



Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, August 24, 2011

Time:

3:30 p.m.

Place:

Council Chambers

Richmond City Hall

Present:

Dave Semple, Chair

Andrew Nazareth, General Manager, Business and Financial Services

John Irving, Director, Engineering

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 27, 2011, be adopted.

CARRIED

2. Development Permit DP 09-498967

(File Ref. No.: DP 09-498967) (REDMS No. 3256988)

APPLICANT:

OTO Development Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION:

8080 and 8100 Blundell Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

- 1. Permit the construction of eight (8) townhouse units at 8080 and 8100 Blundell Road on a site zoned Low Density Townhouses (RTL3); and
- 2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - a) reduce the minimum front yard setback from 6.0 m to 5.0 m for Building 1; and
 - b) allow a total of eight (8) tandem parking spaces in four (4) of the eight (8) townhouse units.

Applicant's Comments

Chris Chung, Architect, CMTC Architects, provided the following background information regarding the proposed eight townhouse units at 8080 and 8100 Blundell Road:

- the site is currently occupied by two single-family houses; the proposed development is surrounded by developments with higher densities to the north, east and west;
- two rows of 4-unit buildings are being proposed, with 3-storey units in the middle and 2-storey end units facing Blundell Road and the back which were stepped down to respect the massing of adjacent developments and provide visual connection to the street;
- the three trees preserved on site were not included in the original scheme;
- two existing driveways are consolidated and will be used as entrance to the proposed development;
- proposed building materials, e.g. Hardie-Plank siding and board and batten reflect the character of the surrounding developments;
- large windows allow for clear visual connection to the street; and
- amenity space at the southwest corner of the site is augmented by the drive aisle.

Rebecca Colter, Landscape Architect, DMG Landscape Architects, pointed out the following three main landscape architecture design moves:

- creating an attractive entry to the development through landscaping the frontage;
- providing each of the townhouse units with its own private landscaped area with fenced-in private backyard with a lawn area and planted with either an ornamental maple tree or an ornamental pear tree; and
- providing an outdoor amenity area at the southwest corner of the site with i) grasspave pavers over a portion of on-site turning area to accommodate garbage and moving trucks and offer a green grass open amenity space; and ii) a Fibar playground surface area with three play elements designed for individual play for children between one to five years old.

Ms. Colter also mentioned the following landscape features of the project:

- 6-foot solid wood fence around the perimeter of the property;
- 4-foot lattice wood fence between the residential backyards;
- open aluminum rail fence at the frontage;
- 2 to 3 foot retaining walls around the edge of the property;
- a bench adjacent to the children's play area; and
- mostly native planting materials which are drought resistant.

Panel Discussion

In response to the query whether bollards or other safety elements are provided to prevent damage to the buildings from trucking turning movements near the amenity space and garbage and recycling facilities, Mr. Chung stated that none are provided at present as the turning radius is deemed sufficient. He explained that the post at the southwest corner of Building 1 can serve as a bollard and a safety element.

In response to the query whether the two visitor parking spaces are sufficient considering that one of them is allotted for handicapped parking, Mr. Jackson advised that they meet the bylaw requirement and that staff supports the provision of a parking space in the development that is wide enough to accommodate wheelchairs.

In response to the query whether measures are provided to ensure the safety of children going to and using the play area in view of its proximity to the on-site truck turning area, Mr. Chung stated that children should be supervised in the play area and that a walkway originally proposed could be reintroduced.

The Chair advised that it is unacceptable that the project does not provide a safety zone by using bollards, fencing, or other safety elements between the children's play area and the truck turning area. He stated that the applicant needs to go back to staff to address this important safety issue.

The Chair requested the applicant to work with staff regarding the appropriateness of using a structural element of a building, i.e. the post at the southwest corner of Building 1, as a safety element in view of the potential damage that could be done to it by trucks manoeuvring in the garbage and recycling area. He reiterated that the applicant needs to address safety issues in the proposed development.

The Chair noted that units along Blundell Road have front doors facing the street and expressed the Panel's appreciation for this design feature.

Staff Comments

Brian J. Jackson, Director of Development, advised that staff supports the application and stated the following:

- the design of the project is innovative and responsive to adjacent areas;
- some trees are preserved at the back of the property; and
- applicant has responded well to the height issue along Blundell Road by proposing two-storey units facing the street and at the back of the two buildings.

Mr. Jackson also expressed staff's support to the two requested variances for the following reasons:

• moving Building 1 closer to Blundell Road by one meter is justified due to the location and size of the amenity spaces provided at the rear of the property which is larger than the bylaw requirement; and

• the request for tandem parking spaces for four units is appropriate in view of the location of the project.

Panel Discussion

The Panel expressed support for the project subject to the applicant making the necessary design changes as suggested by the Panel to ensure the safety of children in the play area and a safety element to protect the building structure regarding truck manoeuvring.

Correspondence

Alvin Leung, 115-8120 Jones Road, Richmond, B.C. V6Y 4K7 (Schedule 1)

Quan Zhang and Ling Wang, 116-8100 Jones Road, Richmond, B.C. V6Y 4B1 (Schedule 2)

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

- 1. Permit the construction of eight (8) townhouse units at 8080 and 8100 Blundell Road on a site zoned Low Density Townhouses (RTL3); and
- 2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - a) reduce the minimum front yard setback from 6.0 m to 5.0 m for Building 1; and
 - b) allow a total of eight (8) tandem parking spaces in four (4) of the eight (8) townhouse units.

CARRIED

3. Development Variance 11-581634

(File Ref. No.: DV 11-581634) (REDMS No. 3288463)

APPLICANT:

CTA Design Group

PROPERTY LOCATION:

11120 Silversmith Place

INTENT OF PERMIT:

- 1. To vary the maximum building height of a building within the Industrial Business Park (IB1) zone:
 - (a) from 12 m to 19.812 m to accommodate the widening of an existing polyfilm fabrication tower; and
 - (b) from 12 m to 30 m to accommodate the construction of a new polyfilm fabrication tower.

Applicant's Comments

Ciaran Deery, Partner, CTA Design Group, provided the following information regarding the requested development variances by the applicant:

- the proposed variances are sought in connection with the expansion plan of LPL Properties Inc. (Layfield Plastics) which is a significant investment for the company;
- Layfield Plastics, which manufactures film fabrics, was thinking of relocating to a new site to diversify its operations but decided to stay in their present location and bring in new technology; and
- the company is requesting the height variance to enclose the tower which is necessitated by the procedure of the fabrication.

Staff Comments

Mr. Jackson stated that staff supports the development variance application and the expansion of a thriving industry in Richmond. He added that the Google Earth pictures provided by staff show that existing tanks located on the property line will block views of the proposed tower expansion.

Mr. Jackson also mentioned that he received a telephone call from residents living on the west side of the manufacturing facility who complained of the noise coming from the said facility.

Panel Discussion

A comment was made that the consultant should have provided graphics in his presentation as it did not meet the requirements and standards of the Panel.

In response to a query, Mr. Deery clarified that the enclosure and the function within the enclosure is new and not currently existing.

In response to the query regarding the effect of the proposed towers' proximity to the canal ESA, Mr. Jackson advised that the proposed towers are located on the East side, limiting any shading to morning hours.

In response to the query whether a noise issue is associated with the function of the tower, Mr. Deery stated that there is no noise issue with the tower itself. He explained that the noise is generated by the transfer of plastics from the silos into the building. He also mentioned that the applicant is going to meet with the residents in the area to discuss the noise issue.

In response to the query whether the industrial noise level coming from the manufacturing facility meets the City's standards, Mr. Jackson pointed out that it meets the bylaw requirements and that noise bylaw staff have not received any noise complaints. He explained that the noise comes from the existing ground level operations.

The Chair suggested that the applicant can add some graphics and colour to the tower configuration and noted that the proposed consultation of the applicant with residents in the area to mitigate the noise is appropriate.

Correspondence

Ben and Betty Baerg, 11411 Shell Road, Richmond, B.C. (Schedule 3)

Gallery Comments

Betty Baerg, 11411 Shell Road, stated the following:

- she made a previous complaint about the noise when the facility was undergoing expansion several years ago;
- the noise does not emanate only from the ground level; and
- the noise can be heard throughout their 5-acre property.

Ms. Baerg expressed concern that additional silos will increase the noise level and suggested that the applicant make an enclosure or a building configuration to mitigate the noise. She mentioned that she had talked with a representative of Layfield Plastics who was willing to work with the residents regarding the noise issue.

Panel Discussion

In response to the query whether there are pipes or mechanics external to the existing or proposed enclosures that generate noise, Mr. Deery stated that none are being planned.

The Panel reiterated that the applicant should discuss the noise issue with residents living in the area and that maximum efforts should be made by the applicant to mitigate the noise coming from the manufacturing facility.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

- 1. To vary the maximum building height of a building within the Industrial Business Park (IB1) zone:
 - (a) from 12 m to 19.812 m to accommodate the widening of an existing polyfilm fabrication tower; and
 - (b) from 12 m to 30 m to accommodate the construction of a new polyfilm fabrication tower.

CARRIED

- 4. Date Of Next Meeting: Wednesday, September 14, 2011
- 5. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:05 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 24, 2011.

Dave Semple Chair

Rustico Agawin Committee Clerk Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on Wednesday, August 24, 2011.

City of Richmond 6911 No 3 Road Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1 Re: Development Permit DP 09-498967

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing in response to the opposition of the proposal for 8 new townhouse units to be located at 8080 and 8100 Blundell Road.

Blundell Road is already a large arterial road which boasts a lot of steady traffic. This new development which is just east of a really busy No 3 Road would not be a suitable location for additional townhouse units. Traffic is getting heavier on Blundell Road and would further be congested with additional units on this site.

I therefore do not agree with the variance of the Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to reduce the minimum front yard setback and allow a total of eight tandem parking spaces.

Thank-you,

Alvin Leung 115-8120 Jones Road Richmond, BC

V6Y 4K7



Quan Zhang Ling Wang Schedule 2 to the Minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on Wednesday, August 24, 2011.

To Development Permit Panel

Date: August 24, 2011

Re: DP 09-49896

Item #_2

116-8100 Junes Road

Richmond BC VSY 4B1

August 20, 2011

David Weber

Director, City clerk's office

City of Richmond

6911 NO. 3 Road

Richmond BC VGY 2C1

Re: A Meeting on August 24, 2001 regarding A Development Permit DPO9-49896

Dear Mr. Weber:

We've got a notice of application for a development permit regarding the Richmond Development Permit Panel will have a meeting to consider OTO Development Ltd. will construct eight townhouse units on a property Location 8080 and 8100 Blundell Road at 3:30 pm on August 24, 2011 at Richmond City Hall. We are unable to attend the meeting but we strongly hope the Development Permit Panel will consider benefit of all residents of Building 8100 and 8080 and decline this new development. Many thanks and we're willing to hear a good news from you soon.

Best Regard,

LING WANG & Quan Zhang

an 3h h

Schedule 3 to the Minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on Wednesday, August 24, 2011.

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

Attn: David Weber Director City Clerk's Office August 22, 2011

Γο D	Bvel or	ment F	ermit Pane
		24/2	<i>Ð</i> //
tem	communication	11-57	81634

Re: Development Variance DV 11-581634

We are writing in response to Layfield Plastics application to expand their operation.

Our primary concern is that these changes may result in an increase in the noise level that we are exposed to. The increase in activity would result in longer times when the plastic pellets are being blown through the pipes with the accompanying ringing noise. We would like to see Layfield Plastics configure the tower and additional silos so that it mitigates the noise from the pipes.

There would also be more train noise and pollution as more material would be brought in for the expanded operation.

Our customers from our U-pick raspberry farm have commented about the persistent ringing noise that is emitted whenever the plastic pellets are being blown through the pipes.

We would like to see the new tower, new and existing silos and piping be designed or enclosed to minimize the noise level.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Ben & Betty Baerg 11411 Shell Rd Richmond

