




---

**To:** Planning Committee **Date:** May 28, 2007  
**From:** Jean Lamontagne **File:** RZ 06-342074  
Director of Development  
**Re:** **Application by Jordan Kutev Architect for Rezoning at 6860 and  
6820 Eckersley Road from Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision  
Area E (R1/E) to Comprehensive Development District (CD/188)**

---

**Staff Recommendation**

That Bylaw No. 8256, to create "Comprehensive Development District (CD/188)" and for the rezoning of 6860, 6820 Eckersley Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/188)", be introduced and given first reading.




Jean Lamontagne  
*Director of Development*

DN:blg  
Att.

**FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY**

**CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER**



## Staff Report

### Origin

Jordan Kutev Architect, has applied to the City of Richmond to rezone 6860 and 6820 Eckersley Road (**Attachment 1**) from “Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)” to “Comprehensive Development District (CD/188)” to permit development of 16 townhouse units connected by a common outdoor courtyard located at the second level (**Attachment 2**).

### Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details of the development proposal is attached (**Attachment 3**).

### Surrounding Development

To the north: An existing single-family dwelling fronting Eckersley Road zoned “Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)” and designated as General Urban Zone in the City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) Update.

To the east: An existing single-family dwelling fronting Park Place zoned “Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)” is located adjacent to the east property line of 6820 Eckersley Road. An existing hydro substation zoned “School and Public Use District (SPU)” is located adjacent to the east property line of 6860 Eckersley Road. Both adjacent sites are designated General Urban Zone in the CCAP Update.

To the south: Anderson Road and an existing apartment building zoned “Townhouse District (R2)”. The draft CCAP Update designates the site as General Urban Zone.

To the west: Eckersley Road and existing single-family dwellings zoned “Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)” and designated General Urban Zone in the CCAP Update. A rezoning application (RZ 06-322803) is in process at 8371/8411 Anderson Road, 6760/6780/6800/6890 Cooney Road, and 6771/6811/6831 Eckersley Road to rezone the site from “Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)” to “Comprehensive Development District (CD)”. The applicant proposes to develop two (2) residential towers and an apartment building; however, the application has not yet proceeded to Planning Committee for consideration.

### Related Policies & Studies

#### Official Community Plan (OCP)

The subject site is designated “Neighbourhood Residential” in the Official Community Plan (OCP). The proposed land use and density are consistent with the range permitted by the Plan.

### City Centre Area Plan (CCAP)

The subject site is designated “Residential” in the City Centre Area Plan (CCAP). Further, it is within an area identified as Medium Density (T4 General Urban Zone) within the CCAP Update Study, which is currently underway. The intention of the Medium Density area is to provide a transition between the City Centre’s lower and higher density zones (**Attachment 4**).

The building typology proposed, which consists of 16 three-storey townhouse units connected by a common second storey courtyard, references existing single-family, apartment and townhouse dwellings within the neighbourhood.

### OCP Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development (ANSD) Policy

The subject site is located south of Westminster Highway in an area that permits consideration of all aircraft noise sensitive land use types. However, as the site is affected by Airport Noise Contours, the development is required to register a covenant prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

### BC Hydro

The site is located adjacent to a BC Hydro substation. In association with the nearby proposed development at 8400 and 8440 Anderson Road (RZ 04-272735 and DP 05-312751), BC Hydro requested substantiation that development within the area would not block access to the substation. The applicant is required to submit a construction parking and traffic management plan to the satisfaction of the Transportation Department, which is to minimize traffic disruption on Anderson Road.

### **Consultation**

This rezoning application complies with the Official Community Plan (OCP). The statutory Public Hearing will provide area residents, businesses and property owners with opportunity to comment on the application.

### **Public Input**

Staff have not received any telephone calls or written submissions expressing concerns associated with the proposed development.

### **Analysis**

#### Background

- The applicant proposes 16 three-storey townhouse units, which share a common outdoor courtyard located at the second level (**Attachment 2**).
- The subject site is within the City Centre in an area designated as General Urban Zone (1.2 - 2.0 FAR), which is intended to facilitate transition between higher and lower density areas within the City Centre. More specifically, the site is located within close proximity of the Sub-Urban Zone (0.55 – 1.2 FAR) area on the south side of Granville Avenue and the east side of Garden City Road (**Attachment 4**).

- In contrast to recent development proposals within the area, which are characterized by proposed density at the higher end of the range permitted within the General Urban Zone and a more urban building typology, the subject application proposes a density of 1.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR), which is at the lower end of the scale and a townhouse building form.
- The density and the building typology proposed reference development that was undertaken prior to the commencement of the CCAP Update Study, such as existing developments at 6468 Cooney Road and 8088 Spires Gate, which allow a maximum density of 1.1 FAR and 0.9 FAR respectively, with provisions for the inclusion of indoor amenity space.
- More recently, rezoning application (RZ 04-267994), located at the corner of Eckersley Road and Cook Road, which proposes a comparable density and a townhouse building form, was considered by Council on December 5, 2006 and was forwarded to Public Hearing on January 15, 2007.
- Each of the 16 townhouse units has access at grade and via the covered parking area. The outdoor courtyard level located at the second storey is a distinguishing feature of the proposed townhouse development. It establishes a common covered and secured parking area in lieu of a drive aisle providing access to individual garages for the townhouse units. The courtyard element facilitates an expanded, functional common outdoor amenity space, and provides a transition between the more urban typology of townhouse and apartment units being introduced into the neighbourhood and the lower density existing multi-family dwellings and the adjacent Sub-Urban designated neighbourhood.

#### Proposed Comprehensive Development (CD) Bylaw

- The proposed Comprehensive Development (CD/188) Bylaw is a tailored hybrid of existing CD/121 (8088 Spires Gate), CD/133 (6468 Cooney Road), and proposed CD/178 (8400, 8440 Cook Road and 6571 Eckersley Road), which are developments that are a similar typology.
- The permitted density and lot coverage reflect the resolution of site-specific constraints and the context.
- The density permitted on the site is a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1.0, which includes provisions to exclude areas used for parking, garbage and recycling, elevator shafts, common stairwells and unenclosed balconies. Each dwelling unit provides secured bike storage that is located adjacent to the individual unit and accessible only through the parking level; therefore, it has similarly been excluded from the total density.
- Although the applicant is electing to provide cash-in-lieu of indoor amenity space, proposed CD/188 includes a provision for an additional 0.1 FAR provided that it is entirely used to accommodate indoor amenity space.
- Setbacks have been specified to respond to the site-specific context and to encourage articulation of the building façades.

#### Tree Preservation

- 18 bylaw-sized trees were identified on the site in the Arborist's assessment (**Attachment 5**). The report states that all trees located on the subject site would be critically impacted by the construction proposed on-site, are within the proposed building envelope, or conflict with the location of the proposed road and cannot be retained. Further, the report

identifies three (3) off-site trees, a tree located on the property line at the south-east corner of the site, and a tree at the north-east corner of the site for possible retention and provides tree protection fencing details.

- As a result of removing 17 on-site trees, and damaging one (1) on-site tree and four (4) off-site trees without a permit in early January, 2007, a Stop Work Order was placed on the subject site and the infraction was investigated by a City Tree Preservation Official.
- In response to the infraction, the applicant was required to pay a penalty fee for the removal and damage of trees without a Permit, and substantiate that letters of apology were issued to affected neighbours.
- The applicant's Arborist prepared an addendum Arborist report responding specifically to the existing site conditions. The applicant is required to comply with all conditions outlined in the addendum report (**Attachment 6**).
- Further, the applicant is required to provide a landscaping plan that verifies the provision of replacement planting at a ratio of 2:1 in accordance with the Official Community Plan (OCP). If the required number of replacement trees cannot be accommodated on the site, the applicant will provide a cash-in-lieu contribution or be required to plant replacement trees on City-owned property in an alternate location.

#### Parking

- The subject site is located within 800 m (2,625 ft.) or within a 10-minute walk of the downtown core. It is within close proximity of the future Canada Line Station (Saba Station), existing transit service, and amenities, which support increased use of transit, walking and cycling. To further promote the use of alternative modes of transportation, a storage area that can only be accessed from the parking level but is part of the unit is allocated to provide secure bicycling parking for each unit.
- A total of twenty four (24) resident and four (4) visitor off-street parking stalls are required on-site. The applicant proposes to provide 30 resident and 4 visitor off-street parking stalls. One visitor stall is accessible.

#### Road Dedications, Transportation and Upgrades

- At the time the site is consolidated, the applicant is required to dedicate a 4 m x 4 m corner cut at the south west corner, at the intersection of Eckersley Road and Anderson Road.
- The applicant is required to enter into a Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of the Eckersley Road and Anderson Road frontages according to City Centre standards (**Attachment 7**).

#### Servicing Capacity

- The applicant has agreed to contribute a proportionate amount equivalent to \$3,999.99 for storm sewer, and \$3,194.87 for sanitary sewer toward the Downstream Consortium Upgrades.
- A voluntary contribution of \$10,482.40 for water, \$41,394.08 for storm, and \$31,620.80 for sanitary for City Identified Catchment Upgrades is also requested to address servicing concerns. Should the development finalize after the implementation of the proposed new Development Cost Charges (DCC) rates are in effect (July 1, 2007), then the applicant will be required to provide the new DCCs instead of this voluntary contribution.

Development Cost Charges (DCC) rates are in effect (July 1, 2007), then the applicant will be required to provide the new DCCs instead of this voluntary contribution.

#### Amenity Space

- The developer proposes to provide on-site outdoor amenity space in compliance with the Official Community Plan (OCP) and cash-in-lieu of indoor amenity space (\$16,000). Should the applicant revise the plans to include common indoor amenity space, an additional 0.1 FAR is accommodated by proposed C/D 188.

#### Affordable Housing Strategy – Interim Strategy

- The applicant has elected not to supply on-site affordable housing. However, the applicant has offered a voluntary contribution toward the provision of affordable housing at a rate of \$0.60 per buildable ft<sup>2</sup> (\$ 21,497.52).

#### Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

- In accordance with the City's Flood Management Strategy, the applicant is required to register a Flood Indemnification Covenant on title referencing the minimum habitable elevation for the area, which is 0.9 m (geodetic).

#### Aircraft Noise

- The site is affected by Airport Noise contours and is required to register a covenant prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 8256 to disclose noise restrictions and to engage an acoustical consultant.

#### Proposed Development Permit (DP 06-352760)

- The proposed development would introduce a building density that is within the range permitted by the CCAP Update. The building typology would provide a transition between the evolving urban character and the existing lower density building typologies in the area.
- The development has responded to comments from both the Advisory Design Panel and staff related to the provision of access to units at grade, maximizing the landscaped area for each dwelling unit at grade, improving light penetration into the parking area by incorporating design elements along the north and south elevations and removing partition walls between parking stalls, incorporating weather protection at the pedestrian accesses to the site, and providing an elevator to facilitate accessibility to the second storey outdoor space.
- Prior to the Development Permit application being forwarded for consideration, the applicant is required to undertake further design development of the Anderson Road façade to reflect its street fronting location to ensure the Anderson Road elevation becomes a feature of the development, to articulate the south elevation of the garbage and recycling enclosure, to resolve the interrupted landscape treatment along the north edge of the site, to consider opportunities to incorporate additional landscaping throughout the site, and to demonstrate further consideration of design development to permit penetration of light through the outdoor amenity area into the parking level.


- A variance for the building encroachment at the southwest corner of the site, located adjacent to the intersection of Anderson Road and Eckersley Road, will be requested in association with the proposed Development Permit (DP 06-352760).
- Prior to the Development Permit (DP 06-352760) being permitted to proceed to Development Permit Panel for consideration, the applicant is required to substantiate that the length of the small car stalls complies with the requirements of the Bylaw.
- Further, the applicant is to substantiate that the base elevation of the development will not be required to be raised, which would impact the design of the proposed building, by confirming the elevation of the storm sewer connections to the City system and demonstrating that a gravity drainage system can be installed.

### **Financial Impact or Economic Impact**

No financial or economic impact is anticipated as a result of the proposed development.

### **Conclusion**

Rezoning of the site facilitates a land use and density that is supported by the existing City Centre Area plan and recommendations of the City Centre Area Plan Update process. On this basis, the proposed density and land use is supportable.



Diana Nikolic, MCIP  
*Planner II (Urban Design)*  
(Local 4040)

DN:blg

Attachment 1: Location Map

Attachment 2: Conceptual Development Plans

Attachment 3: Development Application Data Sheet

Attachment 4: City Centre Area Plan Land Use and Density Plan


Attachment 5: Arborist Report (November 10, 2006)

Attachment 6: Addendum to Arborist Report (March 28, 2007)

Attachment 7: Rezoning Considerations Concurrence








RZ 06-342074

Original Date: 07/27/06

Amended Date: 07/31/07

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



City of Richmond Development Applications Department		Attachment 1	
<b>DP</b>	5900 Eversley Rd Richmond BC V6P 2Y6	<b>Address:</b>	5900 Eversley Rd Richmond BC V6P 2Y6
<b>Applicant:</b>	Jordan Kulev @ Jordan Kulev Architects	<b>Owner:</b>	Mt. Siam Chang Ltd
<b>Planning Area(s):</b>	2,115.3 m <sup>2</sup>	<b>Floor Area Max:</b>	2075.41 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Floor Area Gross:</b>	2084.59 m <sup>2</sup>		
<b>Site Area:</b>	2,115.3 m <sup>2</sup>	<b>Existing:</b>	2,115.3 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Net Site Area:</b>	n/a	<b>Proposed:</b>	2,107.3 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>4m x 5m corner cut dedication:</b>	8 m <sup>2</sup>		8 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Land Uses:</b>	residential		residential
<b>OCF Designation:</b>	residential townhouse		residential townhouse
<b>Zoning:</b>	R1		C3 (Reserv. based on existing CO/131)
<b>Number of Units:</b>	1		16
		<b>Bylaw Requirement</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>Floor Area Ratio</b>	0.930 1:1		0.985
<b>Lot Coverage</b>	Max 50%		41.5%
<b>Lot Coverage including courtyard</b>	n/a		67.33 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Setback - Front Yard</b>	Min 3.60 m		4.10 m
<b>Setback - Rear Yard</b>	0.90 m		0.90 m
<b>Front Yard bay window projection</b>	0.90 m		0.90 m
<b>Setback - Side Yard Street</b>	Min 3.60 m		3.68 m
<b>Side Yard bay window projection</b>	0.90 m		0.90 m
<b>Side Yard courtyard projection</b>	n/a if cantilevered		cantilevered 2.95 m
<b>Setback Unit B from commercial</b>	18.79 m (per City of Richmond agreement to PL)		2.70 m
<b>Side Yard Garage enclosure</b>	agreement to PL		agreement to PL
<b>Setback - Side Yard - Interior</b>	Min 3.05 m		3.65 to ground level
<b>Rear Yard courtyard projection</b>	14.6' cantilevered		cantilevered
<b>Setback - Rear Yard</b>	Min 3.05 m		4.10 m
<b>Rear Yard bay window projection</b>	0.90 m		0.90 m
<b>Rear Yard balcony projection</b>	n/a if cantilevered		cantilevered
<b>Height (m)</b>	Max 12 m		11.95 m
<b>Lot Size</b>	Min 40 m x 35 m		\$5 173 m x 317.5 m
<b>On-street Parking Spaces - Town Residential</b>	24		30
<b>On-street Parking Spaces - Off-street Parking Spaces - Integral visitors</b>	4		1 (85) and 1 (85)
<b>Total of street Spaces</b>	28 (24 + 4)		34 (30 + 4)
<b>Townhouse Parking Spaces</b>	10		10
<b>Assembly Space - Indoor</b>	Min 70 m		70 m
<b>Assembly Space - Outdoor</b>	Min 95 m		95 m

**TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT**  
6860 ECKERSLEY ROAD RICHMOND, B.C.

**SITE PLAN PROJECT STATISTICS DEMOLITION PLAN**

**50% COORDINATION REVIEW**


**A101**


**DESIGNER:** JORDAN KULEV ARCHITECTS

**DATE:** 2024-07-26


**PROJECT NO.:** JK0027286






	
<b>Jordan Kutiev</b> architect	
<small>1000 17th Street, Suite 1000, Richmond, BC V6X 1R7          Tel: 604.273.8888          Fax: 604.273.8889          Email: info@jordankutiev.com</small>	
PROJECT NO: <b>A203</b>	
DATE: 09/03/2006	PROJECT NO: 0903
DRAWN BY: [Signature]	CHECKED BY: [Signature]
50% COORDINATION REVIEW	
TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT 6880 ECKHENSLEY ROAD RICHMOND, B.C.	
SECOND FLOOR PLAN	
SHEET NO: 30/OCT/2006	


NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE
1	ISSUED FOR PERMITS	09/03/06
2	REVISED PERMITS	09/03/06
3	REVISED PERMITS	09/03/06
4	REVISED PERMITS	09/03/06
5	REVISED PERMITS	09/03/06




<p>100%</p> <p><b>Jordan Kulev</b> architect</p> <p>708 975 0087 1100 West Beaver Creek Road Richmond, BC V6X 3K9</p> <p>Project: COMM. L100</p>		<p>DATE: 30 OCT 2008</p> <p>SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"</p> <p>PROJECT NO: 0603</p> <p>DRAWN BY: JPK</p> <p>CHECKED BY: JPK</p>	
<p>50% COORDINATION REVIEW</p> <p><b>A251</b></p>			
<p>ROOF PLAN</p>			
<p>9890 EDGEMERE ROAD RICHMOND, B.C.</p>			
<p><b>LAND ASSOCIATES</b> LAND ASSOCIATES COMMERCIAL ARCHITECTS</p>			
<p><b>TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT</b></p>			
<p>NO DATE REVISIONS</p>			
<p>2 31 OCT 08 ISSUED FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT</p> <p>1 04 OCT 08 ISSUED FOR REVIEW</p>			



1 NORTH ELEVATION  
A401 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




2 SOUTH ELEVATION  
A401 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




3 EAST ELEVATION - UNIT B  
A401 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

- EXTERIOR FINISH LEGEND
- ① STUCCO
  - ② VINYL SIDING
  - ③ DOUBLE GLAZED
  - ④ BRICK/CLAY GLAZED
  - ⑤ HORIZONTAL
  - ⑥ VERTICAL
  - ⑦ STONE
  - ⑧ BRICK
  - ⑨ PAINTY FINISH


<p>DATE: 08-11-10 DRAWN BY: JAK DATE: 08-03 CHECKED BY: JAK 300012006</p>		<p>PROJECT: A401</p>	
<p>50% COORDINATION REVIEW</p>			
<p>BUILDING ELEVATIONS</p>			
<p>TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT</p>			
<p>8980 ESPERLEY ROAD RICHMOND, B.C.</p>			
<p>JORDAN KURIEV architect</p>			
<p>100-111 100th Ave. S.W. Richmond, BC V6V 2G9 Tel: 604-273-8888 Fax: 604-273-8889 www.jordankuriev.com</p>			
<p>DATE: 08-11-10</p>			
<p>SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"</p>			
<p>PROJECT: A401</p>			
<p>DATE: 08-03</p>			
<p>CHECKED BY: JAK</p>			
<p>300012006</p>			



1 WEST ELEVATION - UNIT A  
 1/8" = 1'-0"  
 A402



2 EAST COURTYARD ELEVATION - UNIT A  
 1/8" = 1'-0"  
 A402



3 WEST COURTYARD ELEVATION - UNIT B  
 1/8" = 1'-0"  
 A402

- ARCHITECT
- SHIMAZU
- CONSULTANT
- CONSULTANT
- CONSULTANT
- CONSULTANT
- CONSULTANT
- CONSULTANT
- CONSULTANT
- CONSULTANT
- CONSULTANT

<p>8660 ECKERSLEY ROAD RICHMOND, B.C.</p> <p>TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>BUILDING ELEVATIONS</p> <p>50% COORDINATION REVIEW</p> <p><b>A402</b></p>		<p>Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"</p> <p>Date: 08/03</p> <p>Project: 300012006</p>	
<p>1. 300012006 FOR APPROVAL</p> <p>2. 300012006 FOR APPROVAL</p> <p>3. 300012006 FOR APPROVAL</p> <p>4. 300012006 FOR APPROVAL</p>		<p>jordankyriak architect</p> <p>1001 West Broadway, Suite 1000, Vancouver, BC V6E 2Y1</p> <p>Phone: (604) 681-1111</p> <p>Web: www.jordankyriak.com</p>	





## City of Richmond

6911 No. 3 Road  
 Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1  
 www.richmond.ca  
 604-276-4000

# Development Application Data Sheet

**RZ 06-342074**

**Attachment 3**

Address: 6860 and 6820 Eckersley Road

Applicant: Jordan Kutev Architect

Planning Area(s): City Centre Area Plan

	Existing	Proposed
<b>Owner:</b>	Yuan Heng Construction Ltd.	Yuan Heng Construction Ltd.
<b>Site Size (m<sup>2</sup>):</b>	Gross: 2115.3 m <sup>2</sup>	Net: 2,107.4 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Land Uses:</b>	Residential	Residential townhouses
<b>OCP Designation:</b>	Neighbourhood Residential	Neighbourhood Residential
<b>Area Plan Designation:</b>	Residential	Residential
<b>Zoning:</b>	Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)	Comprehensive Development District (CD/188)
<b>Number of Units:</b>	2	16
<b>Other Designations:</b>	Neighbourhood Residential (in the OCP), Residential (in the City Centre Area Plan)	Medium Density (in the City Centre Area Update Plan)

On Future Subdivided Lots	CD/188 Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 1.0	0.98	none permitted
Lot Coverage – Building:	Max. 60%	42%	none
Lot Size:	1,900 m <sup>2</sup>	2,107.4m <sup>2</sup>	none
Setback – Public Road:	3.6 m (12 ft.) (bay windows may project 0.5 m, gateways, landscape structures and garbage and recycling enclosures may be located within the public road setback, a covered common stairway may encroach but shall be no closer than 0.6 m to the property line.	3.6 m Projections: bay window: 0.46 m Stair well: 2.95 m Garbage enclosure: 3.65	none



On Future Subdivided Lots	CD/188 Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Setback – Side & Rear Yards (m):	Side yard: 4.0 m (bay windows may project 0.5 m) Rear yard: 3.6 m (covered stairwell may project into the setback but shall be no closer than 0.6 m to the rear property line)	Side yard: 4.1 m (bay window projection: 0.46 m) Rear yard: 3.65 m with an encroaching stairwell	none
Height (m):	12.5 m	11.99 m	none
Off-street Parking Spaces – Regular (R) / Visitor (V):	24 (R) and 4 (V) per unit	31 (R) and 4 (V) per unit	none
Tandem Parking Spaces:	Permitted	none	none
Amenity Space – Indoor:	70 m <sup>2</sup>	Cash in lieu	none
Amenity Space – Outdoor:	96 m <sup>2</sup>	106 m <sup>2</sup>	none


Other: Tree replacement compensation required for loss of significant trees.

# A. Land Use & Density

The framework proposes an approach centred on the establishment of a network of distinct, yet complementary, mixed-use transit villages, each of which will provide an attractive, livable environment and together will provide for a dynamic, sustainable downtown.

**Further Investigation**

1. Refine employment targets and related land use and density requirements for the downtown's mixed-use and business districts
2. Identify strategies aimed at coordinating the City Centre with objectives for the airport, port, and agricultural lands
3. Refine density targets for residential development and how that relates to trends in dwelling unit and household size



**City Centre Area Plan Update Study**  
**Land Use and Density**  
**RZ 06-342074**

Original Date: 05/31/07

Amended Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



**Froggers Creek  
Tree Consultants Ltd.**

7763 McGregor Avenue Burnaby BC, V5J4H4  
Telephone: 604-721-6002 Fax: 604-437-0970

City of Richmond  
**Policy Planning Department**  
6911 No. 3 Rd,  
Richmond, BC, V6Y 2C1  
Attention: Diana Nikolic: City of Richmond Planner

November 10, 2006

Cc. Jordan Kutev .

Re: 6820 & 6860 Eckersley Road, Richmond BC  
Tree Protection Report

Please find enclosed my **Revised Tree Protection Report**. I am also attaching as appendices to the Report, a Revised **Tree Inventory** and a Revised **Tree Protection Plan** drawing for reference purposes.

## **TREE PRESERVATION SUMMARY**

18 On-site trees affected by this development. 1 Shared tree affected by this development 3 Off-site trees affected by this development. 17 Trees proposed for removal. 1 On-site tree proposed for retention 1 Shared tree proposed for retention 3 Off-site trees proposed for retention
--

## **INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this report is two-fold: firstly, to describe the existing tree resource growing on site; secondly, to set forth measures to protect some or all of this resource; or, in the absence of any opportunities for meaningful tree retention, to explain why it is not feasible.

The report will document the following:

1. the extent, character and condition of all surveyed on-site and off-site trees that may be potentially impacted by the development;
2. trees proposed for removal and retention;
3. measures proposed to minimize tree loss and maximize successful tree conservation;

The only trees that will be proposed for removal are those trees that will either be:

- Critically impacted by the construction
- Within the building envelope
- Dead, dying or hazardous

All other trees will be retained.

I have been provided with the following resources:

1. a tree survey of the existing properties and adjacent lands;

2. a proposed site layout drawing.

I have visited the site and assessed the surveyed trees located on the two lots and on lands immediately adjacent. All trees have been tagged, inventoried and evaluated for health and structure.




Figure 1. Aerial photo of subject properties - from the City of Richmond's online mapping and GIS website – <http://www.richmond.ca/discover/maps.htm>

## OBSERVATIONS

### Current Site Conditions

The site is a large flat poorly drained lot. The south lot has no house only trees. There is a house located on the north lot 6820 Eckersley Road. The ground cover is uncut grass.

### Proposed Development Plans

The proposed development will create a condominium complex. The building envelope will be set back 3m from the property lines on all sides.



Tree Resource

22 trees are inventoried in total. 18 of them are on-site, 1 tree is located on the property line to the east and 3 of them are located on the neighbouring properties. Most of the trees on site are very old, unhealthy and poorly maintained fruit trees. There are very few healthy trees on site. The table below shows the species composition of the tree resource on site.

Type	Number
Cherry	7
Apple	2
Crab Apple	2
Purple Plum	2
Blue Spruce	1
Lawson Cypress	1
Magnolia	2
Mountain Ash	2
Pear	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>

Details of this tree inventory are provided in the table attached as Appendix—1.

**DISCUSSION**

Tree Removals

17 Trees are proposed for removal (see Appendix-3). These removals are categorized as follows:

- 14 Tree are located within Building Envelopes
- 2 Trees will be critically impacted by the development
- 1 Tree is located in the middle of the proposed road.

The two trees that will be critically impacted by the construction are two Cherries (#460 and #470). These trees are in infected with Bacterial Canker a serious incurable disease of Cherries and are not in good health. These trees are not worth altering the plans to retain and the City of Richmond would be better off in if replacement trees were planted.

Tree # 472 is a Lawson Cypress that is located in the proposed Rec Room for Unit #9. The tree is multi-stemmed and a Lawson Cypress and not a high value tree. Unit #9 cannot be moved to the east or to the north and the laneway cannot be made any narrower because of building restrictions set by the City of Richmond. I am recommending that the tree should be replaced with a more suitable tree after the construction is complete.

Tree Retention

One on-site tree #476 and one shared tree # 456 are recommended for retention. These trees are in fair health and there are dead stems within the canopy that have decayed. This is common in Mountain Ash. The trees are not hazardous and are not dead or dying so I have recommending retaining the trees. The trees will need to be pruned to remove the dead decayed stems.



### Off-site Trees

The canopy and the roots of 3 off-site trees are encroaching into the subject property from the east and the north.

Off site trees are not considered in the statistical calculations. They are identified on the drawings as having shaded canopies.

Off- site trees can not be altered in any way without the consent of the owner of the tree.

### Drawings

One drawing is included in this report.

A **Revised Tree Protection Plan** drawing, which plots all on and off-site trees in relation to the proposed development layout is attached as **Appendix—3**.

### Tree Protection Fencing

All retained trees on the property and neighbouring properties will be surrounded by Tree Protection Fencing as laid out in the **Revised Tree Protection Plan** drawing Appendix 3. All fencing must be constructed to a robust standard and clearly signed: "TREE PROTECTION AREA – KEEP OUT" See Appendix 2 for construction details.

The canopies of tree # 458 and 459 encroach on the proposed stairs for units 1-4. The tree protection fencing will be installed outside the canopies of these trees. The protection fencing will need to be left up during the construction of the units. An Arborist will need to be consulted during the construction of the stairs for these units to insure that the protected trees are not critically impacted by the construction.

End Report.

### **CERTIFICATION:**

This report and the opinions expressed within it have been prepared in good faith and to accepted arboricultural standards within the scope afforded by its terms of reference and the resources made available to the consultant.

---

Dated: November 10, 2006

Glenn Murray – Board Certified Master Arborist  
I.S.A. Certification # PN-0795B  
Certified Tree Risk Assessor #0049  
Froggers Creek Tree Consultants Ltd.



## ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITING CONDITIONS

1. This report and the opinions expressed within it have been prepared in good faith and to accepted arboricultural standards within the scope afforded by its terms of reference and the resources made available to the consultant. The report provides no undertakings regarding the future condition or behavior of the trees reviewed within it. Tree hazard and condition assessments are not an exact science. Both qualities can and do change over time and should be reappraised periodically.
2. This assessment was limited to a visual tree evaluation only. No core samples were taken. No tissue samples have been cultured or analyzed by plant pathologists. No root crown excavations were undertaken. No aerial reconnaissance was attempted, beyond that made possible by binoculars. The evaluation period for this assessment is 12 months.
3. Any legal description provided to the consultant/appraiser is assumed to be correct. No responsibility is assumed for matters legal in character. Any and all property is appraised or evaluated as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.
4. It is assumed that any property is not in violation of any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes, or other governmental regulations.
5. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as possible; however, the consultant/appraiser can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the information provided by others.
6. The consultant/appraiser shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services as described in the fee schedule and contract of engagement.
7. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.
8. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior expressed written or verbal consent of the consultant/appraiser.
9. Neither all nor any part of the contents of this report, nor copy thereof, shall be conveyed by anyone, including the client, to the public through advertising, public relations, news, sales or other media, without the prior expressed written or verbal consent of the consultant/appraiser—particularly as to value conclusions, identity of the consultant/appraiser, or any reference to any professional society or institute or to any initiated designation conferred upon the consultant/appraiser as stated in his qualification.
10. It is impossible to predict exactly how a tree will react to any excavation near the tree. Sometimes underground soil water movement can be changed because of the building of a house and this could stress or kill a tree.

**Appendix-1**  
Revised Tree Inventory Table


#	Type	Stem Diameter (cm)	Drip line (m)	Action	Rationale	Retention Value	Height (m)	Health	Structural Condition
456	Mountain Ash	5x15	4	Retain		Low	8	Fair	Trunk has decay in it, requires pruning to remove decay
457	Western Red Cedar	40	4.5	Retain		Moderate	15	Fair	No apparent defects
458	Horse Chestnut	3x40	5	Retain		Moderate	17	Good	Tree has been topped
459	Birch	30	5	Retain		Moderate	13	Fair	No apparent defects
460	Cherry	42	3.5	Remove	Will be critically impacted by the construction	Low	5	Poor	Trunk has decay in it. Tree has Bacterial canker in trunk
461	Cherry	50	6	Remove	Will be critically impacted by the construction	Low	8	Fair	Tree has been topped; Tree has Bacterial Canker in trunk.
462	Magnolia	20,22	4	Remove	Within Building Envelope	High	10	Good	No apparent defects
463	Cherry	25	5	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Low	7	Poor	Trunk has decay in it
464	Cherry	28,20,20	6	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Low	8	Poor	No apparent defects
465	Crab Apple	20,19	4	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Low	7	Poor	No apparent defects
466	Cherry	21	3	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Low	4	Poor	No apparent defects
467	Apple	29	3	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Low	7	Poor	No apparent defects
468	Cherry	22	2.5	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Low	7	Poor	Trunk has decay in it
469	Apple	20	2.5	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Low	4	Poor	Trunk has decay in it
470	Pear	20	2	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Low	4	Poor	No apparent defects
471	Blue Spruce	28	4	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Moderate	12	Good	Tree has been topped
472	Lawson Cypress	20	3	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Moderate	7	Good	Multi-stemmed
473	Purple Plum	12	1	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Low	3	Poor	Tree has been topped
474	Crab Apple	12	2.5	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Low	4	Poor	No apparent defects
475	Purple Plum	19	2.5	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Low	3	Fair	Trunk has decay in it
476	Mountain Ash	3x10	3	Retain		Low	7	Fair	Trunk has decay in it, requires pruning to remove decay
477	Cherry	15	1.5	Remove	Within Building Envelope	Low	3	Poor	No apparent defects






## Appendix 2

### Tree Protection Fencing Detail



APPENDIX 3  
REVISED TREE PROTECTION PLAN




#	Type	Stem Diameter (cm)	Drip Line (m)	Action	Rationale
456	Mountain Ash	6x15	4	Retain	
457	Western Red Cedar	40	4.5	Retain	
458	Horsechestnut	3x40	5	Retain	
459	Birch	30	5	Retain	
460	Cherry	42	3.5	Remove	Will be critically impacted by the construction
461	Cherry	50	6	Remove	Will be critically impacted by the construction
462	Manilla	20,22	4	Remove	Within Building Envelope
463	Cherry	25	5	Remove	Within Building Envelope
464	Cherry	28,20,20	6	Remove	Within Building Envelope
465	Crab Apple	20,19	4	Remove	Within Building Envelope
466	Cherry	21	3	Remove	Within Building Envelope
467	Apple	29	3	Remove	Within Building Envelope
468	Cherry	22	2.5	Remove	Within Building Envelope
469	Apple	20	2.5	Remove	Within Building Envelope
470	Pear	20	2	Remove	Within Building Envelope
471	Blue Spruce	28	4	Remove	Within Building Envelope
472	Lawson Cypress	20	3	Remove	Within Building Envelope
473	Purple Plum	12	1	Remove	Within Building Envelope
474	Crab Apple	12	2.5	Remove	Within Building Envelope
475	Purple Plum	19	2.5	Remove	Within Building Envelope
476	Mountain Ash	3x10	3	Retain	
477	Cherry	15	1.5	Remove	Within Building Envelope

SCALE: 1:200



All distances are in metres and decimals thereof unless otherwise indicated



NOTES:  
1. SEE LAYOUT INFORMATION AND DPE SURVEY DATA FOR TREE LOCATIONS.  
2. REFER TO ATTACHED TREE PROTECTION REPORT FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING TREE SPECIES, STEM QUALITY, CANOPY CONDITION, SOIL AND ROOT CONDITION, PROPOSED PROTECTION MEASURES, AND SERVICE CORRIDOR ALIGNMENT CONSIDERATIONS.



**Froggers Creek  
Tree Consultants Ltd.**

7763 McGregor Avenue Burnaby BC, V5J4H4  
Telephone: 604-721-6002 Fax: 604-437-0970

City of Richmond  
**Policy Planning Department**  
6911 No. 3 Rd,  
Richmond, BC, V6Y 2C1  
Attention: Diana Nikolic: City of Richmond Planner  
Brett Mortensen: City of Richmond Arborist

March 28, 2007

Re: 6820 & 6860 Eckersley Road, Richmond BC

Field Report

I have been asked to provide an update of the activities since my last report that provided recommendations to minimize the impact to the neighbouring trees that have been damaged during the original site clearing.

**March 21, 2007**

I met with the new site contractor Gary from Mike's Contracting. The sand was carefully removed to a depth of 4cm by the contractor. I inspected the damage and carefully pruned all the damaged roots to reduce the impact to the tree. The chart below describes the damage that was done to each tree:

Tree #	Type	Damage level	Damage	Mitigation
456	Mountain Ash	Critical	Excavation is 80cm from the trunk of the tree. The top soil has been removed to a depth of 40cm. 4 large roots (10cm in diameter) and many smaller roots have been cut or damaged.	Damaged roots were pruned back to good wood
457	Western Red Cedar	Critical	Excavation is 1.5m from the trunk of the tree. The top soil has been removed to a depth of 30cm. 4 roots 5cm in diameter, 6 roots 3cm in diameter have been cut or damaged.	Damaged roots were pruned back to good wood
458	Horsechestnut	Critical	Excavation is 2.5m from the trunk of the tree. The top soil has been removed to a depth of 30cm. 4 roots 10cm in diameter, 6 roots 5cm in diameter and 8 roots 3cm in diameter have been cut or damaged.	Damaged roots were pruned back to good wood
459	Birch	Moderate	Excavation is 2.5m from the trunk of the tree. The top soil has been removed to a depth of 30cm. 4 roots 5cm in diameter, 6 roots 3cm in diameter have been cut or damaged.	Damaged roots were pruned back to good wood

I told Gary that that a sandy soil with organic matter needed to be replaced within the drip line of the trees back to the original grade level. Tree protection needs to be installed outside the drip lines of the four trees.



## March 28, 2007

Gary phoned me to inform me that the soil was in place and the fencing was up. I went out to site and inspected the trees. A sandy organic soil has been replaced within the drip line of the trees back to the original grade. The tree protection fencing is up outside the drip line of the trees and all the trees are protected.

## Conclusion

The first four of my recommendations (see below) have been completed to my satisfaction. The next step is mulching the trees; this will need to be in place before June 1<sup>st</sup>. This will give Gary time to contact the neighbours before mulching the trees. The mulch will help keep the roots cool and moist during the summer. Plans should be made soon to either have a pump truck visit the site weekly or a temporary irrigation system be installed to water the trees in the summer between June 1 and Sept 15th.

## Recommendations from Tree Impact Report dated February 17, 2007.

1. Before anything else happens on the site the tree protection fencing will need to be installed around all the protected trees as per my revised report dated November 10, 2006. I have provided a Tree Protection Detail in the Appendix. **DONE**
2. The damaged roots will need to be pruned back and cleaned up. This must only be done by a qualified certified arborist. **DONE**
3. Some of the sand within the tree protection zones will need to be removed back to 8cm below the original grade level. It is very important that the soil below the sand is not disturbed during this process. **DONE**
4. Organic matter (compost only no peat moss or cow manure) will need to be mixed carefully with the sand within the protection zone at a ratio of 1 part compost to 5 parts sand. The compost is available from Answer Products or from Fraser Richmond Soil and Fibre. **DONE**
5. The entire dripline of the tree will need to be mulched with 4 inches of composted hemlock bark mulch. The neighbours will need to be contacted to see if they agree to have mulch put down on their property. This product is different than the compost and is available from Fraser Richmond Soil and Fibre.
6. The entire drip line of the trees will need to be watered to a depth of 30cm once a week from June 1 until mid September for the next two years.
7. The trees need to be monitored monthly from June 1 until mid September for signs of stress. The watering regime may need to be increased during extended dry periods.

## Other Protection Measures

The following steps are recommended to minimize any further damage or impact to the protected neighbouring trees:

- 1) No access by vehicles or personnel is permitted with the fenced-off area. Storage of materials is also not permitted inside this area. In the eventuality that the site supervisor requires access to the tree protection area, the Project Arborist should be consulted beforehand.
- 2) If it should prove necessary for construction access the protected areas protective cover should be placed on the unfenced portions of the root zone to protect the soils against compaction and other forms of disturbance. Such cover generally includes a base layer of filter cloth and either 6 – 12" of "road-base" or tree-chip mulch, depending on the anticipated usage of the area. A bridging of ¾" plywood is also sometimes used in small areas.



- 3) Services (gas, sewer, septic, water, electrical) must be dug outside the protected areas of the retained trees.
- 4) The Project Arborist should be consulted before any grade changes are performed within the protected areas. This includes landscape grade changes that take place after construction.
- 5) All soil protection measures, including fencing and protective covers, should be put in place before any on site work commences.
- 6) The Site Supervisor should contact the Project Arborist whenever a potential conflict arises with respect to the trees. Such contacts should be proactive in nature. The Project Arborist will ensure that they are available for immediate consultation. (Possible examples of potential conflicts would include the need to temporarily access one of the tree protection areas or the need for some encroachment pruning to be carried out).
- 7) The Project Arborist should be responsible for inspecting the tree sites following completion of the project.

End Report.

**CERTIFICATION:**

This report and the opinions expressed within it have been prepared in good faith and to accepted arboricultural standards within the scope afforded by its terms of reference and the resources made available to the consultant.

---

Dated: March 28, 2007

Glenn Murray – Board Certified Master Arborist  
I.S.A. Certification # PN-0795B  
Certified Tree Risk Assessor #0049  
Froggers Creek Tree Consultants Ltd.



## ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITING CONDITIONS

1. This report and the opinions expressed within it have been prepared in good faith and to accepted arboricultural standards within the scope afforded by its terms of reference and the resources made available to the consultant. The report provides no undertakings regarding the future condition or behavior of the trees reviewed within it. Tree hazard and condition assessments are not an exact science. Both qualities can and do change over time and should be reappraised periodically.
2. This assessment was limited to a visual tree evaluation only. No core samples were taken. No tissue samples have been cultured or analyzed by plant pathologists. No root crown excavations were undertaken. No aerial reconnaissance was attempted, beyond that made possible by binoculars. The evaluation period for this assessment is 12 months.
3. Any legal description provided to the consultant/appraiser is assumed to be correct. No responsibility is assumed for matters legal in character. Any and all property is appraised or evaluated as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.
4. It is assumed that any property is not in violation of any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes, or other governmental regulations.
5. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as possible; however, the consultant/appraiser can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the information provided by others.
6. The consultant/appraiser shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services as described in the fee schedule and contract of engagement.
7. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.
8. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior expressed written or verbal consent of the consultant/appraiser.
9. Neither all nor any part of the contents of this report, nor copy thereof, shall be conveyed by anyone, including the client, to the public through advertising, public relations, news, sales or other media, without the prior expressed written or verbal consent of the consultant/appraiser—particularly as to value conclusions, identity of the consultant/appraiser, or any reference to any professional society or institute or to any initiated designation conferred upon the consultant/appraiser as stated in his qualification.
10. It is impossible to predict exactly how a tree will react to any excavation near the tree. Sometimes underground soil water movement can be changed because of the building of a house and this could stress or kill a tree.

## **Rezoning Considerations**

RZ 06-342074

6860, 6820 Eckersley Road

Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8256, the developer is required to complete the following:

- Consolidation of the subject site (6860 and 6820 Eckersley Road) into one (1) legal parcel;
- Dedication of a 4 m x 4m corner cut at the intersection of Anderson Road and Eckersley Road;
- Registration of a Flood Indemnification Covenant on title referencing the minimum habitable elevation of the area, which is 0.9 m (geodetic);
- Registration of an Aircraft Noise Sensitive Use Covenant on title;
- Process a Development Permit application to a satisfactory level as determined by the Director of Development, which includes response to the items that require further resolution that are outlined in this report.
- City acceptance of a voluntary contribution of \$ 21,497.52 toward affordable housing and execution of a legal agreement confirming the terms of the contribution and provision of the contribution;
- City acceptance of a contribution of \$16,000 in lieu of the on-site provision of indoor amenity space;
- Contribution towards the following Downstream Consortium Upgrades:
  - \$ 3,999.90 for storm sewer; and
  - \$ 3,194.87 for sanitary sewer;
- Contribution for the following City Identified Catchment Upgrades:
  - \$10,482.40 for water;
  - \$41,394.08 for storm; and
  - \$31,620.80 for sanitary;(Should the development finalize after the implementation of the proposed new Development Cost Charges (DCC) rates are in effect (July 1, 2007), then the applicant will be required to provide the new DCCs instead of this contribution.)
- Enter into the City's standard Servicing Agreement.\* Works include but are not limited to:
  - i Full frontage half-road upgrades on both Eckersley Road and Anderson Road. Works include, but are not limited to, a Benkelman beam test or other method approved by Engineering Departmentt to determine the strength of the existing roads. Should the existing road "fail", then full half-road construction is required, but if the road is acceptable, road widening is required with appropriate overlays as determined by the developer's Engineer. Other works include curb and gutter, creation of a grass and treed boulevard (trees on Eckersley Road are to be Honey Locust), including City Centre Type I luminaire poles (L12.5), painted black, with a 2 m concrete sidewalk at

the property line. The existing ditch must be replaced by establishing a storm sewer system to a *minimum* of 600 mm diameter. The corner of Eckersley Road and Anderson Road is a high point, with Eckersley Road draining north. *This entire development site may need to be raised to ensure the new drainage system can operate.* Ultimate cross section has Eckersley Road as an 11.2 m wide road, curb to curb, with Anderson Road being 8.5 m wide. Traffic calming at the intersection of Anderson Road and Eckersley Road is required using bulges, the exact requirements will be determined by the Transportation Department. The hydro pole line across the frontage is to be undergrounded, with a distribution conduit system, as required by BC Hydro. Boulevard widths must support the hydro/telephone undergrounding, on Eckersley Road and be a minimum of 2 m in width along Anderson Road.

- ii **Sanitary sewer:** The Engineering Department has advised that upgrading the sanitary sewer system across the rear (east edge) of the site is no longer required. Sanitary upgrades for that system will run west out Park Road to a new system on Eckersley Road, south to Anderson Road. This developer is to construct the new gravity sanitary sewer line fronting their Eckersley Road site from Anderson Road, north to the next manhole (“manhole to manhole”). Note, that as of this writing (May 14, 2007), a First Submission of off-site design has just been received from MacLean Homes (SA 07-370783), which, to meet their requirements, has the sanitary design completed from their development site, south to Anderson Road. Should a Servicing Agreement be entered by MacLean Homes with the City, for doing this work *prior* to this application proceeding, this applicant would then only be responsible for making a Latecomers contribution to this section.
  
- iii **Water:** Per the capacity analysis comments from Engineering above, the current pressure for the water is 111 L/s, whereas the requirement for townhouses is 200 L/s. The developer’s Engineer needs to achieve the 200 L/s, which *may* include upgrade/renewal of the water system by this developer.

All works are at the developer’s sole cost, no credits apply.

Prior to issuance of a Building Permit\*, the developer is required to complete the following requirements:

- Submission of a construction parking and traffic management plan to be provided to the Transportation Department, which is to minimize traffic disruption on Anderson Road.

\*denotes that a separate application to the city is required.

[Signed original on file]

---

Signed

---

Date





---

**Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300  
Amendment Bylaw 8256 (RZ 06-342074)  
6860 AND 6820 ECKERSLEY ROAD**

The Council of the City of Richmond, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

1. Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300 is amended by inserting as Section 291.188 thereof the following:

**“COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/188)**

The intent of this zoning district is to accommodate multiple-family dwellings.

**291.188.1 PERMITTED USES**

The following uses are permitted:

**RESIDENTIAL**, limited to **Townhouses** and **Multiple-Family Dwellings**;  
**BOARDING & LODGING**, limited to two persons per **dwelling unit**;  
**HOME OCCUPATION**;  
**COMMUNITY USE**;  
**ACCESSORY USES, BUILDINGS & STRUCTURES.**

**291.188.2 PERMITTED DENSITY**

- .01 Subject to subsection .04, herein, the maximum **Floor Area Ratio** shall be: 1.0.
- .02 An additional 0.1 **Floor Area Ratio** is permitted provided that it is entirely used to accommodate **Amenity Space**.
- .03 An additional 10% of the maximum **Floor Area Ratio** for the **lot** in question is permitted provided that it is exclusively **used** for covered areas of the principal **building** which are open on one or more sides.
- .04 **Floor Area Ratio** excludes the following:
  - (a) **buildings** or portions of a **building** that are **used** exclusively for off-street parking, bike storage, garbage & recycling facilities;
  - (b) elevator shafts and common stairwells; and
  - (c) unenclosed balconies.

**291.188.3 MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE**

- .01 Maximum **Lot Coverage**: 50%

**291.188.4 MINIMUM SETBACKS FROM PROPERTY LINES**

- .01 **Public Road** Setback: 3.6 m (12 ft);
- (a) bay windows may project into the **public road** setback for a maximum distance of 0.5 m (1.6 ft);
  - (b) gateways, landscape structures and garbage and recycling enclosures that do not form part of the principal **building** and are less than 3 m (10 ft) in height and 10 m<sup>2</sup> (107 ft<sup>2</sup>) in area may be located within the **public road** setback; and
  - (c) a covered common stairway may encroach into the **public road** setback but shall be no closer than 0.6 m (2 ft.) to the property line abutting a **public road**.
- .02 **Side Yard** Setback: 4.0 m (13 ft), except that bay windows may project into the **side yard** setback for a maximum distance of 0.5 m (1.6 ft.).
- .03 **Rear Yard** Setback: 3.6 m (12 ft.), except that a covered common stairway may encroach into the **rear yard** setback but shall be no closer than 0.6 m (2 ft.) to the **rear property line**.

**291.188.5 MAXIMUM HEIGHTS**

- .01 **Buildings**: 12.5 m (41 ft).
- .02 **Accessory Buildings & Structures**: 4 m (13 ft).

**291.188.6 MINIMUM LOT SIZE**

- .01 A **building** shall not be constructed on a **lot** of less than 1,900 m<sup>2</sup> (22,604 ft<sup>2</sup>).

**291.188.7 OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING**

- .01 Off street parking shall be provided in accordance with Division 400 of the Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300, except that:
- (a) Off-street parking shall be provided at the rate of:
    - i. For Residents: 1.5 spaces per **dwelling unit**; and
    - ii. For Visitors: 0.2 spaces per **dwelling unit**.

**291.188.8 SIGNAGE**

- .01 Signage must comply with the City of Richmond's Sign Bylaw No. 5560, as amended, as it applies to development in the "Townhouse District (R2)".

- 2. The Zoning Map of the city of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following areas and by designating it **COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/188)**.

P.I.D. 004-118-421

Lot 15 Section 9 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 16523

P.I.D. 004-118-413

Lot 14 Section 9 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 16523

- 3. This Bylaw may be cited as **“Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300, Amendment Bylaw 8256”**.

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED for content by originating dept.
<i>[Signature]</i>
APPROVED for legality by Solicitor
<i>[Signature]</i>

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER