

To: Development Permit Panel From: Wayne Craig Director of Development Date: April 1, 2014 File: DV 13-627930

Re: Application by Rogers Communications Inc. c/o Standard Land Company Inc. for a Telecommunication Antenna Tower Installation and Development Variance Permit on a Provincially Owned Highway Road Right-of-Way (Highway 99 – Westminster Highway off-ramp)

### Staff Recommendation

That:

- Richmond City Council grant concurrence to the proposed telecommunication antenna monopole installation for the site located on a provincially owned highway road right-of-way (Highway 99 – Westminster Highway off-ramp); and
- A Development Variance Permit be issued which would vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to increase the maximum height for accessory structures from 20 m to 35 m for a site located on a provincially owned highway road right-of-way (Highway 99 – Westminster Highway off-ramp) for the development of a 35 m tall telecommunication antenna monopole on land zoned "Agriculture (AG1)".

Wayne Craig Director of Development

WC:ke

### Staff Report

### Origin

Rogers Communications Inc. c/o Standard Land Company Inc. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to vary Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to increase the maximum height for accessory structures from 20 m (66 ft.) to 35 m (115 ft.) to allow for the development of a 35 m tall telecommunication antenna monopole. The proposed telecommunication installation is located on the Highway 99 – Westminster Highway off-ramp (southeast corner of the Highway 99 Westminster Highway interchange), which is a provincial highway.

The proposed location is zoned "Agriculture (AG1)" with an accessory structure height limitation of 20 m (66 ft.). The area is also located in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) and complies with applicable guidelines, therefore no approval is required from the ALC.

### **Proposed Development**

The proposed 35 m (115 ft.) monopole will consist of antenna mounted at the top portion of the monopole and a fenced compound (100 sq. m or 1076 sq. ft.) at the base containing the supporting equipment. The proponent has had pre-application discussions with Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MOTI) staff to locate the monopole on the provincial highway. No objections were noted on the proposed location for this purpose by MOTI staff. MOTI have identified that approval from the local government for any such installation is required prior to the submission of a new application for use of a provincial highway.

The monopole will accommodate cellular antenna infrastructure to provide service for this carrier (Rogers Communications) in the surrounding area. MOTI staff have identified that no direct access to the monopole or enclosure area is permitted from the Highway 99 off-ramp. Rather, access is proposed along a frontage road (Westminster Highway) that dead ends and provides necessary access to the area of the installation for construction and maintenance purposes (please reference the attached design drawings and location map).

### Background

Development surrounding the subject site is as follows:

To the north, the Highway 99 – Westminster Highway off-ramp;

To the east, "Agriculture (AG1)" zoned properties in the ALR;

To the south, the Highway 99 corridor; and

To the west, the Highway 99 corridor.

## Staff Comments

Transportation and Engineering staff have no objections to the proposal. In conjunction with the use of Westminster Highway frontage road for construction and maintenance of the installation, a construction traffic and parking management plan is required to be submitted and approved by the City prior to issuance of a building permit. A building permit will be required for the proposed monopole and related buildings/structures.

An Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) designation exists over the portion of the provincial highway where the monopole and equipment shelter is proposed. Although the installation is proposed to be located in an ESA, no significant loss of habitat or impacts to riparian areas is anticipated. Modifications to the site will consist of a small clearing of tall grass and invasive blackberry brambles at the edge of the road to accommodate the telecommunication structure. No tree removal will be required as a result of the proposed installation. Based on this, the surrounding context and the minimum scope of work, further review through an ESA Development Permit is not warranted.

## **Related City Policies**

<u>Council Policy 5045 – Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol</u> Richmond City Council approved Council Policy 5045 on February 13, 2012, which guides the City's review and consideration of telecommunication antenna proposal. Please reference **Attachment 1** for a copy of Council Policy 5045. The following is a summary of applicable provisions of the Policy that apply to the proposal:

- Policy Exclusions/Exemptions -- No exclusions apply to the proposed installation.
- Locational/Siting Criteria The highway corridor where the proposed installation is located is contained in the ALR, designated Agriculture in the 2041 Official Community Plan (OCP) and zoned "Agriculture (AG1)". These designations are sensitive land uses in Council Policy 5045 and require public consultation and consideration must be given to the proposals impact to agriculture. The proposal is located along a major transportation corridor and no impacts to existing agricultural operations will occur. Furthermore, as the site of the proposal is contained in the ALR, the overall footprint of the development will be less than 100 sq. m (1,076 sq. ft.), which is in compliance with ALR regulations.

## • Public Consultation

- The proponent undertook public consultation (advertisements and mailed information packages) with the properties to the east, north and south of the subject site. No comments were received as part of this public consultation.
- Through the Development Variance Permit process, a sign is required to be posted on the subject site. To date, no public comments have been received from the sign posting. Additional advertisements and mailed notification will be sent out by the City in advance of the Development Permit Panel meeting.

## • Design Guidelines

- Co-location on Other Structures The proponent investigated a number of options to co-locate the proposed telecommunication antenna on existing poles and/or structures in the surrounding area. Locating on existing telecommunication towers was not feasible as their location did not allow for expanded service coverage. There are existing hydro poles with overhead power lines along the highway corridor, some of which have telecommunication antenna located on top. The proponent reviewed the existing hydro towers, but there were locational, structural and geotechnical issues that prevented co-location on these structures.
- Co-location for Other Carriers The applicant has contacted other service providers about opportunities to co-locate on the proposed installation. In addition to the antenna equipment being proposed by the proponent, the monopole is able to accommodate equipment for up to one or two additional carriers, depending on their service coverage and equipment space needs. This approach adheres to the Policy provisions in regards to co-location to prevent the unnecessary proliferation of telecommunication towers across the City. If no other carrier is able to or has no interest in co-locating on this structure, the monopole is able to accommodate an expansion of the proponent's antenna equipment.
- Rationale for Monopole Height The proponent has noted that the service coverage from a 35 m (115 ft.) monopole is significantly larger than a structure that complies with the 20 m (66 ft.) maximum height regulation and that a taller structure would avoid having to locate additional installations in the surrounding area. The increased height of the structure also enables future co-location of other carrier's infrastructure or an expansion of the existing carrier's equipment. The monopole height is similar to the height of the surrounding hydro poles that are also approximately 35 m in tall.
- Design Integration The monopole structure was selected to fit with other hydro and highway illumination poles in the area and provide a minimal, non-obtrusive visual impact to the surrounding area. Antenna equipment is flush mounted to the monopole structure to provide a slim a profile as possible. The proponent examined the feasibility of implementing a cylindrical cone cover around the top of the monopole to provide additional screening; however, maintenance activities that required access to the antenna involved having to bring heavy machinery (i.e., cranes to remove the screen) on a regular basis that would have impacts to the operation of the Highway 99 off-ramp and Westminster Highway frontage road. As a result, the proponent identified that the implementation of a cylindrical screen is not feasible for this telecommunication installation. The monopole will be painted a satin white colour to blend in with the surrounding area and be consistent with the colour of the existing hydro standards.
- Equipment Enclosure A 1.8 m (6 ft.) chain link fence with barbed wire and privacy slats is proposed for as the perimeter treatment for the equipment compound to allow for screening and security of the installation.
- Photo simulations of the proposed monopole have been provided showing perspectives of the installation from the south, east and west (see **Attachment 2**).

## Analysis

The proposal to install a telecommunication monopole on the Ministry controlled Highway 99 – Westminster Highway off-ramp and request to vary the maximum accessory structure height from 20 m (66 ft.) to 35 m (115 ft.) has been reviewed in conjunction with Council Policy 5045 (Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol). This installation has addressed the relevant components of the Policy by proposing a slim profile monopole capable of handling additional telecommunication equipment for co-location and/or expansion purposes.

Although the location is in the ALR, there will be no impacts to farming/agriculture as it is part of the Highway 99 corridor. The installation complies with ALR regulations, therefore no application or approval is required from the ALC.

The proposed telecommunication installation will be accessed by a frontage road (Westminster Highway) that services seven "Agriculture (AG1)" zoned sites in the ALR to Sidaway Road to the east. During construction, use of Westminster Highway will be addressed through a construction traffic and parking management plan that is required to be approved by Transportation prior to issuance of the building permit. Future impacts on the Westminster Highway frontage road will be minimal as use will be limited to periodic maintenance and service vehicles. The proposed monopole installation is located approximately 25 m (82 ft.) from the adjacent "Agriculture (AG1)" zoned property to the east. The distance between the monopole and existing single-family dwelling on this property is approximately 45 m (148 ft.) with a dense vegetated screen located between (consisting of primarily large evergreen conifers), which provides for sufficient separation and screening.

## Conclusions

Staff support the proposed telecommunication installation on the provincial highway and related request to vary the maximum accessory structure height from 20 m (66 ft.) to accommodate the proposed 35 m (115 ft.) monopole. The proposal has addressed all relevant components of Council Policy 5045 (Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol) and public consultation and review of all technical aspects of the installation (co-location provisions; design; screening/landscaping) have been completed and resolved.

On this basis, staff recommend that:

- Council grant concurrence to the proposed telecommunication antenna monopole installation for the site located on a provincially owned highway road right-of-way (Highway 99 Westminster Highway off-ramp); and
- A Development Variance Permit be issued to vary the maximum accessory structure height from 20 m (66 ft.) to 35 m (115 ft.) to permit installation of the telecommunication monopole.

Kevin Eng Planner 2

### KE:cas

Prior to future Building Permit issuance, the developer is required to complete the following:

- The applicant is required to obtain a Building Permit for any construction hoarding associated with the proposed development. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a street, or any part thereof, or occupy the air space above a street or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. *For further information on the Building Permit, please contact Building Approvals Division at 604-276-4285.*
- Submission of construction traffic and parking management plan to the satisfaction of the City's Transportation Division (<u>http://www.richmond.ca/services/ttp/special.htm</u>).



Page 1 of 8	Adopted by Council: February 13, 2012	Policy 5045
File Ref: 08-4040- 01-2012	Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protoco	)

### **POLICY 5045**

The Federal Radiocommunications Act regulates the telecommunications network (e.g. antennas) and supersedes local zoning powers. Nevertheless, the Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol (Protocol) identifies the City's interests in managing network elements, in order for network providers to know and follow them, as long as they do not impair the performance of the telecommunications network.

The Protocol addresses:

- A. City zoning, acknowledging the authority of the Radiocommunication Act (Act), Industry Canada's role, policy and regulations under this Act, and that local zoning is not applied so as to impair the performance of the telecommunications network.
- B. Public consultation requirements associated with the placement of certain telecommunication antenna installations within the City of Richmond (City), including completing the consultation process within **120 days** of a Protocol application being received by the City.
- C. Siting design guidelines applicable to all telecommunication antenna installation proposals described under this Protocol.
- D. The City's process for Council and staff for providing recommendations of concurrence or nonconcurrence under the authority of the Act as well as exemptions to this process.

### 1. Federal Authority and City Regulations

- A. Zoning Federal authority over telecommunication antenna installations provides that the City is not able to prohibit these uses under its zoning, and thus:
  - a. Telecommunication antenna installations (Installations) are a permitted use in all zones.
  - b. **Zoning regulations** apply to the zone in which the **installation** is located (i.e. siting, height, landscaping, etc.).
  - c. Development Variance Permit applications to vary height or siting provisions under the zoning may be considered if necessary to the extent that they would not reasonably prohibit an Installation.
- B. Siting Design Guidelines are included in this Protocol with a preference for new tower Installations to be located outside of the Residential, Agriculture, Agriculture & Open Space and Public & Open Space OCP land-use designations or associated zones.
- C. Building permits are required to be issued by the City for foundations for antennas and associated construction of new buildings and building additions to accommodate Installations.
- D. Municipal Access Agreements apply to any Installations within the City's roads, rights of way and other public places as defined and permitted in such Municipal Access Agreements.

#### Notes:

a. For the purposes of this Protocol, "telecommunication antenna Installations" (Installations) can take the form of either antennas mounted on stand-alone towers or building-mounted antennas along with any supporting mechanical rooms, buildings and infrastructure of telephone and data networks that serve public subscribers.



Page 2 of 8	Adopted by Council: February 13, 2012	Policy 5045
File Ref: 08-4040- 01-2012	Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protoco	bl

- b. "**Residential"** includes all Residential, Neighbourhood Residential, Mixed Use, High-Density Mixed-Use, and Neighbourhood Service Centre land use designations in the OCP and includes all zones consistent with these OCP designations.
- c. Subsequent OCP land use designations with similar uses to those described in this Protocol may be used in place of the current OCP land use designations.
- d. **"Tower"** includes monopoles, stand-alone towers, masts and similar structures to which antennas are attached, but does not include building-mounted antennas under 6.0m in height.

#### 2. Antennas Requiring Protocol Processing

#### A. Situations Where Protocol Consultation Provisions Do not Apply

Sections 3 (Consultation), 4A(Co-Location) of this Protocol do not apply to:

#### **Industry Canada Exclusions**

- a. **Maintenance** of existing radio apparatus including the antenna system, transmission line, mast, tower or other antenna-supporting structure.
- b. Addition or modification of an antenna system (including improving the structural integrity of its integral mast to facilitate sharing), the transmission line, antenna-supporting structure or other radio apparatus to existing infrastructure, a building, water tower, etc. provided the addition or modification does not result in an overall height increase above the existing structure of 25% of the original structure's height.
- c. **Maintenance of an antenna system's painting or lighting** in order to comply with Transport Canada's requirements;
- d. **Installation, for a limited duration** (typically not more than 3 months), of an antenna system that is used for a **special event**, or one that is used to support local, provincial, territorial or national **emergency operations** during the emergency, and is removed within 3 months after the emergency or special event; and
- e. New antenna systems, including masts, towers or other antenna-supporting structure, with a height of less than 15 metres above ground level.

#### **City Exclusions**

- f. **New building-mounted Installations** provided they do not extend more than 3.0m above highest point of the building and meet section 4B of the Design Guidelines.
- g. A new stand-alone tower that replaces an existing tower provided it does not exceed the height of the existing tower and that the new tower is located not more than 15m from the existing tower; the Proponent is required to remove the existing tower along with any unused associated foundations, buildings, fencing and other structures to the extent agreed by the landowner and the City.



Page 3 of 8	Adopted by Council: February 13, 2012	Policy 5045
File Ref: 08-4040- 01-2012	Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protoc	ol

- h. Land that is designated in the OCP as Airport, Business and Industry <u>and that</u> is more than 300m (for new towers over 30m in height) or more than 150m (for new towers between 15m and 30m in height) from land with Residential OCP land-use designations.
- i. **Local government Installations** that are solely dedicated to operation of local government utilities and infrastructure.
- j. Private receiving antennas and closed telecommunication networks, neither of which serve public subscribers.

### B. Situations Where Both Protocol Consultation and Detailed Design Provisions Apply

Sections 3 (Consultation) and Section 4 (Design Guidelines) of this Protocol <u>apply</u> to all new standalone Installations on sites that are:

- a. Within the Agriculture and Agriculture & Open Space OCP land-use designations/associated zones<sup>1</sup>;
- b. Residential or Public & Open Space OCP land use designations /associated zones or are within 300m for (new towers over 30m in height) or more than 150m (for new towers between 15m and 30m in height) of such lands.

#### Notes:

- a. Broadcasters require licensing approval from the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications (CRTC). Where a broadcaster constructs an **installation**, the broadcaster is required to provide documentation to the **City** confirming the initiation of the applicable (CRTC) licensing process and it's decision when made.
- b. Where an **installation** is located on a **City** property the proponent may be required to enter into a specific agreement related to that property, or in the case of a road or SROW the proponent may be required to enter into a Municipal Access Agreement with the **City**.
- c. Transport Canada and other federal transportation regulations and policies, including the current YVR maximum height zoning, is to be followed by the Proponent.

### 3. Stepped Consultation Process

- A. For those new Installations to which this Protocol applies, the process will generally involve the following steps:
  - a. **Proponent** should undertake initial pre-application consultation with the City to ascertain policy and technical issues as well as alternatives to locations that require consultation.
  - b. Proponent submits the Protocol application along with a siting plan that addresses this Protocol's Design Guidelines (Section 4) and provides written confirmation of compliance with Industry Canada, Nav Canada and other federal regulations. The City confirms whether the consultation process under this Protocol applies and whether a Development Variance Permit (DVP) to relax zoning regulations is required. If neither of these are required for more minor applications, an application for Design Review: Staff Concurrence is made under Process Stream No. 1 under Section 3B below.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Notes A and B on page 1. 3510492



Page 4 of 8	Adopted by Council: February 13, 2012	Policy 5045
File Ref: 08-4040- 01-2012	Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protoco	ol

- c. **City** reviews the application based on the parameters established in this **Protocol** and provides initial comments
- d. Proponent undertakes initial public consultation, at his/her cost, that includes:
  - i. **Advertising** in at least two consecutive weekly issues of a local newspaper and City Hall Bulletin Board to inform the public of a proposed **installation over 30m in height**; and
  - ii. Written notification, via direct-addressed mail, to all property owners within a radius from the base of the proposed tower equal to 6 times the tower height or adjacent property owners if no other property is located within 6 times tower height (mailing address list is provided by the City).
- e. **Proponent receives any public comments, within a 10-day public comment period** commencing on the notice mailing date or second advertisement date (whichever is later), and addresses them with the public via correspondence through explanation or proposed changes to the proposal **within a 10-day Proponent reply period** commencing immediately after the public comment period.
- f. Proponent documents all aspects of the public consultation process and provides a summary report to the City not more than 10 days after the end of the Proponent reply period. In addition to highlighting the details of the consultation process, the report must contain all public correspondence received and responses by the proponent to address public concerns and comments. Examples of concerns that proponents are to address, as identified by Industry Canada, include, but are not limited, to issues similar to the following:
  - Why is the use of an existing antenna system or structure not possible?
  - Why is an alternate site not possible?
  - What is the proponent doing to ensure that the antenna system is not accessible to the general public?
  - How is the proponent trying to integrate the antenna into the local surroundings?
  - What options are available to satisfy aeronautical obstruction marking requirements at this site?
  - What are the steps the proponent took to ensure compliance with the general federal requirements including the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (CEAA), Safety Code 6, etc.?
- g. Proponent may be required to hold a first public meeting if there are any outstanding public concerns after responding to any public comments from the initial consultation and reporting them back to the City. This meeting may take the form of a general public open house or invitee meeting if there are relatively few people expressing issues of concern. The notification process will be the same of that of initial notification if there is to be a public meeting or notification of only interested parties to an invitee meeting.(As necessary determined at the discretion of the City's Director of Development, based on public comments from initial mail-out consultation).



Page 5 of 8	Adopted by Council: February 13, 2012	Policy 5045
File Ref: 08-4040- 01-2012	Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protoco	bl

- h. **Proponent addresses** public comments from the first public or invitee meeting on issues and repeats documentation process as outlined in (e) above.
- i. **Proponent may need to make a DVP application** if the proposal does not meet the applicable zoning setbacks, heights or landscaping/screening provisions. The DVP process is coordinated with the **Protocol** consultation process. If the **Installation does not require public consultation as outlined above,** but requires a DVP to relax zoning provisions, the **Proponent** will need to **submit a standard DVP application** following Process Stream 3 below, but with the regular 50m DVP consultation radius.
- j. If the proposed **Installation** is located within the ALR, the proposal will also be referred to the City's Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) concurrently with the above Proponent consultation process.

B. The application takes one of **Three Process Streams** depending on whether the above public consultation and a DVP are required.

1. Staff Concurrence: 2. Council Concurrence: 3. Council Concurrence: Consultation	
Design Outleting Only Demotes Office Design	
Design Guidelines Only Regular Consultation Process Process With a DVP	
a. If there is no public a. City undertakes public notification for a. City undertakes public notification f	or
consultation required as set out   formal consideration of application using   formal consideration of a DVP following t	he
above nor a DVP required to the consultation area as set out in this <b>City DVP process</b> , but using the	
relax zoning requirements, City <b>Protocol.</b> consultation area as set out in this	
staff will view an application for Protocol.	
siting and design.	
b. Staff prepares a memo b. City staff prepares a report to b. City staff prepares a report to DP	
reviewing how the proposed <b>Planning Committee</b> that reviews how the <b>Panel</b> that reviews how the proposal	
<b>Installation</b> meets the <b>Design</b> proposal meets the <b>Protocol</b> Design requires a variance to zoning, meets the	
<b>Guidelines</b> under Section 4 Guidelines, addresses public comments <b>Protocol</b> Design Guidelines, addresses	
and provides a recommendation (i.e. public comments and provides a	
endorse; not endorse). recommendation (i.e. endorse; not	
endorse).	
c. The Director of Development c. City Planning Committee reviews the c. City Development Permit (DP) Pane	
considers the above memo and application and staff report. This will be reviews the application and staff repo	rt.
either issues a letter with a the first meeting if no previous proponent. This will be the first meeting if no previou	IS
recommendation of held meeting was required by the City or a proponent-held meeting was required by	
concurrence or requests second meeting if there was an initial the City or a second meeting if there was	3
changes to design and/or public meeting. an initial public meeting.	
siting.	
d. City Planning Committee makes a d. City DP Panel makes a	
recommendation of concurrence or non- recommendation of concurrence or non-	n-
concurrence. concurrence.	
d. Proponent may undertake e. Proponent undertakes possible e. Proponent undertakes possible	-
possible design or siting proposal modifications and commitments, proposal modifications and commitments	s, if
modifications and/or provides if any, requested by Planning Committee. any, requested by DP Panel.	
additional documentation on	
design rationale if required.	
e. The Director of Planning and f. Council considers Planning f. Council considers DP Panel	
Development issues a letter Committee's Recommendation of Recommendation of concurrence or	
with a recommendation of concurrence or non-concurrence that is non-concurrence that is then forwarded	l to
concurrence or non- then forwarded to the proponent and the proponent and Industry Canada to	
concurrence for design and Industry Canada to conclude processing conclude processing	
inducity current to considue proceeding. Considue proceeding.	



Page 6 of 8	Adopted by Council: February 13, 2012	Policy 5045
File Ref: 08-4040- 01-2012	Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protoco	bl

**Note:** The City's DVP notification area is expanded, at City cost, beyond the standard 50m-radius area to a radius of equal to 6 times the proposed tower/antenna height measured from the tower/antenna or includes adjacent properties (whichever is greater) to be consistent with the proponent notification area in this **Protocol.** 

#### 4. Design Guidelines

These design guidelines apply to <u>all Installations</u> - whether they involve new towers or are co-located on existing towers or erected on existing buildings. Proponents must also comply with Industry Canada design requirements, some of which are included in these guidelines (Please refer to CPC-2-0-03 – Issue 4 or subsequent Industry Canada Policies and Regulations).

### A. Co-Location: The First Choice for All New Installations

- a. Co-Locate on Existing Towers Each proponent proposing a new tower Installation will need to explore opportunities for co-location on existing towers as required by Industry Canada, particularly to the extent that it does not significantly increase the visible bulk of antennas of the tower. Proponents should contact all other relevant telecommunication service providers to confirm opportunities for or agreements to co-locate on an existing tower installation.
- b. **Planning for Co-Location** All new **Installations** should be designed and engineered to accommodate additional antennas and related supporting infrastructure (e.g., mechanical buildings) as required by Industry Canada, particularly to the extent that it does not significantly increase the visible bulk of antennas for stand-alone towers or that accommodates multiple antennas on a building consistent with these guidelines.
- c. **Confirming Support for Co-Location -** The proponent is to document whether they will be co-locating on existing towers Installations or providing offers to share for future co-location opportunities if there are no current opportunities for co-location. Appropriate information from the Proponent's professional consultants, may be required to confirm the extent to which co-location is possible under the above sections.

### B. Specific Siting Criteria for All New Installations

The following guidelines apply <u>to all new Installations</u> (whether completely new towers or co-located on existing towers or erected on existing structures/buildings):

- a. **Comply with Existing Zoning** All applicable zoning regulations (height, setback, lot coverage and landscaping) apply to both stand-alone and building mounted **Installations** and supporting utility structures unless a DVP is obtained, while acknowledging the *Radiocommunication Act.*
- b. Integrate With Existing Adjacent Buildings and Landscape Stand-alone Installations should be properly integrated with existing buildings/structures and landscape in a manner that does not unduly affect their technical performance and be located to minimize the visual impact of the Installation on surrounding land uses.
- c. **Integrate Into Building Design** Building-mounted **Installations** should be architecturally integrated into the design of the building with appropriate screening (that does not unduly add the appearance of building mass) in a manner that does not unduly decrease their technical performance and colour



Page 7 of 8	Adopted by Council: February 13, 2012	Policy 5045
File Ref: 08-4040- 01-2012	Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protoco	bl

applied to minimize and integrate their appearance to the building. The preference is to have antennas screened only when screening will:

- i. Not to increase mass unless appropriately integrated into the building mass; and
- ii. Reduce visibility from street level and other major nearby buildings.
- d. **Coordinate With Current Building Rooflines** Building-mounted antennas should not extend beyond 3 m above the highest point of a building nor 3 m above a parapet wall surrounding the main part of a flat-roofed building to which the antenna is affixed. In addition to this guideline, the installation must comply with the maximum permitted building height under the applicable zoning, unless a DVP to relax the height provision is issued by the City.
- e. Conform with Any Applicable Existing Development Permit (DP) and Development Permit Area (DPA) Design Guidelines Installations affixed to existing buildings and structures should be consistent with or not defeat the intent of the applicable DP conditions or DPA design guidelines to the extent that conformity does not hamper the functionality of the Installation.

#### C. General Location for New Stand-Alone Installations

The following guidelines <u>apply to new stand-alone Installations</u> (where they can not be co-located on existing towers or erected on existing buildings/structures).

- a. Preference to Locate in OCP Industry and Business and Airport Designations A new standalone Installation should be located in the designated or zoned areas provided it is greater than 300m (for new towers over 30m in height), or more than 150m (for new towers between 15m and 30m in height), from lands with Residential or Public & Open Space land-use designations or associated zones.
- b. Minimize Environmental Impact Do not locate Installations in a manner that would negatively impact designated OCP Conservation Areas, Riparian Management Areas, and other areas with ecological habitat.
- c. **Minimize Impact to Public & Open Space lands** Do not locate **installations** in a manner that would negatively impact existing parkland and other public open spaces which include playgrounds, sports fields, trails and other similar recreational features.
- d. Protect and Utilize Existing Vegetation Installations should be located to minimize disturbance of and maximize screening from existing trees and landscaping with the objective of minimizing the visual impact of the Installations.
- e. **Minimize Agricultural Impact** Proponents should avoid locating **Installations** on land within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) or in the OCP Agriculture and Agriculture & Open Space designations or associated zones. If it is deemed necessary for a proposed **installation** to be located in these areas, the following requirements apply:
  - i. Comply with ALR regulations, including requiring that all tower and related equipment/buildings **not exceed** a maximum footprint area of 100 sq. m.
  - ii. If this maximum footprint area is exceeded, a "non-farm use" application to the **City and Agricultural Land Commission will be required prior** to going through the **Protocol** consultation and any applicable DVP application processes.
  - iii. **Installations** should be located in a manner that maximizes land available for farming and minimize negative impacts to existing and future potential agricultural operations.



Page 8 of 8	Adopted by Council: February 13, 2012	Policy 5045
File Ref: 08-4040- 01-2012	Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protoco	bl

#### D. Screening and Landscaping For New Tower Installations

**Proponents** are **encouraged** to construct **any new tower Installations** meeting the following screening guidelines:

- a. Fencing Appropriate fencing is to be implemented to properly secure Installations.
- b. Screening Buffers- A contiguous, solid decorative fence or planted landscape buffer, consisting of a combination of hedging, trees and shrubs, is to be implemented to screen stand-alone tower **Installations** from **Residential** areas, adjacent buildings and public roads. A minimum height of 2.0 m, and sufficient thickness for vegetation screening to obscure view of the installation, constitutes a landscape buffer.
- c. **Maintenance** Proponents should provide for long-term maintenance and upkeep of appropriate landscaping for its stand-alone telecommunication **Installations**.

## ATTACHMENT 2

## Photo Simulations









## **Development Variance Permit**

### No. DV 13-627930

To the Holder:	Rogers Communications Inc. c/o Standard Land Company Inc.
Property Address:	Provincially Owned Highway Road Right-of-way (Highway 99 – Westminster Highway Off-ramp)
Address:	Suite 610 - 688 West Hastings Street Vancouver, BC V6B 1P1

- 1. This Development Variance Permit is issued subject to compliance with all of the Bylaws of the City applicable thereto, except as specifically varied by this Permit.
- 2. This Development Variance 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. The "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500" is hereby varied to increase the maximum accessory structure height of the "Agriculture (AG1)" zoning district from 20 m (66 ft.) to 35 m (115 ft.) in order to permit the construction of a telecommunication antenna monopole as shown on Plan #1 to #5 attached hereto.
- 4. 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.
- 5. 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.

This Permit is not a Building Permit.

AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION NO. DAY OF

### ISSUED BY THE COUNCIL THE

DELIVERED THIS DAY OF

MAYOR





		L			
			ROG	ERS	M
0. 5 RD M	OT		1600-4710 KINGSV BURNABY, BC	IAY	
					A
			319, 19292 60TH AV SURREY, BC V3S 3 TEL: (604) 546-02 FAX: (604) 546-02	ENUE M2 21 26	
		REV	DESCRIPTION	DATE {DD/MM/YY}	BY
		,	,		,
			,		,
		1		,	,
			,	3	•
	10 400 m	۵	REVISED PER MUNICIPALIT	/ 31/03/14	SA
	Ĩ	A .	ISSUED FOR REVIEW	27/08/13	SA
	ZHC ZHC	CHECK	ER: DA	_	
	<u>م</u> م	APRO	val: FM		
	<u>م م م م</u>		NINI THOMOO	T de long	
			ENGINEERING STA	MP	
		ACT ACT SHEET TIT	A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERS ING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A LIC ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DO LE:	DN, UNLESS THEY AR NSED PROFESSIONA CUMENT.	쁥늰
			TITLE SHEET		
		SITE NAM	e: WESTMINSTER HV	/Y & NO. 5 F	Q
ONLY		SITE ID: PROJECT	W2637		
	]	DATE:	1304-006-3654 AUGUST 27, 2013		
		SHEET NO	× T-1		
					l





SITE NAME:

WESTMINSTER HWY & NO. 5 RC

SITE I.D.:

W2637

SITE ADDRESS:







			NOTES:	
T.O. MONOPOLE/ROGERS PANEL ANTENNA TIP HEIGHT			<ol> <li>ELEVATION IS DIAGRAMMATIC ONLY.</li> <li>MONOPOLE TO BE PAINTED "SATIN WHITE".</li> </ol>	<b>C</b> ROGERS <sup>14</sup>
	ROGERS PA	ANEL ANTENNA INSTALLATION. DETAIL 1 ON A-5		
EUTURE ROGERS PANEL ANTENNA TIP HEIGHT				1600-4710 KINGSWAY BURNABY, BC
		OGERS PANEL ANTENNA TON. REFER TO DETAIL 2 ON A-5		
ROGERS RRU TIP HEIGHT ELEV:: 29.7m AGL FUTURE ROGERS RRU TIP HEIGHT ELEV:: 28.6m AGL	ROGERS RF REFER TO L	RU INSTALLATION. DETAIL 3 AND 4 ON A-5		CONTECH A
FUTURE ROGERS MICROWAVE ANTENNA TIP HEIGHT	FUTURE RC	OGERS M/W INSTALLATION. DETAIL S ON A-S		319, 19292 60TH AVENUE SURREY, BC V35 3M2 TEL: (604) 546-0221 FAX: (604) 546-0226
		OGERS M/W INSTALLATION. DETAIL 6 ON A-5		REV DESCRIPTION DATE BY BY
				· · ·
				B REVISED PER MUNICIPALITY 31/03/14 SA
				A ISSUED FOR REVIEW 27/08/13 SA CHECKER:
MONOPOLE CLIMBING 1 ADDER BOTTOM				DA Approval: FM
OF LADDER TO BE 3048mm A.G.L. AND EXTEND TO TOP OF MONOPOLE				
				T de St
PROVIDE WOOD POLE FOR OVERHEAD SERVICE DROP FROM (E) NEARBY BC HYDRO POWER POLE. EXACT POWER SOURCE T.B.D.		IGERS 35m MONOPOLE TO IE PAINTED "SATIN WHITE"		AHISADO HOD TSON ION O
		OGERS WALK IN ABINET (WIC). REFER O A-6 FOR DETAILS		0
				ENGINEERING STAMP IT IS A VOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF ALENSED PROFESSIONAL EVENTEE TO ALTEE THIS DOCUMENT.
		829mm HIGH CHAINLINK ENCE C/W BARBED WIRE OP AND PRIVACY SLATS	PLAN #3	SHEET TITLE: NORTHWEST ELEVATION
GADE GADE		OGERS 9.9m x 10m ENCED LEASE AREA	3-627930	STTE NAME: WESTMINSTER HWY & NO. 5 RD STTE ID: W2637 PROJECT NO: 1304-006-3654
			SCALE: 1:150	<sup>рате:</sup> AUGUST 27, 2013 <sup>3неет мо:</sup> A-3

	NORTHWEST ELEVATION	
	1	



			<b>ROGERS</b>	-
			1600-4710 KINGSWAY BURNABY, BC	
			COMPLETE AND COMPL	
			319, 19292 60TH AVENUE SURREY, BC V3S 3M2 TEL: (604) 546-0221 FAX: (604) 546-0226	
			REV DESCRIPTION DATE (DD/MM/YYY) B	ΒY
Ē.				,
			•	
			•	
			B REVISED PER MUNICIPALITY 31/03/14 S.	SA
	ANTENNA	SPECIFICATIONS	A ISSUED FOR REVIEW 27/08/13 S	SA
	MODEL #	101-2065/1	CHECKER: DA	
	MANUFACTURER	KATHREIN	APPROVAL: FM	
	MOUNTING BRACKET	TILT KIT 850 10007		
	LENGTH	2058 mm		
	WIDTH	262 mm	A P	
	рертн	149 mm	DURAST IN	
	WEIGHT	27 kg	103 403 T	
			iss ton oo	
			ENGINEERING STAMP	
			IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR AM' PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTON OF AL LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.	
	ADA ADA	AN # 57	SHEETTITLE: CABINET AND ANTENNA ISOMETRIC	
		0 7 0 Z 0	SITE NAME: WESTMINSTER HWY & NO. 5 RD	
			stre ID: W2637	
			PROJECT NO: 1304-006-3654	
			DATE: AUGUST 27, 2013	
			A-6	٦

	R
•	
	100

<b>NNA SPECIFICATIONS</b>	ANT2 0.6m 23 HPX	ERICSSON	INCLUDED (ADJUSTABLE)	663 mm	350 mm	13.1 kg W/MOUNT	
M/W ANTEI	MODEL #	MANUFACTURER	MOUNTING BRACKET	DIAMETER	DEPTH	WEIGHT	

WALK IN CABINET	MODEL #	MANUFACTURER	LENGTH	WIDTH	неіднт		WEIGHT
(WIC) SPECIFICATIONS	W1C0508	HYBRID BUILDING LOGISTI	2743 mm	1619 mm	2413 mm	EMPTY : 907 kg	FULL: 2722 kg (MAX. GROSS WEIGHT)

WALK IN CABINET	(WIC) SPECIFICATIONS
DDEL #	W1C0508
ANUFACTURER	HYBRID BUILDING LOGISTICS
VGTH	2743 mm
DTH	1619 mm
IGHT	2413 mm
	EMPTY : 907 kg
EIGHT	FULL: 2722 kg (MAX. GROSS WEIGHT)

