## City of Richmond

## Report to Development Permit Panel

To: Development Permit Panel<br>Date: September 25, 2019<br>\(\begin{array}{ll}From: \& Wayne Craig<br>Director of Development\end{array}\)<br>Re: Application by Integrated Construction for an Environmentally Sensitive Areas Development Permit at 1600 Savage Road

## Staff Recommendation

That an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) Development Permit be issued at 1600 Savage Road in order to allow construction of a warehouse building on a site partially designated as an ESA.


Att. 6

## Staff Report

## Origin

Integrated Construction has applied to the City of Richmond for an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) Development Permit to construct a $2,918 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(31,415 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ warehouse building at 1600 Savage Road (Attachment 1). As the construction would impact an ESA, a Development Permit is required prior to Building Permit approval.

The site is currently developed as a paved parking lot. No rezoning is needed as the proposed use is consistent with the 'Light Industrial (IL)' zone.

## Development Information

Please refer to the attached Development Application Data Sheet (Attachment 2) for a comparison of the proposed development data with the relevant Bylaw requirements.

## Background

Development surrounding the subject site is as follows:

- to the north across River Road, City-owned land zoned Light Industrial (IL) and designated as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA);
- to the east, an industrial building on a lot zoned 'Light Industrial (IL)' and partially designated as ESA;
- to the south, an industrial building with outdoor storage on a lot zoned 'Light Industrial (IL)'; and
- to the west across Savage, an industrial building on a lot zoned 'Light Industrial (IL)'.


## Staff Comments

The proposed scheme attached to this report has satisfactorily addressed the significant Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) issues and other staff comments identified as part of the review of the subject Development Permit application (DP Plans 1, 2, 3, 4.a, 4.b and 5). In addition, it complies with the intent of the applicable sections of the Official Community Plan and is generally in compliance with the Light Industrial (IL) zone. No variances are being sought through this ESA Development Permit application.

## Advisory Design Panel

As the scope of this Development Permit does not involve any building design components, the application has not been reviewed by the Advisory Design Panel.

## Analysis

## Site Planning

1600 Savage Road is a $5,257 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (1.3 acre) parcel zoned Light Industrial (IL) and designated Industrial in the Official Community Plan. An Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA)
designation is present on portions of the property and requires that a Development Permit be issued prior to construction. There are two distinct ESA on site: the northern ESA (approximately $788 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / 8,482 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ), which is predominantly 'Upland Forest' with a small sliver of 'Shoreline' ESA along the northern property line; and a central, disconnected ESA (approximately $198 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / 2,131 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) that is entirely classified as 'Upland Forest' (Attachment 3).

The applicant proposes to remove the Upland Forest ESA at the centre of the site to enable development of a warehouse with associated office space, loading and surface parking. The proposed two storey warehouse is $2,918 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(31,415 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ and $11.1 \mathrm{~m}(36.5 \mathrm{ft})$ in height. The proposal includes four loading bays: two located on either side of the front elevation in order to serve separate operational requirements of the business. Two vehicle driveways are proposed from Savage Road to facilitate loading from each of the loading areas; one at the southern corner of the site (currently existing) and a second access to the north near River Road.

To compensate for removing the central ESA area, the applicant proposes to establish two new ESA areas on-site (DP Plan 1):

- $305 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,283 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of new ESA contiguous with the existing northern portion of Upland ESA; and
- $109 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,173 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of new, discontinuous ESA along the western property boundary adjacent Savage Road.

Net gain in total ESA over the site would be $216 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,325 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$. Additional compensation measures proposed include the removal of invasive species and replanting of native species within the existing ESA to be retained and within the new ESA to be established.

## ESA Environmental Inventory

The City of Richmond identifies the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) on this site as predominantly 'Upland Forest' with a small sliver of 'Shoreline' ESA along the northern property line. The northern portion of Upland Forest ESA is contiguous with ESA designated on the neighbouring parcel to the east (totalling approximately $1,900 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / 20,451 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ). Both are contiguous with the Shoreline and Intertidal ESAs associated with the Fraser River to the north, which form a 'hub' in the Ecological Network Management Strategy.

An environmental inventory and assessment report was submitted by Aquaterra Environmental Ltd. (July, 2019). The environmental inventory, completed in the winter of 2018 and spring of 2019 , found the site to be primarily disturbed and generally flat with no defining geological or topographical features. No watercourses were found on site, although a dry ditch was observed immediately north of the site within the City road dedication, and a Riparian Management Area (RMA) protected watercourse was observed to the west across Savage Road. The Fraser River is located less than 50 m north of the site.

Within the small portion of on-site Shoreline ESA, vegetation was found to consist of riparian vegetation, including: mature black cottonwood, red alder, red-osier dogwood and paper birch trees.

The areas classified as Upland Forest, both the northern and the central ESA areas, were found to be degraded habitat with established invasive species throughout. The northern ESA, which is proposed to be protected, consists of non-native Norway maple, as well as native Western red cedar, black cottonwood, lodgepole pine, Western red pine and red alder, with an understory impacted by invasive species and dominated by Himalayan blackberry. Invasive species cover was found to be approximately $60 \%$. The trees were found to be generally intact and providing cover and habitat for terrestrial species such as birds and small mammals.

The central ESA, which is proposed to be removed, consists of 15 conifer trees, including lodgepole pine, Western red cedar and Western red pine. The understory consists of large cleared areas with invasive Himalayan blackberry and cherry laurel. Invasive species cover was found to be approximately $50 \%$. The central ESA was found to have little habitat value as a result of its small size and isolation from other habitat areas, marginal understory cover and anthropogenic disturbance from being situated within a parking lot.

Limited bird activity was observed during the field assessments; direct observations were limited to Northwestern crow, with one inactive crow's nest observed within a row of off-site trees to the west. One bald eagle site was observed approximately 300 m east of the site along the Fraser River. According to Aquaterra, site redevelopment is not anticipated to impact bald eagles or their nesting success.

No mammals, amphibians, reptiles or invertebrates were directly observed.

## Tree Inventory

The applicant has submitted a Certified Arborist's report which identifies on-site and off-site tree species, assesses tree structure and condition, and provides recommendations for tree retention and removal relative to the proposed development. The report assesses 54 bylaw-sized trees on the subject property, 4 trees on the neighbouring property, and 5 trees on City property. (Attachment 4).

## Tree Removal

30 on-site trees are proposed to be removed, including 15 trees from the central ESA area and 15 trees located on-site but outside the ESA. The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has reviewed the arborist report and has the following comments:

- 1 tree (tag\# 704), a 48 cm Norway maple, exhibits a significant crack in the main trunk and is now a high hazard. This tree should be removed as soon as possible.
- 4 trees (tag\# 728, 729, 730 and 731), all Norway maples ranging from $20-25 \mathrm{~cm}$, are in poor condition (sparse canopy) and conflict with the proposed development. Remove and replace.
- 15 trees (tag\# 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724 and 725) located in the central ESA are in good condition but conflict with the proposed development. Remove and replace.
- 6 are lodgepole pines ranging from $30-60 \mathrm{~cm}(\# 711,719,720,721,724$ and 725);
- 8 are Western redcedars, ranging from $40-50 \mathrm{~cm}(\# 712,713,714,715,716,717$, 722 and 723); and
- 1 is a 25 cm Western red pine (\#718).
- 10 trees (tag\# 701, 702, 703, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 726 and 727), all Norway maples in good condition, ranging from $30-48 \mathrm{~cm}$, conflict with the proposed development. Design alternatives were assessed to protect tree tag \#701, 702, 703, 705, 706, 707, 708, and 709, however, insufficient area is available to accommodate trees as well as the required parking and drive aisle. The applicant has committed to replacing trees closer to the western property line. Tree tag \#726 and 727 conflict with the proposed building footprint.
- Replacement trees should be provided at a 2:1 ratio as per the OCP.
- If required replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site, a cash-in-lieu contribution in the amount of $\$ 500 /$ tree to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for off-site planting is required.


## Tree Retention

24 on-site trees and 4 off-site trees are proposed to be retained and protected on site. The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has reviewed the arborist report and has the following comments:

- 2 trees ( $\operatorname{tag} \# 710$ and 737), are located on-site but outside the ESA. Tree tag \#737 is a significant tree in good condition. These are to be retained and protected.
- 22 trees (tag \# 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745,746, 749, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, $758,759,760,761,762$, and 763 ) located in the northern ESA are in good condition. These are to be retained and protected.
- 4 trees ( $\operatorname{tag} \# 747,748,450$, and 751 ) located on the neighbouring site are to be retained and protected.
- Retained trees should be protected as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.


## City Trees

5 trees (tag \# 732, 733, 734, 735, 736) located on City property were assessed by Parks Arboriculture staff.

- 4 trees $(\operatorname{tag} \# 732,733,734$ and 736$)$ are to be retained.
- 1 tree ( $\operatorname{tag} \# 735$ ) is a 10 cm caliper tree that has been pruned for hydro lines and conflicts with development. Compensation of $\$ 650$ is required to remove the tree for the City to plant two new trees at or near the development site.


## Tree Protection

The applicant is to submit a tree management plan showing the trees to be retained and the measures taken to protect them during development stage (Attachment 4). To ensure that the
trees identified for retention are protected at the development stage, the applicant is required to complete the following items:

- Prior to approval of the Development Permit, the applicant is required to submit a tree security of $\$ 10,000$ for the four City trees to be protected.
- Prior to issuance of the Development Permit, the applicant is to register legal agreements on title to ensure protection and retention of the modified ESA, including protection of trees be retained on-site (tag \#710, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745,746, 749, $752,753,754,755,756,757,758,759,760,761,762$, and 763 ) and submit landscape security for the restoration works
- Prior to issuance of the Development Permit, the applicant is to submit to the City a contract with a Certified Arborist for the supervision of all works conducted within or in close proximity to tree protection zones. The contract must include the scope of work required, the number of proposed monitoring inspections at specified stages of construction, any special measures required to ensure tree protection, and a provision for the arborist to submit a post-construction impact assessment to the City for review.
- Prior to any works on the subject site, the applicant is to ensure installation of tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained. Tree protection fencing must be installed to City standard in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03 prior to any works being conducted on-site, and remain in place until construction and landscaping on-site is completed.


## Tree Replacement

The applicant wishes to remove 30 on-site trees (tag \#701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, $709,711,712,713,714,715,716,717,718,719,720,721,722,723,724,725,726,727,728$, 729,730 and 731). The $2: 1$ replacement ratio would require a total of 60 replacement trees. The applicant has proposed to plant 26 trees in the proposed development. The required replacement trees are to be of the following minimum sizes, based on the size of the trees being removed as per Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057.

Table 1: Tree Replacement Calculation

| No. of Replacement Trees | Minimum Caliper of Deciduous <br> Replacement Tree | Mimum Height of Coniferous <br> Replacement Tree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 8 cm | 4 m |
| 14 | 9 cm | 5 m |
| 8 | 10 cm | 5.5 m |
| 2 | 11 cm | 6 m |

To satisfy the $2: 1$ replacement ratio established in the OCP, the applicant will contribute a total of $\$ 17,000$ to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the remaining thirty-four trees that cannot
be accommodated on the subject property after redevelopment. An additional $\$ 650$ is required in compensation for one City tree to be removed.

As part of the Development Permit application, the applicant must provide a Landscape Plan prepared by a registered Landscape Architect, which must include the agreed upon replacement trees. The City will collect a Landscape Security prior to issuance of the Development Permit based on the cost estimate for the works, including a $10 \%$ contingency, provided by the Landscape Architect.

## Proposed Environmentally Sensitive Area Compensation

To compensate for removal of $198 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of ESA, the applicant proposes to add $414 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(4,456 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of new ESA, and complete landscape restoration and enhancement as follows (DP Plans 1, 2, 3, 4.a, 4.b and 5):

- removal of Himalayan blackberry and other invasive plant species within the existing northern ESA to be protected (approximately $788 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / 8,482 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of the site) and within the new ESA to be created, Attachment 5;
- expansion of the northern ESA by $305 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(93,283 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ and enhancing both the new and existing ESA at the north of the site (totalling $1,093 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / 11,765 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ). Proposed plant species include:
- 4 large western redcedar trees (5.0-5.5 m in height);
- 10 large Douglas fir trees (5.5-6.0 m in height);
- 345 native shrubs including 54 salal, 67 Oregon grape, 47 baldhip rose, 55 oceanspray, 58 salmonberry, 64 common snowberry plants; and
- 1059 perennial plants, including 120 vanilla leaf, 160 pacific bleeding heart, 214 sword fern, 284 small flowered alumroot, 80 large leaved lupine, and 201 pink fawn lily.

Plant density is proposed to be 1.3 plants $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ in addition to the existing trees to be retained.

- designation, enhancement and protection of $109 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,173 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of non-contiguous ESA with native plant species, including:
- 6 large western redcedar trees ( 5.0 m in height);
- 5 large Douglas fir trees ( 5.0 m in height);
- 87 native shrubs including 42 salal, 35 Oregon grape, 4 baldhip rose, 2 salmonberry, 4 common snowberry plants.
Plant density is proposed to be 0.9 plants $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$.

Table 2: Balance Sheet

| ESA Area | ESA Existing | ESA Loss | ESA Gain | FINAL ESA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northern ESA | $788 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(8482 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | 0 | $305 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,283 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $1,093 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(11,765 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| Central ESA | $198 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,135 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $198 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,135 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | 0 | 0 |
| New ESA along Savage Road | 0 | 0 | $109 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,177 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $109 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,177 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| TOTAL | $986 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(10,613 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $198 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,135 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $414 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(4,456 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | 1,202 m ${ }^{2}\left(12,938 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |

The proposal represents a net gain of $216 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,325 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ in habitat area (ratio of $2: 1$ ), with a net gain in function by augmenting the upland forest with a new densely planted, natural area to be protected as ESA. Enhancement will support utilization by a variety of terrestrial species, including small and medium-sized mammals, birds and invertebrates. Improvements are anticipated to improve foraging potential, cover, nesting, and direct and indirect utilization by wildlife as a home range for resident and migratory species.

To ensure that the proposed enhancements have the best chance of survival and that invasive species are controlled, monitoring and annual reporting by a Qualified Environmental Professional will occur for three years following completion of the landscape restoration plan.

Development Permit Considerations include bonding for the landscape restoration costs and success monitoring, installation of temporary tree and ESA protective fencing, and the registration of legal agreements to ensure protection and retention of the modified ESA (Attachment 6).

An existing covenant (BP 245419), associated with a previously issued Development Permit (DP 99-170971) and registered over the existing, northern ESA for the protection of the native vegetation, is to be discharged as a condition of this Development Permit. The new legal agreement, noted above, will reflect updated conditions, including the proposed modified ESA boundary and enhancements.

## Engineering Comments

A Servicing Agreement will not be required for this development. Utility connections and frontage improvements will be addressed through a Work Order at the time of Building Permit, including completing new water and stormwater connections. At the time of future installation of any private utilities, all above-ground utility boxes (transformers, kiosk, etc) required to service the development will be situated within the development site. Utility alignments and connections must be approved by Engineering.

Registration of a new 13 m Statutory Right of Way for access, construction and maintenance of future road, dike and utility works is a consideration of the Development Permit. The dyke SRW will overlap with the ESA protective covenant. The covenant will prohibit any excavation or construction within the SRW and provide the City with unrestricted vehicular and man access to all areas of the SRW. Any future impacts to ESA as a result of the ultimate dyke cross section will be addressed at that time.

An existing flood plain covenant (BP 245434), associated with a previously issued Development Permit (DP 99-170971), is to be discharged as a condition of this Development Permit. A new flood protection covenant agreement reflecting current City standards is a condition of this Development Permit.

## Financial Impact

The application results in an insignificant Operational Budget Impact (OBI) for off-site City infrastructure (such as road works, waterworks, storm sewers, sanitary sewers, street lights, street trees and traffic signals).

## Conclusion

The applicant proposes to remove a total of $198 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,325 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ from the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) to allow development of a warehouse and associated parking, loading and office. Compensation is proposed through a combination of additional ESA designation on-site, planting of $414 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of newly established ESA area with native trees, shrubs and plants, and invasive species management and replanting of $788 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(8,482 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of existing ESA. The total net gain in area would be $216 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,325 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ with a total of $1,202 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(12,938 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of enhanced ESA (new and existing).

As the proposed landscape restoration plan would result in a net gain in ESA area and function, staff recommend that the Development Permit be endorsed, and issuance by Council be recommended.
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## Development Application Data Sheet

Development Applications Department

DP 18-820689

## Attachment 2

Address: 1600 Savage Road
Applicant: Integrated Construction Owner: 10647462 Canada Ltd.
Planning Area(s): Bridgeport
Floor Area: Gross: $2,918 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \quad$ Net: $2,918 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$

| Site Area: | $5,257 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Land Uses: | Surface parking lot | $5,257 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| OCP Designation: | Industrial | Warehouse |
| Zoning: | Light Industrial (IL) | No change |


|  | Bylaw Requirement | Proposed | Variance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | Max. 1.0 | 0.55 | none permitted |
| Lot Coverage: | Max. $60 \%$ | $42 \%$ | none |
| Setback - Front Yard: | Min. 3.0 m | Min. 3.0 m | none |
| Setback - Exterior Side Yard: | Min. 3.0 m | Min. 3.0 m | none |
| Setback - Interior Side Yard: | No minimum | 0.3 m | none |
| Setback - Rear Yard: | No minimum | 0.32 m | none |
| Height (m): | Max. 12.0 m | Max. 11.12 | none |
| Off-Street Parking Spaces: | Min. 30 | 30 | none |
| Off-Street Parking Spaces <br> (accessible): | Min. 1 | 1 | none |
| Total Off-Street Parking Spaces: | Min. 31 | 31 | none |
| Loading Spaces: | Min: 1 large/1 Medium | 2 Large/2 medium | none |
| Bicycle Parking Spaces: | Class $1: 8$ spaces <br> Class 2: 8 spaces | Class 1:8 spaces <br> Class 2: 8 spaces | none |




## AQUAEERRA

## ATTACHMENT 4




## TABLE 1. TREE INVENTORY - SAVAGE ROAD PROPERTY

*The tree health and structural condition ratings are as follows and are based on factors that could include one or a combination of:
Poor Condition - Severe Canopy dieback, significant lean, decayed, missing leader, significant disease or parasitic plant presence
Fair Condition - Moderate Canopy dieback and/or lean, limb defects, multiple stems, moderate foliage damage from stress, moderate damage from disease or parasite.
Good condition - Healthy vigorous growth, no or minor visible defects or damage

| TREE OR TAG \# | BOTANICAL NAME | COMMON NAME | DBH (cm) | CANOPY RAD. (m) | STEMS | CONDITION* | COMMENTS | RECOMMENDATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 701 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 39 | 3 | 1 | Good-Fair | Pruned | Remove for Development |
| 702 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 34 | 3 | 1 | Good | Pruned, slight lean | Remove for Development |
| 703 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 48 | 3 | 1 | Good | Pruned, slight lean | Remove for Development |
| 704 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 48 | 3 | 1 | Poor | Crack in trunk, pruned | Remove for Condn/Development |
| 705 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 38 | 3 | 1 | Fair | Pruned, dieback | Remove for Development |
| 706 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 35 | 2 | 1 | Fair | Pruned, dieback | Remove for Development |
| 707 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 49 | 3 | 1 | Fair | Pruned, dieback, has birds nest | Remove for Development |
| 708 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 44 | 3 | 1 | Fair | Pruned, dieback, corrected lean, broken branches | Remove for Development |
| 709 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 37 | 2 | 1 | Fair | Pruned, dieback on one side, uncorrected lean | Remove for Development |
| 710 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | $\begin{gathered} 3 @ 25,1 @ \\ 15 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 4 | Fair | Pruned, dieback, growing into tree wire and rebar | Retain and Protect |
| 711 | Pínus contorta | Lodgepole Pine | 40 | 2 | 1 | Good-Fair | Shaded dieback one side | Remove for Development |
| 712 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 45 | 4 | 1 | Good |  | Remove for Development |
| 713 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 45 | 4 | 1 | Good |  | Remove for Development |
| 714 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 50 | 4 | 1 | Good | Minor shaded dieback | Remove for Development |
| 715 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 50 | 4 | 1 | Good |  | Remove for Development |
| 716 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 45 | 4 | 1 | Good | Shaded dieback | Remove for Development |
| 717 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 40 | 2 | 1 | Good |  | Remove for Development |
| 718 | Pinus resinosa | Western Red Pine | 25 | 1 | 1 | Poor | Shaded dieback | Remove for Development |
| 719 | Pinus contorta | Lodgepole Pine | 35 | 1 | 1 | Poor | Shaded dieback, corrected lean | Remove for Condn/Development |
| 720 | Pinus contorta | Lodgepole Pine | 45 | 3 | 1 | Fair-Poor | Shaded dieback | Remove for Condn/Development |
| 721 | Pinus contorta | Lodgepole Pine | 30 | 2 | 1 | Poor | Leader missing, dieback, leaning | Remove for Development |
| 722 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 52 | 4 | 1 | Good | Shaded dieback | Remove for Development |
| 723 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 40 | 3 | 1 | Poor | Some canopy dieback, fruiting bodies, holes in trunk indicate insect infestation, likely internal decay | Remove for Condn/Development |
| 724 | Pinus contora | Lodgepole Pine | 60 | 2 | 1 | Fair | Shaded dieback, one stem removed, corrected lean | Remove for Development |
| 725 | Pinus contorta | Lodgepole Pine | 55 | 4 | 1 | Good-Fair | Shade dieback, corrected lean | Remove for Development |
| 726 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 40 | 4 | 1 | Good | Pruned | Remove for Development |
| 727 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 30 | 3 | 1 | Fair | Pruned, Dieback | Remove for Development |
| 728 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 25 | 1 | 1 | Fair | Pruned | Remove for Development |
| 729 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 25 | 2 | 1 | Fair | Dieback, Leaning | Remove for Development |
| 730 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 25 | 2 | 1 | Poor | Missing leader, broken limbs, dieback, large trunk cavity | Remove for Condn/Deveiopment |
| 731 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 20 | 1 | 1 | Poor | Broken limbs, dieback, heavily pruned | Remove for Condn/Development |
| 732 | Acer freemanii | Freeman's Maple | 10 | 2 | 1 | Good-Fair | Leaders all pruned due to hydro lines | Retain and Protect |
| 733 | Acer freemanii | Freeman's Maple | 10 | 2 | 1 | Good-Fair | Leaders all pruned due to hydro lines | Retain and Protect |
| 734 | Acer freemanii | Freeman's Maple | 10 | 2 | 1 | Good-Fair | Leaders all pruned due to hydro lines | Retain and Protect |
| 735 | Acer freemanii | Freeman's Maple | 10 | 2 | 1 | Good-Fair | Leaders all pruned due to hydro lines | Remove for Development |
| 736 | Acer freemanii | Freeman's Maple | 17 | 3 | 1 | Good-Fair | Leaders all pruned due to hydro lines | Retain and Protect |
| 737 | Acer species | Maple | 40 | 5 | 1 | Good | Pruned on one side | Retain and Protect |
| 738 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 45 | 6 | 1 | Good |  | Retain and Protect |
| 739 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 50 | 3 | 1 | Good | Shaded dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 740 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 45 | 2 | 1 | Fair-Poor | Significant dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 741 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 30 | 4 | 1 | Fair | Shaded dieback, slight lean | Retain and Protect |
| 742 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 45 | 3 | 1 | Good | Shaded dieback on one side | Retain and Protect |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { TREE OR } \\ \text { TAG \# } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | BOTANICAL NAME | COMMON NAME | DBH (cm) | CANOPY RAD. (m) | STEMS | CONDITION* | COMMENTS | RECOMMENDATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 743 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 50 | 3 | 1 | Good-Fair | Shaded dieback on one side | Retain and Protect |
| 744 | Pseudotsuga menziesil | Douglas fir | 60 | 3 | 1 | Good-Fair | Dieback, one sided growth | Retain and Protect |
| 745 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 60 | 3 | 1 | Good-Fair | Dieback, one sided growth | Retain and Protect |
| 746 | Populus trichocarpa | Black Cottonwood | 75 | 2 | 1 | Fair | Ivy on trunk | Retain and Protect |
| 747 | Populus trichocarpa | Black Cottonwood | 70 | 1 | 1 | Poor | lvy on trunk | Retain and Protect |
| 748 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 70 | 2 | 1 | Good-Fair | lvy on trunk some dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 749 | Populus trichocarpa | Black Cottonwood | 75 | 2 | 1 | Fair | Shaded dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 750 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 50 | 3 | 1 | Good-Fair | lvy on trunk | Retain and Protect |
| 751 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 1 Broken, 1@ <br> 45,1@40 | 3 | 3 | Good-Fair | Shaded dieback, ivy on trunk | Retain and Protect |
| 752 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | $\begin{gathered} 1 @ 10,1 @ \\ 15,1 @ 20, \\ 1 @ 35 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3 | 4 | Good-Fair | Shaded dieback, ivy on trunk | Retain and Protect |
| 753 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 60 | 6 | 1 | Good |  | Retain and Protect |
| 754 | Acer macrophyllum | Big Leaf Maple | 45 | 4 | 1 | Good | Dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 755 | Acer macrophyllum | Big Leaf Maple | 70 | 5 | 1 | Good-Fair | Dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 756 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 20.5 | 2 | 1 | Good |  | Retain and Protect |
| 757 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 22 | 2 | 1 | Poor | Missing leader | Retain and Protect |
| 758 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 20.5 | 1 | 1 | Goad-Fair | Dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 759 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 @ 22,1 @ \\ 15 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 2 | Good-Fair | Corrected lean | Retain and Protect |
| 760 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 41 | 4 | 1 | Good | Shaded dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 761 | Populus trichocarpa | Black Cottonwood | 22 | 2 | 1 | Good |  | Retain and Protect |
| 762 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 55 | 7 | 1 | Good |  | Retain and Protect |
| 763 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 50 | 6 | 1 | Good-Fair | Shaded Dieback, Pruned | Retain and Protect |

ATTACHMENT 5
Figure 9: 1600 Savage Road - May 2019 Invasive Plant Mapping



# Development Permit Considerations 

## Prior to approval of the Development Permit, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. Receipt of a Letter of Credit for landscaping and tree retention security in the amount of $\$ 36,247.20$ based on the cost estimate provided in the Environmental Impact Assessment (Aquaterra Environmental, July 30, 2019) including 10\% contingency.
2. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute $\$ 17,650$ to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of replacement trees within the City.
3. Submission of a Contract entered into between the applicant and a Certified Arborist for supervision of any on-site works conducted within the tree protection zone of the trees to be retained. The Contract should include the scope of work to be undertaken, including: the proposed number of site monitoring inspections, and a provision for the Arborist to submit a post-construction assessment report to the City for review.
4. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of $\$ 10,000$ for the four City trees to be retained.
5. Installation of appropriate tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained as part of the development prior to any construction activities, including building demolition, occurring on-site.
6. Installation of appropriate Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) protection fencing and silt control fencing at the boundary of the ESA as proposed by the Development Permit, per the ESA Changes Plan L2.2 (August 22, 2019) prior to any construction activities, including building demolition, occurring on-site.
7. Submission of a Contract entered into between the applicant and a Qualified Environmental Professional to monitor and provide annual reporting to the City on the ESA for three years following City approval of substantial completion.
8. The granting of a 13 m wide statutory right-of-way along the northern property line for the purpose of access, construction, and maintenance of future road, dike, and utility works by the City. The SRW shall prohibit any excavation or construction within the SRW and provide the City with unrestricted vehicular and man access to all sections of the SRW.
9. Registration of a flood plain covenant on title identifying a minimum habitable elevation of 3.0 m GSC.
10. Registration of a legal agreement on title to identify the modified ESA and to ensure that landscaping is retained and planted as identified within the Environmental Impact Assessment (Aquaterra Environmental, July 30, 2019) and will not be abandoned or removed.
11. Registration of a legal agreement on title to allow City access to the property in case the works identified within the Environmental Impact Assessment (Aquaterra Environmental, July 30, 2019) are not completed, maintained or monitored as proposed.
12. Discharge of Covanant BP245419.
13. Discharge of Covenant BP245434.

## Prior to Building Permit Issuance, the developer must complete the following requirements:

1. Submission of a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to the Transportation Department. Management Plan shall include location for parking for services, deliveries, workers, loading, application for any lane closures, and proper construction traffic controls as per Traffic Control Manual for works on Roadways (by Ministry of Transportation) and MMCD Traffic Regulation Section 01570.
2. Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
3. Complete works to be done at the developer's sole cost via City Work Order:

- Water Works:
$\qquad$
a) Using the OCP Model, there is $424 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ of water available at a 20 psi residual at the Savage Road frontage. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of $250 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$.
b) The Developer is required to:
i) Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage building designs.
ii) Provide a right-of-way for the water meter. Minimum right-of-way dimensions to be the size of the meter box (from the City of Richmond supplementary specifications) + any appurtenances (for example, the bypass on W2o-SD) +0.5 m on all sides. Exact right-of-way dimensions to be finalized during the building permit process.
iii) Install a water meter on the existing water service connection. Water meter to be located onsite in a right-of-way.
- Storm Sewer Works:
a) The Developer is required to:
i) Confirm the capacity and condition (via video inspection) of the existing storm connection near the south property line. If the existing storm connection is adequate to serve the proposed development, at the City's digression, the existing connection may be retained to serve the proposed development. A new inspection chamber will be required. If the existing storm connection is not adequate to serve the proposed development, the existing connection shall be capped and a new storm connection complete with inspection chamber shall be installed by the City at the developer's cost.


## - Sanitary Sewer Works

a) The Developer is required to:
i) Confirm the capacity and condition (via video inspection) of the existing sanitary connection at the south property line. If the existing connection is adequate to serve the proposed development, at the City's digression, the existing connection may be retained to serve the proposed development. If the existing connection is not adequate to serve the proposed development, the existing connection shall be replaced by the City at the developer's cost.
b) At Developer's cost, the City is to:
i) Replace the sanitary inspection chamber at the south property line with a 1050 mm manhole.

## - Frontage Works

a) The Developer is required to:
i) Coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers:
(1) To pre-duct for future hydro, telephone and cable utilities on all road frontages.
(2) Before relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the property frontages.
(3) To underground overhead service lines.
(4) To locate/relocate all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks required to service the proposed development, and all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks located along the development's frontages, within the developments site (see list below for examples). A functional plan showing conceptual locations for such infrastructure shall be included in the development design review process. Please coordinate with the respective private utility companies and the project's lighting and traffic signal consultants to confirm the requirements (e.g., statutory right-of-way dimensions) and the locations for the aboveground structures. If a private utility company does not require an aboveground structure, that company shall confirm this via a letter to be submitted to the City. The following are examples of statutory right-of-ways that shall be shown on the architectural plans/functional plan:

- BC Hydro PMT - $4.0 \times 5.0 \mathrm{~m}$
- BC Hydro LPT $-3.5 \times 3.5$ m
- Street light kiosk $-1.5 \times 1.5 \mathrm{~m}$
- Traffic signal kiosk $-2.0 \times 1.5 \mathrm{~m}$
- Traffic signal UPS $-1.0 \times 1.0 \mathrm{~m}$
- Shaw cable kiosk - $1.0 \times 1.0 \mathrm{~m}$
- Telus FDH cabinet - $1.1 \times 1.0 \mathrm{~m}$

4. If applicable, payment of latecomer agreement charges associated with eligible latecomer works.
5. Obtain a Building Permit (BP) for any construction hoarding. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a public street, the air space above a public street, or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For additional information, contact the Building Approvals Department at 604-276-4285.

## Note:

* This requires a separate application.
- Where the Director of Development deems appropriate, the preceding agreements are to be drawn not only as personal covenants of the property owner but also as covenants pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act.
All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall have priority over all such liens, charges and encumbrances as is considered advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall, unless the Director of Development determines otherwise, be fully registered in the Land Title Office prior to enactment of the appropriate bylaw.
The preceding agreements shall provide security to the City including indemnities, warranties, equitable/rent charges, letters of credit and withholding permits, as deemed necessary or advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements shall be in a form and content satisfactory to the Director of Development.
- Additional legal agreements, as determined via the subject development's Servicing Agreement(s) and/or Development Permit(s), and/or Building Permit(s) to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering may be required including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, de-watering, drilling, underpinning, anchoring, shoring, piling, pre-loading, ground densification or other activities that may result in settlement, displacement, subsidence, damage or nuisance to City and private utility infrastructure.
- Applicants for all City Permits are required to comply at all times with the conditions of the Provincial Wildlife Act and Federal Migratory Birds Convention Act, which contains prohibitions on the removal or disturbance of both birds and their nests. Issuance of Municipal permits does not give an individual authority to contravene these legislations. The City of Richmond recommends that where significant trees or vegetation exists on site, the services of a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) be secured to perform a survey and ensure that development activities are in compliance with all relevant legislation.


## City of Richmond

## Development Permit

No. DP 18-820689

To the Holder:<br>Property Address:<br>1600 Savage Road<br>Address:<br>4610 Marine Drive<br>Burnaby, BC V5J 3G2

1. This Development Permit is issued subject to compliance with all of the Bylaws of the City applicable thereto, except as specifically varied or supplemented by this Permit.
2. This Development Permit applies to and only to those lands shown cross-hatched on the attached Schedule " A " and any and all buildings, structures and other development thereon.
3. Subject to Section 692 of the Local Government Act, R.S.B.C.: buildings and structures; off-street parking and loading facilities; roads and parking areas; and landscaping and screening shall be constructed generally in accordance with Plans \#1, 2, 3, 4.a., 4.b, and 5, attached hereto.
4. Sanitary sewers, water, drainage, highways, street lighting, underground wiring, and sidewalks, shall be provided as required.
5. As a condition of the issuance of this Permit, the City is holding the security in the amount of $\$ 36,247.20$ to ensure that development is carried out in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Permit. Should any interest be earned upon the security, it shall accrue to the Holder if the security is returned. The condition of the posting of the security is that should the Holder fail to carry out the development hereby authorized, according to the terms and conditions of this Permit within the time provided, the City may use the security to carry out the work by its servants, agents or contractors, and any surplus shall be paid over to the Holder. Should the Holder carry out the development permitted by this permit within the time set out herein, the security shall be returned to the Holder. The City may retain the security for up to one year after inspection of the completed landscaping in order to ensure that plant material has survived.
6. If the Holder does not commence the construction permitted by this Permit within 24 months of the date of this Permit, this Permit shall lapse and the security shall be returned in full.

## Development Permit

No. DP 18-820689
To the Holder: Braden Smith
Property Address: 1600 Savage Road
Address: 4610 Marine Drive
Burnaby, BC V5J 3G2
7. The land described herein shall be developed generally in accordance with the terms and conditions and provisions of this Permit and any plans and specifications attached to this Permit which shall form a part hereof.
This Permit is not a Building Permit.
AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION NO.
ISSUED BY THE COUNCIL THE DAY OF
DELIVERED THIS ..... DAY OF
MAYOR

City of Richmond

$\mathbb{N}$

## DP 18-820689 <br> SCHEDULE "A"






Plan 4.b


