

SCHEDULE 13 TO THE MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL FOR
PUBLIC HEARINGS HELD ON MONDAY,
JANUARY 18, 2010.

To Public Hearing	
Date:	JAN 18, 2010
Item #	6
Re:	Bylaw 8562

Sent by fax to 604-278-5139
Attention: Director, City Clerk's Office

Comments on 6411 Blundell Road
Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8562 (RZ 09-497547)

We are the owners of the property directly north of this proposed redevelopment. Our address is 6500 Chelmsford Street, at which we have lived for the past 20 years. Part of the proposed development includes the continuation of a lane that currently does not extend past the south edge of our property but we understand that it is proposed that the lane will now extend directly past the south edge of our property. We have a large, very well established hedge and as well, a fence in place that will be at risk should the lane be extended, as the roots of our hedge might be exposed when the lane is being built, causing the trees to die.

What we are most concerned with is that our back yard privacy is maintained; we have worked many years at building up a peaceful, serene atmosphere in which to relax. The hedge is approximately 20 - 30' high in places. It is mainly a cedar hedge, with a few cypress trees as well. These provide a home to many birds as well as to a pair of bats.

Our first preference would be for the lane development to be set back far enough so that no scraping away of the tree roots occurs, therefore not damaging our fence or existing trees.

A second option would be that if the roots are exposed in some way, the developer Ajit Thaliwal would ensure that the arborist he has retained (Norman Hol of Arbortech) would be treating and attending to the trees in order to ensure they live and stay healthy. Please note that the enclosed report is from 2008, when this proposed development was first raised. As far as we know, circumstances have not changed since then.

It would be prudent to have in writing, a fall-back to this second option; in that if, after all the care that has been provided to the existing trees does not succeed and that some or all of our hedge does die, the developer would be responsible for supplying and planting new 12 - 14' ones, and the fence, if need be. Mr. Hol has suggested this could be done in the form of a bond, with a 2-year limit from the time construction on the new housing/lane has been completed. We would like the bond to be long enough to be sure that we know the hedge will survive before the bond expires.


Mr. Hol has put his suggestions in writing, a copy of which is enclosed.

We ask that these comments and concerns be entered into the record of the meeting this evening.

Respectfully,



Brian & Susanne Galloway
6500 Chelmsford Street
Richmond, B.C. V7C 4H9
604-271-1643





**ARBORTECH
CONSULTING
LTD**

Suite 200 - 3740 Chatham Street
Richmond, BC Canada V7E 2Z3

MEMORANDUM:

July 21, 2008

File: 07267

Attn.: Ajit Thaliwal

Unit 2240 - 4871 Shell Road
Richmond BC V6X 3Z6

cc:

Project: 6411 Blundell Road Richmond

Re: Neighbouring Hedge at 6500 Chelmsford Street

Dear Mr. Thaliwal,

Please be advised that I have met with the Mrs. Galloway, the owner of the neighbouring property to the proposed subdivision at the above noted address. In discussions with her on site, and with Mr. Galloway in the telephone, I propose the following terms to be incorporated into an agreement in principle for the protection of the hedge on their property, and provision for its replacement if in the worst case that it does not survive the pending lane construction:

Assessment

For the purposes of this report, referenced to the "hedge" includes the entire row of shrubs and trees located within the neighbouring property running east to west along their south property line. The hedge is described below for reference:

- The hedge includes a combination of a sheared formal section and an un-pruned, tree form section. The plants are currently in good health, however some previous root damage from fence construction was observed. The western section formed by 4.0 m tall (approximate) sheared Lawson cypress (*Chamaecyparis lawsoniana*) planted approximately 0.6 m from the common property line on 1.0 m centres. The eastern section of the hedge is comprised of 5 Lawson cypress trees that have not been sheared, and have been left to grow to normal tree form. These trees are closely spaced such that the crowns fully merge in their lower crowns. This combination of sheared and tree form cypresses form a valuable privacy screen between the two properties. Note that 5 stems of the hedge were determined to be of bylaw size.
- The foliage of the west portion overhangs by approximately 1.5 m into the development site, where a city lane is required to be constructed by the developer. The eastern section is suppressed by adjacent trees (#'s 533 and 534), so the foliage is slightly bare and the south overhang is reduced.
- The grades of the neighbouring lot are higher than the development site by approximately 0.35 m, and the grade change is abrupt. A wood fence is installed between the hedge and the development site at that grade change, and during its installation, some roots of the hedge and trees appear to have been cut. These factors make the root system of the hedge shrubs and trees significantly asymmetrical, and heavily reliant on the northern root zone within the neighbouring property.
- It is my opinion that the hedge can be retained and protected as requested by the owners, but some protection measures and treatments should be implemented as per my recommendations below. With or without the measures and treatments, the trees may still decline in health and die. In case of mortality to the hedge, the neighbours would like provision for a bond in place for a suitable term to cover the replacement cost of the hedge.

AJIT THALIWAL
6411 BLUNDELL ROAD
NEIGHBOURS HEDGE

FILE 07267

Recommendations


1. The city planning and engineering departments should be consulted to obtain permission for a reduced asphalt width such that root protection for the hedge can be maximized. Ideally, a setback to the asphalt of 1.5m from the north property line would be required, however with the asymmetrical root zone, a protection zone as small as 0.75m from the property line can likely be tolerated.
2. The project arborist should be on site to supervise and direct the site preparation for any construction on the site adjacent to the hedge. This would include services and lane construction. Root pruning would be undertaken at this time in order to minimize root damage.
3. Treat the remaining root zone with a root building fertilizer.
4. Prepare a schedule for supplemental watering. I assume that the neighbour would be willing to implement the watering since they have direct access to water and the root zone.
5. Developer to provide securities in the form of a landscape bond to be held in trust for two years. The project arborist would make an assessment of the hedge at the end of that term in order to determine the viability. One full growing season after disturbance is sufficient for the viability of the hedge to be determined, however the owners prefer to have securities for two years. In the event that the hedge will need to be removed, the developer will need to coordinate approvals from the City of Richmond (i.e. to conform to bylaw requirements).
6. The amount of the bond should be sufficient to cover the costs to remove the hedge and to plant 20 new hedge trees. I recommend using 4m tall nursery grown trees of Western redcedar (*Thuja plicata*) species rather than the Lawson cypress species due to the latter's high susceptibility to root disease. Future maintenance to shear the hedge would be the responsibility of the neighbours.

Estimated Costs, Tree removal and site preparation for planting:	\$3,000.00
Estimated Costs, Supply and Install 18 4.0 m Thuja plicata:	\$6,300.00
Contingency:	\$700.00
TOTAL SECURITIES:	\$10,000.00

With the above, I trust that the concerns of the impacts to the neighbours hedge are fully addressed. Please provide a copy of this report to the planner at the city and to the neighbour for their consideration and approval.

Thank you for choosing Arbortech for your tree assessment needs. If you require any further information, please call me directly at 604 275 3484 to discuss.

Regards,



Norman Hol,
Consulting Arborist
ISA Certified Arborist, Certified Tree Risk Assessor, Qualified Wildlife and Danger Tree Assessor

Enclosures; none