



Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, August 22, 2012

Time: 3:30 p.m.
Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall
Present: Joe Erceg , Chair
John Irving, Director of Engineering
Victor Wei, Director of Transportation

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 25, 2012, be adopted.

CARRIED

2. Development Permit 10-541227

(File Ref. No.: DP 10-541227)(REDMS No. 3486620)

APPLICANT: Gagan Deep Chadha and Rajat Bedi

PROPERTY LOCATION: 9551 No. 3 Road (formerly 9511/9531 and 9551 No. 3 Road)

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of 14 townhouse units at 9551 No. 3 Road (formerly 9511/9531 and 9551 No. 3 Road) on a site zoned Low Density Townhouses (RTL4); and
2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - a) increase the maximum lot coverage for buildings from 40% to 42%;
 - b) reduce the minimum landscape structure setback to a Public Rights of Passage Right of Way from 2.0 m to 0.0 m for a trellis located at the southeast corner of the site; and
 - c) allow a total of 16 tandem parking spaces in eight (8) townhouse units.

Applicant's Comments

Wilson Chang, of Wilson Chang Architect, provided the following details regarding the proposed 14 townhouse units on No. 3 Road on a site that is currently vacant:

- the purpose of the proposed project is to achieve a solution to balance the busyness of No. 3 Road with the quieter residential neighbourhood at the rear of the subject site;
- units facing east onto No. 3 Road feature brick, and metal bay windows, with brick carried around the side of the units;
- units facing existing single-family homes to the west are smaller in scale than those facing No. 3 Road, and they feature green yard spaces; and
- the sidewalk along No. 3 Road connects to the outdoor amenity area at the northwest corner of the site, thereby acting as a buffer between noisy No. 3 Road and the rear units.

Panel Discussion

In response to a query from the Chair, Mr. Chang advised that the green space adjacent to the outdoor amenity area is an unused area, with grass and a tree, and is not a park. The opportunity exists to locate the proposal's outdoor amenity space between the unused green space and the existing lane in order to provide better supervision for those using both the green space and the outdoor amenity area.

Discussion ensued, and Denitsa Dimitrova, Landscape Architect, provided the following further information in response to queries:

- the outdoor amenity area includes two separate parts: (i) a playground for toddlers and pre-schoolers with a "home sweet home" theme, that includes a small red house, a car, and a table with four chairs, as well as a bench, and plants 42 inches in height; and (ii) an area for the mailbox kiosk, bicycle racks and an open area to encourage social activities;
- a landscaped strip as well as a fence will separate the outdoor amenity area from the existing east-west lane; and
- five trees on site were identified for removal due to poor condition, and will be replaced with ten trees.

Discussion then centered on the request to reduce the minimum landscape structure setback to the Public Rights of Passage Right of Way (ROW) from 2.0 metres to 0.0 metres, for a trellis located at the southeast corner of the site, and the Panel queried why the applicant was requesting the elimination of the setback.

Mr. Chang advised that a transformer is located at the back of the subject site, and that the proposed trellis would provide visual interest at the transformer location.

Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012

Discussion took place regarding whether the applicant could respect the current setback, and Mr. Chang advised that it would be possible to do so, except that the fence line would not be aligned with the site to the south of the subject site, if the request for the variance was not granted.

Wayne Craig, Program Coordinator – Development, advised that through the rezoning process for the subject site, there was an additional two metre ROW to accommodate the future relocation of the sidewalk, and that staff was satisfied with the proposed location of the trellis.

Further discussion ensued and Mr. Chang stated that if the trellis was moved back from its proposed location, it could act as a screen for the transformer.

The Chair encouraged the architect to re-design the trellis and in this way effectively define the walkway, while at the same time screen the transformer.

Discussion then turned to access to the site, and in response to a query Mr. Craig advised that:

- there is access to the subject site off the existing rear lane;
- Transportation Department staff have reviewed the access components of the proposed project, as well as traffic management along No. 3 Road;
- the lane established along the north side of the subject site provides vehicular access to Broadmoor Boulevard and only pedestrian access to No. 3 Road; and
- there is no current, or planned, vehicular access from No. 3 Road.

Staff Comments

Mr. Craig advised that: (i) the project includes one convertible unit; and (ii) the request to increase the maximum lot coverage for buildings, from 40% to 42%, is a function of the additional road dedication, provided at the rezoning process stage.

Gallery Comments

None.

Correspondence

Mr. Craig noted that a letter received from Earnest Kokotailo, Bates Road (attached to these Minutes as Schedule 1) objected to: (i) increased vehicular traffic; (ii) the request to reduce the setback to the Public Rights of Passage ROW; (iii) the erection of a block of townhouse units; and (iv) the request to increase lot coverage.

The Chair stated that the mandate of the Development Permit Panel is to deal with form and character issues, and that the question of the use of the site for townhouse units is a matter of zoning and is not dealt with by the Panel

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012**

Mr. Craig advised that Edwin Lee, Planner, responded to a letter from Richard Matiachuk, #22-8111 Saunders Road (attached to these Minutes as Schedule 2) and that, as a result of the discussion with the correspondent, Mr. Matiachuk has a better understanding of the proposed project, and the requested variances.

Panel Discussion

There was general support for the project. The Chair stated that if the request to reduce the minimum landscape structure setback from 2.0 metres to 0.0 metres is not necessary, he was disinclined to proceed with the variance.

In response to a query from the Chair, staff advised that a motion be introduced to have staff work with the applicant on the design of the trellis, before the project went to a future Council meeting.

Panel Decisions

It was moved and seconded

1. *That the request to vary the provision of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, to reduce the minimum landscape structure setback to a Public Rights of Passage Right of Way from 2.0 metres to 0.0 metres for a trellis located at the southeast corner of the site, be deleted from DP 10-541227; and*
2. *That a redesign of the proposed trellis element be undertaken by the applicant, with the assistance of staff, before DP 10-541227, is forwarded to a future meeting of City Council.*

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded

That after a redesign of the proposed trellis element is undertaken by the applicant, with the assistance of staff, a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *Permit the construction of 14 townhouse units at 9551 No. 3 Road (formerly 9511/9531 and 9551 No. 3 Road) on a site zoned Low Density Townhouses (RTL4); and*
2. *Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:*
 - a) *increase the maximum lot coverage for buildings from 40% to 42%; and*
 - b) *allow a total of 16 tandem parking spaces in eight (8) townhouse units.*

CARRIED

Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012

3. Development Permit 11-587896

(File Ref. No.: DP 11-587896)(REDMS No. 3549715)

APPLICANT: Oval 8 Holdings Ltd.- Parcel 12

PROPERTY LOCATION: 6622 Pearson Way

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of multi-residential development consisting of two (2) high-rise towers blocks and townhouses with a total square footage of 29,772.3 m² (320,467 ft²), which includes a total of 268 dwellings and 2,531.5 m² (27,249 ft²) of street fronting commercial space at 6622 Pearson Way on a site zoned "High Rise Apartment and Olympic Oval (ZMU4) – Oval Village (City Centre)"; and
2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - a) Increase the maximum allowable canopy projection onto the required road setback, along the commercial frontages on Hollybridge Way, Pearson Way and River Road from 2.0 m to 2.3 m ; and
 - b) Increase the maximum allowable canopy encroachment onto the required road setback at the corner of River Road and Hollybridge Way from 2.0 m to 3.0 m.

Applicant's Comments

Martin Bruckner, Architect, IBI/HB Architects, addressed the Panel regarding the proposed development at 6622 Pearson Way of a multi-residential development, consisting of two high-rise towers and townhouse units, and street fronting commercial space in the Oval Village.

Mr. Bruckner provided the following details:

- the subject site is bounded by streets on four sides; there are no lanes; the west tower is opposite the Olympic Oval; and the large floor plate of the proposed project makes it more compatible with the size of the adjacent Olympic Oval;
- the architectural character of the proposed structures is different from that of other Richmond buildings due to the location and the nature of the Oval 8 Holdings project, which is a four phase plan taking place between 2011 and 2016;
- the stepping down characteristics of the west tower allow for adequate separation between residential buildings to be constructed at a later phase at 6611 Pearson Way;
- the entire ground floor area along the new River Road, at the south side of the subject site, is for commercial retail units; plans call for small, not large, stores;
- an 'indent' in the south side facade provides sunlight;
- there is a four-storey street wall composed of two levels of two-storey townhouse units, along three sides of the subject site;

Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012

- the parking podium is invisible; there is a parking entrance off Hollybridge Road for commercial parking, with a second parking entrance off Pearson Way for residential parking;
- the main, formal access to the two towers is the driveway into the interior courtyard, with each tower also having a secondary access;
- materials include glass, spandrel glass, window walls, and a frameless curtain wall;
- the 15-storey tower, at the corner of Hollybridge Way and the new River Road, is a signature corner that has been designed to establish a landmark architectural detail; it wraps up and over the top of the tower, and expresses itself with faceted pieces; at grade there is a 'jewel box' type of store with transparent walls that helps to create an attractive public realm; and
- there is access to the dike from the proposed project via a greenway.

Panel Discussion

In response to the Chair's request to describe the amenity area, Mr. Bruckner advised that:

- the two-storey upper level townhouse units have indoor amenity spaces that extent onto semi-private outdoor patios/decks that create a transition area;
- indoor amenity space for residents is on Level 2 and Level 3, and includes meeting rooms; outdoor amenity space in the form of courtyards and green roof areas for residents is provided at a variety of levels; and
- near the main entrance, on Level 2, is an indoor swimming pool.

At the request of the Chair, Mr. Bruckner used boards to illustrate the overall design of the subject site, and in response to a query regarding views for residents Mr. Bruckner advised that units in the east tower have a view and that units on the west side have a partial view.

In response to a further query, Mr. Bruckner advised that there are a total of four accessible units, and that the layout of these units can be adjusted if needed. In addition, one of the bathrooms in each unit in the proposed project is provided with blocking in the walls, to allow for future installation of grab bars.

The Panel raised a question regarding the curb line on the east side of Hollybridge Way, as the street tapers in the northbound lane. Advice was provided that the tapering accommodates for larger vehicles going southbound to negotiate left turns on Hollybridge Way.

In response to a query regarding whether or not drivers would park their vehicles on the east side of Hollybridge Way, Mr. Craig stated that staff would examine the situation.

Further queries were made and discussion ensued. The following advice was provided:

- retail and commercial units face Hollybridge Way, and there is no provision for access doors to these units from Pearson Way;

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012**

- the request to increase the maximum allowable canopy projection onto the required road setback along the commercial frontage is less about natural light, and more about weather protection; the flat canopies are transparent, with glass framed with metal, thereby allowing the maximum amount of natural light through;
- the parking levels are designed to provide convenience for people to walk between the subject site and the Olympic Oval, as all commercial parking is on the same level; in addition, when pedestrians exit the parkade they walk up only a few steps to access the dike;
- there are 66 off-street parking spaces in the shared visitor/commercial component;
- there is no intention to fence off the plaza area on the south side of the project facing River Road, although it is a privately managed space; and
- a Public Rights Right-of-Way will be secured so the public can access the plaza area on the south side of the project.

Staff Comments

Mr. Craig advised that the development will be designed to connect to a future District Energy Unit. He stated that the buildings have been designed acoustically and mechanically for interior comfort regarding noise levels and thermal environmental conditions.

Mr. Craig added that staff is pleased with the linkage of private outdoor space to provide for access to the dike parkland.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

There was general agreement that the attractive project connects well to the Oval Village neighbourhood, and that staff and the applicant have undertaken a lot of work.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *Permit the construction of multi-residential development consisting of two (2) high-rise towers blocks and townhouses with a total square footage of 29,772.3 m² (320,467 ft²), which includes a total of 268 dwellings and 2,531.5 m² (27,249 ft²) of street fronting commercial space at 6622 Pearson Way on a site zoned “High Rise Apartment and Olympic Oval (ZMU4) – Oval Village (City Centre)”;* and
2. *Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:*
 - a) *Increase the maximum allowable canopy projection onto the required road setback, along the commercial frontages on Hollybridge Way, Pearson Way and River Road from 2.0 m to 2.3 m ; and*
 - b) *Increase the maximum allowable canopy encroachment onto the required road setback at the corner of River Road and Hollybridge Way from 2.0 m to 3.0 m.*

CARRIED

4. Development Permit 11-588094

(File Ref. No.: DP 11-588094)(REDMS No. 3545447)

APPLICANT: Centro Terrawest Development Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 6011 and 6031 No. 1 Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

Permit the construction of a four-storey mixed-use building consisting of approximately 704 m² of commercial space and 36 dwelling units at 6011 and 6031 No. 1 Road on a site zoned Commercial Mixed-Use (ZMU21) – Terra Nova.

Applicant's Comments

Rob Whetter, Architect, Cotter Architects, addressed the Panel regarding the proposed development of a four-storey, mixed-use building consisting of 700 square meters of at-grade commercial space, and approximately 36 apartment units above, on No. 1 Road at Westminster Highway.

The following details were provided:

- to the west and to the south of the subject site are townhouse unit developments; to the north, across Westminster Highway, is the Terra Nova Shopping Centre;
- due to adjacencies of surrounding buildings, the proposed development has been “pushed up” to the north-east corner of the subject site, thereby providing for increased separation between the proposed building and existing residences in the area;

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012**

- a taller building height at the corner of No. 1 Road and Westminster Highway provides a landmark gateway into the Terra Nova neighbourhood;
- a parking lot that serves both residential and retail needs is accessed from Westminster Highway;
- an access from No. 1 Road to a secured parking lot serves only the residential units;
- there are two levels of parking; the lower parking level is partially buried; the outdoor amenity space provides partial screening to the upper parking level; and a berm provides a transition between the lower and upper parking levels;
- above the retail units, the building steps back 1.5 metres to the residential units above;
- the architectural character is “contemporary west coast”, with heavier cladding materials on the ground level, and lighter cladding material applied on the upper levels; vertical appearance is emphasized on the proposed building’s corners;
- the proposed retail units are close to the street, to enhance the pedestrian experience; there is extensive weather protection on the south side of the subject site, and as part of the existing pedestrian walkway on the east side;
- along the east side of the subject site, the existing fence will be removed, the pedestrian walkway will be widened, and the berm will be created;
- there is one accessible parking space provided for residents, and another provided for visitors to the residential units and/or the retail component; and
- existing neighbouring cherry trees will be retained, with additional landscape elements added to screen the parkade and line the adjacent walkway.

Mark Synan, Landscape Architect, Van Der Zalm & Associates Inc., provided the following information:

- the berm is located by the parkade wall;
- for protection, trees on site will be fenced during the construction phase;
- the amenity area is fully accessible, and is an open deck for social functions, and it includes seating spaces and a small play space;
- permeable pavers are introduced into the upper parking area, and this level is screened and softened by a trellis with climbing vines; and
- the sidewalk is treated with granite edging, and old country stone pavers to reflect local character.

Panel Discussion

Discussion ensued among the Panel and the architects, and the following advice was provided:

- the west-facing outdoor amenity area will be cooled by the presence of Boston Ivy climbing on the trellis, as well as some trees, and other colourful shading materials;

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012**

- residents have access to the semi-secured outdoor amenity area, and a ramp provides wheelchair access;
- to differentiate the residential levels from the retail unit level, brick extends around the base of the retail units to the guardrail height, with the decks of the residential units providing a distinct delineation;
- the residential units are recessed, with their balconies becoming deck space, and this provides weather protection for pedestrians on No. 1 Road and Westminster Highway sidewalks;
- further weather protection for pedestrians is provided by timber and glass canopies at featured areas, as well as by low canvas awnings for the bays in between the canopies; different coloured bricks express the rhythm of these canopy features;
- it is expected that there will be between four and six small scale retailers on site; and
- the vehicular access for the commercial component is from Westminster Highway, while pedestrians have two access options: (i) an open-air staircase, and (ii) a walkway beside the driveway.

Staff Comments

Mr. Craig advised that the building has been designed acoustically regarding the impact of aircraft noise. He added that there is provision for electrical vehicle plug-ins for 20% of the residential parking.

Gallery Comments

John Tsang, 6111 No. 1 Road, listed the following concerns he had regarding the proposed development: (i) the impact it might have on the nature park in the Terra Nova neighbourhood; (ii) the increase in density in the area due to the addition of approximately 36 housing units in the proposed building; (iii) the potential for increased traffic at an intersection that is already heavily used; (iv) the potential for traffic and/or pedestrian accidents at the intersection of No. 1 Road and Westminster Highway; and (v) the impact on the privacy of the adjacent residents.

A resident of 6111 No. 1 Road expressed her concern that there was not enough space between her townhouse unit and the proposed development. She stated that she was concerned about an increase in: (i) noise; (ii) pollution; and (iii) the smell of gas. She added that she thought the proposed four-storey building was too high for her neighbourhood.

In response the Chair reiterated that the mandate of the Development Permit Panel is to deal with form and character issues, and that questions of density and height is a matter of zoning and is not dealt with by the Panel

The Chair advised that traffic in the area was addressed by the Transportation Department and that additional traffic was taken into account.

Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012

In response to queries based on comments from the delegates, Mr. Whetter and Mr. Synan advised that:

- the proposed residential units are set back from the property lines by 12 metres, and this exceeds the three metre distance required by the Zoning Bylaw;
- the 12 metre setback allows for more privacy, as well as for more natural light, for adjacent residents; and
- to enhance privacy for adjacent residents, the landscape scheme includes: (i) a trellis, with evergreen climbing plants, around the edge of the parking surface; and (ii) native trees and a small area with evergreen and deciduous shrubs that will mature in time.

In response to a query from the Chair, Mr. Craig advised that the concerns expressed by the two speakers were considered and addressed at a Public Hearing held on April 16, 2012.

Correspondence

John Tsang, 6111 No. 1 Road (Schedule 3)

Panel Discussion

The Chair noted that the concerns raised at the April 16, 2012 Public Hearing were factored into the design of the proposed project. There was general agreement that the project was a good one, and it was noted that no variances were requested as part of the application.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of a four-storey mixed-use building consisting of approximately 704 m² of commercial space and 36 dwelling units at 6011 and 6031 No. 1 Road on a site zoned Commercial Mixed-Use (ZMU21) – Terra Nova.

CARRIED

5. Development Permit 11-592270

(File Ref. No.: DP 11-592270)(REDMS No. 3545519)

APPLICANT: Westmark Developments Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 9691, 9711 and 9731 Blundell Road

Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of a 25-unit townhouse development at 9691, 9711 and 9731 Blundell Road on a site zoned Town Housing (ZT60) – North McLennan (City Centre); and
2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - a) reduce the minimum front yard setback from 6 m to a range of 4.5 m to 6 m; and
 - b) permit tandem parking for 15 of the 25 townhouse units (30 tandem parking spaces).

Applicant's Comments

Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architects Inc., provided the following information regarding the proposed 25-unit townhouse development on Blundell Road near No. 4 Road:

- a lot south of the proposed development, on Keefer Avenue, provides cross-access through the subject site in order to facilitate future redevelopment of the corner properties, so there is no vehicular access to the subject site from Blundell Avenue; in the future there will be complete local traffic through three developed sites;
- the design has responded to the immediate context, with two-storey units on either side of the central drive aisle entry;
- large trees are to be retained along the east property line, to enhance privacy between the proposed townhouse units and existing single-family homes to the east of the subject site;
- the width of the rear of the subject site provides for extra depth of rear unit yards, and additional natural light;
- the streetscape along Blundell Road consists of street fronting townhouses with pedestrian-oriented front entries, individual gated front yards, and a communal pedestrian entry to the development;
- the buildings surround a central outdoor amenity space, one that gets a lot of sun exposure and has a sense of openness; it includes a play area, as well as a lawn area for flexible play;
- the internal drive aisle is not straight, but swings to the north to facilitate: (i) the retention of a tree; and (ii) future development to the east;
- the architectural style is gabled, heritage, or “country-estate”, with an emphasis on individual units designed to break down the massing;
- the end units alternate with beige-coloured bays in between;
- materials change from the end bay to the middle bay, with an emphasis on different unit types to provide separate identity to individual units; and

Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012

- proposed materials include Hardi-plank, Hardi-shingles and some vinyl applied to the upper levels; there is painted wood trim, brackets, and some brick.

Keith Ross, Landscape Architect, provided the following details regarding the landscape scheme:

- the main pedestrian access is on Blundell Road, and leads to the central outdoor amenity area where there is: (i) a seating area; (ii) decorative paving; and (iii) a variety of shrubs, hedging, and five trees;
- there are large existing trees along the east property line, and special attention was paid in order to preserve them; and
- there are nine trees to be retained along the west property line.

Mr. Yamamoto advised that with no vehicular access from Blundell Avenue, there will be a substantial sign at the entry point, as well as a sign on Blundell Road, with an area map to identify how to get to the site by vehicle.

Panel Discussion

With regard to the location of the enclosed garbage and recycling structure across from the central amenity area, and how safe it would be when the doors of the enclosure swing outward, Mr. Yamamoto advised that the planned swinging doors could be replaced with sliding doors to provide more space, and more safety, between the road and the enclosed structure.

The Chair requested that staff work with the applicant to address this issue.

A brief discussion took place with regard to the north-south pedestrian walkway through the site, leading to Blundell Road, and whether its width was adequate for the occasion when two strollers would have to pass, or when wheelchairs would be used on the walkway.

Mr. Yamamoto advised that it would be possible to widen the walkway, but at the expense of some landscaping elements.

Further discussion took place, after which the Panel suggested that the applicant make minor revisions to widen at least a portion of the pedestrian walkway to 1.5 metres.

Staff Comments

Mr. Craig had no comments.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

The Chair noted the integration of the outdoor amenity space. He then requested that the applicant make minor revisions to widen the pedestrian walkway and redesign the garbage/recycling structure doors before referring the project to Council.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *Permit the construction of a 25-unit townhouse development at 9691, 9711 and 9731 Blundell Road on a site zoned Town Housing (ZT60) – North McLennan (City Centre); and*
2. *Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:*
 - a) *reduce the minimum front yard setback from 6 m to a range of 4.5 m to 6 m; and*
 - b) *permit tandem parking for 15 of the 25 townhouse units (30 tandem parking spaces).*

CARRIED

6. Development Permit 12-598474
(File Ref. No.: DP 12-598474)(REDMS No. 3561413)

APPLICANT: Yamamoto Architecture Inc.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 9100, 9120 and 9140 No. 3 Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of 18 townhouse units at 9100, 9120 and 9140 No. 3 Road on a site zoned Low Density Townhouses (RTL4); and
2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - a) reduce the front yard setback from 6.0 m to 5.05 m on the ground floor and 4.75 m on the second floor of the two (2) northernmost units of Building No. 1; and
 - b) allow a total of 16 tandem parking spaces in eight (8) townhouse units.

Applicant's Comments

Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architects Inc. provided the following details regarding the proposed development of 18 townhouse units on No. 3 Road, near Francis Road, on a site that is currently vacant:

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012**

- after public input from neighbours residing in single-family dwellings to the east and south of the subject site, the design went through several iterations, and the scheme was reduced by one unit;
- three-storey units face No. 3 Road, and the end units, at the north and south ends, are stepped down to two stories;
- the outdoor amenity space sits at the entry of the subject site with a short pedestrian linkage, thereby: (i) reducing the number of residential units facing south; (ii) increasing setbacks along the south property line; and (iii) allowing for the increase in size of the planted buffer along the south property line;
- the No. 3 Road frontage is designed to create a rhythm of entries, entry gates, and porches;
- the shallow pitch roof of each unit relates well to the area's single-family home's roof pitches;
- the integrated paving area at the location of the outdoor amenity area increases the appearance of the area's size;
- the materials include some Hardie-plank siding, with some masonry features along the base of the buildings;
- two onsite undersized trees will be relocated and stored offsite during the construction phase, and will be transplanted, to the left of the driveaisle, when construction is complete;
- one of the sustainability features is foam sealing in the garage areas for an efficient envelope; and
- the proposed development includes one convertible unit, with all other units having accessibility features that allow for aging-in-place to be incorporated.

The Chair noted that as a result of concerns expressed by neighbours to the south of the subject site, raised at the April 16, 2012 Public Hearing, the architect had revised the design scheme.

Keith Ross, Landscape Architect, provided the following details regarding the landscape scheme:

- a low metal picket fence will demarcate private space on the No. 3 Road frontage, and will be enhanced by mixed shrubs;
- a pedestrian access is proposed for the north end of the subject site;
- the outdoor amenity area will feature a small play area, as well as a small lawn;
- mailboxes, supported by a paving pattern, are also a feature of the outdoor amenity area;
- to enhance privacy, an existing hedge along the south property line will be retained, and a trellis will be added to a landscape buffer adjacent to the back yard of the single-family home to the south; and

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012**

- along the east property line is a statutory right-of-way, some trees will be retained on this property line, and infill hedging will be added to support what is already there.

Staff Comments

Mr. Craig commended the applicant's work with neighbours and the resulting new design scheme.

Panel Discussion

In response to queries, Mr. Yamamoto and Mr. Craig provided the following advice:

- the location of the electrical panel kiosk that separates the two buildings fronting No. 3 Road respects the scale of the adjacent single-family homes; and
- the drive aisle along the south property line is subject to legal conditions.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Discussion

There was general agreement regarding the merits of the project.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *Permit the construction of 18 townhouse units at 9100, 9120 and 9140 No. 3 Road on a site zoned Low Density Townhouses (RTL4); and*
2. *Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:*
 - a) *reduce the front yard setback from 6.0 m to 5.05 m on the ground floor and 4.75 m on the second floor of the two (2) northernmost units of Building No. 1; and*
 - b) *allow a total of 16 tandem parking spaces in eight (8) townhouse units.*

CARRIED

7. Development Permit 12-599057

(File Ref. No.: DP 12-599057)(REDMS No. 3538883)

APPLICANT: Townline Gardens Inc.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 10820 No. 5 Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

Permit the construction of a 5-storey mixed-use commercial and residential building (Building 'D') located at 10820 No. 5 Road, which is in Phase 2 of 'The Gardens' a master planned development on a site zoned Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) – The Gardens (Shellmont).

Applicant's Comments

Tiffany Duzita, Development Manager, Townline Group of Companies, provided the following background information regarding "The Gardens", a four-phase master planned development at No. 5 Road and Steveston Highway:

- Phase 1 is under construction and the development permit is requested for Phase 2, or, Building D;
- all streetscapes are being put in and include both the public realm and the streetscape of the proposed development's internal roadway;
- after some design mediations to Building D's fifth floor, there are now nine affordable housing units included in the design scheme;
- there is a larger indoor amenity space, including a gym, an exercise room, and meeting rooms, to be shared among residents of the entire development; secured access to the amenity space is through common corridors; and
- there is no outdoor amenity space related to Building D, but direct links from the building, provided as part of the development's road network, will allow residents to access outdoor amenity space and the outdoor public plaza, on the subject site.

Alan Johnson, Architect, DA Architects and Planners, provided the following information:

- Building D is a five-storey, mixed-use commercial and residential building, and is only one component of a comprehensive development at the former site of Fantasy Gardens;
- there is an internal east-west village street, with a modest number of retail units at ground level; there is a surface parking lot;
- the influences on Building D are the City-planned park at the north end of the site, the on-site daycare component, and Steveston Highway to the south of the site;
- there is the potential for a large commercial retail unit with some exposure onto No. 5 Road;

Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012

- the building's residential units are oriented to the north, for park views, and in response to the smaller scale residential development on the west side of No. 5 Road, the building steps away from the street on the top, or fifth, floor; large scale terraces are another feature;
- the architectural character is "townhouse-like", with a main, two-storey lobby; Building D is just one of a series of unique buildings on the subject site; individual "townhouse-like" expression mitigates the perceived length of the project;
- facade materials include brick along the base of the commercial frontage, with concrete, metal panels and glazing; and
- a prominent, glassy corner element, of concrete construction, flies out in slabs to make an arresting visual presentation.

Darryl Tyacke, Landscape Architect, Eckford Tyacke and Associates, provided the following details:

- the interior courtyard is designed as a continuation of the courtyard treatment in Phase 1, with similar plant elements, the same paving material, and the same furnishings, to provide cohesiveness to the phases;
- along the street frontages each of the townhouse-like units have staired access down a small grade to the street, and have brick cladding to create rhythm at the street level;
- a low retaining wall wraps around the subject site, allowing the grade to be banked up to hide most of the parkade wall; a green, multi-seasonal imprint is around the building; and
- the east and west corners will each have an arbour, and a wall featuring the name and address signage for the building.

Panel Discussion

In response to a request, Mr. Tyacke described the pedestrian experience on the subject site and noted that the site's entry was set up during Phase 1. There are wide sidewalks, raised crosswalks, decorative paving, a series of ramps to the commercial level, pedestrian plazas and water features and a landscape design that enhances the pedestrian experience.

Staff Comments

Mr. Craig noted that five of the nine affordable housing units in Building D are two-bedroom units, while the other four units each have one bedroom.

Panel Discussion

In response to a query from the Chair regarding the provision of an outdoor amenity space and the public park, Mr. Johnson advised that there is a private outdoor amenity space included in the building constructed during Phase 1, and for Building D the smaller commercial footprint invites people into the public realm, one that is designed for residents and visitors alike.

Mr. Craig added that the City plans to work on the public park construction so that limited access is achieved in 2015, and full access achieved by 2017.

In response to a further query, Mr. Craig advised that Phase 3 of the project will trigger the need for daycare spaces, and the play area affiliated with it.

In response to a final query, Ms. Duzita confirmed that a grocery store, a stand-alone restaurant, and a series of commercial rental units, are all part of the master plan for "The Gardens".

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of a 5-storey mixed-use commercial and residential building (Building 'D') located at 10820 No. 5 Road, which is in Phase 2 of 'The Gardens' a master planned development on a site zoned Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) – The Gardens (Shellmont).

CARRIED

8. New Business

It was moved and seconded

That the Development Permit Panel meeting tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, September 12, 2012 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, September 26, 2012.

CARRIED

9. Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday, September 26, 2012

**Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, August 22, 2012**

10. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 5:29 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, August 22, 2012.

Joe Erceg
Chair

Sheila Johnston
Committee Clerk

August 13, 2012

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

**Schedule 1 to the Minutes of
the Development Permit
Panel Meeting of Wednesday,
August 22, 2012.**

To Development Permit Panel	
Date:	August 22, 2012
Item #	2
Re:	DP-10-541227

Re: Notice of Application for Development Permit – DP 10-541227
Applicant: Gagan Dep Chadha and Rajat Bedi

As a resident, home owner and taxpayer adjacent to this proposed development I am opposed to erecting yet another block of townhouses. The neighbourhood is crowded with vehicular traffic already! Crowding more people and cars into the area is a bad and offensive idea. More traffic, more noise, more garbage on the streets, more vandalism – the list goes on and on.

I am particularly opposed to reduction of the minimum landscape structure setback to the Public Right of Way from 2.0 m to 0.0 m. A lot of us residents living in the neighbourhood use this passage way frequently, both in the day time and at night.

Having no set back is the same as walking through a tunnel or walled passage – neither pleasant nor safe!

Why should this developer be allowed to build right to the property line with zero set back? – Can I do the same thing? How about the rest of my neighbours? – can we all build right up to the edge of our property lines, with no set back or consideration for others living in the neighbourhood? Would you like this happening next to where you live?

I thought the purpose of implementing zoning bylaws was to keep construction under control and in accordance with agreed upon and established guidelines. City council members must remember that they are voted into a position of trust by the local residents and should respect the views of the people who placed trust in them to not allow such activities so that only the developer prospers.

THIS IS SIMPLY UNACCEPTABLE!

Yours truly,



Earnest Kokotailo
Resident, Homeowner and Taxpayer



From: Richard Matiachuk [richard.matiachuk@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 21 August 2012 15:31
To: Johnston, Sheila
Subject: DP 10-541227

To Development Permit Panel
Date: AUG. 22, 2012
Item # 2
Re: 10-541227

Dear Panel Members:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Notice of Application for a development permit (DP 10-541227) with regard to varying the provisions of the Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 specifically at 9551 No. 3 Road.

I encourage development in Richmond.

In this case however, I am **not in favour of either: a)** increasing the maximum lot coverage for buildings from 40% to 42% **or b)** reducing the minimum landscape structure setback to a Public Rights of Passage Right of Way

I feel the bylaw of 40% lot coverage allows for adequate lot development while still maintaining open space (potential green space in the community). **And I am against** any loss of Right of Way (pathways) from interior neighbourhoods to the major roads / public transit access as well as the loss of potential open space in the community. Development is important but not at the expense of existing open space or public access ways.

Thanks again for the opportunity to have input on the development of the city of Richmond.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely

Richard Matiachuk
Owner/resident #22-8111 Saunders Road
604.836.9855

**Schedule 2 to the Minutes of
the Development Permit
Panel Meeting of Wednesday,
August 22, 2012.**



**Schedule 3 to the Minutes of
the Development Permit
Panel Meeting of Wednesday,
August 22, 2012.**

**The content refers to an opposition to Centro Terawest Development Ltd.'s
application for development permit DP 11-588094:-**

At 6011 & 6031, No. 1 Road, Richmond, B.C. for a four-storey, mixed-use commercial and residential project and 36 dwelling units on zoning (ZMU21) – Terra Nova.

To: Richmond Development Permit Panel

This application, given the size, scale and significant permanent alteration on this piece of land is a big challenge to the Terra Nova neighbourhood in which we have an expanding nature park.

The percentage of increase in population density is so intensified that originally it contained a 2-storey grocery store and a 2-storey duplex.

During heavy traffic hours, this site is on a busy key route for south bound traffic coming from the east on Westminster Hwy as well as north from River Road. It is also a key route for north bound traffic for drivers from the south going to Richmond City-centre and exiting into Vancouver via No. 2 Road as well as shoppers heading for the Terra Nova Shopping Mall.

The site is at the cross-section of No.1 Road & Westminster Hwy and I believe it is a black-spot for accidents as there were pedestrians injured by motor vehicles at this intersection on and off. This increase in the traffic from the proposed development would only aggravate to the safety for pedestrian and putting them into much more dangerous pedestrian crossings given the fact there would be more customers going to the proposed commercial shops as well as visitors and residence from the much bigger size 36 units development.

The privacy of the adjacent neighbours would be infringed as the new residences on the 4th floor of the new development could easily look over onto the neighbouring town-houses which are relatively lower in height.

As a matter of facts, I oppose to the above high density population development.

Sincerely,

John *W Tsang*

A resident from the next door at Salisbury Lane at 6111 & 6179, No. 1 Road, Richmond.

