



# REPORT TO COUNCIL

To: **Mayor and Councillors**

Subject: Development Permit Amendment Application  
DP 02-20

File #: 6620.00

Doc #:

From: Roy M. Beddow, RPP, MCIP  
Deputy Director of Development Services

Date: June 22, 2020

---

## RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Development Permit Amendment Application DP 02-20 by JMC Properties to permit site plan changes and a reduction in the number of visitor parking stalls from 17 spaces to 11 spaces for the 69-unit apartment development at 20416 Park Avenue be approved.

---

## PURPOSE:

To consider an application to amend Development Permit DP 12-17 to expand the landscaped area along the rear lane and relax the visitor parking requirements.

## POLICY:

Off-street parking requirements - including visitor parking requirements in multifamily residential developments - are set out in Zoning Bylaw, 1996, No. 2100. Council may relax off-street parking requirements through the approval of a Development Permit or Development Variance Permit.

## COMMENTS/ANALYSIS:

The City issued Development Permit DP 12-17 for a 6-storey, 69-unit apartment building at 20416 Park Avenue on April 3, 2018. The building is currently under construction and the developer is proposing to amend the site plan at the rear of the building in order to provide an additional landscaped area separating the ground floor units from the rear lane (see Attachments 1, 2 and last page of Attachment 3). In order to provide this additional landscaping, the originally approved perpendicular

parking spaces along the rear lane, between the underground parking entrance and the secondary entrance/bike rack area, need to be re-oriented to parallel spaces.

This proposed change would result in the loss of 6 visitor parking spaces (from 17 spaces to 11 spaces) from what was approved in DP 12-17. The zoning bylaw requires a total of 14 visitor parking spaces for this project, based on the bylaw requirement of 0.2 visitor parking spaces per unit in multi-family residential zones. The requested variance from the zoning bylaw requirement is therefore 3 spaces (see table below).

*20416 Park Avenue - Visitor Parking Comparison*

DP 12-17	Zoning Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Bylaw Variance
0.25 spaces/unit	0.20 spaces/unit	0.16 spaces/unit	-0.04
17 spaces	14 spaces	11 spaces	-3 spaces

In support of this application, the applicant has provided a parking study from a traffic engineering consultant (Attachment 3). The study surveyed actual demand for visitor parking in the existing apartment developments on Park Avenue and reviewed standards and bylaw requirements in other municipalities in the area. According to the study, the requested variance (to 0.16 visitor space per unit) is similar to standards for residential developments in downtown areas and consistent with or higher than bylaw requirements in Surrey, New Westminster and Port Moody. The study concludes that 11 visitor parking spaces is sufficient to meet the forecast demand for this 69-unit development.

City staff have reviewed the parking study and are satisfied with the methodology employed and the recommendation presented by the consultant. Staff would also note that off-street parking requirements (including visitor parking) are currently being reviewed as part of the work underway on a new zoning bylaw. Preliminary results suggest the potential for reduced parking requirements within the “core” and “shoulder” areas (i.e. within 400-800 metre radii) around the planned SkyTrain stations. In this context, the subject property, located approximately 500 metres from the planned Downtown Langley/203 Street station, would be considered for a reduced parking requirement. The requested variance of 3 spaces amounts to an overall parking relaxation of 2.61% (based on a total requirement of 115 spaces) which is well within the range of reductions under consideration in the new zoning bylaw. Staff support the requested variance and recommend that the development permit amendment application be approved.

Given the limited scope of the proposed Development Permit amendment, this application does not require review by the Advisory Design Panel prior to Council consideration.

**BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

N.A.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. That Development Permit Amendment application DP 02-20 not be supported.

Respectfully Submitted,



Roy M. Beddow, RPP, MCIP  
Deputy Director of Development Services

Concurrence:



Carl Johannsen, RPP, MCIP  
Director of Development Services

Concurrence:



Rick Bomhof, P. Eng.  
Director of Engineering, Parks  
& Environment

Concurrence:



Rory Thompson, Fire Chief

Attachments:

1. Revised Architectural Plans;
2. Revised Landscape Plans;
3. Parking Study (Creative Transportation Solutions Ltd.)

**CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER'S COMMENTS:**

I support the recommendation.



---

Francis Cheung, P. Eng.  
Chief Administrative Officer