## City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

## To: Planning Committee

From: Wayne Craig Director, Development

Date: May 22, 2019
File: RZ 17-777664

Re: Application by Matthew Cheng Architect Inc. for Rezoning at 7391 Moffatt Road from the "Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1)" Zone to the "High Density Townhouses (RTH1)" Zone

## Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9894, for the rezoning of 7391 Moffatt Road from the "Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1)" zone to the "High Density Townhouses (RTH1)" zone, be introduced and given First Reading.


| REPORT CONCURRENCE |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Routed To: | CONCURRENCE | CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER |
| Affordable Housing | $\square$ |  |
| Transportation | $\square$ |  |

## Staff Report

## Origin

Matthew Cheng Architects Inc. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 7391 Moffatt Road from the "Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1)" zone to the "High Density Townhouses (RTH1)" zone, to permit the development of six townhouse units with vehicle access from Moffatt Road, to be shared with 7411 Moffatt Road (Attachment 1). There is an existing statutory right-of-way (SRW) registered on 7411 Moffatt Road that allows vehicle access to the subject property.

## Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details about the development proposal is provided in Attachment 2.

The subject property is a residual lot resulting from the recent redevelopment of 7411 Moffatt Road (RZ 08-449233) to the south. The owner of the subject property at the time did not wish to be included in the proposed development. Consistent with previous applications, the developer of 7411 Moffatt Road was required to provide a statutory right-of-way (SRW) across the entire driveway enabling vehicle access to the subject property from Moffatt Road. Driveway access to the proposed development is discussed in greater detail in the Transportation and Site access section of this report. A preliminary site plan and conceptual development plans are contained in Attachment 3.

## Subject Site Existing Housing Profile

There is an existing single-family dwelling on the subject property, which would be demolished. The dwelling was previously tenanted, and does not contain a secondary suite.

## Surrounding Development

Development immediately surrounding the subject site is as follows:
To the north: 10 two-storey and three-storey townhouse units on a property zoned "Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1)".

To the south: 12 three-storey townhouse units on a property zoned "High Density Townhouses (RTH4)." This property was recently redeveloped (RZ 08-449233, DP 07-363924, DP 14-678040).

To the east: A three-storey apartment building on a property zoned "Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1)".

To the west: A three-storey apartment building on a property zoned "Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1)".

## Related Policies \& Studies

## Official Community Plan/City Centre Area Plan

The subject property is designated "Neighbourhood Residential" in the Official Community Plan (OCP), which permits low-rise residential housing, including townhouses. The proposed rezoning is consistent with this designation.

The subject property is located within the area governed by the City Centre Area Plan (CCAP). It is designated "General Urban - T4" in the CCAP, which permits low-rise residential development. It is designated "Sub-Area B.1" in the CCAP Development Permit Guidelines, which is intended for grade-oriented high-density townhouses. The lot size and density matrix suggests a maximum density of 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) based on the site area. The proposed rezoning would result in a density of 0.75 FAR , consistent with the CCAP designation.

The application is subject to a community planning implementation contribution for future community planning initiatives. Since the application was submitted prior to February 18, 2019, the applicant will make a cash contribution of $\$ 0.28$ per buildable square foot as per the community planning implementation strategy, for a total contribution of $\$ 2,251.20$ prior, to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

## Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

The proposed redevelopment must meet the requirements of the Richmond Flood Plain Designation and Protection Bylaw 8204. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on Title is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

## Public Consultation

A rezoning sign has been installed on the subject property. Staff have received two inquiries from the public about the rezoning application in response to the placement of the rezoning sign on the property. Both inquiries came from residents of 7411 Moffatt Road and expressed concern with the proposed shared driveway access. Details on the access are discussed in the Transportation and Site Access section of this report.

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant First Reading to the rezoning bylaw, the bylaw will be forwarded to a Public Hearing where any area resident or interested party will have an opportunity to comment. Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the Local Government Act.

## Analysis

## Built Form and Architectural Character

The applicant proposes six three-storey units in two townhouse clusters oriented on either side of a central north-south drive aisle. The three units at the front of the site have pedestrian access to the sidewalk. Each of these units has a second storey balcony oriented to Moffatt Road in addition to private outdoor space at grade. One convertible unit is proposed (Unit 3).

The three units at the rear of the site have both pedestrian and vehicle access from the internal drive aisle. Private outdoor space is provided at grade in the rear yard, and each unit includes two balconies. Unit 4 has a second-storey balcony oriented to rear yard and a third-storey balcony oriented to the internal drive, and Units 5 and 6 each include two second-storey balconies oriented to the rear yard and the internal drive aisle.

The building massing and architectural features are similar to the neighbouring townhouses to the south at 4211 Moffatt Road. Pitched roofs, projecting entry features with balconies above, and secondary eaves contribute to the look and feel of a traditional residential character, consistent with the design objectives for the neighbourhood contained in the City Centre Area Plan.

Further refinement of the site plan and architectural character of the proposed development will occur through the Development Permit process.

## Transportation and Site Access

Vehicle access is proposed via an existing statutory right-of-way (SRW) registered on the drive aisle of 7411 Moffatt Road, to the south. This access arrangement was secured through the rezoning and development applications for 7411 Moffatt Road, which received final adoption by Council on May 14, 2012 (RZ 08-449233).

Staff requested that the applicant discuss use of the SRW with the adjacent strata, in order to address any concerns with the shared use of the driveway as well as day-to-day issues such as maintenance and development signage. In response to this request, both the applicant and the neighbouring strata hired legal counsel to undertake discussions on their behalf. A meeting occurred on December 12, 2018, and was attended by the developer, members of the strata council, and a representative from the property management company. Based on a letter provided by the developer (Attachment 4), staff understand that these parties were unable to reach any agreement, and that the strata is opposed to the proposed shared driveway access.

Subsequent to the meeting between the developer and strata representatives, the City Solicitor wrote a letter to the strata's legal counsel, confirming the SRW in place and the City's intent to use it for the proposed shared driveway access, and offered to arrange a meeting with staff if any additional information was requested. In response to the letter, the strata's legal counsel started making arrangements to meet with staff, but ultimately no date was set and a meeting has not occurred. Staff have advised the strata's solicitor that the City intends to advance the application for consideration with driveway access via the SRW registered on Title of 7411 Moffatt Road.

Transportation staff support the proposed shared driveway access as it provides several benefits to both the development on the subject site and neighbouring properties, including:

- Consolidating driveways reduces the number of conflict points between vehicles making turns and pedestrians using the sidewalk;
- Reducing the number of driveway crossings increases the provision of on-street parking on Moffatt Road;
- The resulting T-shaped drive aisle will enable three-point turning movements on site. Presently, service vehicles must either back in to 7411 Moffatt Road or back out to the street; and
- The proposal is consistent with the vision for the redevelopment of the area established when 7411 Moffatt Road was rezoned.

Removing the proposed shared driveway access would require significant revisions to the proposed development. While this conceptual design work has not been completed, it is assumed that at least one unit would be lost in order to accommodate a driveway, and opportunities for landscaping and tree planting would e reduced.

For these reasons, staff support the proposed shared driveway access as envisioned during the redevelopment of 7411 Moffatt Road.

Registration of a legal agreement on Title prohibiting direct vehicle access to Moffatt Road and limiting access to the SRW on the driveway at 7411 Moffatt Road will be required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

## On-site Parking

The parking rate for townhouses located in Zone 3 of the City Centre is 1.4 residential spaces and 0.2 visitor spaces per dwelling unit. The proposed six-unit townhouse development requires nine on-site parking spaces and two visitor spaces. On-street parking is available on Moffatt Road, and is regulated by Richmond Traffic Control \& Regulation Bylaw 5870.

Three of the proposed units will have two-car garages, and three will have one-car garages. Four parking spaces are proposed in a tandem arrangement ( $45 \%$ of total required residential parking spaces), which is consistent with the Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 requirement for a maximum $50 \%$ of spaces provided in tandem. Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant must enter in to a legal agreement prohibiting conversion of the tandem garage area into habitable space.

Bicycle parking is provided according to Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 inside the garage of each unit, and a bike rack is provided for visitors beside the proposed outdoor amenity space.

## Amenity Space

The applicant is proposing a cash contribution in-lieu of providing the required indoor amenity space on-site, which is permitted for small sites in the Official Community Plan (OCP). As this application was received prior to February 28,2019 , the applicable cash-in-lieu rate is $\$ 1,600$ per unit, resulting in a total cash contribution of $\$ 9,600$ for this six-unit townhouse development.

Outdoor amenity space will be provided on site, and is contiguous with the outdoor amenity space provided on the neighbouring development to the south. Based on the preliminary design, the size of the proposed outdoor amenity space complies with the OCP requirement of $6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ per unit, plus an additional $10 \%$ required by the City Centre Area Plan (i.e. $39.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ). Staff will work with the applicant at the Development Permit stage to ensure the configuration and design of the outdoor amenity space meets the Development Permit Guidelines in the OCP and CCAP.

## Existing Legal Encumbrances

There is an existing 3.0 m wide statutory right-of-way (SRW) across the entire west (rear) property line for the sanitary sewer, which will not be impacted by the proposed development. The applicant is aware that encroachment into the SRW is not permitted.

## Tree Retention and Replacement

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 on tree retention and removal relative to the proposed development. The Report assesses 29 bylaw-sized trees on the subject property; one street tree on City property. A Tree Management Plan is provided in Attachment 5.

Opportunities for tree retention are reviewed based on tree health and construction impacts, including changes to the site grade. The proposed redevelopment of the subject site includes a change to the site grade in order to meet the minimum Flood Construction Level (FCL) requirements, as well as to address the significant grade differences between the subject site and surrounding properties. The current grade of the subject site ranges from 0.54 m to 0.87 m , and the minimum FCL is 1.54 m .

The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has reviewed the Arborist's Report and supports the Arborist's findings, with the following comments:

- One Plum tree (Tag \# 1) located on the development site is in poor condition, with multiple pruning wounds, decay, and one dead stem. This tree is not a good candidate for retention and should be removed and replaced.
- Four trees (Tag \# 3, 5, 6, and 7) located on the development site are in fair condition, but are in direct conflict with the proposed driveway and/or building footprint. These trees should be removed and replaced.
- One Cedar tree (Tag \# 4) located on the development site is in good condition, but is within the proposed building envelope. A significant grade change is proposed to meet the minimum Flood Construction Level requirements, which further restricts opportunities for tree retention. This tree should be removed and replaced.
- One Cedar tree (Tag \# 8) located on the development site is in fair condition. This tree will not be impacted by construction activities on site and should be retained. Provide tree protection as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.
- Four trees (Tag \# 9, 11, 12, and 30) located on the development site are in poor condition, with multiple pruning wounds, decay, dead stems, and evidence of insect boring. These trees are not good candidates for retention and should be removed and replaced.
- 18 trees (Tag \# 10 and 13-29) located on the development site are in fair condition, but will be negatively impacted by excavation for the proposed townhouses and the proposed grade change. Retention of these trees would create a trench up to two feet deep along the north property line, which would likely collect water and lead to a significant decline in the trees'
health. These trees are not good candidates for retention and should be removed and replaced.
- Replacement trees should be specified at 2:1 ratio as per the OCP.

The City Parks Department has visited the site and supports the Arborist's findings, with the following comments:

- One Plum tree (Tag \# 2) located in the City-owned boulevard is in poor health and condition. Compensation of $\$ 1,300$ is required to remove the tree for the City to plant two new trees at or near the development site.


## Tree Protection

One tree (Tag \# 8) on the development site is to be retained and protected. The applicant has submitted a tree protection plan showing the tree to be retained and the measures taken to protect them during development stage (Attachment 5). To ensure that the tree identified for retention is protected at development stage, the applicant is required to complete the following items:

- Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, submission to the City of 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 postconstruction impact assessment to the City for review.
- Prior to demolition of the existing dwelling on the subject site, 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.
- Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, submission of a $\$ 5,000$ Tree Survival Security.


## Tree Replacement

The applicant wishes to remove 28 on-site trees (Tag \# 1, 37, and 7-30). The 2:1 replacement ratio would require a total of 56 replacement trees. The applicant has agreed to plant 15 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.

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

To satisfy the $2: 1$ replacement ratio established in the OCP, the applicant will contribute $\$ 20,500$ to the City's Tree Compensation Fund in lieu of the remaining 41 trees that cannot be accommodated on the subject property after redevelopment.

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.

## Affordable Housing Strategy

As per the City's Affordable Housing Strategy, townhouse rezoning applications are required to provide a cash-in-lieu contribution of $\$ 8.50$ per buildable square foot towards the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund. The applicant proposes to make a cash-in-lieu contribution of $\$ 68,331.50$, which is consistent with the Affordable Housing Strategy.

## BC Energy Step Code

On July 16, 2018, Council adopted BC Energy Step Code requirements for new residential developments. The proposed development consists of townhouses that staff anticipates would be designed and built in accordance with Part 9 of the BC Building Code. As such, this development would be expected to achieve Step 3 of the Energy Step Code for Part 9 construction (Climate Zone 4).

## Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant is required to enter into a Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of the required site servicing and frontage improvements, as described in Attachment 6. Frontage improvements include, but may not be limited to, the following:

- Removal of the existing sidewalk and replacement with a new 1.5 m wide landscaped boulevard behind the existing curb and 2.0 m wide concrete sidewalk along the property line.
- Removal of the existing driveway and replacement with curb, gutter, boulevard, and sidewalk as described above.

The applicant is also required to pay Development Cost Charges (DCC's) (City \& Metro Vancouver), School Site Acquisition Charges, Address Assignment fees, and the costs associated with the completion of the required site servicing works as described in Attachment 5.

## Development Permit Application

A Development Permit application is required to be processed to a satisfactory level prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. Further refinements to architectural, landscape, and urban design will be completed as part of the Development Permit application review process, including, but not limited to the following:

- Compliance with Development Permit Guidelines for multiple-family projects in the 2041 Official Community Plan, including those general and sub-area guidelines contained in the City Centre Area Plan.
- Refinement of the proposed building form, architectural character, and site landscaping, including retention of the Cedar tree in the rear yard.
- Refinement of the design of the outdoor amenity area, including choice of play equipment, to create a safe and inviting environment for children's play and social activities.
- Review of aging-in-place features and the provision of a convertible unit.
- Review of a sustainability strategy for the development proposal, including measures to achieve BC Energy Step Code requirements.

Additional issues may be identified as part of the Development Permit application review process.

## Financial Impact or Economic Impact

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

## Conclusion

The purpose of this application is to rezone 7391 Moffatt Road from "Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1)" to "High Density Townhouses (RTH1)", in order to develop six townhouse units with vehicle access from 7411 Moffatt Road.

The proposed six-unit townhouse development is consistent with the plans and policies contained in the Official Community Plan (OCP). Further review of the project design is required to ensure a high quality project and design consistency with the existing neighbourhood context, which will be completed as part of the Development Permit application review process.

The list of rezoning considerations is included as Attachment 6, which has been agreed to by the applicant (signed concurrence on file).

It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9894 be introduced and given First Reading.


Jordan Rockerbie
Planning Technician
(604-276-4091)
JR:blg
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Attachment 2: Development Application Data Sheet
Attachment 3: Conceptual Development Plans

Attachment 4: Letter from the developer
Attachment 5: Tree Management Plan
Attachment 6: Rezoning Considerations


RZ 17-777664


## City of Richmond



## City of Richmond

Address: 7391 Moffatt Road
Applicant: Matthew Cheng Architect Inc.
Planning Area(s): City Centre

|  | Existing | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Owner: | Arking Development Ltd. | To be determined |
| Site Size $\left(\mathbf{m}^{2}\right):$ | $996 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | No change |
| Land Uses: | One single-family dwelling | Six townhouse units |
| OCP Designation: | Neighbourhood Residential | No change |
| CCAP Designation: | General Urban - T4 | No change |
| Zoning: | RAM1 | RTH1 |
| Number of Units: | One | Six (plus two secondary suites) |


| In Future Development | Bylaw Requirement | Proposed | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | 0.75 | 0.75 | none permitted |
| Buildable Floor Area ( $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ):* | Max. $747 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(8,040 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $746.9 \mathrm{~m}^{\mathbf{2}}$ ( $8,039 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) | none permitted |
| Lot Coverage (\% of lot area): | Building: Max. 45\% Non-porous Surfaces: Max. 70\% | Building: $36.25 \%$ Non-porous Surfaces: Max. 70\% | none |
| Lot Size: | Min. $600 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $996 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | none |
| Lot Dimensions (m): | Width: Min. 20.0 m Depth: Min. 30.0 m | Width: 20.4 m Depth: 48.8 m | none |
| Setbacks (m): | Front: Min. 4.5 m Rear: Min. 2.0 m Side: Min. 2.0 m | Front: 6.2 m Rear: 7.5 m North Side: 3.3 m South Side: 3.1 m | none |
| Height (m): | Max. 12.0 m | 11.44 m | none |
| Off-street Parking Spaces Regular (R) / Visitor (V): | $1.4(\mathrm{R})$ and $0.2(\mathrm{~V})$ per unit, i.e. $9(R)$ and $2(V)$ | 9 Resident and 2 Visitor | none |
| Tandem Parking Spaces: | Permitted - Maximum of $50 \%$ of required spaces | 4 spaces, i.e. $45 \%$ | none |
| Amenity Space - Indoor: | Min. $36 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ or cash-in-lieu | Cash-in-lieu (\$9,600) | none |
| Amenity Space - Outdoor: | Min. 39.6 m ${ }^{2}$ | $58.76 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | none |

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

* Preliminary estimate; not inclusive of garage; exact building size to be determined through zoning bylaw compliance review at Building Permit stage.
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Meeting Date: Dec 12, 2018<br>Attendees: Jessica, Villa, Andrew Chen, Eric Wang, and Xiao Yu<br>Location: 21st Century Strata Management Company office<br>\section*{Re: 7391 Moffatt Rd, Richmond Driveway Sharing Issue}<br>To Whom It May Concern.<br>Dear Madam or Sir,

We are a number of young and hardworking professionals who have been trying very hard to build up our career. For this unreasonable issue, we are suffering big losses. We hope that the City can bring justice to this matter and have our project back on track.

We have been trying to contact with 7411 Moffatt Rd management by ourselves, by our architects and by our lawyers since September 2018. Finally, we had a chance to have a face-to-face meeting with 7411 Strata president Villa, vice-president Jessica and the management company manager Andrew Chen.

A few points from the meeting:

1. Jessica and Villa understand fully that 7391 Moffatt $R d$ is on title to share the driveway with 7411 Moffatt Rd.
2. Jessica and Villa have told us that most of the residents at 7411 Moffatt Rd are families of Chinese government officials and do not care about the rules and regulations. We have told them that here in Canada everyone must obey the rules.
3. Jessica and Villa have also informed us that each resident at 7411 Moffatt Rd would want $\$ 20,000$ from us for a total of $\$ 250,000$. They have clearly told us that they have nothing to lose, and that we will lose the time and money.
4. They also told us that if one day we really have to go to the Court, 7411 will lose and 7391 Moffatt would use the driveway. However, since we, the 7391 developers, already have wasted a lot of time and money on mortgage and lawyer fees, etc, they would strongly suggest us to pay them, and it would be a better choice for us.

We will really appreciate the City's patience and help to bring justice to this matter.

Sincerely,
Developer of 7391 Moffatt Rd


Preliminary Tree Retention \& Removal Plan, Scale $3 / 64^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}$

| $\begin{gathered} \text { TREE } \\ \underset{H}{ } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | SPECIES (Botanical name) | DBH (cm) | SPREAD (m) est. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Plum } \\ \text { (Primus sp.) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 38 | 5 m |
| 2 | Plum (Primus sp.) | 59 | 6 m |
| 3 | Cedar (Thifa occidentatis) | 26 | 2 m |
| 4 | Cedar <br> (Thuja plicata) | 54 | 4 m |
| 5 | Plum (Primus sp.) | $\begin{gathered} 91 \\ \text { combined } \end{gathered}$ | 5 m |
| 6 | Camellia (Camellia sp.) | $\begin{gathered} 59 \\ \text { combined } \end{gathered}$ | 3 m |
| 7 | Walnut (Juglans sp.) | 52 | 7 m |
| 8 | Cedar <br> (Thuja plicata) | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ \text { per survey } \end{gathered}$ | 3 m |
| 9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Plum } \\ \text { (Prumus sp. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $28$ <br> combined | 4 m |
| 10 | Cypress <br> (Chamaecyparis sp.) | 54 | 3 m |
| 11 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Plum } \\ \text { (Primus } s p .) \end{gathered}$ | 46 | 3 m |
| 12 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Plum } \\ \text { (Prumus sp.) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 24 est. | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { Est. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 13 | Hazelnut (Corylus sp.) | 30 est. | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { Est. } \end{aligned}$ |
| 14 | Holly (llex sp.) | $32$ <br> combined | 3 m |
| 15 | Cedar <br> (Thuja plicata) | 14 | 3 m |
| 16 | Cedar (Thujaplicata) | 32 | 3 m |
| 17 | Cedar (Thuia plicata) | 24 | 3 m |
| 18 | Cedar (Thuja plicata) | 24 | 3 m |
| 19 | Cedar (Thiuja plicata) | 16 | 3 m |
| 20 | Cedar (Thijia plicata) | 29 | 3 m |
| 21 | Cedar <br> (Thuja plicata) | 20 | 3 m |
| 22 | Cedar <br> (Thuja plicata) | 29 | 3 m |
| 23 | Cedar (Thuja plicora) | 22 | 3m |
| 24 | Cypress <br> (Chamaecyparis sp.) | 42 combined | 3 m |
| 25 | Cypress (Chamaecyparis sp.) | $\begin{gathered} 82 \\ \text { combined } \end{gathered}$ | 3 m |
| 26 | Cypress <br> (Chamaecyparis sp.) | 60 per survey | 3 m |
| 27 | Cedar (Thuia plicata) | 35 combined | 3m |
| 28 | Cedar (Thuia plicata) | 13 | 3 m |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { TREE } \\ H \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | SPECIES (Botanical Iname) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{DBH} \\ & (\mathrm{~cm}) \end{aligned}$ | SPREAD (m) est. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29 | Cypress (Chamaecyparis sp) | 90 combined | 3 m |
| 30 | Plum (Prtmus sp.) | 30 per survey | 5 m |

## Suitable Replacement Tree Species

- Purple Fountain European Beech (Fagus sylvatica 'Purple Fountain')
- Japanese Tree Lilac 'Ivory Silk' (Syringa reticulata 'Ivory Silk')
- Japanese maple (Acer palmatum sp.)
- Persian Ironwood (Parrotia persica)
- Stewartia (Stewartia pseudocamellia)
- Ginkgo 'Princeton Sentry' (Ginkgo biloba 'Princeton Sentry')
- Dik's Weeping Cypress (Chamaecyparls lawsoniana 'Dik's Weeping')
- Serviceberry (Amelanchier x grandiflora 'Autumn Brillance')
- Oriental Dogwood (Cornus kousa)
- Paperbark maple (Acer griseum)
- Threadleaf Cypress (Chamaecyparis pisifera 'Filifera')
- Sentinel Columnar pine (Pinus nigra 'sentinel')
- Picea omorika (Serbian sprúce)


## Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9894, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute $\$ 20,500$ to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of replacement trees within the City.
2. The submission of a $\$ 5,000$ Tree Survival Security for the one on-site tree to be retained.
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. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on Title.
5. Registration of a legal agreement on title ensuring that the only means of vehicle access is via the SRW BB4037709 registered on 7411 Moffatt Road, and that there be no direct access to Moffatt Road. This agreement must include language indemnifying and releasing the City from any issues arising from such reliance.
6. Registration of a cross-access easement, statutory right-of-way, and/or other legal agreements or measures, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, over the internal drive-aisle in favour of 7411 Moffatt Road.
7. City acceptance of the developer's voluntary contribution in the amount of $\$ 2,251.20$ (i.e. $\$ 0.28 / \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of buildable area, excluding affordable housing) to future City community planning studies, as set out in the City Centre Area Plan.
8. Contribution of $\$ 1,600$ per dwelling unit (i.e. $\$ 9,600$ ) in-lieu of on-site indoor amenity space.
9. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute $\$ 8.50$ per buildable square foot (i.e. $\$ 68,331.50$ ) to the City's affordable housing fund.
10. Registration of a legal agreement on Title prohibiting the conversion of the tandem parking area into habitable space.
11. The submission and processing of a Development Permit* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.

## Prior to a Development Permit ${ }^{*}$ being forwarded to the Development Permit Panel for consideration, the developer is required to:

1. Submission of a Landscape Plan, prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development. The Landscape Plan should:
a) Include the 15 agreed upon replacement trees;
b) Include a mix of deciduous and coniferous species; and
c) Comply with the landscaping requirements contained in Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 .

## Prior to Development Permit* issuance, the developer must complete the following requirements:

1. Submission of a Landscape Security based on $100 \%$ of the cost estimate provided by a Landscape Architect, including all hard and soft materials, installation, and a $10 \%$ contingency.

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

1. 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.

## 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 energy efficiency, CPTED, sustainability, and accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
3. If applicable, payment of latecomer agreement charges, plus applicable interest associated with eligible latecomer works.
4. 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.
5. Enter into a Servicing Agreement* for the design and construction of required site servicing and frontage improvements. A Letter of Credit or cash security for the value of the Service Agreement works, as determined by the City, will be required as part of entering into the Servicing Agreement. Works include, but may not be limited to, the following:

## Water Works:

- Using the OCP Model, there is currently $215 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ of water available at a 20 psi residual at the Moffatt Road frontage. Based on the proposed development, the site requires a minimum fire flow of $220 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$.
- The Developer is required to:
- Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm the development has adequate fire flow for on-site fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit designs at Building Permit stage.
- Provide a utility right-of-way (ROW) for the required water meter. The details of the utility right-of way (ROW) shall be determined via the Servicing Agreement design review.
- At the Developer's cost, the City is to:
- Install one new water service connection off of the existing 150 mm water main along Moffatt Road, complete with meter and meter box for the proposed development.
- Cut and cap at main the existing water service connection at Moffatt Road and remove the service lead.


## Storm Sewer Works:

- The Developer is required to:
- Confirm the condition of the existing inspection chamber (IC) and storm lead (at the southeast corner) via video inspection. Re-use of existing lead, and IC may be permitted if the video inspections show they are in good condition. If not in good condition, a new storm service connection shall be required at the same alignment.
- At the Developers cost, the City is to:
- Cut and cap at main the existing storm service connection at Moffatt Road and remove the service lead.


## Sanitary Sewer Works:

- The Developer is required to:
- Confirm condition of the existing IC and the existing lead that's tied-in to the pump station (via video inspection). Re-use of existing lead, Pa d m 28 permitted if the video inspections show they are in good condition. If the existing lead (that's tied-in to the pump station) is not in good condition, a new
sanitary service connection to service the project and abandonment of the existing lead and removal of the IC will be required. Details shall be determined via the Servicing Agreement (SA) design.
- Confirm via video inspection if the existing sewer pipe (at the northwest corner of 7411 Moffatt Road) that's aligned southeast is in service. If it's not in use, plug the opening at the IC, cut \& cap the existing sewer pipe.
- Not start with the excavations and foundation works until all rear yard sanitary sewer works to be done by City crews are completed and operational.
- At the Developers cost, the City is to:
- Perform all tie-ins to City-owned sanitary lines and complete all plugging, cutting and capping works.


## Frontage Improvements:

- Developer to coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers:
- To underground service lines and overhead utility lines for the proposed development along Moffatt Road, at the Developer's cost.
- Review the existing street lighting levels along Moffatt Road and upgrade lighting along the developments frontage
- To pre-duct for future hydro, telephone and cable utilities along all road frontages at Developer's cost.
- When relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the property frontages.
- To locate all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks required to service the proposed development within the developments site (see list below for examples). A functional plan showing conceptual locations for such infrastructure shall be included in the staff report and the development process design review. Please coordinate with the respective private utility companies and the project's lighting and traffic signal consultants to confirm the requirements and the locations for the above ground structures. If a private utility company does not require an above ground structure, that company shall confirm this via a letter to be submitted to the City. The following are examples of SRWs that shall be shown in the functional plan and registered prior to SA design approval:
- BC Hydro PMT -4 mW X 5 m (deep)
- BC Hydro LPT -3.5 mW X 3.5 m (deep)
- Street light kiosk-1.5mW X 1.5 m (deep)
- Traffic signal kiosk -2 mW X 1.5 m (deep)
- Traffic signal UPS - 1 mW X 1 m (deep)
- Shaw cable kiosk - 1 mW X 1 m (deep) - show possible location in functional plan
- Telus FDH cabinet -1.1 mW X 1 m (deep) - show possible location in functional plan
- Complete offsite improvements to the Moffatt Road frontage, including:
- Removal of the existing sidewalk and replacement with a new 1.5 m wide landscaped boulevard behind the existing curb and 2.0 m wide concrete sidewalk along the property line.
o Removal of the existing driveway and replacement with curb, gutter, boulevard, and sidewalk as described above.
- All frontage works to be completed prior to building occupancy.


## General Items:

- At the Developers cost, the Developer is required to:
- Building encroachment and permanent structures (such as trees and patios etc.) will not be permitted inside rear yard sanitary SRW. Please note fencing along the west property line should be a standard wooden fence
- Provide, within the first SA submission, a geotechnical assessment of preload and soil preparation impacts on the existing utilities (e.g., rear yard sanitary mains, etc.) fronting or within the development site and provide mitigation recommendations.
- Enter into, if required, additional legapagngemqnts 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, including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, dewatering, 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.


## 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 contain 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

## Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9894 (RZ 17-777664) 7391 Moffatt 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 Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following area and by designating it "HIGH DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTH1)".
P.I.D. 011-300-884

South Half Lot 17 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 59725, Block 1 Section 17 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 8037
2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9894".
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