## City of

 Richmond
## Report to Development Permit Panel

To: Development Permit Panel
From: Wayne Craig
Director, Development

Date: October 4, 2023
File: DP 17-790086

Re: Application by Jhujar Construction Ltd. for a Development Permit at 9291 and 9311/9331 No. 2 Road

## Staff Recommendation

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of 12 townhouse units and one secondary suite at 9291 and 9311/9331 No. 2 Road on a site zoned "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" with vehicle access provided via 9211 No. 2 Road.


Wayne Craig
Director, Development
(604-247-4625)
WC:el
Att. 4

## Staff Report

## Origin

Jhujar Construction Ltd. (Director: Harjan S. Johal and Satnam Johal) has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to develop 12 townhouse units at 9291 and 9311/9331 No. 2 Road with vehicle access through a Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) registered on Title of the adjacent property to the north at 9211 No. 2 Road. One of the 12 townhouse units is proposed to contain a ground-level secondary suite and two of the 12 units will be designed in accordance with the convertible unit guidelines.

The site is being rezoned from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" and "Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1)" zones to "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone for this project under Bylaw 9749 (RZ 15716773), which received third reading following the Public Hearing on October 16, 2017. The site is currently vacant. A Servicing Agreement for frontage beautification works and service connections is required prior to Building Permit issuance.

## Development Information

Please refer to the attached Development Application Data Sheet (Attachment 1) for a comparison of the proposed development data with the relevant bylaw requirements.

## Background

Development surrounding the subject site is as follows:
To the north: A ten-unit townhouse complex on a lot zoned "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)".
To the east: Across No. 2 Road, a four-storey senior's apartment building (three-storeys over parking) on a lot zoned "Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1)" and a church on a lot zoned "Assembly (ASY)".

To the south: Existing single-family homes on lots zoned "Single Detached (RS1/E), which are identified for townhouse development under the Arterial Road Land Use Policy.
To the west: Existing single-family dwellings on lots zoned "Single-Detached (RS1/B)".

## Rezoning and Public Hearing Results

The Public Hearing for the rezoning of this site was held on October 16, 2017. No concems regarding the rezoning application were expressed at the Public Hearing.

## Staff Comments

The proposed scheme attached to this report has satisfactorily addressed the significant urban design issues and other staff comments identified as part of the review of the subject Development Permit application. In addition, it complies with the intent of the applicable sections of the Official Community Plan (OCP) and is generally in compliance with the "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone.

## Advisory Design Panel Comments

The Advisory Design Panel (ADP) has reviewed the project and supports it. A copy of the relevant excerpt from the Advisory Design Panel Minutes from Wednesday, October 19, 2022, is attached for reference (Attachment 2). The design response from the applicant has been included immediately following the specific Design Panel comments and is identified in 'bold italics'.

## Analysis

## Conditions of Adjacency

- The proposed height, siting and orientation of the buildings generally address the massing of the surrounding residential developments.
- While three-storey units are proposed along No. 2 Road, the building height is stepped down to two-storeys along the side property lines to provide a transition to the adjacent singlefamily home to the south and the two-storey end units of the townhouse development to the north.
- Two-storey units in duplex and detached unit form are proposed along the rear (west) property line to minimize privacy and overlook concerns.
- The site grade along the north property line will be raised to match the existing grade of the adjacent townhouse development to the north; no new retaining wall will be required.
- Along the rear (west) property line, the existing site grade will be maintained to provide an appropriate transition to the adjacent single-family properties to the west, and to accommodate tree retention on-site and on the neighbouring properties.
- The site grade along the south property line will be raised, except for the area at the southwest corner of the site adjacent to a protected tree. The maximum height of the proposed retaining wall is approximately 1.0 m . The heights of the wood fences proposed on top of the retaining wall will be reduced to approximately 1.2 m in order to ensure the overall privacy screen height (retaining wall plus wood fence) is no taller than 1.8 m .
- Three hedgerows and two trees located along the west and south property lines will be retained; a variety of trees will also be planted along the rear and side property lines to enhance the interfaces between the proposed townhouse development and the existing adjacent residential developments. Further details in the Landscape Design section below.
- Perimeter drainage will be required as part of the Building Permit to ensure storm water is managed and addressed through the development and will not impact the neighbouring properties.


## Transportation and Site Access

- Vehicle access is proposed through an existing Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW EPP51370, CA5001638-CA5001643) registered over the drive aisle of the neighbouring townhouse development to the north at 9211 No. 2 Road; no direct vehicle access to No. 2 Road is permitted from the subject site.
- This access arrangement was secured through the rezoning and development applications for 9211 No. 2 Road, which received final adoption by Council on March 29, 2016 (RZ 12620563).
- A legal opinion prepared by the applicant's lawyer confirms that the City can rely on this SRW. This legal opinion has also been reviewed by the City's Law Department.
- Staff requested that the applicant discuss the 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 wayfinding signage.
- The applicant has made offers to cost share but no formal agreement has been reached between the developer and the neighbouring strata. Discussions are ongoing. A summary report prepared by the developer's solicitor is presented in Attachment 3.
- Should the Development Permit application proceed, staff would continue to encourage discussions between the two parties on the shared use of the driveway through the Building Permit process.
- Properties to the south of the subject site are also designated for townhouse development. A Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) allowing access to/from the adjacent future development sites through the subject site (internal drive aisle) has been secured at rezoning.
- Signage indicating that the driveway on the subject site may connect to the future adjacent townhouse developments will be installed at the south end of the drive aisle so that future residents/owners/strata of the subject development are aware that they may be required to provide access to the south.
- Servicing Agreement is required as a condition of Building Permit issuance and includes, but is not limited to, a new 1.5 m concrete sidewalk at the property line and minimum 1.5 m wide landscaped boulevard with street trees behind the existing curb.


## Urban Design and Site Planning

- The layout of the townhouse units is oriented around the north-south internal manoeuvring aisle, providing access to the unit garages.
- Units along No. 2 Road will have direct pedestrian access from the street, and units along the rear (west) property line will have access from the internal drive aisle.
- One of the units will contain a ground-level secondary suite (studio) of approximately $37.4 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(403 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ in size. No additional parking stall is required for the proposed secondary suite since the required parking spaces for the unit containing a secondary suite are provided in a side-by-side arrangement.
- All townhouse units will have two vehicle parking spaces in a double-car garage. The proposal will feature four units with a total of eight spaces in a tandem arrangement ( 33 per cent of total required residential parking spaces), which is consistent with the maximum 50 per cent of tandem parking provision of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500. A restrictive covenant to prohibit the conversion of the tandem garage area into habitable space has been secured at rezoning.
- A total of three visitor parking spaces, including one van accessible parking space, will be provided throughout the site. The number of visitor parking spaces proposed is in compliance with the minimum bylaw requirement.
- Both internal and external bicycle parking spaces have been incorporated into the proposal and are in compliance with the Zoning Bylaw requirements.
- The provision of private outdoor spaces complies with the Development Permit Guidelines of the OCP. All units will have private outdoor spaces consisting of a front or a rear yard; the three-storey units will also have a covered deck on the second floor facing the internal drive aisle.
- Outdoor amenity space is centrally located on the subject site. The size and location of the outdoor amenity space is appropriate in providing open landscape and amenity space convenient to all units.
- No indoor amenity space is proposed on site. A $\$ 12,000.00$ cash-in-lieu contribution has been secured as a condition of rezoning approval, consistent with the OCP.
- A covered mailbox kiosk is proposed at the entrance to the outdoor amenity area.
- A walkway is proposed through the outdoor amenity space to provide direct pedestrian access from No. 2 Road to the internal drive aisle of the site.
- The required garbage, recycling and organic waste storage enclosure has been incorporated into the design of the building proposed at the northwest comer of the site (Building \#1) to minimize the visual impact.


## Architectural Form and Character

- The exterior form and materials are reminiscent of heritage-style architecture. The building's character includes several elements common to a heritage design, including classic hip roof form with gables and dormers on the upper floor.
- A pedestrian scale is generally achieved along the public sidewalk and internal drive aisle through the inclusion of variation in building projections, recesses, variety of materials/colours and landscape features.
- The impact of blank garage doors has been mitigated with panel patterned doors, transom windows and planting islands along the drive aisle.
- The proposed building materials (asphalt roof shingles, Hardi panel siding, face brick, stucco, wood fascia/trim) are generally consistent with the OCP Guidelines and compatible with the existing single-family character of the neighbourhood.
- A palette of earthly colours with white as an accent colour on the main cladding materials, are generally consistent with the heritage design of the project.


## Landscape Design and Open Space Design

- Tree preservation was reviewed at rezoning stage:
- Significant efforts were made to ensure the retention of one 40 cm calliper English Oak tree (Tag\# 681) located along the site's No. 2 Road frontage which will be retained and protected in a tree well proposed in the front yard of the site. A survival security in the amount of $\$ 10,000.00$ will be required prior to Development Permit Issuance.
- One hedgerow (five stems) identified as (tag\# 687) located along the rear property line of the site will be retained and protected within the rear yard of Building \#2. A survival security in the amount of $\$ 25,000.00$ will be required prior to Development Permit Issuance.
- Eight trees and two hedgerows were identified for removal at the Rezoning stage and have been removed under Tree Permits T3 15-717055 due to their poor condition (either dead, dying, had been previously topped or exhibited structural defects).
- Based on the 2:1 tree replacement ratio stated in the OCP, 16 replacement trees are required for the removal of eight bylaw-sized trees.
- The applicant is proposing to plant 38 replacement trees on-site, including 15 conifers and 23 deciduous trees.
- One tree (Tag \#N03) and two hedgerows (Tag \#N02 \& \#N04) located on the adjacent properties to the west, as well as one tree (Tag \# N01) located on the adjacent property to the south, are to be retained and protected.
- Tree protection fencing is required to be installed as per the Arborist Report recommendations prior to any construction activities (including demolition) occurring on-site.
- The proposal provides for a pedestrian-oriented streetscape fronting No. 2 Road with a landscaped edge treatment including brick pilasters, aluminum fencing and gates, as well as new trees and sodded lawn in the front yards.
- All units along the rear (west) property line will have a private yard with a raised deck and a sodded lawn area.
- Various hedges, shrubs and ground covers, as well as perennials and grasses have been selected to ensure the landscape treatment remains interesting throughout the year.
- Landscaping including Japanese cherry trees will be provided along the north-south internal drive aisle to soften the internal streetscape.
- A children's play area is proposed for the outdoor amenity area and play equipment has been chosen to fit into the outdoor amenity space and to provide different play opportunities. A bench is also provided for caregivers.
- Surface parking spaces and designated walkways on-site will be treated with permeable pavers for better water infiltration and variety in paving surfaces.
- An on-site irrigation system is proposed to ensure continued maintenance of live landscaping.
- Lighting plans are included in the DP plans, which indicates various lighting provided throughout the site. Wall mounted sconce lighting will be provided at each unit entry and by the garage doors. Bollard lighting will be provided throughout the site in the common areas including the outdoor amenity space and visitor parking areas, etc.
- In order to ensure that the proposed landscaping works are completed, the applicant is required to provide a landscape security of $\$ 310,750.00$ in association with the Development Permit.


## Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

- A combination of planting and fencing is proposed along the perimeter of the site to define the public, semi-public and semi-private realms.
- All pedestrian access points to the site, including access to the townhouse units, are to be gated to provide a visual and physical separation from public circulation paths.
- All walkways, outdoor amenity spaces and visitor parking stalls can be viewed directly from windows within the project, providing visual surveillance from the townhouse units.
- All exterior lighting will be down-directed or ground-oriented to eliminate the impact on the townhouse units and adjacent properties.


## Sustainability

- The Step Code Target for the townhomes is Level 3 with Low Carbon Energy System (LCES). To achieve this requirement, the following items will be included in the design:
- High-performance envelope;
- Low window-to-wall ratio;
- Low-E double pane glazing;
- Heat Recovery Ventilators (HRV); and
- Heat pumps for heating and domestic hot water.
- Level 2 EV charging will be provided in each garage as per Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500.


## Accessible Housing

- The proposed development includes two convertible units that are designed with the potential to be easily renovated to accommodate a future resident in a wheelchair. The potential conversion of this unit will require the installation of a chair lift (where the staircase has been dimensioned to accommodate this in the D1 units) in the future if desired.
- All of the proposed units incorporate aging-in-place features to accommodate mobility constraints associated with aging. These features include:
- Stairwell handrails.
- Lever-type handles for plumbing fixtures and door handles.
- Solid blocking in washroom walls to facilitate future grab bar installation beside toilets, bathtubs and showers.


## Conclusions

As the proposed development would meet applicable policies and Development Permit Guidelines, staff recommend that the Development Permit be endorsed, and issuance by Council be recommended.


Edwin Lee
Planner 2
(604-276-4121)
EL:he

Att. 1: Development Application Data Sheet
2: Excerpt from the Minutes of the Advisory Design Panel Meeting - October 19, 2022
3: Summary Letter - Negotiation with Neighbour Strata with respect to use of SRW EPP51370
4: Development Permit Considerations

## DP 17-790086

## Attachment 1

Address: 9291 and 9311/9331 No. 2 Road
Applicant: Jhujar Construction Ltd. Owner: Jhujar Construction Ltd.

Planning Area(s): Blundell
Floor Area Gross: $\quad 2,084.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$
Floor Area Net: $\quad 1,452.9 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$

|  | Existing | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site Area: | $2,482 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $2,452 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Land Uses: | Single-Family Residential / Two-Family Residential | Multiple-Family Residential |
| OCP Designation: | Low-Density Residential | No Change |
| Zoning: | Single Detached (RS1/E) and Two-Unit Dwellings <br> (RD1) | Low Density Townhouses (RTL4) |
| Number of Units: | 3 | 12 |


|  | Bylaw Requirement | Proposed | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | Max. 0.60 | 0.59 | none permitted |
| Lot Coverage - Building: | Max. 40\% | 40\% | none |
| Lot Coverage - Non-porous Surfaces: | Max. 65\% | 63\% | none |
| Lot Coverage - Landscaping: | Min. 25\% | 26\% | none |
| Setback - Front Yard (m): | Min. 6.0 m | 6.2 m | none |
| Setback - North Side Yard (m): | Min. 3.0 m | 3.0 m | none |
| Setback - South Side Yard (m): | Min. 3.0 m | 3.0 m | none |
| Setback - Rear Yard (m): | Min. 3.0 m | 5.1 m | none |
| Height (m): | Max. 12.0 m (3 storeys) | 11.42 m (3 storeys) along No. 2 Road \& 8.31 m ( 2 storeys) along west property line | none |
| Lot Width: | Min. 50.0 m | 50.25 m | none |
| Lot Depth: | Min. 35.0 m | 45.12 m | none |
| Off-street Parking Spaces Regular (R) / Visitor (V): | $2(\mathrm{R})$ and $0.2(\mathrm{~V})$ per unit | $2(\mathrm{R})$ and $0.2(\mathrm{~V})$ per unit | none |
| Off-street Parking Spaces Total: | $24(\mathrm{R})$ and $3(\mathrm{~V})$ | $24(\mathrm{R})$ and $3(\mathrm{~V})$ | none |


| Tandem Parking Spaces: | Max. 50\% of proposed residential spaces in enclosed garages ( $24 \times \operatorname{Max} .50 \%=12$ ) | 8 | none |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Small Car Parking Spaces | None when fewer than 31 spaces are provided on site | 0 | none |
| Handicap Parking Spaces: | Min. 2\% of parking stalls required when 3 or more visitor stalls are required $(27 \times 2 \%=1 \text { space })$ | 1 | none |
| Bicycle Parking Spaces - Class 1 / Class 2: | 1.25 (Class 1) and 0.2 (Class 2) per unit | 1.3 (Class 1 ) and 0.3 (Class 2) per unit | none |
| Off-street Bicycle Parking Spaces - Total: | 15 (Class 1) and 3 (Class 2) | 16 (Class 1) and 4 (Class 2) | none |
| Amenity Space - Indoor: | Min. $70 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ or Cash-in-lieu | Cash-in-lieu | none |
| Amenity Space - Outdoor: | $\begin{gathered} \text { Min. } 6 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \times 12 \text { units } \\ =72 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | $90 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | none |

# Excerpt from the Minutes from <br> The Design Panel Meeting 

Wednesday October 19, 2022 - 4:00 p.m.
Remote (Webex) Meeting

## 1. DP 17-790086-12 UNIT TOWNHOUSE PROPOSAL WITH VEHICLE ACCESS VIA THE ADJACENT SITE TO THE NORTH

ARCHITECT:

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT:
PROPERTY LOCATION: 9291 and 9331 No. 2 Road

## Applicant's Presentation

Zubin Billimoria, DF Architecture Inc., David Rasouli, Alphatec Energy Inc., and Alex Fu, Hapa Collaborative, presented the project and answered queries from the Panel.

## Panel Discussion

Comments from Panel members were as follows:

- commend the landscape team for their efforts to come up with a well thought out landscape design for a small townhouse development;
- providing three walkways between No. 2 Road and the internal drive aisle is excessive due to the small size of the proposed development; consider retaining just the main pedestrian walkway through the proposed common outdoor amenity area and utilize the space for the other two proposed walkways for installation of additional soft landscaping in lieu of the proposed concrete paving treatment for the walkway;

Walkway along the North property line has been eliminated and replaced with the landscaping. 3ft wide maintenance access to the electrical room has been provided.

Walkway connecting to the sidewalk previously along the South property line has been revised and a 5ft. wide Firefighters access has been provided to access the main entrance of the unit D1 in building 4. A landscaping buffer has been provided at the South property line along this Firefighters access.

- use of space would have been more efficient and the building appearance would have been better if the three two-storey buildings in the rear were consolidated into one continuous building with five units;

According the OCP, 14.4.13.C, rear yard building form should be limited to two (2) units in the townhouse cluster (duplex).

- review the provision of a lock-off unit in Unit B2 in Building No. 3 as it compromises the design of Unit B2, resulting in a very tight living, dining and kitchen areas and limits the opportunity to provide an adequate number of windows to the unit, thus reducing daylight penetration into the unit; consider eliminating the lock-off unit and integrating the space into Unit B2 to improve its livability;
The lock-off unit has been redesigned to improve livability of the unit by increasing the kitchen and living area of the unit due to reconfiguration of the washroom, relocation of washer/dryer, moving the washroom and providing a larger closet.
- concern about the proposed location of heat pumps due to their potential noise impacts is moot as newer models of heat pumps are very quiet and compact and could be located more efficiently in the project as they will not pose noise concerns;

The heat pump units have been moved out of the South side yard for building 4. For building 5 (North side yard), 3 out of 4 condenser units have been moved to the decks on upper floor of the building. One unit stays in the side yard but has been moved away from the property line as much as possible with adequate Landscape buffer to mitigate acoustic concerns.

For buildings 1,2 and 3 (rear yard), the condenser units have been moved to the patio of these units and landscape buffers have been introduced for all the patio to mitigate the noise.

- appreciate the drawings and site layout presented by the applicant;
- support the Panel comment that the provision of three pedestrian walkways is not necessary; the north and middle walkways would be sufficient and ensure that these walkways are accessible for people with disabilities; the space for the south walkway could be utilized for additional soft landscaping;
Walkway along the north property line has been eliminated and replaced with the landscape. 3ft wide maintenance access to the electrical room has been provided.

Walkway connecting to the sidewalk previously along the South property line has been revised and a 5 ft. wide Firefighters access has been provided to access the main entrance of the unit D1 in building 4. A landscaping buffer has been provided at the South property line along this Firefighters access.

- agree with the Panel comment that the proposed location of heat pumps should not be a concern as newer models of heat pumps do not pose noise concerns;
See responses above.
- look at the proposed location of the heat pump for Unit B1 to ensure that it will not block the window at the back of the unit;

Heat pumps will not block these windows as they are placed on the patio and the heat pump is 2'6" high. There is a 2'2" gap between the sill of the window and top of the heat pump.

- the roof massing appears heavy; the dark colour of dormers make them look heavy; consider a lighter colour for the dormers;

Color and material for all dormers has been revised. Stucco siding with same color has been used for the dormers making the overall massing look much lighter. Battens and trims have been eliminated except for the trims around the windows to give an accentuated appeal to the overall design. Trim colors have also been revised to a lighter color.

- not concerned with the decorative pickets on top of the entry porches as they look nice;


## Noted

- north elevation of Building 4 and south elevation of Building 5 should be treated as a front façade;

Elevations for building $4 \& 5$ facing the outdoor amenity have been revised by adding a band to give the building a distinct top, middle and base. Also, the dormers facing the amenity area have been revised with the same treatment as the dormer of other buildings.

- consider installing additional glazing on the north elevation of Building 1 to provide passive surveillance opportunity over the vehicle entrance to the development and the visitor parking area;

North elevation of building 1 has been revised with overall massing being reduced by using a lower slope for the roofs and addition of another window on this side to improve passive surveillance opportunity over the vehicular entrance to the development and the visitor parking area.

- review the accessibility of the washer and dryer for Unit D1 (Convertible Unit) on the second floor; ensure that they are accessible to people with disabilities, particularly people in wheelchairs;

This has been considered and changes have been made.

- like the proposed landscaping around the existing oak tree and wood deck that cantilevers over the tree protection zone; confirm with the project arborist whether the sod lawn around the tree could be trampled on; if the tree roots need to be protected, the wood deck could be extended over;

The suggestion of extending wood platform in the ADP comments cannot be implemented, because there is not much available space near the existing tree, most of the areas are in the root protection zone.

- appreciate the creative use of space around the existing oak tree; similar treatment could be extended to the children's play area through installation of wood platforms, extended wood beam and wood natural features in lieu of the slide to make the whole outdoor amenity space cohesive and interesting;
A wooden playhouse is proposed in the Children's play area as the main play equipment which can continue the natural interestingness to the children's play area.
- consider smaller sodded lawns at the rear yards of units but with more planting; consider increasing the size of the decks at the back if there are no private roof decks provided;
More planting area and trees have been added in the rear yards.
- consider increasing the density of planting, e.g. installing evergreen trees, along the west property line to provide more screening from adjacent properties and more greenery during winter;

Five Serbian Spruce as evergreen trees have been added along the west property line to provide more privacy and greenery.

- there are a lot of trees on the planting strip immediately adjacent to the buildings facing No. 2 Road; consider providing a drain strip along the buildings and relocating the trees to the sidewalk edge to avoid conflict between the buildings and the trees' canopies and roots;
Trees were adjacent to the buildings have been moved to the sidewalk edge.
- review the proposed planting of Japanese Skimmia on the south side as they do not grow well under the sun; ensure that shade plants are on the north side and sun plants are on the south side;
All Skimmias on the south side have been replaced with sun plants like Nandina domestica 'Gulf Stream' and Kinnikinnick. All plants on the north side are adaptive to the shade environment.
- support Panel comments regarding appreciation for applicant's efforts to incorporate existing trees into the proposed development;
- review the play value of the proposed play equipment and consider installing natural play elements; the landscaping for the whole outdoor amenity area needs to be cohesive;
A timber play panel is proposed, which can work well with the landscaping to create more naturalizing and cohesive feeling.
- appreciate the lighting plan for the proposed development;
- consider adding more variety to the proposed planting palette;

Two shrub species have been added into the planting palette.

- review the use of corrugated metal roof for the mail box shelter as it may impact the overall aesthetic of the proposed development; and
Corrugated metal sheet won't be visible from the ground level as the slope is so small. In addition, the pressure treated plywood layer under the corrugated will prevents the corrugated metal from being seen from the ground level.
- ensure there is no conflict between the proposed hedging and fencing for units facing No. 2 Road.
Confirmed, no conflict between the proposed hedging and fencing for units facing No. 2 Road.
(The following comments were submitted by Kelly Riopelle and read into the record by Chris Lee)
- review dormer heights on No. 2 Road and make more similar to internal drive aisle side of Buildings 1 and 4 ; review width of dormers to reduce their mass; do not support dark colour to camouflage them into dark asphalt shingled roof;
Color and material for all dormers has been revised. Stucco siding with same color has been used for the dormers making the overall massing look much lighter. Battens and trims have been eliminated except for the trims around the windows to give an accentuated appeal to the overall design. Trim colors have also been revised to a lighter color.
- review pickets above entry porches and delete if possible as they are not serving practical value;
The decorative pickets on top of the entry porches have been removed from all building to keep them consistent.
- the applicant is encouraged to use full brick versus face brick only and to return around corners instead of transitioning into Quoin veneer; elevations feel very busy otherwise; the applicant is also encouraged to represent brick courses in scaled elevation accurately; the brick and Quoin IXL veneer presently appear sized at CMU block $8^{\prime \prime} \times 4$ " or larger;

Use of Face Brick $3^{1 / 2}$ "x $7^{1 / 2}$ " by Mutual Materials and Quoin IXL were the client's preference.

- consider further development of north elevation of Building 4 and south elevation of Building 5 to address level 1 pedestrian walkway; support the brick treatment specified, but explore having a brick that wraps the No. 2 Road elevation around the corners with a full brick versus a veneer.

Elevations for building 4 \& 5 facing the outdoor amenity have been revised by adding a band to give the building a distinct top, middle and base. Also, the dormers facing the amenity area have been revised with the same treatment as the dormer of other buildings.

FILE NO: 102688
reply to: Brian J. P. Corcoran
Direct line: 604-231-5103
EMAIL: bcorcoran@pllr.com


LAWYERS

## BY EMAIL

City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC V6Y 2Cl

## Attention: Edwin Lee, Planner

Dear Sirs:

## Re: Jhujar Construction Ltd. (the "Owner") <br> Rezoning Application No. RZ 15-716773 <br> Lands situated at 9291 and 9311/9331 No. 2 Road, Richmond (the "Proposed Development") - Negotiation with Neighbour located at 9211 No. 2 Road, Richmond, B.C. for use of SRW CA5001638

We are the solicitors for the Owner with respect to the Proposed Development. You have requested an update on our extended negotiations with respect to a cost sharing agreement to use the existing drive aisles of 9211 No. 2 Road, Richmond (the "Neighboring Development").

The following is a summary of our discussions with the Neighbouring Development to date:

- On March 15, 2023, our firm sent correspondence to Pacifica First Property Management Ltd. ("Pacifica"), who are the property management company of the Neighbouring Development. Our letter indicated the City of Richmond's requirement that the Owner enter into a Cost Sharing Agreement with the Neighbouring Development in exchange for access to the drive aisles of the Neighbouring Development for the purpose of accessing No. 2 Road.
- On March 15, 2023, we received a response from Pacifica that William Wong was the property manager and to contact William directly.
- On March 15, 2023, we followed up directly with William Wong outlining our request.
- On March 16, 2023, William Wong responded that he had forwarded our email and documents to the Strata Council of the Neighbouring Development.
- On March 16, 2023, I responded to William Wong's email asking for a timeline as to when the Strata Council would be able to meet with my client.
- On March 16, 2023, William Wong responded that he could not provide a timeline for a response from the Strata Council at this time.
- On March 30, 2023, William Wong responded and asked for our firm to provide a written proposal and legal advice as a starting point for the negotiation.
- On March 30, 2023, I wrote to William Wong that we cannot provide legal advice to the Strata Council but we will provide a form of agreement.
- On May 19, 2023, I provided a draft form of Shared Lane Access Agreement and Cost Sharing Agreement (the "Agreement") to William Wong which indicated that the Owner would share all costs of maintenance and upkeep of the drive aisles $50 / 50$ with the Neighbouring Development.
- On May 23, 2023, William Wong indicated he forwarded my email and Agreement to the Strata Council.
- On July 25, 2023, I sent a follow up email to William Wong inquiring as to the status of the Strata Council's review of the Agreement.
- On July 25, 2023, William Wong responded and apologized for the delay and indicated that a new Strata Council for the Neighbouring Development was elected in June and it would take some time for the new Strata Council to be caught up on the matter.
- On July 26, 2023, William Wong responded with the Strata Council's requests that we provide documents/maps and plans for the proposed development along with confirmation that the Owner would pay for the Strata Council's legal fees and disbursements with respect to the negotiations of an agreement. There was some erroneous information from the Strata Council included which indicated the Strata Council's believe that the Owner was purchasing additional lots south of the Owner's Proposed Development.
- On August 14, 2023, I responded to William Wong to confirm that the Owner is not purchasing any further lots with respect to this development. I further clarified that we are only making this access request as it is a requirement by the City of Richmond and is contemplated by the fact that the City of Richmond placed a Statutory Right of Way on the Neighbouring Development's drive aisles for just this reason. I provided a copy of a schematic of the Proposed Development together with a ParcelMap Report showing the Owner's 2 lots immediately south of the Neighbouring Strata. In addition, I confirmed that the Owner would cover reasonable legal fees of the Neighbouring Strata with respect
to the review of the Agreement. Finally, I indicated that the continued delays are severely hampering the Owner's ability to move forward with the Proposed Development.
- On August 14, 2023, William Wong responded and indicated that he had forwarded my email and attachments to the Strata Council.
- On August 14, 2023, I emailed William Wong to again stress the urgency of the matter.
- On August 14, 2023, William Wong replied indicating that he understood time is an issue and that he had asked the Strata Council to appoint a representative to deal with both me and the Strata Council's own legal counsel to speed up the communication process.

I have attached all of the above correspondence and attachments for reference. It is also my understanding that the Owner originally reached out to the Neighbouring Strata directly as early as May, 2019 to try and come to an agreement with respect to the cost sharing and access agreement. It is our opinion that the Owner has made all reasonable efforts to reach a cost sharing agreement with the Neighbouring Strata and as a result of continued delays and requests by the Strata Council, the Proposed Development has been unfairly stalled resulting in potential damages to the Owner. We respectfully request that, based on the forgoing, the Owner's Proposed Development be forwarded to the City's Development Permit Panel in the interim while we continue to work with the Neighbouring Strata to enter into a cost sharing and access agreement.

We trust you will find the above to be in order. Should you have any questions or concern, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

## PRYKE LAMBERT LEATHLEY RUSSELL LLP

Per:
thin lun

Brian J. P. Corcoran

BC:msd
cc:Client
Encls.

## Development Permit Considerations

## Address: 9291 and 9311/9331 No. 2 Road

File No.: DP 17-790086
Prior to approval of the Development Permit, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. (Tree Survival Security) Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of $\$ 35,000$ for the 40 cm calliper English Oak tree (Tag\# 681) and hedgerow (tag\# 687, five stems) to be retained on site. The City will release $50 \%$ of the security after construction and landscaping on the proposed development are completed, inspections are approved, and an acceptable post-construction impact assessment report is received. The remaining $50 \%$ of the security would be released one (1) year later subject to inspection. A legal agreement is required to accompany the Tree Survival Security to set the terms for its use and release.
2. (Tree Protection Fencing) 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.
3. (Landscaping Security) Receipt of a Letter of Credit for landscaping in the amount of $\$ 310,750.00$ (based on the costs estimate provided by a CSLA registered landscape Architect including $10 \%$ contingency). A legal agreement is required to accompany the Landscape Security to set the terms for its use and release.

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

1. Enter into a Servicing Agreement* for the design and construction of engineering infrastructure improvements and frontage beautification works. 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:

## Water Works

a. Using the OCP Model, there is $442 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ of water available at a 20 psi residual at the hydrant at 9260 No .2 Rd . Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of $220 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$.
b. 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 onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage and Building designs.
- Install a fire hydrant at No. 2 Road frontage to service the proposed townhouse development. Coordination with the City's Fire Department to confirm the location of the proposed hydrant is required.
c. At Developers cost, the City is to:
- Cut and cap at main, the existing water service connections to both 9291 and 9311 No. 2 Rd.
- Install 1 new water service connection off of the 200 mm PVC watermain along No. 2 Rd.

Storm Sewer Works
a. At Developer's cost, the City is to:

- Check the size and condition of the existing storm service connection on lot 9291 's frontage. Upgrade to the service connection pipe may be required if it is inadequately sized or in poor condition.
- Cut, cap, and abandon the existing storm service connection lead and dispose existing inspection chamber at the northeast corner of Lot 9311 .
- Install a new Type IIl inspection chamber and remove the existing storm inspection chamber STIC51279.
$\qquad$


## Sanitary Sewer Works

a. At Developers cost, the City is to:

- Remove the existing IC and sanitary lead that services Lot 9291.
- Install a 150 mm service connection complete with an inspection chamber and tie-in to existing manhole SMH3304 located at the northwest corner of 9311 No 2 Road. Connection shall utilize the existing opening at the southeast face of SMH3304.
b. The Developer is required to:
- Not start building construction until the rear yard sanitary connection is completed by city crews.


## Frontage Improvements

a. The Developer is required to:

- Construct a new 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk immediately along the east property line of the site. The new sidewalk is to connect to the existing sidewalk north and south of the subject site. The alignment of the sidewalk may be changed for tree protection purposes.
- Remove the existing sidewalk next to the curb and backfill the area to provide a grass/tree boulevard between the new sidewalk and the existing curb.
- The existing driveways to provide access to the subject site from No. 2 Road are to be closed permanently. Remove the existing driveway crossings and replace with barrier curb/gutter, boulevard and sidewalk per standards described above. The developer of this site is responsible for the design and construction of curb/gutter, sidewalk and boulevard as part of the driveway closure works in addition to other required frontage improvements.
- Coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers when:
i. Undergrounding Hydro service lines.
ii. Relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the property frontages.
iii. Determine if above ground structures are required and coordinate their locations on-site with the architect and private utility companies (e.g. PMT, LPT, Shaw cabinets, Telus, Kiosks, etc).


## General Items

a. The Developer is required to:

- Provide additional ROW to accommodate the proposed service connections. Details to be determined during the SA process.
- Enter into, if required, 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, 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.
- Provide a pre-load plan and geotechnical assessment of impact to existing surrounding utilities and recommendations to mitigate the impact.

2. 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.
3. Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
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
$\qquad$
fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For additional information, contact the Building Approvals Department at 604-276-4285.

## Note:

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

Signed

## Date

No. DP 17-790086

| To the Holder: | Jhujar Construction Ltd. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Property Address: | 9291 and 9311/9331 No. 2 Road |
| Address: | c/o DF Architecture Inc. <br>  <br>  |

1. This Development Permit is issued subject to compliance with all of the Bylaws of the City applicable thereto, except as specifically varied or supplemented by this Permit.
2. This Development Permit applies to and only to those lands shown cross-hatched on the attached Schedule "A" and any and all buildings, structures and other development thereon.
3. Subject to Section 692 of the Local Government Act, R.S.B.C.: buildings and structures; off-street parking and loading facilities; roads and parking areas; and landscaping and screening shall be constructed generally in accordance with Plans \#1 to \#34 attached hereto.
4. Sanitary sewers, water, drainage, highways, street lighting, underground wiring, and sidewalks, shall be provided as required.
5. As a condition of the issuance of this Permit, the City is holding the security in the amount of $\$ 310,750.00$ to ensure that development is carried out in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Permit. Should any interest be earned upon the security, it shall accrue to the Holder if the security is returned. The condition of the posting of the security is that should the Holder fail to carry out the development hereby authorized, according to the terms and conditions of this Permit within the time provided, the City may use the security to carry out the work by its servants, agents or contractors, and any surplus shall be paid over to the Holder. Should the Holder carry out the development permitted by this permit within the time set out herein, the security shall be returned to the Holder. The City may retain the security for up to one year after inspection of the completed landscaping in order to ensure that plant material has survived.
6. If the Holder does not commence the construction permitted by this Permit within 24 months of the date of this Permit, this Permit shall lapse and the security shall be returned in full.

To the Holder: Jhujar Construction Ltd.

| Property Address: | 9291 and 9311/9331 No. 2 Road |
| :--- | :--- |
| Address: | c/o DF Architecture Inc. |
|  | 10851 Shellbridge Way Unit 350, |
|  | Richmond, British Columbia, V6X 2W9 |

7. The land described herein shall be developed generally in accordance with the terms and conditions and provisions of this Permit and any plans and specifications attached to this Permit which shall form a part hereof.
This Permit is not a Building Permit.

AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION NO.
ISSUED BY THE COUNCIL THE DAY OF

## DELIVERED THIS DAY OF

## MAYOR



City of Richmond


$\mathbf{N}$
DP 17-790086
SCHEDULE "A"
Original Date: 10/27/17
Revision Date: 09/18/23

Note: Dimensions are in METRES


City of Richmond



DP 17-790086

Original Date: 10/27/17
Revision Date: 09/18/23

Note: Dimensions are in METRES

## TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT

CIVIC ADDRESS: $9291 \& 9311$ NO. 2 ROAD, RICHMOND B.C.


PROJECT DRIECTORY:
ARCHITECTURAL: DF ARCHITECTURE INC.
$1205-4871$ SHEL
ROAD $1205-4871$ SHELL ROAD,
RICHMOND, B.C. VVX 326 CONTACT: UESSSIE ARORA jessie@dfarchitecture. essie@dforchitecture.co
ifoodforchitecture.ca

ARBORIST:
Arbotech (acl group) LANGLEY TWP, BC
V2Y'
SS 6042753484

ENERGY:
PHATEC ENERGY INC. NORTH VANCOUVER, BC VIMICS 047715886

LANDSCAPE:
HAPA Ondscope Architecture 03- 375 West Fifth Avenue Vancouver BC,
604 gog 4150
aIVL:
Core Concept Consulting Lt andscope Architecture Urban Design
$220-2639$ vinking Woy Richmond BC, V6V 387
6042495041 oreconceptconsulting.com ACOUSTIC:
BROWN STRACHAN ASSOCIATES O20 MAINLAND STREET,
ANCOUVER, BC V6B2T5 VANCOUVER, BC
6046890514



| OFF STREET PARKING |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REQUIRED PARKING | No. OF UNITS | REQUIRED <br> CARS PER D.U | No. Of CARS | REQUIRED TOTAL |
| RESIDENTIAL REQUIRED | 12 | 2 | 24 | 24 |
| VISITORS CAR PARK REQUIRED | 12 | 0.2 | 2.4 | 3 |
| total no. of PARKING REQuIRED |  |  |  | 27 |
| REQUIRED ACCESSIBLE PARKING | 2\% OF TOTA | AL REQUIRED | 0.52 | 1 |
| proposed parking |  |  |  |  |
| PROPOSED TANDEM RESIDENT PARKING |  |  |  | 10 |
| PROPOSED DOUBLE GARAGE RESIDENT PARKING |  |  |  | 14 |
| proposed vistors parking | VAN ACCESSIBLE |  |  | 1 |
|  | STANDARD VISITOR |  |  | 2 |
| TOTAL PROPOSED PARKING |  |  |  | 27 |
| NOTE: All resident parking spaces to be equipped with level $\mathbf{2}$ ev charging outlets as per bylaw requirements. <br> NOTE: Maximum $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ of residential parking can be provided in tandem arrangement. Currently $\mathbf{1 0}$ of $\mathbf{2 4}$ spaces(42\%) are proposed as tandem spaces. |  |  |  |  |
| BICYCLE PARKING |  |  |  |  |
| required bike parking | No. of UnITS | REQUIRED BIKES PER | NO. OF BIKES | SAY |
| CLASS 1 BIIEE PARKING | 12 | 1.25 | 15 | 15 |
| CLASS 2 BIIKE PARKING | 12 | 0.2 | 2.4 | 2 |
| PROPOSED BIIE PARKING |  |  |  |  |
| PROPOSED BIKE PARKING | CLASS 1 |  |  | 16 |
|  | CLASS 2 |  |  | 5 |

df



${ }_{\text {and }}^{\text {amam }}$ sam johal

FAR CALCULATION

| BUILDING | ExCLusions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Net AREA | NET AREA(SQM) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LVL1 | LVL2 | LVL 3 | GROSS AREA | GARAGE DEDUCTION | GARBAGE/ELEC./ BALCONIES | STAIRS+ENTRY DEDUCTION | STAIRS DEDUCTION UPPER FLOOR |  |  |
| BUILIDING 1 | 2,055.08 SFT | 1,622.88 SFT | 0.00 SFT | 3,677.96 SFT | 714.66 SFT | 75.00 SFT | 113.36 SFT | 110.70 SFT | 2,664.24 SFT | 247.5 SQM |
| BUILDING 2 | 974.08 SFT | 754.33 SFT | 0.00 SFT | 1,728.41 SFT | 443.50 SFT |  | 61.36 5FT | 22.36 SFT | 1,201.19 SFT | 111.6 S ${ }^{\text {am }}$ |
| BUILIING 3 | 2,636.25 SFT | 1,435.00 SFT | 0.00 5FT | 4,071.25 SFT | 776.32 SFT |  | 86.70 5FT | 75.68 SFT | 3,132.55 SFT | 291.0 Sam |
| BUILIING 4 | 2,137.50 SFT | 2,128.15 SFT | 1,344.09 SFT | 5,609.74 5FT | 1,236.99 SFT | 127.00 SFT | 229.02 SFT | 112.17 SFT | 3,904.56 SFT | 362.7 Sam |
| BUILDING 5 | 2,760.33 5FT | 2,736.45 SFT | 1,855.33 SFT | 7,352.11 SFT | 1,930.70 SFT | 166.00 SFT | 355.08 SFT | 164.27 SFT | 4,736.06 SFT | 440.0 Sam |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 22,439.47 SFT |  |  |  |  | 15,638.60 Sq.Ft. | 1452.9 SQM |







CONTEXT PLAN



| Condensed Tree Inventory and Assessment Data： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3} \\ \vdots \end{array}$ | g | Common name， （Botanical） | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & \mathbf{N} \\ & \mathbf{Z} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | 童 | 京 | ¢ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { 営 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{2}{2} \\ & \frac{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ | Action | N | N |
| 681 | 1 | Y | ON | English oak （Quercus robur） | 46 | 15 | 6 | 80 | 0 | 1 | RETAIN | 6 | 2.8 $\times$ 4.0 |
| 687 | 5 | Y | ON | Western redcedar （Thuja plicata） | 29 | 10 | 4.0 | 90 | 0 | Low | retain | 4.0 |  |
| N01 | 1 | Y | OfF | Southern magnolia evergreen （Magnolia grandiflora） | 30 | 9 | 4.0 | 70 | 0 | 2 | PROTECT |  | 3.0 |
| N02 | 1 | $Y$ | Off | Eastern white cedar （Thuja occidentalis） | 15 | 6 | 1.0 | 100 | o | Low | PROTECT |  | 1.0 |
| N03 | 1 | Y | OfF | English laurel （Prunus laurocerasis） | 20 | 7 | 3.0 | 80 | $\bigcirc$ | Low | PROTECT |  | 2.0 |
| NO4 | 1 | Y | off | Eastern white cedar （Thuja occidentalis） | 15 | 5 | 1.0 | 100 | 0 | Low | PROTECT |  |  |
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|  | NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reatases torop | Cot03202 |
|  | Pa-buate te de |  |
|  | lismemop | Hu2 |
|  | Ismotroop | Novi 1820 |
|  | Robeseet ofr ap | Oitcor 20 |
|  | Rolsematrap | spen 2022 |
|  | motere tre hever | $1 \times 2 \mathrm{~m}$ |
|  | Rotravere aume | 00t292020 |
|  | Relsw tor Roviem | 16202 |
|  | 1 mat |  |
|  | neltasataremem |  |
|  | netatextara 0 P | Docs 20.1 |
|  | Retiswem op |  |
|  | lesseterop | ${ }^{0+1720012}$ |
|  | Rearsubur feemer |  |
|  |  | Ans 201 |
|  | Hastere heonle |  |
|  | hast tremennma |  |
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Landscape
Materials Plan


Multiunit Developmen 9291 \& 9311 No 2 Rd kichmond BC

Landscape
Planting Plan





1. Wal monnte sconce ligming
brano moel
BEGA Impactressistant wall uriniaine
$\square$ Stieverea 33 327


notes
REEET TE EEETTCACA DaAMMGS:

2. IRRIGATION CONTRACTOR PERFORMING THE WORK MUST HAVE A MIN. (5) FVE YEARS DOCUMENTED EXPERRENCE ANO A MEMBER IN GOOD STANDING OF THE IIABC (IRRIGATON INDUSTRY ASSOCIITED OF BC).
3. IRRIGATON TO CONFORM TO ALL LOCAL PLUMBBG AND ELECTRICAL CODE REQUIREMENTS,

4. COORDINATE WITH CIIL CONTTACTOR TO PROVIDE PVC SIEEVNG WEEE PEDURED
5. REEER TO PLAN FOR HOSE BIB LOCATIONS.
6. PROVIDE SHOP DRAWINGS FOR IRRIGATION LYYOUT TO LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT FOR REVIEW
 PPPE SIEE, HEAD LYYOUT, VALVE BOXES, ETC., AND ALL IRRIGATION COMPONENT
SPECIFCCATONS. VALLE BOXES TO BE LOCATED IN LOW-VIIIBLE, PLANTED AREAS ONLY AND

7. HIGH EFFICIENCY RRRIGATON TECHNOLOGY IS TO BE USED.
8. TEST SYTTEM PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF LANDSCAPE WORKS TO ENSURE NO LEAAKGE AND STANDARDS (LEAKS SHALL NOT BE REPARIRED WTH PATCHING).
9. PROUIDE COVERRAGE AND CONTROLLER TEST WHEN SYTTEM IS COMPLLETE AND MAKE
a provin is as repured.
10. Provide as bull record dahnings to scale showing locatons of all concealed
11. MAITTAIN AND DPERRATE RRIIGATION PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATON

12. Provig (3) THREE COPLES OF INSTRUCTON MANUALS FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PARTS CATALOUUE.
13. INSTRUCT OWNER'S PERSONNEL IN THE OPERATION AND MANTENANCE OF THE SYSTEM, AS BASIS FOR DEMONSTRATION.


 $\underset{\substack{\text { Bat seop } 1.50 \\ \text { napecococom }}}{ }$


## 

Multiunit Developmen 9291 \& 9311 No 2 Rd -

Landscape
Irrigation Plan

(1.11 Tree Protection (East to West Profile)

( 2 ) Tree Protection (South to North Profile)
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Section South Side
DP 17-790086
PLAN \#16
October 4, 2023


(12.41) DETAIL \& SECTION OF HIGH TIMBER RETAINING WALL AND FENCE ON WEST SIDE OF BUILDING 1 (EAST TO WEST)


HA A


Multiunit Development 9291 \& 9311 No 2 Rd Richmond BC
(2 ELEVATION OF HIGH TIMBER RETAINING WALL AND GUARDRAIL ON WEST SIDE OF BUILDING 1 (NORTH TO SOUTH)


October 4,2023



(3) Metal Signage Mounted to Wall




( 13.20 Wood Fence 43" Typ.

(4. Stone Pllaster Metal Fence Typ.


BA Wood Fence $6^{\prime}$ Typ.

( $\left.{ }^{13.20}\right)_{1}$ Blike Rack
$\qquad$
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Landscape Details Walls, Furnishings
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Landscape Details Walls, Furnishings


SCHEDULE OF FINISHES

(1) EAST ELEVATION
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## 12 Unit Townheusentoren
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BLDG 1 ELEVATIONS




SCHEDULE OF FINISHES

(3) ${ }^{2}$


(5) Hapme peancl sing wit battens



(14) Screve doin - PANIE METAL
(7) MNM Eramed wnows mTH $2 \times 6$ Haroie trim


(15)
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BLDG 2 ELEVATIONS


(A.306) WESTELEVATION

${ }^{\text {pasectel }} 12$ INIT Townhouse development
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BLDG 3 ELEVATIONS
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( 1 (-307) WESTELEVATION






(12) $8^{\prime \prime}$ CONCRETE HEADER \& SILL
(13) ENRR DOOR- SOLID CORE METAL WTH TEMPERED GLAZZING
(14) SERYME DOOR-PANTED METAL


| (1) AshPralt shincle roofng |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| (2) PREFINISHED ALUMINUM GUTTER ON <br>  | (10) $2 \times 4.2 \times 8 \times 2 \times 10$ HoRIzONTAL AHROIE TRMM |
| (3) $1 \times 4$ wood trim on $2 \times 10$ WOOD FASCIA |  |
| (4) STJCCo sions | (12) $8^{\prime \prime}$ CONCRETE HeADER \& SILL |
| (5) HARDIE-PANEL SIDING WITH BATTENS | (13) ENTRY Door - Soliv core metal wit tempered glazing <br>  |
|  | (14) SERYCE DOOR- PANTED METAL |
| (7) VINYL FRAMED WINDOWS WTH $2 \times 6$ HARDIE TRIM | (15) GaRAEE DOOR- PANTES METAL WTH glazing |
| (8) $12 \times 12$ BuITT-UP COUMMN W/ HARDIE PANEL SIONG |  |


|  | average grade calculation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CORNER GRADES | AVG |
| BUILDING \#1: | NW 2.02m, NE 2.18, SE 2.23m, SW 2.02 | 2.11m |
| NG \#2: | NW 1.06m, NE 2.25m, SE 2.21m, SW 1.35 m | 1.72 m |
| BUILDING \#3: | NW 1.20 m, NE 2.24 m , SE 2.25 m , SW 1.36 m | 1.76m |
| BUlLING \#4: | NW 2.18 m , NE 2.39 m, SE $2.44 \mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{~W} 2.20 \mathrm{~m}$ | 2.30 m |
| BULLOING \#5: | NW 2.21 m , NE 2.36 m , SE 2.43 m , SW 2.21 m | 2.30 m |
| SITE | NW 1.67m, NE 2.29m, SE 2.38 m , SW 1.09 m | 1.86 |




|  | AVERAGE GRADE CALCULATION |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CORNER GRADES | avg |
| BUILDING \#1: | NW 2.02m, NE 2.18, SE 2.23m, SW 2.02 m | 2.11 m |
| BUILDING \#2: | NW 1.06m, NE 2.25m, SE 2.21 m , SW 1.35 m | 1.72m |
| \# | NW 1.20m, NE 2.24m, SE 2.25m, SW 1.36 m | 1.76 m |
| BUILIING \#4: | NW 2.18 m , NE 2.39m, SE $2.44 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{SW} 2.20 \mathrm{~m}$ | 2.30 |
| BUILING \#5: | NW 2.21m, NE 2.36m, SE 2.43m, SW 2.21 m | 2.30 m |
| SITE | NW 1.67m, NE 2.29m, SE 2.38m, SW 1.09 m | 1. |


 SCHEDULE OF FINISHES
(1) ASHPHALT SHINGLE ROOFNG
(2) PREFINSEED ALMINUM GUTTER ON
$2 \times 10$ WODO FASCIA


(10) $2 \times 4,2 \times 6 \& 2 \times 10$ HORIZONTAL AHRDIE TRMS

(5) Hardiemane sing mit battens
(II) $3^{3}$ - $6^{0}$. HICH ALUMINUM PICKET GUARORAL
(13) ENTPY DOOR - SOLDO CORE METAL WTH TEMPERED GLAZIN
(6) FACE RRICK (3-1/2" $\left.\times 7-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}\right)$
(14) SERYCE DOOR - PAATEC METAL

 $\ldots$ , Rum rompouse ${ }_{\text {sima }}^{\text {sitnam Joh }}$

bLDG 5 ELEVATIONS
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BLDG 1 PLANS



satnam johal


BLDG 1 PLANS


( 1 MAIN FLOOR PLAN

( 2 LEVEL 2 PLAN

$\frac{\text { ROOF PLAN }}{\operatorname{schtE} 3 / 6=16=1.0}$


BLDG 2 PLANS

| 10'0" | gamme |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A-203 | G |







BLDG 4 PLANS



