

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on May 28, 2008 and May 14, 2008.

DP 07-389190 – OVAL 6 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP – 5111 HOLLYBRIDGE WAY (May 28, 2008)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of a two-storey commercial building over one (1) level of parking at 5111 Hollybridge Way on a site zoned “Comprehensive Development District (CD/157)”. Variances are included in the proposal to increase building height and a setback reduction.

Mr. James Cheng, Architect, briefly reviewed the proposal, advising that the project was located close to the Oval building as shown in the master plan. Changes since the master plan included a new Birch Grove next to the river, a continuation of the plaza and an arrival court at the lower road. He advised that the landscaping was naturalistic, with a walkway at the back, and the canal had been upgraded. He noted that the building design was transparent and included a three-storey atrium from the arrival court.

Staff recommended the Development Permit be issued and the variances approved. Staff noted that the elimination of the rooftop Public Art had resulted in a lower building height variance.

In response to a Panel query regarding restaurant truck deliveries, Mr. Cheng advised that there was a fully enclosed servicing area in the building accessed from the lower arrival court.

In response to a Panel query regarding materials, Mr. Cheng advised that the landscaping would continue the same materials as the adjacent Oval site, including granite pavers and colour concrete. Proposed building materials were high quality and low maintenance, including a zinc roof, and anodized aluminum windows.

In response to Chair query regarding the water feature, Mr. Cheng advised that the feature was not connected to the water feature at the Oval due to seismic considerations.

In response to a Panel query regarding Public Art, Mr. Cheng advised that the originally proposed rooftop Public Art piece was eliminated to not detract from the proposed adjacent Oval Public Art features. An overall Public Art and sustainability proposal would be provided for the future phases.

Mr. Kush Panatch, Centro Properties Group, asked about construction timing. In response, Mr. Cheng advised that it was hoped to be completed by Spring of next year.

In response to a Chair query regarding security during the Olympic Games, Mr. Ryan, representing the applicant, advised that the building was located in a secure zone and was required to be closed for four months. He further advised that the building would be used as a marketing centre and ultimately renovated to restaurant use in the future.

In conclusion, the Chair commended the applicant and staff.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.

DP 07-395965 – AM-PRI CONSTRUCTION LTD. – 7420, 7426, 7440 &
7480 GARDEN CITY ROAD AND 9031, 9051 & 9071 GENERAL CURRIE ROAD
(May 14, 2008)

The Panel considered a Development Permit application to permit the construction of 45 townhouses with vehicle access from Turnill Street on a site zoned "Comprehensive Development District (CD/128)". Variances are included in the proposal to: reduce General Currie Road and Turnill Street road setbacks and increase porch projections facing Turnill Street.

Mr. Taizo Yamamoto, Architect, briefly reviewed the proposal, advising that the site and amenity area had been planned around the retention of an existing significant Oak tree. He stated that the setback variances were minor and intended to animate the façades with more depth. The primary materials for the project include Hardi-plank siding, Hardi board and batten in two colours, and horizontal vinyl siding. One (1) adaptable unit was provided and could be converted to be fully accessible.

Staff recommended that the Permit be issued and variances approved. Staff advised that the applicant had changed the design to respond to comments from the Advisory Design Panel and Public Hearing. Staff further advised that the proposal included the retention and replacement of existing trees.

A letter was submitted to the Panel - Mr. Ying Wang, area resident, submitted a letter to the Panel outlining parking concerns. Staff advised that this concern had resulted in Transportation Department staff investigating the issue and installing "no parking" signs on the 'half road' narrowed stretch of Turnill Street to ensure that parking does not occur on both sides. Staff noted that Turnill Street is currently a 'half road' and a portion will be widened to a full road as a condition of the development.

In response to a Panel query, staff advised that the site will meet the grade of the neighbouring lots to the north and a privacy fence would be installed.

The Panel recommends that the Permit be issued.



Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

Time: 3:30 p.m.
 Place: Council Chambers
 Richmond City Hall
 Present: Joe Erceg, General Manager, Planning and Development, Chair
 Robert Gonzalez, General Manager, Engineering and Public Works
 Andrew Nazareth, General Manager, Business and Financial Services

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, May 14, 2008, be adopted.

CARRIED

2. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 07-389190

(Report: May 1, 2008 File No.: DP 07-389190) (REDMS No. 2329646)

APPLICANT: Oval 6 Limited Partnership

PROPERTY LOCATION: 5111 Hollybridge Way

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the development of an approximately (1,502 m²) 16,158 sq. ft. two-storey commercial building over one level of parking at 5111 Hollybridge Way on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD 157); and
2. Vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:
 - a) increase the height from 18 m (59 ft.) geodetic to 20.6 m for a portion of the curved roof and 23.6 m (77 ft.) for the elevator tower of the proposed building; and
 - b) permit the building to encroach 2.1 m (6.8 ft.) into the north side yard setback.

Applicant's Comments

James Cheng, architect for the project was in attendance as well as John Ryan, representing the applicant. Mr. Cheng advised that the project was located close to the corner of the Oval building, and was part of the master plan. He explained that since the original master plan, a birch grove had been created next to the river and there was a continuation of the plaza. Mr. Cheng further advised that an arrival court had been included and the building was located exactly where it was on the master plan, together with a walkway at the back, and the canal had been upgraded. He noted that the building was intended to be seen as transparent from the dyke. Visitors would arrive from the lower road, into a three-storey atrium, and the building would be used originally for marketing, and eventually for a restaurant. He advised that the landscaping was naturalistic. Mr. Cheng then used a three dimensional computer graphic to further describe the building and he noted that the glass foyer was incorporated to allow people to see into the building.

Staff Comments

Brian Jackson, Director of Development stated that staff were recommending in favour of a development permit being issued and were also recommending approval of the variances. He advised that there was a follow-up report from staff describing a change to the design to eliminate the public art from the roof which lessened the previous elevator tower height variance. The requested variance was to increase the height from 18 m. to 20.6 m. for a portion of the curved roof and to 23.6 m. for the elevator tower instead of the previously 31 m.

Panel Discussion

In response to a question from the Panel on how trucks would make deliveries to a future restaurant in the building, Mr. Cheng advised that trucks would arrive from River Road to a loading bay located beneath the building where there was also a garbage holding area. This services area was fully enclosed within the building with large opening doors.

In response to further questions from the Panel on the finishes used on the building and the area adjacent to the river, Mr. Cheng described a water feature which would include a pond and a small waterfall. There would be granite pavers on the plaza as well as coloured concrete. He noted that the same materials used in the landscaping for the Oval were being used on this site. He stated that there was a "green" roof with a public viewing area, and that the building would be low maintenance, with a zinc roof, and anodized aluminium windows.

In response to a question from Chair on the connection to the water feature at the Oval, Mr. Cheng advised that because of seismic considerations it was a stand-alone feature. Mr. Cheng continued by saying that cobblestones had been used in the parking area to allow water to drain away.

Referring to the public art, he advised that although originally included in the design on the top of the building, it had been eliminated because it was felt that it would detract from the two spectacular public art features that were being incorporated into the adjacent Oval landscaping but that public art would be included elsewhere on the site and this feature would be included in a future overall public art and sustainability proposal for the future phases.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

Mr. Kush Panatch, President, Centro Properties Group, 200 – 6791 Elmbridge Way, asked about the timing for construction of the building, and Mr. Cheng advised that it was hoped to be completed by spring of next year. In response to a question from the Chair about security during the Olympic Games, Mr. Ryan explained that the applicant was obligated by its agreement with the City to close the building during the 4 months shutdown as part of secure zone of the Oval but were in discussions about the potential for part of the building to be used as part of the secure zone. He confirmed that after the Olympic Games, the building would continue to be used as a marketing centre and ultimately renovated in the future to restaurant use.

Panel Discussion

The Chair stated that there was a very complimentary staff report on the proposal, and that he was personally happy with the proposal.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. *Permit the development of an approximately (1,502 m²) 16,158 sq. ft. two-storey commercial building over one level of parking at 5111 Hollybridge Way on a site zoned Comprehensive Development District (CD 157); and*
2. *Vary the provisions of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 to:*
 - a) *increase the height from 18 m (59 ft.) geodetic to 20.6 m for a portion of the curved roof and 23.6 m for the elevator tower of the proposed building, and 31.0 m (101.7 ft.) to the top of the proposed public art piece; and*
 - b) *permit the building to encroach 2.1 m (6.8 ft.) into the north side yard setback.*

CARRIED

3. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be adjourned at 3.44 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 Wednesday, May 28, 2008.

Joe Erceg
Chair

Valerie Wilmot
Executive Assistant to the General
Manager, Corporate Services