



Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

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

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, July 13, 2011, be adopted.

CARRIED

2. Development Permit 10-545704

(File Ref. No.: DP 10-545704) (REDMS No. 3218163)

APPLICANT: Chen Design Studio

PROPERTY LOCATION: 7900 Bennett Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of two (2) back-to-back duplexes at 7900 Bennett Road on a site zoned "Infill Residential (RI2)"; and
2. Vary the provisions of the Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500 to permit a 0.5m building projection beyond the vertical height envelope.

Applicant's Comments

Xi Chen, Designer, Chen Design Studio, provided the following details regarding the proposed two back-to-back duplexes at 7900 Bennett Road:

- the subject site was subdivided into two new lots, and a two-unit duplex building is proposed for each lot;

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, July 27, 2011**

- the proposed design of the buildings are two-storey wood frame homes, approximately the same height as existing adjacent residences;
- the proposed front yard setback matches the front yard setback of existing adjacent homes;
- the proposed density is 0.55 floor area ratio;
- architectural form and character is similar to single-family, duplex, and two-storey townhouse residences on adjacent lots;
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is applied to the proposed development, and safety and security is enhanced by: (i) a front fence that is less than 1 metre in height to allow casual observation of the street; (ii) well lit entrances to residences; and (iii) a shared tenant pathway for “B” units;
- accessibility features are in place throughout the design scheme, and aging-in-place features are provided in all units;
- the rear “B” units will be convertible, and have the base level of accessible features, such as widened doors, stairs and corridors throughout;
- framing and electrical elements are included for a future stair lift, and the living room is convertible into a bedroom, with an accessible washroom included;
- sustainability features on site include permeable pavers, low flow fixtures and faucets, water efficient appliances, and dual flush toilets;
- there are motion sensors and timers in the public area to reduce electricity consumption;
- low glazing is used, as are low emitting materials, where applicable; and
- operable windows will create a better indoor environment.

In response to the Chair’s query regarding parking, Ms. Chen stated that the zoning bylaw requirement of greater than 1.0 resident parking spaces per dwelling unit, or 0.5 parking spaces per bedroom (3 spaces per lot), is achieved.

In response to the Chair’s request for information regarding access to the site, garages, and landscaping, Masa Ito, Ito and Associates, Landscape Architects, advised that:

- rear lane access is provided to this site from Acheson Road, with parking garages at the rear of the site;
- the landscape scheme includes a patio space at the front of each unit, and boulevard street trees; and
- an open arbour denotes the main entrance to the site.

Panel Discussion

Discussion ensued between the Panel and Mr. Ito regarding:

- all parking is at the rear of the subject site, and a pathway in the centre of the site features some low landscaping to soften the edges;
- the proposed fence could be relocated further toward the north, to allow the addition of more landscaping elements;
- the access from the lane is a hard surface;
- no outdoor amenity space is provided on site, but the project is located close to the City's Brighthouse Park, an area that offers outdoor space; and
- fencing the perimeter is a questionable solution to adjacency issues.

Discussion continued with the Panel questioning the appropriateness of: (i) a lack of outdoor space; (ii) reliance on Brighthouse Park for outdoor activity for children; (iii) questionable safety for children leaving the subject site and going to Brighthouse Park for play; and (iv) the general lack of quiet outdoor space on the subject site.

Staff Comments

Brian J. Jackson, Director of Development, advised that the unique zone "Infill Residential" was created specifically for the Atchison Road/Bennett Road area, and that the zone has no requirement for a common outdoor amenity space, though the infill residential project to the east of the subject site features detached garages.

The design scheme includes a trade off between attached garages and having additional parking off the lane, and pushing the garages further south.

In response to a query from the Chair, Mr. Jackson advised that if the applicant moved the garages further north on the subject site without a dedication on the south side, vehicles might have a problem manoeuvring onto the half lane.

Gallery Comments

Bob Harrison, 9591 McBurney Drive, stated that a 3:30 p.m. start time for a Panel meeting was inconvenient for some residents.

Correspondence

None.

Panel Discussion

The Chair stated that the project's design could be more appropriate and more sensitively executed in terms of: (i) landscaping; (ii) presentation to the lane; (iii) whether there is a way to make access to the site, and parking, more workable; and (iv) the provision for usable outdoor space for each unit.

The Chair added that he had a concern regarding liveability for future residents of the rear, or, "B" units.

The Panel further commented that: (i) now was an opportune time to be creative; and (ii) replacing fences was an inadequate response to interface with adjacent properties.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That Development Permit 10-545704 be referred back to staff for further examination of:

- (i) the landscaping scheme;*
- (ii) presentation to the lane;*
- (iii) access to the site;*
- (iv) on-site parking; and*
- (v) provision of useable outdoor space for each unit.*

CARRIED

3. Development Permit DV 10-542375

(File Ref. No.: DV 10-542375) (REDMS No. 3227953)

APPLICANT: Provincial Rental Housing Corporation

PROPERTY LOCATION: 8180 Ash Street

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Vary the minimum lot width from 12 m to 8.3 m for proposed Lot 5; and
2. Vary the minimum lot frontage from 6 m to 0.38 m for proposed Lot 4, to 2.7 m for proposed Lot 5 and to 0.60 m for proposed Lot 6

To permit subdivision of 8180 Ash Street into six (6) lots zoned "Single Detached (RS1/B)" for the purpose of developing affordable single-family dwellings.

Applicant's Comments

Julio Gomberoff, Retired Architect, 455 Beach Crescent, Vancouver, spoke in general terms regarding: (i) the more than 6 feet of frontage; (ii) the recessed property line; (iii) the unique hammerhead driveway arrangement that allows for cars to go forward onto Dayton Court; (iv) the size of the six proposed lots exceeds the zoning bylaw requirement; (v) the 2 ½ storey height of the proposed homes; (vi) the finished site grade; (vii) the subject site's potential to add between 6 and 9 cars to the neighbourhood; and (viii) shrubs, grass, and the number of trees to be planted on site as part of the landscaping scheme.

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, July 27, 2011**

In concluding his remarks, Mr. Gomberoff stated that the project is 99.9% in compliance with the City's zoning bylaw.

The Chair noted that the requested variances indicated that the project is not in compliance with the City's zoning bylaw.

Naomi Brunemeyer, Manager, Regional Development, B.C. Housing Management Commission, explained the relationship between the Provincial Rental Housing Corporation and the B.C. Housing Management Commission.

She remarked that the application is an overall housing package, and that the Provincial Rental Housing Corporation has owned the site for some time, and has tried to achieve more density on the site. Ms. Brunemeyer drew the Panel's attention to the following features of the proposed development:

- the application was originally presented to the Development Permit Panel in February 2011, and since that time the applicant has worked with City staff to address concerns regarding the original driveway design;
- the hammerhead driveway arrangement that has been incorporated addresses the manoeuvring issue, allowing vehicles to turn around and exit the common driveway by driving forward, not backing out;
- single-family residences would better suit the neighbourhood's needs;
- six lots on the site would make for cost efficiency;
- the application presents an affordable home ownership opportunity for families and individuals with low to moderate incomes, defined as a household income of slightly below \$65,000 annually, and purchasers would qualify for an external mortgage;
- income from tenants in small rental suites in each proposed residence would help the owners' finances;
- there is not much affordable housing ownership in the province, but research shows that it is usually young families who take advantage of opportunities such as those offered by the applicant, and that the owners are willing to spend more time living in their affordable homes;
- on-site parking provisions are more generous in the current design scheme than those in the earlier design scheme, presented to the Panel in February 2011;
- at a public Open House hosted by BC Housing on June 21, 2011, the application was submitted to attendees for feedback;
- before the applicant can move forward with the proposal, the applicant must learn if the request for variances is successful;
- building drawings could be submitted for review by the applicant, to area residents, to provide assurance before construction began; and
- the applicant would work with the City to ensure that the project complies with all City bylaws and policies.

Panel Discussion

The Chair noted that efforts had been made to address the issues of access, parking and manoeuvring of vehicles on site that arose at the February 16, 2011 Development Permit Panel meeting, and that the modified plans, including the hammerhead driveway design, appeared to be a good one.

Mr. Gomberoff remarked that an extension of the existing cul de sac was considered, but the dimensions did not work for that scenario, and so the hammerhead driveway design was the best solution.

In response to a query from the Chair, Mr. Gomberoff advised that the proposed development exceeds the minimum parking requirements, as each lot fronting Dayton Court provides adequate space for four vehicles outside of the on-site manoeuvring area.

Staff Comments

Mr. Jackson noted that although the application is an unusual one, staff supports the proposed variances that would facilitate subdivision of the subject site to accommodate six single-family homes.

Mr. Jackson also noted that no increase in the height of the dwellings was being sought, and, in response to a query from the Chair, indicated that the single family houses would be built at the same density as other houses on Dayton Court, and the lot coverage was significantly less.

He noted that the applicant had made changes to the plan since first presenting it to the Panel in February 2011, to reflect concerns raised by neighbours, and to ensure that vehicles would not back out onto the cul de sac.

In response to a query from the Chair, Mr. Jackson stated that financial security will be achieved to ensure the installation of the landscaping element to reconfigure the emergency access.

In response to a further query from the Chair, Mr. Jackson advised that the applicant is willing to submit the building permit information for review.

Gallery Comments

The Chair requested that, for the benefit of those assembled in the gallery, Mr. Gomberoff use the display boards to provide details regarding: (i) parking and landscaping; (ii) the pedestrian walkway; (iii) the siting of the proposed houses; and (iv) the location of the replacement trees.

Bob Harrison, 9591 McBurney Drive, outlined his understanding of the history of past applications for 8180 Ash Street. He complimented the architect on the design scheme and then stated that he thought four or five, not six, structures were planned for the subject site.

In conclusion he remarked that he wanted to: (i) see a proposal outlining how the proposed development would be sold; and (ii) hear an admission that the project was 'experimental'.

Henry Lim, 9391 Dixon Avenue, was concerned that the two proposed structures that would be adjacent to his residence would appear to 'dwarf' his home. He questioned whether the proposed structure that abuts the lane to the south of the subject site is the same height as the residence across the lane, and queried how safe the alley would be for emergency vehicles using the lane.

Discussion between the Panel and Mr. Jackson ensued regarding the density and height components of Mr. Lim's queries, and the following information was provided:

- the height of the proposed structures meet the zoning bylaw requirement;
- if the requested variances are granted there would be six separate lots at the subject site, but the density of structures is based on the floor area ratio, or square footage;
- a typical structure on Dayton Court is allowed to cover 45% of the lot, and in the case of this application, the structures on Dayton Court are proposed to cover between 26% and 33% of the lot, thereby providing more green space than does a typical Dayton Court lot;
- due to the north/south orientation, the stepped down end of the proposed structure abutting the lane would face the lane; and
- the lane is for emergency vehicles only.

The Panel commented that the applicant had offered to submit building drawings for review by area residents to provide assurance, and the Chair requested that staff take note of the offer.

Janet Yeung, 8211 McBurney Court, stated two concerns: (i) to reduce the minimum lot frontage from 6 metres to 0.38 metres represented a large variance, and she questioned the veracity of the zoning bylaw; and (ii) although the scheme allows for cars to drive forward, not back out, onto the cul de sac, the subject site might accommodate 12 cars, and this number represents a safety issue for children in the neighbourhood who play street hockey, and other games, in the cul de sac.

The Chair explained that the City's zoning bylaw effectively addresses minimum lot frontage, and that the standards in the bylaw apply to approximately 95% of zoning cases, but that the bylaw standards do not fit the other 5%, as in this case, due to the limited amount of frontage on Dayton Court, making it difficult for this application to meet the bylaw requirement.

The Chair stated that the choice was between fewer lots to accommodate larger homes, versus a greater number of lots to accommodate smaller homes. He added that the built square footage of the structures would achieve the same density, regardless of the number of lots created.

Arzina Hamir, 8480 Dayton Court, spoke in support of the proposed development and stated that in the neighbourhood, where she has resided since 1985, there are some troubling issues regarding affordability of homes.

She advised that she liked: (i) the creative use of the lot; (ii) the smaller size of the proposed residences and the resulting size of green space; and (iii) trees on the site, although she wanted to see fruit trees included in the landscaping scheme.

She stated that the neighbourhood has distinctive architecture, and expressed the hope that the applicant would design the proposed new residences to reflect the current architectural expression.

She noted that the price for a home in her neighbourhood averaged \$700,000, and that families with young children find it difficult to afford such homes, and that declining enrolment in the area's public school attests to the lack of new families moving into the area.

Ms. Hamir said that there are traffic issues in the area, due to families having up to four cars each, creating busy traffic on a cul de sac that features 35 homes, and she asked if a speed bump could be added, especially at the end of the cul de sac, where drivers are more likely to speed.

The Chair advised that before the City commits to the placement of a speed bump, Transportation staff assesses the speed and volume of traffic at specific locations to ascertain if traffic calming is warranted.

The Chair directed Mr. Jackson to pass Ms. Hamir's comment along to Transportation staff.

Correspondence

Ling Ho, address unknown (Schedule 1)

Vivienne Ho, address unknown (Schedule 2)

Tony Ho, address unknown (Schedule 3)

In addressing the concerns expressed by the correspondents Mr. Jackson advised that: (i) the significant apron provided in the forecourt of the proposed development allows cars to drive forward, not back out, onto the cul de sac, thereby improving safety in the neighbourhood; and (ii) each residential unit's one bedroom secondary suite would measure approximately 800 square feet.

Panel Discussion

The Chair commented that the applicant had taken the time since presenting the earlier design iteration to the Panel in February 2011, to meet with the community and to participate in more dialogue regarding the proposal.

He noted that the project design was significantly improved, and said he was pleased with the solutions for access, on-site parking, and manoeuvring vehicles from the hammerhead driveway design forward onto the cul de sac.

The Chair added that in terms of the proposed size and character of the proposed houses, they were more in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood, than larger homes on fewer lots.

Further comments from the Panel included support for: (i) the improved access and egress schemes; (ii) the lane would not be overpowered by the size of the proposed house; (iii) how the six proposed residences provide advantages, such as landscaping elements, that four larger residences may not provide; and (iv) the design's compatibility with the neighbourhood.

The Chair requested that a Building Scheme for house design be registered at the time of subdivision, and that the applicant share design information with the neighbourhood.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That:

(1) *a Development Permit be issued which would vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:*

(a) *Vary the minimum lot width from 12 m to 8.3 m for proposed Lot 5; and*

(b) *Vary the minimum lot frontage from 6 m to 0.38 m for proposed Lot 4, to 2.7 m for proposed Lot 5 and to 0.60 m for proposed Lot 6*

To permit subdivision of 8180 Ash Street into six (6) lots zoned "Single Detached (RS1/B)" for the purpose of developing affordable single-family dwellings; and that

(2) (a) *a Building Scheme for house design be registered at time of subdivision; and*

(b) *the applicant undertake consultation with the neighbours once house designs have been developed further.*

CARRIED

4. New Business

It was moved and seconded

That the Development Permit Panel meeting tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, August 10, 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, August 24, 2011.

CARRIED

Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, July 27, 2011

5. **Date Of Next Meeting:** **Wednesday, August 24, 2011**

6. **Adjournment**

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:55 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 27, 2011.

Joe Erceg
Chair

Sheila Johnston
Committee Clerk

Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the
Development Permit Panel
meeting held on Wednesday, July
27, 2011.

To Development Permit Panel
Date: <u>July 27, 2011</u>
Item # <u>3</u>
Re: <u>DN 10-542375</u> <u>8180 Ash St.</u>

To City of Richmond and BC Housing,

I am happy that BC Housing is proposing 8180 Ash Street property to single family lots to create affordable homes for low to moderate income families, but I have many concerns. Below are concerns with the width of the access point of the 3 units at Dayton Court.

1. All units will have secondary suites, therefore the 3 units that access to Dayton Court will be equivalent to 6 families and there will be a minimum of 10 to 12 cars backing up through that small access point every day. The visibility given for backing up through that small access point is not clear and it is dangerous to the people who live in that cul-de-sac.
2. Kids like to bike around and play out door games in the cul-de-sac, in the area where the driveway of the 3 units would be located. Dayton Court residents and many other people around the neighborhoods take daily walks with their families and dogs in the cul-de-sac. With the extra 10 to 12 cars in and out of that small access point it is not safe for the kids to bike and play at that cul-de-sac anymore.
3. BC housing maximized the lot to 6 units with secondary suits, but would provide extremely limited parking space for them. The people or tenants in that 3 units will not park their cars behind one another (on the drive way) to avoid having to move their cars for people who want to exit or park in the garage. Therefore, the tenants will park on the streets of Dayton Court but Dayton Court Residents are already over whelmed with numerous cars and little parking space supplied presently, and it is already a great problem for them.
4. Because the 3 units have rental suites, their garages are more likely turn into storage rooms instead of parking space. Ultimately, they will park their cars on to Dayton Court which will create parking problems for the present Dayton Court residents.

All the above concerns were brought up at the open house. We sincerely hope BC Housing and the City of Richmond will consider our concerns.

Best regards,

Ling Ho



Schedule 2 to the Minutes of the
Development Permit Panel
meeting held on Wednesday, July
27, 2011.

To City of Richmond and BC Housing,

To Development Permit Panel	
Date:	<u>July 27, 2011</u>
Item #:	<u>3</u>
Re:	<u>DV 10-542375</u> <u>8180 Ash St.</u>

Regarding the proposal to build on the 8180 Ash Street property from BC Housing, to build single family lots that would be affordable homes for low to moderate income families, I have many concerns. Below are concerns regarding the width of the access point of the 3 units facing Dayton Court.

Firstly, all the units will have secondary suites, therefore the 3 units that access to Dayton Court will be equivalent to 6 families and there will be a minimum of 10 to 12 cars backing up through that small access point every day. The visibility given for backing up through that small access point is not clear and it is dangerous to the people who live in that cul-de-sac. Secondly, kids like to bike around and play out door games in the cul-de-sac, in the area where the driveway of the 3 units would be located. Dayton Court residents and many other people around the neighbourhoods take daily walks with their families and dogs in the cul-de-sac. With the extra 10 to 12 cars in and out of that small access point it is not safe for the kids to bike and play at that cul-de-sac anymore. Thirdly, BC housing maximized the lot to 6 units with secondary suites, but would provide extremely limited parking space for them. The people or tenants in that 3 units will not park their cars behind one another (on the drive way) to avoid having to move their cars for people who want to exit or park in the garage. Therefore, the tenants will park on the streets of Dayton Court but Dayton Court Residents are already overwhelmed with numerous cars and little parking space supplied presently, and it is already a great problem for them. Lastly, because the 3 units have rental suites, their garages are more likely turn into storage rooms instead of parking space. Ultimately, they will park their cars on to Dayton Court which will create parking problems for the present Dayton Court residents.

All the above concerns were brought up at the open house. We sincerely hope BC Housing and the City of Richmond will consider our concerns.

Sincerely,

Vivienne Ho



**Schedule 3 to the Minutes of the
Development Permit Panel
meeting held on Wednesday, July
27, 2011.**

To City of Richmond and BC Housing,

To Development Permit Panel
Date: <u>July 27, 2011</u>
Item #: <u>3</u>
Re: <u>DV 10-542375</u> <u>8180 Ash St.</u>

I have many safety concerns regarding the property 8180 Ash Street, Richmond.

The access points of the 3 units of property 8180 Ash Street that are on Dayton Court are an extreme danger hazard. First of all, the driveways/access points pose as a hazard because there are people, from not only the cul-de-sac but also the community, that take daily walks in that area. With the 10 to 12 extra cars (considering each unit will contain 2 or more families) driving in that area, the probability of a child, dog, adult, or senior of being injured by a car is significantly higher. Also, there is a very small area of paved sidewalk on Dayton Court. The public cannot walk, run, or play on the sidewalk because of the lack of it, so the area where the access point is a necessity for those people to play, run, or walk daily. In addition, the extra 10 to 12 cars that could be parked in the cul-de-sac is a gigantic problem for the current residents of Dayton Court. With the already limited amount of parking spaces provided, the current residents are struggling to get a parking space. The garage and drive way that would be provided for the 3 units and many families is not a realistic or ideal parking area of the families' cars. This is because it would be a pain for them to move and re-park their cars for the other cars to get out or in of their original parking space. Therefore is it clear that parking would be a problem for both the families of the 3 units and the current residents of Dayton Court. Inevitably, the amount of traffic that would be created by adding in the cars from the additional 3 units would cause a staggering increase in probability of car accidents involving other cars or pedestrians in the community.

I hope you will take my concerns into consideration.

Best Regards,

Tony Ho

