



## **Development Permit Panel**

**Wednesday, December 15, 2010**

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

### **1. Minutes**

It was moved and seconded

*That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on Wednesday, November 10, 2010, be adopted.*

**CARRIED**

### **2. Development Permit DP 10-534599** (File Ref. No.: DP 10-534599) (REDMS No. 3064213)

APPLICANT: Yamamoto Architecture Inc.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 9840 Alberta Road

#### **INTENT OF PERMIT:**

1. Permit the construction of eight (8) townhouse units at 9840 Alberta Road on a site zoned "Town Housing (ZT60)"; and
2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
  - a) reduce the front yard setback from 6.0 m to 3.4 m for a single-storey garbage and recycling enclosure attached to the building;
  - b) allow a 2.59 m porch projection into the front yard setback; and
  - c) reduce the rear yard setback from 3.0 m to 2.2 m for a single-storey electrical closet attached to the building.

**Applicant's Comments**

Taizo Yamamoto, Yamamoto Architecture Inc., provided the following details regarding the proposed development of eight three-storey townhouse units at the corner of Alberta and No. 4 Roads.

- the subject site is considered 'tight' and the proposed townhouse units are clustered in two four-plexes fronting No. 4 Road;
- a north-south drive aisle along the west property line provides vehicle access to the subject site from Alberta Road;
- the buildings are articulated with individual entrances;
- five trees are being retained on the No. 4 Road frontage, ensuring greenery;
- site elevation is maintained at the existing elevation for the purpose of tree preservation;
- new landscapings provide a buffer between the subject site and the single family home to the west;
- the outdoor amenity area is provided in two separate areas: (i) a multi-functional space includes a passive sandbox for children and an open lawn area for casual play; and (ii) the second space contains a shared community garden area with raised planting beds to provide on-site gardening;
- upper storeys have been stepped back at the south east corner of the subject site to better relate to the adjacent 12-unit townhouse complex;
- the townhouse units fronting Alberta Road feature a gable to better relate to the adjacent dwellings to the north;
- consistent height and massing has been achieved to enhance the streetscape;
- sustainability features include: (i) the use of energy efficient appliances; (ii) the use of Low-E glass; and (iii) insulation beneath the ground floor slab;
- the development design promotes pedestrian use of Alberta and No. 4 Roads; and
- for enhanced accessibility one of the townhouse units is convertible, and the other seven units include blocking inside the walls in all washrooms to facilitate future potential installation of grab bars/handrails.

Masa Ito, Landscape Architect, Ito Landscape Inc., provided the following information:

- tree retention along No. 4 Road creates lush landscaping;
- the inclusion of individual garden plots promotes urban agriculture;
- the outdoor amenity space is divided into two separate areas: (i) the sandbox area for passive play by young children; and (ii) the community garden; and
- future development at 9820 Alberta Road would provided an opportunity for a combined landscape area.

### **Panel Discussion**

In response to queries from the Panel, Mr. Yamamoto and Mr. Ito confirmed the following information:

- the trees retained along No. 4 Road include Birch trees;
- of the individual garden plots on the subject site, three are 30 inches above the grade of the walkway, and the remainder are 6 inches above grade;
- the nearest active play equipment for children is located at Anderson Elementary School;
- the narrowness of the outdoor amenity area on the small subject site does not allow for the inclusion of required safety clearances for active play equipment;
- a lid for the sandbox would be provided and small play equipment for the sandbox would be explored; and
- the mailbox and garbage/recycling enclosures are located just off the main vehicle entry.

A brief discussion ensued with regard to the inability of garbage/recycle trucks to turn around on the subject site, and the necessity that they back up.

Brian J. Jackson, Director of Development, advised that staff reviewed the location of the garbage/recycle area with City Transportation, and Recycling, staff, and agreement was reached that: (i) the location off the main vehicle entry was the preferred location for the garbage/recycling enclosures; and (ii) truck backing up was the acceptable solution.

Mr. Jackson acknowledged that when future development takes place at 9820 Alberta Road, there may be an option for trucks to enter, and turn around onsite without having to back out.

The Panel suggested that future development at 9820 Alberta Road allow trucks to turn onsite.

### **Staff Comments**

Mr. Jackson advised that staff supports the proposed Development Permit application, and the proposed variances.

With regard to the variance that would reduce the rear yard setback, from 3 metres to 2.2 metres, for a single-storey electrical closet attached to the building, Mr. Jackson advised that: (i) the same variance was granted to the 12-unit townhouse complex to the south of the subject site; and (ii) the electrical closet would be screened from the neighbours' view by a 6-foot high fence.

### **Correspondence**

None.

### **Gallery Comments**

Nolita Cheng, 11051 Trimaran Gate, advised that she spoke on behalf of a family member who lives in one of the townhouse units to the south of the subject site, at 6551 No. 4 Road, who was concerned that the variance from 3 metres to 2.2 metres would bring the proposed development too close to her residence.

The Chair referred to the information Mr. Jackson had provided, regarding the same variance having been granted for the development of the townhouse units at 6551 No. 4 Road, and the planned presence of a 6-foot high fence.

### **Panel Discussion**

The Chair noted that when the property to the west of the subject site is developed, the size and the configuration of the drive aisle allows trucks to turn on site. The Chair added that the variance to reduce a setback for an electrical closet is a common one sought by developers.

### **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 9840 Alberta Road on a site zoned "Town Housing (ZT60)"; and*
2. *Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:*
  - a) *reduce the front yard setback from 6.0 m to 3.4 m for a single-storey garbage and recycling enclosure attached to the building;*
  - b) *allow a 2.59 m porch projection into the front yard setback; and*
  - c) *reduce the rear yard setback from 3.0 m to 2.2 m for a single-storey electrical closet attached to the building.*

**CARRIED**

### **3. Development Permit DP 10-539751**

(File Ref. No.: DP 10-539751) (REDMS No. 3068121)

APPLICANT: Centro Parkside Development Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 9651 Alberta Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of 22, three-storey townhouse units at 9651 Alberta Road, zoned "High Density Townhouses (RTH1)"; and

**Development Permit Panel**  
**Wednesday, December 15, 2010**

---

2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
  - a) reduce the required front yard setback along Hemlock Drive from 4.5m to 2.3m to allow an encroachment of the front balcony;
  - b) reduce the required lot width from 40.0m to 26.1m;
  - c) reduce the required landscaped area from 25% to 21.3%; and
  - d) permit resident parking to allow a tandem parking configuration for 22 units (44 stalls).

**Applicant's Comments**

Kush Panatch, Applicant, addressed the Panel and remarked that the long and narrow nature of the subject site provided a design challenge for the proposed 22-unit townhouse complex.

Mr. Panatch noted that an overriding factor in the design was how to provide a three-metre right-of-way on the east side of the subject site in order to provide a six-metre walkway to connect to Hemlock Drive.

Mr. Panatch added that when properties to the east and the west of the subject site are developed, the 22-unit townhouse complex development will be tied in.

Taizo Yamamoto, Architect, Yamamoto Architecture Inc., advised that the proposed units are arranged in four building clusters. He then drew the Panel's attention to the following details of the proposed development:

- the internal drive aisle shifts from the western edge to the east to reduce the long view corridor that would have resulted if the building clusters had been lined up along one side of the site;
- the outdoor amenity area is centrally located on the north side of the drive aisle in order to allow for southern exposure;
- there is more ceiling height on the townhouse unit main levels to encourage more light and more open space;
- units in two of the four building clusters are configured along the edge of the new pedestrian corridor and provide easy access from the corridor, as well as ensuring "eyes on the street" security;
- units in a third building cluster have their entries from the drive aisle, and are separated from their garages;
- the architectural form is a rowhouse, or linear, design that creates: (i) a robust appearance, and (ii) rhythm down the drive aisle;
- each unit is accentuated with brick cladding, planters, and painted shutters on the windows;
- garages feature transoms and windows; and

**Development Permit Panel**  
**Wednesday, December 15, 2010**

---

- sustainability features include low water faucets, energy efficient appliances, and proximity to public transportation routes.

Meredith Mitchell, Landscape Architect, DMG Landscape Architects, provided information relating to the proposed landscape design:

- a mixture of asphalt and a permeable paving system helps identify areas of interest, such as the amenity area;
- an increase in landscape elements is featured on Hemlock Drive, and hedge material adds green elements on the west property line;
- the design of the central amenity area includes a childrens' active play area;
- the design provides: (i) fencing along the eastern property line; and (ii) picket fences;
- the pedestrian corridor, from Hemlock Drive to Alberta Road, would temporarily be: (i) 3 metres in width; and (ii) paved in asphalt;
- at a future date, when the property to the east is developed, the pedestrian corridor would widen to 6 metres; and
- a public art structure doubles as a gateway at each end of the pedestrian corridor to identify its public use.

Mr. Yamamoto added that the garbage and recycling enclosure is centrally located, and that the proposed development for the adjacent site includes a continuous loop that circulates through the site, providing a turn-around radius for trucks.

### **Panel Discussion**

Discussion ensued between the Panel and the presenters regarding the following details:

- the arborist report called for the removal of 26 on-site trees, and one border tree located on the lot to the east of the subject site, due to: (i) their location within the development footprint; and (ii) the increase in the required grade to meet the City's Flood Protection Bylaw requirements;
- the outdoor amenity area includes large structures for active play by children; and
- one townhouse unit is convertible, with a pit depression and framing for a vertical lift, and clearances for wheelchair turns, and is located close to the accessible visitor parking stall; the other units include blocking inside the walls in all washrooms to facilitate future potential installation of grab bars/handrails.

In response to the Chair's query regarding provisions for the equitable sharing of costs in the future when the pedestrian corridor is widened, Mr. Panatch advised that permanent lighting, signage, and artwork costs have already been calculated.

**Development Permit Panel**  
**Wednesday, December 15, 2010**

---

Mr. Jackson remarked that staff is satisfied that an arrangement between Centro Parkside Development Ltd. and the future developer of the adjacent site would be equitable. He noted that it is typical that the first developer undertakes the design work and installation of some of the permanent features and that the completion cost is covered by the second developer.

**Staff Comments**

Mr. Jackson stated that staff supports the proposed development, and that the applicant had responded well to the unique conditions and dimensions of the subject site. The design of the internal drive aisle eliminates the 'bowling alley' effect, seen in some other developments.

**Panel Discussion**

In response to the Chair's query regarding the rationale to reduce the front yard setback along Hemlock Drive, from 4.5 metres to 2.3 metres, Mr. Jackson advised that the variance would allow each unit fronting Hemlock to include a real appearance of a front door.

Mr. Yamamoto added that the requested variance would accommodate a step back from the porch, not from the façade of the building.

**Correspondence**

Vicky Shen, 6233 Birch Street (Schedule 1)

Mr. Jackson noted that the correspondent was concerned about traffic in the area, and wrote about the narrowing of Birch Street. He advised that traffic patterns in the area had been discussed during the rezoning process for the subject site. The extension of Birch Street through the subject site was previously envisioned to be a vehicular street and now would be constructed as a pedestrian pathway.

Mr. Jackson stated that the applicant would dedicate 10 metres on Hemlock Drive, thus widening the street, and that when future development takes place to the west of the subject site, Hemlock Drive would be further widened.

The Chair reiterated that Hemlock Drive would be widened, and the existing Birch Street would no be narrowed.

**Gallery Comments**

None.

**Development Permit Panel  
Wednesday, December 15, 2010**

---

**Panel Decision**

It was moved and seconded

*That a Development Permit be issued which would:*

1. *Permit the construction of 22, three-storey townhouse units at 9651 Alberta Road, zoned "High Density Townhouses (RTH1)"; and*
2. *Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:*
  - a) *reduce the required front yard setback along Hemlock Drive from 4.5m to 2.3m to allow an encroachment of the front balcony;*
  - b) *reduce the required lot width from 40.0m to 26.1m;*
  - c) *reduce the required landscaped area from 25% to 21.3%; and*
  - d) *permit resident parking to allow a tandem parking configuration for 22 units (44 stalls).*

**CARRIED**

**4. New Business**

Mr. Jackson advised that there were no items for the Panel's consideration at the tentatively scheduled December 29, 2010 meeting of the Development Permit Panel. As a result of Mr. Jackson's advice the following motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

*That the Development Permit Panel meeting tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, December 29, 2010 be cancelled, and that the next meeting of the Development Permit Panel be scheduled to take place in the Council Chambers, Richmond City Hall, at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, January 12, 2011.*

**CARRIED**

**5. Date Of Next Meeting – Wednesday, January 12, 2011.**

**6. Adjournment**

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting be adjourned at 4:11 p.m.*

**CARRIED**



**Development Permit Panel**  
**Wednesday, December 15, 2010**

---

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, December 15, 2010.

---

Joe Erceg  
Chair

---

Sheila Johnston  
Committee Clerk

**To Development Permit Panel**  
 Date: DEC. 15, 2010  
 Item #: 3  
 Re: DP 10-539751

Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the  
 Development Permit Panel meeting  
 held on Wednesday, December 15,  
 2010.

Attention: Mr. David Johnson,  
 Planning and Development Dpt.  
 Concerning: Development Permit DP 10-539751

Dear Sir,

As residents at the 6233 Birch Street, we consider the Intent of Permit DP 10-539751 is clearly against our neighbourhood's fundamental interests as well as the safety of all vehicles travelling though the road along 6233 Birch if it is going to be narrowed due to the developers' unreasonable and greedy intention.

Our neighbourhood has become very crowded due to the city's planning of too many high density housing projects. If this new development is going to take away so much treasured public space for the developers' individual profits, it is to make their money at our expense/sacrifice without paying us anything, which is pure robbery of our free space and common property.

Second, the present road at 6233 Birch is too narrow and quite a number of cars have minor accidents at the turn because of the narrowness of the road. We were hoping that by developing a new housing project, the road might be widened, thus reducing future car crashes. However, if the city allows the developers to narrow the road instead of widening it as indicated on the map given, it will be ignoring the consequence of having more car crashes in our area on the part of the city, because by building new houses, more cars will be travelling here, and with the road still so narrow, the traffic problem will be intensified.


The public space does not belong to the developers, nor to the city, it is the common property of the residents living in the area.

The city hall must consider our residents' interests and turn down all the four suggested points. In clear wording: No intrusion of public space/property for the interests of those businessmen.

The city is working for the interests of the people. All the present problems are due to the greediness of the developers. They should check their desires and plan their housing project according to the land they purchased. They have no right to intrude into public space and rob from us common people what should belong to us.

Many people in our neighbourhood are worried and infuriated by the developers' unreasonable demands. Therefore, no point to negotiate with them at all. Just tell them to do with the land they purchased, period.

Thank you for reading this letter and do please stop the developers.

  
 Vicky Shen,  
 Resident at 6233 Birch

