed the Panel on the main landscape features of the project, including (i) the public realm interface on the west and south sides of the site and frontage improvements, (ii) the variety of proposed surface paving treatments to assist pedestrian circulation, help identify building entries and parking spaces, and provide visual interest, (iii) the provision of an accessory structure containing secured bicycle parking, (iv) buffering along the north and east property lines to provide separation to adjacent residential developments, and (v) the proposed design, siting and programming of the common outdoor amenity area on the building rooftop.

In reply to queries from the Panel, the project design team including Elise Spearing, MOSAIC Homes, acknowledged that (i) the proposed Juliet balconies are not designed for residents to stand on, (ii) a significant number of market rental units are family-oriented, (iii) the site slopes down towards the northeast corner where a retaining wall is proposed, (iv) a variety of paving treatments would help soften the drive aisle and surface parking area, (v) the design of the vehicular entry/exit takes into account pedestrian safety and required turning radius for large and small vehicles, (vi) the applicant will consider upsizing the trees to be planted on ground level with consideration for not impacting vehicle parking and pedestrian circulation, and (vii) the design of electric vehicle charging stations for residential parking stalls would be appropriate for an outdoor surface parking area.

Staff Comments

Mr. Craig noted that (i) both driveway letdowns will be restricted to right- in/right-out only, (ii) the design of the letdowns will be done through a City servicing agreement, (iii) 42 percent of the market rental units have two or more bedrooms, (iv) the proposed setback variance due to the required corner cut road dedication at the No. 3 Road and Williams Road intersection was extensively reviewed and will not impact pedestrian circulation and vehicle sightlines at the corner, and (v) there will be a Servicing Agreement for frontage works and site services.

In reply to query from the Panel, Mr. Craig advised that the proposed size of the communal rooftop outdoor amenity area will compensate for the small size of the Juliet balconies and significantly exceeds the City's typical requirements for total common and private outdoor space.

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 a four-storey mixed use building containing 638 m² (6,867 ft²) of non-residential uses on the ground floor and 33 secured market rental apartment units at 9900 No. 3 Road and 8031 Williams Road on a site zoned "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU44) Broadmoor"; and
- 2. vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to reduce the setbacks to No. 3 Road and Williams Road for the southwest corner of the building from 2.0 m to 0.0 m.

CARRIED

- 4. Date of Next Meeting: July 29, 2020
- 5. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:37 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, July 15, 2020.

Joe Erceg	Rustico Agawin
Chair	Committee Clerk