




**To:** Planning Committee  
**From:** Jean Lamontagne  
Director of Development  
**Date:** September 1, 2006  
**File:** RZ 06-337137  
**Re:** **Application by Benn Panesar for Rezoning at 11471 Williams Road from Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E) to Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6)**

---

**Staff Recommendation**

That Bylaw No. 8116, for the rezoning of 11471 Williams Road from “Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)” to “Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6)”, be introduced and given first reading.




Jean Lamontagne  
*Director of Development*

EL:blg  
Att.

**FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY**

**CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER**



## Staff Report

### Origin

Benn Panesar has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 11471 Williams Road (**Attachment 1**) from Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E) to Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6) in order to create two (2) new single-family lots with an existing lane.

### Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details about the development proposal is attached (**Attachment 2**).

### Surrounding Development

To the north and south: Single-family dwellings on large lots (typically 18 m wide or wider) and zoned as Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E); and

To the east and west: Older single-family dwellings on Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E) zoned lots as well as recently completed single-family dwellings on Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area K (R1/K) zoned lots.

### Related Policies & Studies

#### Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies

The rezoning application complies with the City's Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies, as it is a single-family residential redevelopment proposal with access to an operational lane. A number of properties in the 10000 and 11000 block of Williams Road are currently in the process of redevelopment. The majority of the lots in these two (2) blocks have similar development potential due to the existing lane system.

### Staff Comments

A number of similar applications to rezone and subdivide nearby properties to Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area K (R1/K) have been approved along Williams Road between Shell Road and No. 5 Road (reference file RZ 02-199174, RZ 01-197785, RZ 01-197729, RZ 01-196031, RZ 01-114608). The application to rezone 9980 Shell Road (at Williams Road) to Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6) has been given first reading on July 24, 2006 (reference file RZ 06-328581). Four (4) separate rezoning applications to rezone four (4) other properties on the north side of Williams Road between Shell Road and No. 5 Road to Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6) have been received.

### Landscaping

A tree survey is submitted (**Attachment 3**) and eight (8) bylaw-sized trees were noted on site. The applicant is proposing to raise the grade of the site and is proposing to remove all of the trees on site. An arborist report is submitted in support of the proposed tree removal (**Attachment 4**). The applicant has agreed to plant and maintain sixteen (16) replacement trees on site in order to meet the Tree Replacement goals in the OCP. The size of the replacement trees will be in accordance with the requirements of Schedule A of the Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057.

In order to ensure that the replacement trees will be planted and the front yards of the future lots will be enhanced, a landscape plan prepared by a registered landscape architect and a landscaping security (100% of the cost estimates provided by the landscape architect) are required to be submitted prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. In the event that not all the replacement planting can be accommodated on-site the City will accept cash-in-lieu (\$500/tree) for off-site replacement planting.

### Site Servicing

No servicing concerns with rezoning. Registration of a Flood Indemnity Covenant with a minimum Building Elevation Requirement of 0.9 m geodetic is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

At subdivision, the applicant will be required to pay Neighbourhood Improvement Charge (NIC) fees for future lane improvements. The applicant is also required to pay Development Cost Charges (DCCs), Greater Vancouver Sewerage Drainage DCCs, School Site Acquisition Charge, Address Assignment Fee and Servicing costs at the subdivision stage.

### **Analysis**


The rezoning application complies with the Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies. This is a single-family residential development on an arterial road where an existing municipal lane is fully operational. The future lots will have vehicle access to the laneway with no access being permitted onto Williams Road.

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

None.

**Conclusion**

The rezoning application complies with all policies and land use designations contained within the Official Community Plan (OCP) and is consistent with the direction of redevelopment currently ongoing in the surrounding area. On this basis, staff support the application.



Edwin Lee  
*Planning Technician – Design*  
(Local 4121)  
EL:blg

- Attachment 1: Location Map/Aerial Photo
- Attachment 2: Development Data Sheet
- Attachment 3: Proposed Subdivision Layout/Tree Survey
- Attachment 4: Arborist Report

The following must be completed prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw:

- Submission of a landscape plan prepared by a registered landscape architect to the satisfaction of the Director of Development and deposit of a landscaping security based on 100% of the cost estimates provided by the landscape architect. The landscape plan and landscaping security should include the sixteen (16) replacement trees required (six 6 cm calliper, six 8 cm calliper, and four 9 cm calliper). If replacement trees cannot be accommodate on-site cash-in-lieu (\$500/tree) for off-site planting is required;
- Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.




# City of Richmond



32.3	20.15	32.3	20.15	32.3	20.15	32.3	20.15
32.31	20.15	32.31	20.15	32.31	20.15	32.31	20.15
11451	11471	11491	11511				
18.29	18.29	18.29	18.29	18.29	18.29	18.29	18.29
11460	11480	11500	11520				
33.53	33.53	33.53	33.53	33.53	33.53	33.53	33.53

**WILLIAMS RD**



## RZ 06-337137

Original Date: 06/08/06

Revision Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



RZ 06-337137

Original Date: 06/08/06

Amended Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



**City of Richmond**

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

**Development Application  
 Data Sheet**

**RZ**

**Attachment 2**

Address: 11471 Williams Road

Applicant: Benn Panesar

	Existing	Proposed
<b>Owner:</b>	Silby John, Jolly Thomas & Matthew Thomas	To be determined
<b>Site Size (m<sup>2</sup>):</b>	651 m <sup>2</sup> (7,008 m <sup>2</sup> )	325.5 m <sup>2</sup> (3,504 ft <sup>2</sup> )each
<b>Land Uses:</b>	Single-Family Residential Dwelling	Two (2) Single-Family Residential Lots
<b>OCP Designation:</b>	Low Density Residential	No Change
<b>Zoning:</b>	Singe-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)	Singe-Family Housing District (R1-0.6)
<b>Number of Units:</b>	1 single-family detached	2 single-family detached

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.60	Max. 0.60	none permitted
Lot Coverage – Building:	Max. 50%	Max. 50%	none
Lot Size (min. dimensions):	270 m <sup>2</sup>	270 m <sup>2</sup>	none
Setback – Front Yard (m):	6 m Min.	6 m Min.	none
Setback – Side (m):	Min. 1.2 m	Min. 1.2 m	none
Height (m):	2.5 storeys	2.5 storeys	none

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

**BRITISH COLUMBIA LAND SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE SHOWING EXISTING TREES ON LOT 12 BLOCK 1 SECTION 25 B4N R6W NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT PLAN 18935.**


Current Civic Address:

11471 Williams Road  
Richmond, B.C.

SCALE : 1:250

Note:

- All dimensions are in metres.
- This plan is NOT to be used for location of property lines.
- Only trees with a diameter of at least 0.20m are shown
- This plan does not show non-plan charges, liens or interests.



© COPYRIGHT  
DHALIwal AND ASSOCIATES  
LAND SURVEYING INC.  
121-13140 80th Avenue  
Surrey, B.C. V3W 3B2  
Phone: 604 501-6188  
Fax: 604 501-6189  
File: 0605004-T01.DWG

THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT VALID UNLESS  
ORIGINALLY SIGNED AND SEALED

GENE PAUL NIKULA  
Date of Survey:  
30th day of August 2008  
GENE PAUL NIKULA  
B.C.L.S. 803





August 9, 2006

RECEIVED  
AUG 09 2006

BY:.....

**ARBORIST REPORT PREPARED FOR:**

**Benn Panesar, #550-9100 Blundell rd., Richmond BC, V6Y 1K3  
604-306-3030**

11471  
**RE: ~~10471~~ WILLIAMS RD., RICHMOND**

The scope of this report was to inspect and inventory all trees on the property and further to provide comment on the feasibility of retaining each tree. The property in question is being redeveloped splitting the lot into two.

Each tree is listed by common name and botanical name, the diameter breast height (DBH) as well as the approximate height (H). The overall health of the tree is stated as satisfactory, meaning progressing in a positive normal manner with a healthy full canopy and foliage, or poor, meaning the tree is in decline, showing dieback, thinning canopy and / or sparse foliage. See attached sketch for tree numbering and location reference.

During my inspection of this property I found a single family home still remaining, no excavation or pre demolition work had been done. There were also no survey pegs installed to clearly indicate the property lines. I was informed that the new proposed homes would be built out to the maximum allowable – I assumed this to be a 6m set back from front and back property line and 1m from side lines. In the absence of survey pegs I referenced the property lines as the fence lines with the footnote that these were not easy to clearly see. I was also informed during my inspection that the entire property would be raised up to be close to the elevation at the existing front retaining wall. There was also a call for a retaining wall to be built down both east and west side property lines which would require perimeter drain lines to be installed.

**A DIVISION OF CEDAR RIDGE LANDSCAPE LTD.**



---

# CEDAR RIDGE TREE CARE

---

*Caring For Your Trees Since 1986*

Tree #1) Common fruiting Apple, Diameter at base 460mm, H 7M, Satisfactory. Because of the grade raising required for this lot this tree would have in the order of 30cm of fill placed on top of its' entire root zone. This would very likely mean the slow death of this tree as the oxygen supply is cut off in the pore space of the existing root zone layer. This tree is therefore **not suitable** for retention.

Tree #2) Cedar (Thuja plicata), DBH multi stem - 40mm is the largest, H 6M, Satisfactory. Assuming that the grade raising is no more than a few centimeters, this tree would be suitable for retention.

Tree #3) Cedar (Thuja plicata), DBH double stem – 134mm + 180mm, H 6M, Satisfactory. Assuming that the grade raising is no more than a few centimeters, this tree would be suitable for retention.

Tree #4) Hazel Nut (Corylus avellana), DBH multi / multi stem – 30mm is the average, H 5.5M, Satisfactory. Assuming that the grade raising is no more than a few centimeters, this tree would be suitable for retention.

Tree #5) Cedar (Thuja plicata), DBH 345mm, H 8M, Satisfactory. See retaining note

Tree #6) Holly (Ilex aquifolium) DBH triple stem - 98mm each(x3), H 6m, Satisfactory. See retaining note

Tree #7) Mountain Ash ( Sorbus aucuparia), DBH 205mm, H 8M, Satisfactory. See retaining note

Tree #8) Birch ( Betula pendula ), DBH 195 + 238mm, H 13M, Poor – dead top from insect damage. See retaining note

Tree #9) Birch (Betula pendula), DBH 254 + 283mm, H 13M, Poor – dead top from insect damage. See retaining note

Tree # 10) Birch (Betula pendula), DBH 306mm, H 13M, Poor – dead top from insect damage. See retaining note


Retaining note for tree #5 - #10 inclusive: All these trees will be subject to heavy root loss with the installation of the perimeter drainage as they are all directly in line with the east property line. As well, all will be subject to 60 plus centimeters of fill being place on top of their root zones with the grade raising work. All these trees are therefore **not suitable** for retention.

---


**A DIVISION OF CEDAR RIDGE LANDSCAPE LTD.**


This report is submitted in good faith without prejudice of any person or party. My observations are based on visual assessment only and as such do not guarantee the productiveness and / or safety of any tree discussed.

Photos and sketch attached.




Jason Timmis  
International Society of Arboriculture Certified Arborist #PN-2616





APPLE #1  
↖




CEDAR #5  
TRUCK ↘


→  
Holly #6

→  
MTN  
ASH #7


CEDAR #5 IN  
BACK CORNER  
~




NUT #4  
↗



CEDARS  
#2 + #3  
↘



ELEVATION  
DROP @  
FRONT  
←



BIRCH  
# 8, 9 & 10  
←



**Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300  
Amendment Bylaw 8116 (RZ 06-337137)  
11471 WILLIAMS ROAD**

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

1. 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 area and by designating it **SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1-0.6)**.

P.I.D. 004-160-916

Lot 12 Block 1 Sections 25 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 18935

2. This Bylaw may be cited as **“Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300, Amendment Bylaw 8116”**.

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED by

APPROVED by Director or Solicitor


\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

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