



**Development Permit Panel
Thursday, October 28, 2020**

Time: 3:30 p.m.
Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall
Present: John Irving, Chair
Peter Russell, Director, Sustainability and District Energy
Milton Chan, Director, Engineering

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 October 15, 2020 be adopted.

CARRIED

**1. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 19-872960
(REDMS No. 6503736)**

APPLICANT: 1137183 BC Ltd.
PROPERTY LOCATION: 22551 Westminster Highway

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of seven townhouse units at 22551 Westminster Highway on a site zoned “Town Housing (ZT11) – Hamilton”; and
2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to permit tandem parking spaces in all of the units.

Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, October 28, 2020

Applicant's Comments

Eric Law, Eric Law Architect, with the aid of a visual presentation (copy on file, City Clerk's office), provided background information on the proposed development including its site context, site layout and floor plans, highlighting the following:

- the project is consistent with the size, height and form of the adjacent townhouse development to the north;
- the subject site is accessed from Westminster Highway through the internal drive aisle of the adjacent townhouse development to the north;
- the front building (Building A) has been pushed back from the north property line to provide a common outdoor amenity area and in order increase its separation from the adjacent townhouse buildings to the north;
- parking is proposed on the ground floor of units due to the required Flood Construction Level for the area;
- durable and low maintenance materials such as hardie panels are proposed for the project; and
- a pedestrian walkway is proposed along the north property line to provide access to the McLean Neighbourhood Park to the west.

Denitsa Dimitrova, PMG Landscape Architects, provided an overview of the landscaping for the project, noting that (i) each unit will be provided with a landscaped private yard, (ii) a six-foot high wood fence is proposed along the perimeter of the site, (iii) a common outdoor amenity area is proposed at the north of the site, and (iv) a second outdoor amenity area is proposed at the southeast corner of the site which provides opportunities for urban agriculture.

Staff Comments

Wayne Craig, Director, Development, noted that (i) there is a variance associated with the project to allow tandem parking in all of the units which was identified at rezoning stage, (ii) the tandem garages are consistent with the form of development in the Hamilton Area and are used in achieving the City's minimum flood construction level requirement, (iii) the proposed variance is consistent with the adjacent townhouse development to the north, (iv) the project will achieve Step 3 of the BC Energy Step Code, and (v) one convertible unit is proposed for the project.

Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, October 28, 2020

Panel Discussion

In reply to queries from the Panel, Ms. Dimitrova acknowledged that (i) there is no space for landscaping between the wood fence and the walkway to the public park along the north property line, and (ii) permeable paving treatment is proposed at the entrance and terminus of the internal drive aisle and visitor parking stalls.

In reply to queries from the Panel, Mr. Law noted that (i) one of the visitor parking stalls is sited at the southeast corner of the site due to avoid conflicts with the truck servicing the garbage and recycling room, (ii) the garbage and recycling truck will access the subject site through the shared driveway access on the adjacent development to the north, (iii) the garbage and recycling truck will back up after loading/unloading and use the neighbouring development's turnaround to exit the subject development, (iv) the garbage and recycling collection for the development will typically occur once a week, and (v) other options were explored by the applicant for garbage and recycling collection in the subject site.

In reply to the Panel's query regarding the proposed garbage and collection scheme for the subject site, Mr. Craig confirmed that (i) it is common for garbage trucks to have to back down the driveway in order to make a three-point turn at the T-intersection in the driveway, and (ii) the City's Environmental Management staff have reviewed and supported the proposed garbage and recycling location and access arrangement.

In reply to a query from the Panel regarding the number of benches to be provided in the children's play area, Ms. Dimitrova acknowledged that only one bench is proposed to be provided; however, the applicant would consider the proposal to install an additional bench to allow physical distancing between residents.

In reply to queries from the Panel regarding the lack of glazing on the south facade of the front building (Building B), Mr. Law noted that (i) no windows are proposed on the second floor atop the electrical room on the ground floor as there is a stairwell behind the exterior wall, (ii) the south facade of the front building is facing the road right-of-way of Westminster Highway, and (iii) the applicant would investigate opportunities to install windows on the upper floors of the south elevation of the front building to improve the facade treatment and provide passive solar heating.

Gallery Comments

None.

Correspondence

None.

Development Permit Panel Wednesday, October 28, 2020

Panel Discussion

The Panel expressed support for the project and direction was given to staff to work with the applicant to (i) consider installing an additional bench in the children's play area, and (ii) review the lack of glazing on the south façade of the front building and investigate opportunities for installing windows prior to the application moving forward for Council consideration.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *permit the construction of seven townhouse units at 22551 Westminster Highway on a site zoned "Town Housing (ZT11) – Hamilton"; and*
2. *vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to permit tandem parking spaces in all of the units.*

CARRIED

2. **DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 19-875398** (REDMS No. 6484984)

APPLICANT: Spires Road Development Holdings Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 8671, 8691, 8711 and 8731 Spires Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

Permit the construction of 22 townhouse units and two secondary suites at 8671, 8691, 8711 and 8731 Spires Road and the surplus portion of the Spires Road and Cook Crescent road allowance on a site zoned "Parking Structure Townhouses (RTP4)".

Applicant's Comments

Kai Hotson, Hotson Architecture 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 context, site layout, design rationale and process, building elevations, and floor plans, highlighting the following:

- three townhouse building blocks enclose a parking structure at grade;
- each residential unit is assigned its own parking stall;
- there is an outdoor courtyard on the podium overtop the parkade which connects the three building blocks;
- a mix of three to four-bedroom units are proposed, with majority of units having three bedrooms;

Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, October 28, 2020

- each unit has its own private outdoor space at grade and/or on the podium;
- the podium level can be accessed either through an elevator or stairs;
- common outdoor amenity spaces are provided at grade and on the podium;
- public pedestrian walkways are proposed along the north and west property lines to provide pedestrian access through the site, neighbourhood, and future public park in the area;
- seating nodes are provided along the public pedestrian walkways;
- the architecture for the townhouse development is compatible with the predominantly single-family neighbourhood;
- proposed exterior building materials include, among others, brick and plank siding;
- loosely alternating the use of light and dark coloured materials visually breaks down the building blocks and breaks up the repetitiveness of units; and
- two trees at the northeast corner will be retained and protected and six trees on neighbouring properties will also be protected.

Alyssa Semczyszyn, Prospect and Reference Landscape Architects, reviewed the proposed landscaping for the site, noting that (i) the project's landscape design is intended to create enjoyable private outdoor spaces for individual units and engaging pedestrian walkways to encourage people to walk through the neighbourhood, (ii) on the podium level, low fences and raised planters provide separation and privacy between units and encourage social interaction among residents, and (iii) a more substantial screening is proposed to provide separation between the common outdoor amenity area and adjacent private patios of units on the podium level.

In addition, Ms. Semczyszyn reviewed the design of the common outdoor amenity area on the northeast corner of the site, noting that (i) the translucent fencing provides screening to the amenity area and also creates a sense of openness, and (ii) the two retained trees integrated into the children's play area will be protected.

Also, Ms. Semczyszyn reviewed the design of the children's play area on the podium level, the ground level unit patio, the podium level courtyard section, and the ground level sections through the north public pedestrian walkway and the outdoor amenity space at the northeast corner of the site.

Staff Comments

Mr. Craig noted that (i) the project will provide two Basic Universal Housing (BUH) units and two secondary suites, (ii) the project has been designed to achieve Step Code Level 3 of the BC Energy Step Code, (iii) there is a significant Servicing Agreement associated with the project which includes site servicing and frontage works along Spires Road and Cook Crescent, and (iv) staff appreciate the efforts of the project's design team for the retention and protection of two trees along the Cook Crescent frontage.

Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, October 28, 2020

Panel Discussion

In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Hotson acknowledged that (i) the ground floor of the three-storey townhouse units facing Spires Road includes a small room with a closet, a washroom, a mechanical space under the stairwell, and a door that provides access to the parkade, and (ii) the at grade unit entries and living spaces of the three-storey units and the single level BUH unit facing Spires Road provide animation to the street.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Craig confirmed that (i) a Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) for public pedestrian access along the north and west property lines of the subject site has been secured, (ii) the public walkways along the north and west property lines would be expanded when adjacent properties redevelop in the future as SRWs for public pedestrian access would also be secured on these properties, and (iii) the interim fence along the north and west property lines of the subject site would be removed when adjacent properties redevelop.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Hotson noted that potential overlook to adjacent single-family homes would be mitigated by the retained trees along the north and west sides of the site, the public walkways along the north and west property lines, and the significant distance of the north property line of the subject site from the rear yards of single-family homes to the north.

In reply to further queries from the Panel, Mr. Hotson acknowledged that (i) the proposed mechanical systems will not impact the form and character of the project as the Heat Recovery Ventilation (HRV) units are located inside each residential unit and the heat pump is located in the parkade, and (ii) materials for the building envelope include, among others, triple glazed windows and insulated roofs and walls.

In reply to queries from the Panel regarding the provision of on-site parking, Mr. Hotson noted that the project provides 1.2 parking stalls for each unit and five visitor parking stalls.

In reply to a query from the Panel regarding the City's parking requirement for the project, Mr. Craig confirmed that (i) the project meets the Zoning Bylaw's requirement of 1.2 parking stalls for each unit for residential developments in this area of the City Centre Area, (ii) the project assigns a minimum of one parking stall for each unit, and (iii) there are additional unassigned parking stalls that would be assigned as part of the unit sales contract.

In reply to queries from the Panel regarding the species of trees to be planted on raised planters on the podium level courtyard, Ms. Semczynszyn noted that (i) the tree species to be planted would be suitable for the size of planters being proposed, and (ii) irrigation will be provided for the trees.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Craig confirmed that a combination of three tree species are proposed to be planted on the podium level courtyard, which include Hybrid Magnolia, Manchurian Snakebark Maple, and Fullmoon Maple.

Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, October 28, 2020

In reply to a further query from the Panel, Mr. Hotson and Ms. Semczyszyn confirmed that different patterns of pavers are proposed for the private patios and shared pathway on the podium level.

Gallery Comments

None.

Correspondence

Jose Gonzalez, 8935 Cook Crescent ([Schedule 1](#))

In reply to Mr. Gonzalez's concerns on parking, circulation and traffic during construction, Mr. Craig noted that (i) these concerns are largely related to ongoing city utility works in the area which are expected to be completed in January 2021, and (ii) a construction traffic management plan will be required for the project prior to Building Permit issuance to deal with trades parking and deliveries to the site.

With regard to the concern about potential damage to city roads during construction, Mr. Craig further noted that the developer will be required to enter into a Servicing Agreement with the City for new road works and any damages will have to be repaired by the developer.

With respect to the concern on parking and traffic generated by the project in the neighbourhood, Mr. Craig commented that (i) a Transportation Impact study for the project was reviewed and supported by the City's Transportation Division, and (ii) the existing road network is sufficient to accommodate the traffic that would be generated in the area.

In reply to concerns related to illegal street parking by non-residents in the area, Mr. Craig further noted that (i) there will be road improvements along the site frontage, (ii) a traffic and parking management plan will be required during construction, and (iii) the Community Bylaws Department has been asked to conduct more parking enforcement patrols in the area.

With regard to the comment to make the outdoor amenity area at the northeast corner of the subject site a public space, Mr. Craig noted that (i) there are significant liability issues related to providing a public access to private outdoor amenity area, and (ii) the proposed public walkways and a future public park in the neighbourhood would address the public open space needs of the neighbourhood.

Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, October 28, 2020

In reply to concerns related to the appearance of retaining walls on the site and sight lines at the southeast corner, Mr. Craig further noted that (i) low retaining walls are proposed along the edges of the proposed development, and (ii) the project complies with the City's Traffic Bylaw sight line requirements for the southeast corner of the subject site.

In reply to queries from the Panel regarding the provision of outdoor amenity spaces in the neighbourhood, Mr. Craig advised that (i) the future public park will be implemented over the long term as redevelopment occurs, and (ii) in the interim, the active open spaces on William Cook Elementary School to the south, the Garden City Community Park, and the Garden City Lands would provide for the outdoor amenity space needs of residents in the area.

In reply to queries from the Panel regarding the design and height of retaining walls along the site edges, Mr. Hotson acknowledged that (i) low retaining walls are proposed as the site grade along the north and west property lines will be raised by approximately one foot to match the existing grade of adjacent streets, (ii) there is planting on top of the retaining walls which are generally used to create a patio for each unit, (iii) an elaborate design is proposed for retaining walls along the site edges where existing trees are being retained, (iv) the retaining walls are set back from the development's property lines to protect the retained trees and are hidden behind the temporary fence along the west and north property lines, (v) a very low timber retaining wall is proposed for the outer edge of the public walkway along the north edge of the site, and (vi) a low concrete retaining wall is proposed along the site edges to create private patios.

In reply to a further query from the Panel, Mr. Hotson confirmed that the applicant is also considering a block system for the concrete retaining wall along the site edges.

As a result of the discussion on the design of the retaining walls, staff were directed to work with the applicant to improve the retaining wall treatment along the site edges.

Panel Discussion

The Panel expressed support for the project, particularly the architectural treatment for the townhouse building blocks, the provision of public walkways, the use of low-carbon technology to achieve Energy Step Code requirements, and the siting of the parkade in the middle of the townhouse building blocks. In addition, the Panel noted that the project is a good addition to the neighbourhood.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of 22 townhouse units and two secondary suites at 8671, 8691, 8711 and 8731 Spires Road and the surplus portion of the Spires Road and Cook Crescent road allowance on a site zoned "Parking Structure Townhouses (RTP4)".

CARRIED

Development Permit Panel
Wednesday, October 28, 2020

3. New Business

It was moved and seconded

That the Development Permit Panel meeting scheduled on November 12, 2020 be cancelled.

CARRIED

4. Date of Next Meeting: November 25, 2020

5. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 4:44 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 Thursday, October 28, 2020.

John Irving
Chair

Rustico Agawin
Committee Clerk

Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on Wednesday, October 28, 2020.

ON TABLE ITEM

Date: OCTOBER 28, 2020
Meeting: DPP
Item: # 2



From: J G <corvette_racer@hotmail.com>
Sent: October 26, 2020 6:55 PM
To: CityClerk
Subject: Development Permit Panel (Oct. 28) meeting submission

I am writing with serious concerns about **DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 19-875398 on Spires Road**. The form of the development and variances will impact local residents. The parking, circulation and traffic concerns raised at the public hearing are still largely unaddressed.

As a neighbour of the development, I am very concerned that the traffic, parking and other impacts have not been properly addressed both during construction and when the development is finished.

- 1) **Parking, circulation and traffic during construction:** How many times and for how long will traffic in and out of our neighbourhood be completely blocked? It has already been blocked repeatedly (more than 10 times in the last 3 months) by existing construction in our neighbourhood. The latest issue happened last week, when our neighborhood was completely isolated when a van drove into a ditch, blocking the only entrance into the neighbourhood. None of the 100+residents could drive in or out for over 1 hour. This is a safety hazard. No roads should be blocked when either of the 2 access streets are already blocked. All vehicles from construction workers or trades should park completely off the road on narrow stretches, so vehicles can drive past them. Parking enforcement should prevent vehicles from parking so they block traffic.
- 2) **Road damage during construction:** When will the damaged roads get fixed? Large construction machines have torn up roads and left pot-holes over 6 inches deep on Spires Road for over 5 months (including right in front of this development!). Why are developers not responsible for paying and fixing this damage when they are causing them during construction?
- 3) **Parking, circulation and traffic with the proposed development.** Has the City done any traffic and parking modelling to determine the impacts of the proposed development and subsequent similar zoning? What is the mean and maximum queuing that is expected during peak times for vehicles accessing Cook Road and Cooney Road? H
- 4) **Boulevard damage from the proposed development.** How will existing boulevards for current residents be protected so they don't either become mud pits in the winter as cars park on them (which currently the case)? Will current residents be evicted from parking in front of their house by new residents? The current bylaws sanction these evictions, as currently happens along Ash Street, South of Granville Avenue. Parking on one side of the street only on Spires Road is unacceptable and will make this problem worse than even on Ash Street where part of the street has parking on both sides. The City needs to provide parking and sidewalks on both sides of the street (including removing the ditches) before the development is finished.
- 5) **Public outdoor amenity space rejected by the developer.** The City should not grant this development permit unless the developer agrees to make "the proposed outdoor amenity space at the northeast corner a public space to tie in with the adjacent public walkway along the north side;" as mentioned in the **Advisory Design Panel report from April 22**. This should also tie into the public walkway that is mentioned. Otherwise the walkway will be almost useless!
- 6) **Retaining walls.** How will the retaining walls be designed to avoid looking like ugly industrial patches to the surrounding properties and especially from any areas visible to the street? The developer should provide beautification or other designs for the walls.
- 7) **Sight lines.** As noted in the **Advisory Design Panel report from April 22**, the southeast corner planting treatment needs to provide clear sightlines for traffic and pedestrian safety. It's not clear what the developer is proposing. Who will be reviewing and enforcing sight-lines at the corner of the development,

particularly with higher traffic volumes from this and other developments already underway leading to more congestion and conflict between cars at that T-intersection?

Thank you,
Jose Gonzalez
8935 Cook Crescent, Richmond
PS: Please reply to confirm that you have received this email.

From: Lee, Edwin
Sent: October 28, 2020 2:48 PM
To: 'J G'
Subject: RE: Development Permit Panel (Oct. 28) meeting submission - DP 19-875398 - 8671, 8691, 8711, 8731 Spires Road

Mr. Gonzalez

Thank you for taking the time to share your concerns. Please see below for our responses to your concerns.

1) Parking, circulation and traffic during construction: How many times and for how long will traffic in and out of our neighbourhood be completely blocked? It has already been blocked repeatedly (more than 10 times in the last 3 months) by existing construction in our neighbourhood. The latest issue happened last week, when our neighborhood was completely isolated when a van drove into a ditch, blocking the only entrance into the neighbourhood. None of the 100+ residents could drive in or out for over 1 hour. This is a safety hazard. No roads should be blocked when either of the 2 access streets are already blocked. All vehicles from construction workers or trades should park completely off the road on narrow stretches, so vehicles can drive past them. Parking enforcement should prevent vehicles from parking so they block traffic.

As you note, the Spires Road area is experiencing construction due to private property and public works that are underway. Regulations are in place for these types of activities. I have included some information on current works planned for the area below in addition to some information on what is required of developments on the topics you have noted.

Regarding the capital project:

- There is a capital Eckersley B Pump Station and Related Pipe Works construction project that is currently underway on Cook Road at Cook Gate and in the City right of way on the School property.
- Completion is currently projected to the end of December 2020 or early January 2021; however, it could take longer due to the extremely difficult soil and ground water conditions in this area.
- The only road closure that is in effect is the Cook Gate at Cook Road. The Spires Gate always remains open for entering and exiting the Spires Area subdivision.
- The Cook Gate closure most likely would be in effect until all the pipe work is completed.
- It is unlikely but still possible that Cook Road may be closed at some point for the sanitary line pipe crossing to the new pump station; however, Engineering is trying to avoid this situation as much as possible.
- All the road closures are coordinated and approved by Transportation Department.

Regarding land developments:

- A construction traffic management plan will be required for each development in the City.
- All trades parking and loading/unloading operations are to be conducted on-site.
- Any works that will require lane closures on Spires Road will need permission from the City's Traffic Operations division.
- Staff have shared your email with the applicant and they have advised that the development team will attempt to reduce inconveniences to residents.
- They will have a traffic flag team on site when required.
- They will do their best minimizing road damage throughout the course of construction. Any unfortunate damage as a result of this development will be addressed and repaired, in consultation with relevant City staff.
- Their Construction team will be available to address any concerns once construction commences.

- Concerns related to construction traffic management during construction should be directed to the City's Traffic Operations Department trafops@richmond.ca

As you have identified construction parking in the area is an ongoing issue, staff will assign an ongoing patrol file to the Bylaw Enforcement Officers for their attendance.

- In addition, if they see a bylaw traffic violation, please contact our bylaw enforcement team at bylawrequest@richmond.ca with the details. This email goes straight to our Officers in the field and they will respond in a timely manner.
- For other concerns related to construction parking or construction vehicle traffic, please contact Traffic Operations at trafops@richmond.ca.

2) Road damage during construction: When will the damaged roads get fixed? Large construction machines have torn up roads and left pot-holes over 6 inches deep on Spires Road for over 5 months (including right in front of this development!). Why are developers not responsible for paying and fixing this damage when they are causing them during construction?

- For the subject development project, the road along the frontage of the development is covered by Servicing Agreement, where upgrades must be completed to a certain standard and paid for by the developer.
- Any road and boulevard damages during construction are to be repaired and restored by the contractor.
- Any reports on road damages would be investigated by the City and the developers will be notified on the damages and required repairs.
- If you want to report road damages due to constructions on private property, please contact Jaime Villaluz at JVillaluz@richmond.ca.

3) Parking, circulation and traffic with the proposed development. Has the City done any traffic and parking modelling to determine the impacts of the proposed development and subsequent similar zoning? What is the mean and maximum queuing that is expected during peak times for vehicles accessing Cook Road and Cooney Road? H

- Each new townhouse development is required to provide a Transportation Impact study to assess any impacts to traffic volumes, parking etc, associated with the new development. Based on traffic assessments conducted in the area, site-generated traffic in the peak periods is not expected to be significant.

4) Boulevard damage from the proposed development. How will existing boulevards for current residents be protected so they don't either become mud pits in the winter as cars park on them (which currently the case)? Will current residents be evicted from parking in front of their house by new residents? The current bylaws sanction these evictions, as currently happens along Ash Street, South of Granville Avenue. Parking on one side of the street only on Spires Road is unacceptable and will make this problem worse than even on Ash Street where part of the street has parking on both sides. The City needs to provide parking and sidewalks on both sides of the street (including removing the ditches) before the development is finished.

- Frontage improvements along the site frontage including ditch infill, pavement widening, new curb, boulevard and sidewalk have been secured as part of Rezoning and will be constructed as part of the development.
- This development provides on-site parking that meets bylaw requirements.

5) Public outdoor amenity space rejected by the developer. The City should not grant this development permit unless the developer agrees to make "the proposed outdoor amenity space at the northeast corner a public space to tie in with the adjacent public walkway along the north side;" as mentioned in the Advisory Design Panel report from April 22. This should also tie into the public walkway that is mentioned. Otherwise the walkway will be almost useless!

- A series of revisions have been made to the design of the northeast corner of the site based on the feedback provided by the Advisory Design Panel (ADP).
- This area was redesigned to incorporate a children's play area, with a translucent fence separating the public walkway from the amenity area. This provides a visual connection in and out of the space.

- Public walkways have been designed along the north and west property lines providing public access throughout the site. These walkways also include seating elements, and work to retain existing trees.
- Based on the long range plan, Official Community Plan (OCP), for this area, there is a public park proposed just north of this site, where Cook Crescent turns west. The walkways are proposed to provide a more permeable city block pattern, connecting the broader area together and providing easier access to local amenities.

6) Retaining walls. How will the retaining walls be designed to avoid looking like ugly industrial patches to the surrounding properties and especially from any areas visible to the street? The developer should provide beautification or other designs for the walls.

- The retaining walls on development site are low (12"-18" in height) in order to create landscaped front patios for each proposed unit.
- A simple, clean design is proposed for these walls to complement the high quality nature of the project.

7) Sight lines. As noted in the Advisory Design Panel report from April 22, the southeast corner planting treatment needs to provide clear sightlines for traffic and pedestrian safety. It's not clear what the developer is proposing. Who will be reviewing and enforcing sight-lines at the corner of the development, particularly with higher traffic volumes from this and other developments already underway leading to more congestion and conflict between cars at that T-intersection?

- The architecture and landscaping for the south east corner has been designed to meet the city sight line requirements. City requires that corner visibility be maintained by providing a Sight Triangle of 7.5 m x 7.5 m with no obstructions to the line of vision.
- The building has been set back to allow for the required sightlines at this intersection.
- The planting in this area provides some screening (for windows of the residences) while predominately providing habitat.
- The planting design strategy is to provide layers of vegetation to ensure that the plantings near the corner are low or are setback and will not become a barrier to visibility at the corner.

Please note that there are no variances associated with the project. Should you have further questions, please feel free to contact me at 604-276-4121.

Regards.
Edwin

From: J G <corvette_racer@hotmail.com>
Sent: October 26, 2020 6:55 PM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@richmond.ca>
Subject: Development Permit Panel (Oct. 28) meeting submission

I am writing with serious concerns about DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 19-875398 on Spires Road. The form of the development and variances will impact local residents. The parking, circulation and traffic concerns raised at the public hearing are still largely unaddressed.

As a neighbour of the development, I am very concerned that the traffic, parking and other impacts have not been properly addressed both during construction and when the development is finished.

- 1) Parking, circulation and traffic during construction: How many times and for how long will traffic in and out of our neighbourhood be completely blocked? It has already been blocked repeatedly (more than 10 times in the last 3 months) by existing construction in our neighbourhood. The latest issue happened last week, when our neighborhood was completely isolated when a van drove into a ditch, blocking the only entrance into the neighbourhood. None of the 100+residents could drive in or out for over 1 hour. This is a safety hazard. No roads should be blocked when either of the 2 access streets are already blocked. All vehicles from construction workers or trades should park completely off the road on narrow stretches, so vehicles can drive past them. Parking enforcement should prevent vehicles from parking so they block traffic.**

- 2) **Road damage during construction: When will the damaged roads get fixed? Large construction machines have torn up roads and left pot-holes over 6 inches deep on Spires Road for over 5 months (including right in front of this development!). Why are developers not responsible for paying and fixing this damage when they are causing them during construction?**
- 3) **Parking, circulation and traffic with the proposed development. Has the City done any traffic and parking modelling to determine the impacts of the proposed development and subsequent similar zoning? What is the mean and maximum queuing that is expected during peak times for vehicles accessing Cook Road and Cooney Road? H**
- 4) **Boulevard damage from the proposed development. How will existing boulevards for current residents be protected so they don't either become mud pits in the winter as cars park on them (which currently the case)? Will current residents be evicted from parking in front of their house by new residents? The current bylaws sanction these evictions, as currently happens along Ash Street, South of Granville Avenue. Parking on one side of the street only on Spires Road is unacceptable and will make this problem worse than even on Ash Street where part of the street has parking on both sides. The City needs to provide parking and sidewalks on both sides of the street (including removing the ditches) before the development is finished.**
- 5) **Public outdoor amenity space rejected by the developer. The City should not grant this development permit unless the developer agrees to make "the proposed outdoor amenity space at the northeast corner a public space to tie in with the adjacent public walkway along the north side;" as mentioned in the Advisory Design Panel report from April 22. This should also tie into the public walkway that is mentioned. Otherwise the walkway will be almost useless!**
- 6) **Retaining walls. How will the retaining walls be designed to avoid looking like ugly industrial patches to the surrounding properties and especially from any areas visible to the street? The developer should provide beautification or other designs for the walls.**
- 7) **Sight lines. As noted in the Advisory Design Panel report from April 22, the southeast corner planting treatment needs to provide clear sightlines for traffic and pedestrian safety. It's not clear what the developer is proposing. Who will be reviewing and enforcing sight-lines at the corner of the development, particularly with higher traffic volumes from this and other developments already underway leading to more congestion and conflict between cars at that T-intersection?**

Thank you,
Jose Gonzalez
8935 Cook Crescent, Richmond
PS: Please reply to confirm that you have received this email.