City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

To: Planning Committee
Date: August 22, 2022
From: Wayne Craig
File: RZ 21-932698
Director, Development
Re: Application by GBL Architects for Rezoning at 8880 Cook Road/8751 Citation Drive from the "Low Rise Apartment and Town Housing (ZLR32) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" Zone to the "Low Rise Rental Apartment (ZLR44) Brighouse Village (City Centre)" Zone

## Staff Recommendation

1. That Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 10395, to amend Schedule 2.10 of Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100 (City Centre Area Plan), to permit alternate housing forms (i.e. other than high-density townhouses), on a site-specific basis for rezoning applications that provide additional affordable housing and/or market rental housing to address community need, be introduced and given first reading.
2. That Bylaw 10395, having been considered in conjunction with:

- The City’s Financial Plan and Capital Program.
- The Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans.
is hereby found to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 477(3)(a) of the Local Government Act.

3. That Bylaw 10395, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is hereby found not to require further consultation.
4. That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10396 to:
a) Discharge "Land Use Contract (LUC 025)", entered in to pursuant to "Imperial Ventures Ltd. Land Use Contract Bylaw No. 3108 (RD19308)", from the Title of 8880 Cook Road/8751 Citation Drive.
b) Amend the "Low Rise Apartment and Town Housing (ZLR32) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" zone to remove all references to 8880 Cook Road/8751 Citation Drive.
c) Create the "Low Rise Rental Apartment (ZLR44) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" zone, and rezone 8880 Cook Road/8751 Citation Drive from the "Low Rise Apartment and Town Housing (ZLR32) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" zone to "Low Rise Rental Apartment (ZLR44) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" zone.
be introduced and given first reading.


Wayne Craig Director, Development
(604-247-4625)
WC/EL:js
Att. 10

|  | REPORT CONCURRENCE |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Routed To: | CoNCURRENCE | CONCURREMCE OF GENERAL MANAGER |
|  | $\square$ |  |
| Affordable Housing | $\square$ |  |
| Parks Services | $\square$ |  |
| Policy Planning | $\square$ |  |
| Sustainability and District Energy | $\square$ |  |
| Transportation | $\square$ |  |

## Staff Report

## Origin

GBL Architects, on the behalf of 1165225 BC Ltd. (Incorporation number: BC1165225; Directors: Yechuan Wu and Hongda Wu), has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 8880 Cook Road/8751 Citation Drive (Attachment 1) from "Low Rise Apartment and Town Housing (ZLR32) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" to a new "Low Rise Rental Apartment (ZLR44) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" site specific zone in order to permit the development of a $100 \%$ rental residential apartment development consisting of two 6 -storey buildings, containing approximately 338 units.

## Project Description

The key components of the proposal include:

- Two apartment buildings on top of a parking structure with approximately 338 rental units including 272 market rental units and 66 moderate income rental units based on BC Housing's Housing Income Limits (HILs).
- Approximately $20,510 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(220,764 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of purpose-built market rental housing, and approximately $3,374 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(36,316 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of purpose-built moderate income rental housing based on BC Housing's Housing Income Limits (HILs).
- All purpose-built market rental units and moderate income rental units will be secured in perpetuity with rental tenure zoning and housing agreements registered on Title. The units in each tenure type will be maintained under a single ownership.
- The building will meet Energy Step Code step 3 and will provide an on-site low carbon energy plant designed to connect to the future off-site City Centre district energy utility (DEU) system.
- A preliminary site plan, building elevations, and landscape plan are contained in Attachment 2.

Road and Engineering improvement works required with respect to the subject development will be secured through the City's standard Servicing Agreement process prior to rezoning adoption. Works including road widening, traffic signal improvements, frontage improvements along all road frontages, publicly accessible open spaces (mini-pocket parks) along the periphery of the development, and utility upgrades will be designed and constructed at the owner's sole cost.

To facilitate the subject development, amendments are proposed to Schedule 2.10 of Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100 (City Centre Area Plan). The purpose of the amendments is to permit alternate housing forms (i.e. other than high-density townhouses), on a site-specific basis for rezoning applications that provide additional affordable housing and/or market rental housing to address community need. The proposed bylaw would apply to the subject site and future rezoning applications by others elsewhere in the City Centre, on a site specific basis.

In addition, discharge of the existing Land Use Contract from the Title of the subject property is required. The subject "Land Use Contract (LUC 025)" was registered on 8880 Cook Road/8751 Citation Drive along with other properties on Pimlico Way and

Citation Drive at the time of the subdivision of the area in 1975. The Local Government Act provides that all LUCs will expire on June 30, 2024 and requires municipalities to establish underlying zoning for LUC properties. The underlying zoning for this property is "Low Rise Apartment and Town Housing (ZLR32) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)", and was established by the adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9801 on March 19, 2018.

## Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details about the development proposal is attached (Attachment 3).

## Subject Site Existing Housing Profile

The site currently contains two apartment buildings with a total of 102 units, which will be demolished. The subject property was a strata owner occupied apartment condo development that completed a "strata windup" process in July 2018 and then sold to the developer for redevelopment. The applicant has advised that approximately $90 \%$ of the units are currently rented on a month-to-month basis.

## Surrounding Development

To the North: Across Cook Road, a number of two-storey townhouses on properties zoned "Low Density Townhouses (RTL1)".

To the South: Across Citation Drive, a four storey apartment condo on a property on "Land Use Contract (LUC 025)", with the underlying "Low Rise Apartment and Town Housing (ZLR32) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" zone.

To the East: Across Garden City Road, a 16 storey apartment condo on Cook Road zoned "Residential/Limited Commercial (ZMU3) - North McLennan (City Centre)" zone, and Garden City Park located to the south of Alberta Road.

To the West: Across Pimlico Way, a number of two-storey townhouses on a property on "Land Use Contract (LUC 025)", with the underlying "Low Rise Apartment and Town Housing (ZLR32) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" zone.

## Related Policies \& Studies

## Official Community Plan/City Centre Area Plan

The 2041 Official Community Plan (OCP) Land Use Map designation for the subject development site is "Apartment Residential". This redevelopment proposal is consistent with this designation.

Specific Land Use Map: Brighouse Village (2031)
In the City Centre Area Plan (CCAP), the subject site is designated "General Urban T4" in the Specific Land Use Map: Brighouse Village (2031) (Attachment 4), where residential uses are limited to High-Density Townhouses, except that other housing types are permitted to accommodate residents with special needs (e.g., seniors).

In order to accommodate the proposed development, the applicant is seeking an amendment to the CCAP. The proposed amendment to the Implementation \& Phasing Strategies of the CCAP would permit alternative housing form be considered (in this case apartments instead of townhouses) when a rezoning application provides additional affordable housing and/or market rental housing on site. The proposed OCP Amendment is further discussed in the "Analysis" section of this report.

In addition, park spaces are envisioned in the general area of the subject site (see the "Park-Configuration \& location to be determined" notation on the Specific Land Use Map: Brighouse Village (2031) provided in Attachment 4). The proposal responds to this designation by identifying publicly accessible open spaces along the periphery of the development (Attachment 5). The proposed mini-pocket parks are further discussed in the "Analysis" section of this report.

## Sub-Area Guidelines

Under the Development Permit Guidelines in the CCAP, the subject site is located within "Sub-Area B.1: Mixed Use - Low-Rise Residential \& Limited Commercial", which is intended for grade-oriented housing in the form of higher-density townhouses (built over common parking structures). In order to accommodate alternative housing form when bonus density is allowed for the provision of additional affordable housing and/or market rental housing on site, amendments to the sub-area residential development guidelines are required. The proposed amendments would accommodate different typologies based on the net development density, on a case by case basis, to meet objectives of the Development Permit Guidelines. The proposed amendments are further discussed in the "Analysis" section of this report.

## City Centre Development

The subject development site is surrounded by properties with development potential subject to the CCAP. Registration of a legal agreement on Title is required before final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, stipulating that the residential development is subject to potential impacts due to other development that may be approved within the City Centre.

## Market Rental Housing Policy

In recognition of market rental housing comprising an important piece of the City’s housing supply, the OCP, in Section 3.3 (Diverse Range of Housing Types, Tenure and Affordability), encourages the development of new purpose-built market rental housing. A series of incentives are identified in Section 3.3 of the OCP to encourage the development of new market rental housing. Such incentives include:

- A bonus density of 0.20 FAR above the base density set out in the OCP or Area Plan for wood frame apartments on sites that provide $100 \%$ of the residential use as market rental.
- Additional density bonus on a site specific basis for projects that provide additional rental housing to address community need.
- Parking rate reductions for rental housing.
- Exemptions from Public Art, community planning, and affordable housing contributions.

The proposal is consistent with the intent of the Market Rental Housing Policy in that $100 \%$ of the units are proposed to be rental units secured through residential rental tenure zoning and registration of housing agreements on Title. The total density proposed with this project is 2.10 FAR, which includes:

- 1.2 FAR base density for residential as per the CCAP.
- 0.2 FAR density bonus for $100 \%$ market rental wood frame apartments as per OCP.
- A 0.70 FAR additional density bonus; $57.5 \%$ ( 0.40 FAR ) is allocated to market rental units and 42.5 \% (0.3 FAR) is allocated to moderate income rental units.

The bonus density and residential rental tenure housing are further discussed in the "Analysis" section of this report.

## Tenant Relocation Plan

The subject property was a strata owner occupied apartment condo development that completed a "strata windup" process in July 2018. The units are being rented out on a month-to-month basis during the planning and development stage of the redevelopment project and are currently approximately $90 \%$ occupied. Therefore, the subject proposal is not considered a redevelopment of an existing market rental housing property and is not subject to the market rental replacement requirement under the Market Rental Housing Policy. However, a Tenant Relocation Plan (Attachment 6) for the existing residents at 8880 Cook Road/8751 Citation Drive has been provided by the applicant. The proposed Tenant Relocation Plan complies with the Market Rental Housing Policy in the OCP, which includes:

- A minimum four months' notice to end the tenancy.
- A right-of-first-refusal for displaced tenants to return to the new buildings.
- Housing relocation assistance.
- Three months' free rent for tenants who have resided in the applicable rental units longer than one year.

A legal document will be registered on Title, prior to final adoption of the Rezoning Bylaw, to ensure that the proposed tenant relocation plan will be implemented prior to any demolition construction activity occurs on-site.

## OCP Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development (ANSD) Policy

The subject development site is located within Area 4 (Aircraft Noise Notification Area) on the OCP Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development Map. An Aircraft Noise Sensitive Use Covenant will be registered on Title to address aircraft noise mitigation and public awareness is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

At the Development Permit stage, submission of an acoustic report, prepared by a qualified professional, will be required to address indoor sound level mitigation criteria as set out in the OCP and identify how noise mitigation measures will be incorporated into the building design.

## Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

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

## Public Consultation

Rezoning signs have been installed on all four frontages of the subject property. Staff have not received any comments from the public about the rezoning application in response to the placement of the rezoning sign on the property.

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant first reading to the OCP and rezoning bylaws, the bylaws will be forwarded to a Public Hearing, where any area resident or interested party will have an opportunity to comment.

## OCP Consultation Summary

Richmond OCP Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 10395, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is hereby found to not require further consultation. Attachment 7 includes a summary of consultation.

The public will have an opportunity to comment further on all of the proposed amendments at the Public Hearing. Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the Local Government Act.

## Analysis

The applicant has applied to rezone the subject site to permit the construction of a low-rise residential development comprising two 6 -storey buildings with approximately 272 market rental units and 66 moderate income rental units, together with significant road dedication for road widening and frontage improvements, and the provision of statutory right-of ways (SRW's) for open spaces (mini-pocket parks) along the periphery of the development.

## Bonus Density and Residential Rental Tenure Housing

Policy 4.1n of the CCAP (Density Bonusing - Affordable Housing \& Market Rental Housing) allows for additional density bonus on a site specific basis for projects that provide additional rental housing to address community needs. The applicant is proposing a 0.70 FAR additional density bonus, in which 0.40 FAR will be allocated to market rental units and 0.3 FAR will be allocated to moderate income rental units.

The proposed moderate income rentals are considered affordable housing by definition as they will be subject to a Moderate Income Rental Housing Agreement which limits the occupancy of the dwelling units based on household income level and prescribes a maximum rental rate for the dwelling unit. The income thresholds of these moderate income rental units will be based on BC Housing's Housing Income Limits (HILs) and the maximum rental rates will be restricted to no higher than $30 \%$ of the income thresholds. These rates and income thresholds are higher than those under the City's Low End Market Rental (LEMR) Program, but are typically lower than the prevailing market rates.

|  | Proposed initial Moderate Income <br> Rental Rates and Income Thresholds <br> based on HILs (2021) |  | Minimum Unit Size <br> based on Affordable <br> Housing Strategy |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Maximum <br> Rental Rates | Income <br> Thresholds | Minimum Unit Size (ft²) |
| Studio | $\$ 1,438$ | $\$ 57,500$ | 400 |
| 1 Bedroom | $\$ 1,438$ | $\$ 57,500$ | 535 |
| 2 Bedroom | $\$ 1,725$ | $\$ 69,000$ | 741 |
| 3 Bedroom | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 80,000$ | 980 |

The applicant is proposing approximately 272 units comprising $20,510 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(220,764 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of purpose-built market rental units. There will be no City imposed restriction on tenant incomes or rental rates for the market rental units.

Staff support the proposed 0.70 FAR bonus density based on the following:

- The proposal is consistent with the Density Bonusing - Affordable Housing \& Market Rental Housing (Policy 4.1n) in the CCAP and the provision of approximately 66 moderate income rental units would provide a new housing option for the community.
- Unit sizes proposed for all market rental and moderate income rental units meet the minimum unit sizes required under the City's Affordable Housing Strategy.
- The market rental unit type distribution exceeds the unit mix requirements for market rental housing developments with over $40 \%$ of the units are family friendly (i.e., $44 \%$ ).
- The moderate income rental unit type distribution meets the family friendly unit mix requirement for affordable housing with 15\% 2-bedroom units and 5\% 3-bedroom units.
- All single level apartment units would meet the City’s Basic Universal Housing (BUH) standards.
- Significant road dedication (approx. 2,487 $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ or $26,769 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) is required to accommodate road widening and frontage improvement works on all four frontages of the site.

Consistent with the incentives identified in the OCP to encourage market rental housing, this application is exempt from the affordable housing requirements, public art contribution and community planning contribution.

## Dwelling Unit Mix

The OCP and CCAP encourage the development of a variety of unit types and sizes supportive of the diverse needs of Richmond's population including, but not limited to, households with children. Staff support the applicant's proposal, which includes the following mix of rental unit sizes:

| Unit Type | Market Rentals |  |  |  | Moderate Income Rentals |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number <br> of Units | Min. <br> Size <br> (ft²) | $\%$ <br> Family <br> Units | \%BUH <br> Units | Number <br> of Units | Min. <br> Size <br> $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $\%$ <br> Family <br> Units | $\%$ BUH <br> Units |  |
| Studio | 50 | 400 |  | $18 \%$ | 42 | 400 |  | $63 \%$ |  |
| 1 Bedroom | 102 | 535 |  | $38 \%$ | 10 | 535 |  | $15 \%$ |  |
| 2 Bedroom | 72 | 741 | $26 \%$ | $26 \%$ |  | 7 | 741 | $11 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| 3 Bedroom | 15 | 980 | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ |  | 2 | 980 | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Townhouse (2 bed) | 29 | 741 | $11 \%$ |  |  | 4 | 741 | $6 \%$ |  |
| Townhouse (3 bed) | 4 | 980 | $1 \%$ |  |  | 1 | 980 | $1 \%$ |  |
| Total | 272 |  | $44 \%$ | $88 \%$ |  | 66 |  | $21 \%$ | $92 \%$ |

* The proposed minimum unit sizes for the various types of units listed above meet the minimum unit size requirements for Low End Market Rental units under the City's Affordable Housing Strategy.


## Accessibility

The OCP seeks to meet the needs of the city's aging population and people facing mobility challenges by encouraging the development of accessible housing that can be approached, entered, used, and occupied by persons with physical or sensory disabilities.

Staff support the applicant's proposal, which is consistent with City Policy and includes:

- Barrier-free lobbies, common areas, and amenity spaces.
- Aging-in-place features in all units (e.g., blocking for grab bars, lever handles, etc.).
- $100 \%$ of the single level apartment units, including 239 market rental units and 61 moderate income rental units, will meet the Basic Universal Housing (BUH) provisions.


## Housing Agreements

Separate housing agreements and covenants are required to be registered on Title for the market rental units and the moderate income rental units. The legal agreements will provide that:

- $100 \%$ of the units (except for multiple-level townhouse units) be designed to meet the City’s Basic Universal Housing standard.
- Occupants of the units in each tenure type enjoy full and unlimited access and use of all on-site indoor and outdoor amenity spaces at no additional cost.
- The units in each tenure type be maintained under a single ownership.
- Developers/owners may not impose restrictions on the age of tenants within any residential units.
- The terms of the Housing Agreement shall apply in perpetuity.

In addition to the above-noted common terms of the agreements, the Moderate Income Rental Housing Agreement for the moderate income rental units must ensure that:

- The maximum rental rates, income thresholds, and minimum unit sizes for the moderate income rental units apply in the table above. Subject to Council approval, the maximum monthly rents and annual household incomes may be adjusted based on the latest HILs released by BC Housing, or increased annually based on the Consumer Price index if BC Housing no longer publishes HILs, consistent with the Residential Tenancy Act.
- No parking fees are charged to residents of the moderate income rental units.
- At least $15 \%$ of the moderate income rental units are required to be provided as 2 -bedroom units, and at least $5 \%$ must be provided as 3 -bedroom units.
- At least of $50 \%$ of parking stalls allocated to moderate income rental units be standard parking spaces or accessible parking space.
- All other property management requirements and tenant selection guidelines should be based on the City's LEMR program, unless otherwise specified in the Moderate Income Rental Housing Agreement.

In addition to the above-noted common terms of the agreements, the housing agreement for the market rental units must ensure that:

- A minimum of $40 \%$ of market rental units with two or more bedrooms so they are suitable for families with children (e.g. "family-friendly" units).


## Proposed OCP Bylaw Amendment

## Proposed Amendment to the City Centre Area Plan

The subject site is designated "General Urban T4" in the Specific Land Use Map: Brighouse Village (2031) (Attachment 4), where residential uses are limited to high density townhouses. Since the applicant is proposing to increase the density for this site from 1.2 FAR to 2.10 FAR to accommodate a $100 \%$ rental project with market rental units and moderate income rental units, the envisioned townhouse typology is no longer appropriate.

Similar to the typical high density townhouse developments located within the "General Urban T4" area of the Brighouse Village, ground oriented townhouse units with direct access from the fronting streets are proposed as part of the development proposal to conceal the parking structure from street view. An additional four levels of apartment units are proposed on top of the two-storey townhouses and the parking podium, bringing the total building height to six storeys. The proposed low rise apartment typology would accommodate the addition density for rental housing and provide for additional opportunities for tree preservation and provision of public accessible open space on site.

To facilitate the proposed development, an amendment to the Implementation \& Phasing Strategies of the CCAP is required to permit alternative housing form be considered (in this case apartments instead of townhouses) when a rezoning application provides additional affordable housing and/or market rental housing on site.

This proposed amendment is consistent with the current Policy 4.1n of the CCAP (which allows for additional density bonus for additional affordable housing and market rental housing to address community need) and would allow for a more appropriate housing form to accommodate the additional density for rental housing.

## Proposed Amendment to the CCAP Development Permit Guidelines

Under the CCAP Development Permit Guidelines, the subject site is located within "Sub-Area B.1: Mixed Use - Low-Rise Residential \& Limited Commercial", which is intended for grade-oriented housing in the form of higher-density townhouses (built over common parking structures). In order to accommodate an alternative housing form (i.e., apartment buildings) for the subject proposed, an amendment to the sub-area residential development guidelines is required. The proposed amendment would allow a project to be considered under a different set of residential sub-area guidelines based on the net density (including the bonus density) with the provision of additional affordable housing and/or market rental housing on site. In this case, the subject proposal would be subject to the guidelines under "Sub-Area B. 2 - Mixed Use - Mid-Rise Residential \& Limited Commercial" (which is intended for medium-density, mid-rise (4-8 storeys) housing) instead of the guidelines under "Sub-Area B.1" (which is intended for townhouse developments).

Staff proposed to expand this minor text amendment to all of the residential sub-area guidelines in the CCAP to accommodate different typologies based on the net development density, on a case by case basis to meet objectives of the Development Permit Guidelines.

## Proposed Zoning Amendment

The site specific zone is drafted based on the standard High Density Low Rise Apartments (RAH) zone. To accommodate the site specific conditions, the proposed ZLR44 zone includes:

- Permitted land uses: townhouse, apartment and related land uses.
- Maximum density: 2.10 FAR calculated against the net site area. The zone also includes the typical 0.1 FAR density bonus for common indoor amenity space for residents.
- Residential rental tenure restriction relating to the provision of rental units, including at least $3,417.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(36,786 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of moderate income rental housing and a maximum of $20,505.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(220,720 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of market rental housing.
- Maximum lot coverage: $60 \%$ for buildings, which is the same as in the RAH zone.
- Minimum road setbacks: 3.0 m from the new property lines after required road dedications.
- Maximum building height: 25 m to accommodate the proposed 6-storey building.
- Minimum lot size: $11,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, which is based on the net site area after all required road dedications.
- Specific parking provision based on the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, accepted by Transportation Department.


## Land Use Contract (LUC 025) and Underlying Zone (ZLR32)

The subject site is governed by "Land Use Contract (LUC 025)", which is set to automatically expire on June 30, 2024 and be replaced with the underlying "Low Rise Apartment and Town Housing (ZLR32) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" zone. This underlying zoning for this property was established by the adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9801 on March 19, 2018. The owner has requested to discharge "Land Use Contract (LUC 025)" and rezone to a new site specific zone to facilitate the proposed development.

In addition, if Council approves rezoning of the subject site, its underlying zone, ZLR32, which applies to multiple properties in the Citation Drive/Pimlico Way neighbourhood, will be amended to remove all references to the subject site.

## Built Form and Architectural Character

The proposed development will be six storeys high and provides a transition between the 16-storey apartment blocks east of Garden City Road and the two-storey townhouse complex west of Pimlico Way. The proposed parkade podium is designed around the critical root zones of the protected trees located in the central courtyard. The two-level parkade podium would be half-storey sunken and would be screened from the road frontages by series of two-storey townhouse units. An additional four levels of apartment units are proposed on top of the parking podium bringing the total height of the building to six storeys. Vehicle access to the parkade would be through an open service/loading area with a driveway from Pimlico Way.

## Parks and Open Space

In compliance with the CCAP’s "Park-Configuration \& location to be determined" designation, the developer proposes to provide approximately $380 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(4,095 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for publicly accessible open spaces (mini-pocket parks) in strategic locations along the periphery of the development (Attachment 5). These spaces are provided for the benefit of both the residents of the project and the wider community. Considering the close proximity of the site to a large community park, sports fields and other active open spaces, as well as adjacent bicycle pathway within the road frontages, these mini-pocket parks or greenspaces along the edge of the development would be most suitable for passive uses. A conceptual design for the proposed public open space improvements has been prepared by the developer (Attachment 5).

Parks Services staff have reviewed the subject proposal and accepted the design rationale. The proposed public open spaces along the periphery of the development will be secured by way of SRWs prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw; detailed design of these public open space areas will be the undertaken and secured through the development's Servicing Agreement and Development Permit processes, including the provision of Letters of Credit. These SRWs will be maintained by the developer and owners of the development.

## Existing Legal Encumbrances

There is an exiting BC Hydro right-of-way (ROW) along the site’s Cook Road frontage and an existing city utility ROW along the site's Pimlico Drive and Citation Drive frontages. These areas will be transferred to the City as part of the road dedication mentioned above.

## Transportation Requirements and Site Access

Road dedication along all of the site's four road frontages is required to accommodate road widening and frontage improvement works. Frontage improvements include but not limited to:

- Cook Road - addition of a grass/tree boulevard and a multi-use path.
- Garden City Road - addition of a bike lane, sidewalk, and grass/tree boulevards.
- Citation Drive - addition of a travel lane, a parking lane, a grass/tree boulevards, and a multi-use path.
- Pimlico Way - addition of a parking lane and a grass/tree boulevard; and relocation of the existing sidewalk.

No vehicular access off Cook Road, Garden City Road and Citation Drive will be allowed. The vehicle parkade entrance is located approximately mid point of the site's Pimlico Way frontage.

## Vehicle Parking

The conceptual design plans (Attachment 2) provide for 169 resident parking spaces and 54 visitor parking spaces. The proposed number of parking spaces is consistent with the OCP Market Rental Housing Policy where up to a total of $50 \%$ parking reduction may be considered on $100 \%$ rental development sites that are within 800 m of a Canada Line Station, subject to the provision of Transportation Demand Measures (TDM) to the satisfaction of the City. The following TDM measures are to be secured through registration of a legal agreement on Title prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw:

- Car Share Vehicles and Designated Parking Spaces - provision of two (2) car share vehicles and designated car share parking spaces.
- Car Share Membership - provision of a car share membership for each dwelling unit.
- Subsidized Transit Passes - provision of a Transit Pass Program offering a monthly two-zone pass for the each dwelling unit, for one year.
- Additional Class 1 Bicycle Parking - Provision of Class 1 bicycle parking at a rate of 1.9 spaces per unit (instead of 1.25 spaces per units) for units that are one bedroom or larger. The net increase of secured bike storage spaces for the project is 161 spaces. Bike storage rooms will have outlets for bicycle charging.
- Bicycle Maintenance Facility - provision of a bicycle maintenance room for resident use to include a bike stand, repair tools, bike washing area and opportunities for charging of e-devices.
- Shared Bike and Micro Mobility Station - provision of a SRW and access to an area for a future shared e-bike and e-scooter parking corral on the site.
- Implementation of cycling facilities and enhancements along the site's frontage to be secured through the associated site Servicing Agreement for the application.
- Unassigned Parking - registration of a restrictive covenant on Title to ensure that all residential parking spaces are unassigned and assignment is managed by the property manager.
- Delivery vehicle parking - provision of additional delivery vehicle parking for e-commerce vans (Amazon, etc.) and food delivery vehicles, and registration of a legal agreement on Title to outline the operation of the parkade gate to provide access to the delivery vehicle parking and to encourage use of visitor parking on site during day time hours (i.e., from 8 am to 7 pm ).


## Tree Retention and Replacement

The applicant has submitted a Certified Arborist’s Report; which identifies on-site and off-site tree species, assesses tree structure and condition, and provides recommendations on tree retention and removal relative to the proposed development. The Report assesses 146 bylawsized trees on the subject property.

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

- Ten trees identified in good condition (tag\# 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, $1894,1895,1896$ ) are noted to be retained and protected in the central courtyard as per Arborist Tree Management Plan (Attachment 8).
- Four trees (tag\# 1956, 1957, 1958 and 1959) located at the southwest corner of the site and one tree (tag\# 1852) located at the northeast corner of the site are identified in good condition and should be retained and protected.
- A 94 cm caliper Western Red Cedar tree (tag\# 1857) and a 31cm caliper Douglas Fir tree (tag\# 1858) located along Cook Road are identified in good condition and but in conflict with the proposed building envelope. In order to retain these trees, approximately 14 rental units would have to be eliminated. These trees are also too large to be relocated on site; therefore, these trees are proposed to be removed. The applicant has agreed to plant two large specimen trees on site and make a total contribution of $\$ 20,000$ to compensate for the removal of these two trees.
- Three trees (tag\# 1928, 1929, and 1930) located at the northwest corner of the site are in good condition, and 14 trees (tag\# 1950, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916 and 1917) located at the southeast corner of the site are identified in fair condition; however, they are in direct conflict with offsite public realm upgrades such that they cannot be retained.
- 112 trees located on site are all in poor condition - either dead, dying (sparse canopy foliage), have been previously topped or exhibit structural defects such as cavities at the main branch union and co-dominant stems with inclusions. As a result, these trees are not good candidates for retention and should be replaced.


## Tree Replacement

The applicant wishes to remove 130 bylaw-sized on-site trees; the $2: 1$ replacement ratio would require 260 replacement trees. In addition, the applicant wishes to remove one significant tree on site, the $3: 1$ replacement ratio would required an additional three replacement trees. Therefore, the total number of replacement trees required for the proposed removal of 131 trees on site is 263 trees.

The conceptual development plans (Attachment 2) include approximately 105 replacement trees. Staff will work with the applicant to explore the opportunity to include additional replacement trees on site at the Development Permit stage. The size and species of replacement trees will also be reviewed in detail through Development Permit and overall landscape design. The developer will be required to provide $\$ 750$ to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for each and any number of trees short of the required 263 replacement trees included within the Development Permit landscape plans.

## Tree Protection

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

- Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, submission to the City of a contract with a Certified Arborist for the supervision of all works conducted within or in close proximity to tree protection zones. The contract must include the scope of work required, the number of proposed monitoring inspections at specified stages of construction, any special measures required to ensure tree protection, and a provision for the arborist to submit a post-construction impact assessment to the City for review.
- Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, submission to the City of a Tree Survival Security in the amount of $\$ 150,000$ to ensure that the 15 trees identified for retention on site, will be protected. No Tree Survival Security will be returned until the post-construction assessment report, confirming the protected trees survived the construction, prepared by the Arborist, is reviewed by staff.
- Prior to demolition of the existing dwelling on the subject site, installation of tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained. Tree protection fencing must be installed to City standard in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03 prior to any works being conducted on-site, and remain in place until construction and landscaping on-site is completed.


## Sustainability and Renewable Energy

## District Energy

The developer is required to design, construct, and transfer ownership to the City of a Low Carbon Energy Plant (LCEP) and related infrastructure on site to facilitate a future connection to a City Centre District Energy Utility (DEU) system. Registration of a legal agreement on Title to secure the owner's commitment to connect to DEU and granting the statutory right of way(s) necessary for supplying the DEU services to the building(s) is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

## Energy Step Code

The developer has committed to design the subject development to meet the City's Step Code requirements. Under current requirements, the development would be expected to achieve Step 3 of the Energy Step Code for Part 3 construction.

A commitment letter is presented as Attachment 9. Details on how all units are to be built and maintained to this commitment will be reviewed at Building Permit stage.

## Amenity Space

The conceptual development plans include $690 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(7,429 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of indoor amenity, which would meet the minimum requirements in the OCP. The proposed indoor amenity includes a fitness room and a number of multi-purpose spaces with piano rooms, meeting rooms, study rooms, lounge seating, work tables, kitchenettes, and fully accessible washrooms.

The proposed outdoor amenity spaces include an approximately a $1,932 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(20,797 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ central courtyard at grade with amphitheatre seating and children's play area; a $183 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,971 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ children's play area on Level 2, and a $318 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,421 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ outdoor space on Level 3, adjacent to the indoor amenity space, with fire pit and BBQ etc. Staff will work with the applicant at the Development Permit stage to ensure the configurations and designs of the outdoor amenity spaces meet the Development Permit Guidelines in the OCP.

## Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant is required to enter into the City's standard Servicing Agreement, secured with a Letters of Credit, for the design and construction of:

- Road widening and frontage improvement works on all of the site’s four road frontages.
- Traffic signals improvements at the Cook Road \& Garden City Road intersection and at the Cook Road \& Pimlico Way intersection.
- Sanitary and storm sewer upgrades and service connections.

Detailed site servicing and frontage improvement requirements are presented in Attachment 10. All works are at the developer's sole cost (i.e., no credits apply). The developer is also required to pay Development Cost Charges (DCC's) (City \& Metro Vancouver), TransLink DCC’s, School Site Acquisition Charge and Address Assignment Fee.

## Design Review and Future Development Permit Considerations

A Development Permit processed to a satisfactory level is a requirement of zoning approval. Through the Development Permit, the following issues are to be further examined:

- Compliance with Development Permit Guidelines for multiple family projects in the 2041 OCP and the CCAP.
- Refinement of the site plan to ensure all the aboveground private utility infrastructure improvements required as part of this development will be located on site and screened from street view.
- Design development of vehicle parking and circulation, truck manoeuvring, waste management activities, and related features and spaces at the proposed vehicle entrance and open air service area.
- Refinement of the site plan and tree management scheme to ensure protection and long term health of retained trees, which may include registration of additional legal documents or right of ways on title, as well as submission of additional security deposits.
- Opportunities to enhance individual building identity, skyline and streetscape visual interest along all road frontages; to provide different building masses, forms and characters, in response to the road hierarchy, pedestrian and bike circulation routes, and adjacent developments; and to enhance building performance in coordination with architectural expression.
- Design development of the parkade walls and landscaping around the central courtyard.
- Refinement of landscape design, including the size and configuration of the outdoor amenity spaces, as well as choice and location of various play equipment, to create a safe and vibrant environment for children's play and social interaction.
- Further design of the publicly accessible open spaces along the periphery of the development including the programming and landscaping of these spaces to ensure they satisfy City's objectives.
- Opportunities to enhance pedestrian circulation and accessibility throughout the site.
- Opportunities to design the two-storey townhouse units in accordance to the city's convertible unit checklist.
- Detailed design of the offsite frontage elements to be constructed as part of the Servicing Agreement.

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

## Financial Impact or Economic Impact

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

## Conclusion

GBL Architects has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to discharge "Land Use Contract (LUC 025)" from 8880 Cook Road/8751 Citation Drive and to rezone the site from the "Low Rise Apartment and Town Housing (ZLR32) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" to a new "Low Rise Rental Apartment (ZLR44) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" site specific zone. The proposed rezoning would permit the development of a mixed tenure rental development with approximately 272 market rental housing units and 66 moderate income rental housing units.

Associated with the proposed zoning amendment are amendments to the CCAP in order to allow alternative housing forms be considered on a site-specific basis, and project be considered under a different set of residential sub-area guidelines based on the net density, for rezoning applications that provide additional affordable housing and/or market rental housing to address community need.

The proposed site specific "Low Rise Rental Apartment (ZLR44) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)" zone will, if approved, accommodate the proposal, including a market rental housing density bonus.

An analysis of the subject proposal shows it to be consistent with current Market Rental Policy in the OCP, which encourage the development of new purpose-built market rental housing units. The proposal is also considered to be consistent with the OCP CCAP's development, livability, sustainability, and urban design objectives. Further review of the project design is required to ensure a high quality project and design consistency with the existing neighbourhood context, and this will be completed as part of the Development Permit application review process.

The list of rezoning considerations is included as Attachment 10; which has been agreed to by the applicant (signed concurrence on file). On this basis, staff recommend support of the application.

It is recommended that Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 10395 and Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10396 be introduced and given first reading.


Edwin Lee
Planner 2
(604-276-4121)
EL:js
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Address: 8880 Cook Road/8751 Citation Drive
Applicant: GBL Architects
Planning Area(s): Brighouse Village (City Centre)

|  | Existing | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Owner: | 1165225 BC Ltd. | No Change |
| Site Size ( $\mathbf{m}^{2}$ ): | $13,879 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $11,392 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Land Uses: | Apartment Residential | No Change |
| OCP Designation: | Apartment Residential | No Change |
| Area Plan <br> Designation: | City Centre Area Plan: General Urban <br> T4 - High Density Townhouses | No Change |
| Zoning: | Low Rise Apartment and Town Housing <br> (ZLR23) - Brighouse Village (City <br> Centre) | Low Rise Rental Apartment (ZLR44) - <br> Brighouse Village (City Centre) |
| Land Use Contracts: | Land Use Contract (LUC 025) | Discharge |
| Number of Units: | 102 | 338 |


| On Future Subdivided Lots | Bylaw Requirement | Proposed | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | - 1.8 FAR Market Rentals <br> - 0.3 FAR Moderate Income Rentals | - Max. 1.8 FAR Market Rentals <br> - Min. 0.3 FAR Moderate Income Rentals | none permitted |
| Buildable Floor Area $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ :* | $\begin{aligned} & \text { - Market Rental: Max. 20,505.6 } \mathrm{m}^{2} \\ & \left(220,720 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right) \\ & - \text { Moderate Income Rental: Min. } \\ & 3,417.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(36,786 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { - Market Rental: Max. 20,505.6 } \mathrm{m}^{2} \\ & \left(220,720 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right) \\ & - \text { Moderate Income Rental: Min. } \\ & 3,417.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(36,786 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | none permitted |
| Lot Coverage (\% of lot area): | - Building: Max. 60\% <br> - Non-porous Surfaces: Max. 80\% <br> - Landscaping with Live Plant Material: Min. 20\% | - Building: Max. 60\% <br> - Non-porous Surfaces: Max. 80\% <br> - Landscaping with Live Plant Material: Min. 20\% | none |
| Lot Size: | Min. 11,000 m ${ }^{2}$ | 11,391 m ${ }^{2}$ | none |
| Setbacks (m): | Road: Min. 3.0 m | Cook Road: Min. 3.0 m Garden City Road: Min. 3.0 m Citation Drive: Min. 3.0 m Pimlico Way: Min. 3.0 m | none |
| Height (m): | Max. 25.0 m | 25.0 m Max. | none |


| On Future Subdivided Lots | Bylaw Requirement | Proposed | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Off-street <br> Parking Spaces <br> - Regular (R): | Total: 163 (R), including: <br> - Market Rental Unit: $272 \times 1$ space/unit, with $50 \%$ TDM Reduction = $136(\mathrm{R})$ <br> - Moderate Income Rental: 66 units x 0.8 space/unit with $50 \%$ TDM Reduction $=27(\mathrm{R})$ | 169 | none |
| Off-street <br> Parking Spaces <br> - Visitor (V): | 338 units $\times 0.2$ space/unit with $20 \%$ TDM Reduction = 55 (V) | Min. 55 | none |
| Small Car Parking Spaces | Max. $50 \%$ when 31 or more spaces are provided on-site $(218 \times$ Max. $50 \%=109)$ | 96 | none |
| Accessible Parking Spaces (Residential): | Min. $2 \%$ when 11 or more spaces are required ( $163 \times 2 \%=4$ spaces) | Min. 4 | none |
| Accessible Parking Spaces (Visitor): | Min. $2 \%$ when 11 or more spaces are required ( $55 \times 2 \%=2$ spaces) | Min. 2 | none |
| Bicycle Parking Spaces - Class 1 | Total: 583, including: <br> - Studio: 1.25 spaces per unit x 92 = 115 space <br> - All other unit types: 1.9 spaces per unit x $246=468$ space | 584 | none |
| Amenity Space - Indoor: | Min. $2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ per unit $=676 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 690 m² | none |
| Amenity Space <br> - Outdoor: | Min. $6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ per unit $+10 \%$ of the net development site area $=2,028 \mathrm{~m}^{2}+$ $1,139.2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}=3,167.2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 3,401 m² | none |

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

* Preliminary estimate; not inclusive of garage; exact building size to be determined through zoning bylaw compliance review at Building Permit stage.

Specific Land Use Map: Brighouse Village (2031)


Maximum building height may be subject to established Airport Zoning Regulations in certain areas.

## ATTACHMENT 5



## TENANT RELOCATION PLAN July 2022

## 8880 COOK ROAD AND 8751 CITATION DRIVE, RICHMOND

EVERBRIGHT PROPERTIES INC.

## INTRODUCTION

Everbright Properties Inc. on behalf of the owner, has been proudly managing and operating two apartment buildings at 8880 Cook and 8751 Citation Drive, Richmond, since 2020.

The Tenant Relocation Plan (TRP) has been created to provide guidance to our Tenants and it is intended to be used in conjunction with is aligned "Policy 2B: Ending Tenancy to Demolish, Renovate, or Convert a Rental Unit to a Permitted Use" under section and Section 49(6) of the Residential Tenancy Act (RTA). Please refer to Summary Table of TRP.

We encourage and inform our Tenants to review and visit the website for further information: https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/housing-and-tenancy/residential-tenancies/policyguidelines/gl2b.pdf

The following relocation plan provides details about communication, commitment and assistance provided to our Tenants.

## COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

Everbright Properties Inc. is committed to early and ongoing communication with Tenants, including the following:
> A letter to all Tenants outlining the proposed project and expected timeline following 2nd/3rd Reading of the draft zoning bylaw, and a copy of Richmond Tenant Protections and Relocation Assistance due to Redevelopment. Notifications will be provided directly to Tenants by mail and posted in conspicuous places within the building(s).
$>$ Ongoing communications in the progress of the development and tenant relocations process. This includes updating all tenants immediately after achieving each major milestone, including: public hearing, DPP, DP issuance, BP application and demolition application.
$>$ All tenants will be provided with a formal four months 'notice, as per the Residential Tenancy Act any time after development permit issuance or building permit issuance. A draft copy of the End of Tendency Notice and Relocation Assistance Information Package will be submitted for staff's review prior to Provisional Demo Permit issuance.

## PLN - 75

## TENANT RELOCATION PLAN

## a) FINANCIAL COMPENSATION

The owner will provide three-month free rent or equivalent financial compensation for the tenants with tenancy of 1+ years.

## b) RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

The owner will appoint a Tenant Relocation Coordinator and provide tenants with contact information to facilitate communication with tenants, answer questions about the moving process, and assist in finding a new accommodation. Two companies, RE/MAX and Rancho have been selected to handle the tenant relocation process. Formal proposals will be obtained prior to DP Issuance when a detailed scope of work can be further defined and agreed upon with the selected companies.

The Tenant Relocation Assistance will arrange to each eligible tenant household:
> A list of three comparably priced rental units available in Richmond area or in another location at the tenant's discretion, when possible, options will be tailored to the tenants' needs and requirements including pet-friendly, accessible, smoke-free, and other specific preferences. Every reasonable effort will be made to provide every tenants seeking relocation assistance with three unique and comparable listings based on available rental inventory.
> Tenants will be regularly notified as the availability rental inventory fluctuates. When no comparably priced rental units are available, then available units' closest to the comparable price will be provided, unless otherwise specified by the tenant.
> Options will be comparable to the average rents in Richmond, as published on the monthly Rental Market Report by Liv.rent or other qualified research institute.
$>$ Help secure the unit, providing references and setting up viewing times when desired.
$>$ In special circumstances or in cases involving vulnerable tenants, (e.g., seniors, person with disabilities, tenant with low income, etc.) will be provided additional support to tenants to source out suitable rental accommodation. These may include access to BC Housing rent supplement assistance (e.g., Shelter Aid Elderly Residents (SAFER) or Rental Assistance Program (RAP) and when appropriate partnering with health organizations and other non-profit services.

## Tenants Privacy

Everbright Properties Inc. and Tenant Relocation Coordinator will grant to store and use tenant information appropriately protecting tenants' privacy.

## c) RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL

According to the Residential Tenancy Act, s.49(6), "if your tenancy must be ended for renovations or repairs and if your rental unit is in a residential property containing 5 or more rental units, you have a right of first refusal. You must give your landlord notice (using form RTB-28) that you are exercising your right of first refusal before you move out. If you exercise this right, at least 45 days before the rental unit is available, your landlord must provide you with the first opportunity to enter into a new tenancy agreement."

Since the nature of redevelopment of this project, any eligible Tenants will be provided with Right of First Refusal to return into the new building market rental units with market rents or non-market rental units with moderate income housing rents. Tenants will be contacted 6 months prior to the expected occupancy of the new building. Tenants will have 45 days to respond with their continued interesting returning to the building, via email or letter. Note: expressing an interest in returning to the building via the Right of First Refusal Form does not require the tenant to return.

## DOCUMENTS REPORTING

The owner will provide to the City of Richmond with an interim tenant relocation report prior to provisional demolition permit issuance and a final tenant relocation report that documents the result of the tenant relocation process prior to demolition permit issuance.
> The Interim Report must include:

- Names of tenants who have ended tenancy, the reason for its end and the outcomes of their search for alternate accommodation (if assistance requested);
- Names of tenants remaining in the building and the status of the applicant's search for relocation options (if assistance requested) or additional assistance as required through their Tenant Relocation Plan;
> The Final Tenant Relocation Report: outcome of the relocation plan, including name of tenants, options provided, a summary of the monetary compensation, and information about returning tenants (Right of First Refusal). See Appendix A attached.


## Summary Table of Tenant Relocation Plan

## (A) Current Site Information

| Site Address: | 8880 Cook Road \& 8751 Citation Drive, Richmond |
| :--- | :--- |
| Legal Description: | SEC 9 BLK 4N RG 6W PL EPP83741 Parcel A, Block 4N, Plan EPP83741, <br> Section 9, Range 6W, New Westminster Land District, \& SEC 10 |
| Owner Name: | 1166225 BC LTD |
| Applicant Name: |  |
| Phone: | $604-6209199$ |
| E-mail: | info@ebproperties.ca |
| Current Zoning: | LUC 025 / Low Rise Apartment and Town Housing (ZLR32) - Brighouse Village <br> (City Centre) |
| X Market The subject site is not an existing rental property but for <br> Current Rental Type: <br> (Select all that apply) <br> $\square$ | Non-market <br> $\square$ Cooperative <br> $\square$ Other (please specify): |

## (B) Current Total Rental Units

| Unit Type | Number of Current Units |  |  | Average <br> Monthly Rent | Average <br> Size $\left(\mathbf{m}^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Occupied | Ground- <br> Oriented |  |  |
| Studio | 2 | 2 |  | $\$ 950.00$ | 28 |
| 1 BR | 36 | 35 |  | $\$ 1184.62$ | 59 |
| 2 BR | 44 | 41 |  | $\$ 1578.10$ | 81 |
| 3 BR | 22 | 16 |  | $\$ 1818.18$ | 91 |
| $3+$ BR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 4}$ |  | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |

## (C) New Rental Units

| Unit Type | New Rental Units |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Units | Ground-Oriented* | Initial Average Monthly Rent | Average Size (m²) |
| Studio | 92 | No | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 40 |
| 1 BR | 112 | No | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 53 |
| 2 BR | 79 | No | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 75 |
| 3 BR | 17 | No | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 98 |
| TH | 38 | Yes | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 98 |
| Total | 338 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |

*Ground-oriented unit means a unit that is directly accessible from the road.

## (D) Tenant Relocation Plan

| Tenant Relocation Plan Components | Tenant Relocation Plan | Comply with the policy? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Notification: <br> - A minimum 4 months' notice to end tenancy, and otherwise as set out in the provincial Residential Tenancy Act | - Early communication with tenants, a letter will be sent to all tenants outlining the proposed project and expected timeline. These notifications will be provided directly to tenants and where possible, posted in conspicuous places within the building(s). <br> - All tenants will be provided four months' notice, as per the Residential Tenancy Act. | $\begin{array}{ll}\square & \text { Yes } \\ \square & \text { No }\end{array}$ |
| Right of First Refusal: <br> - Offer to return to the building, with rent rates set at low-end market rental (LEMR) rates (without having to meet income thresholds) | - Existing tenants shall be provided Right of First Refusal to move back into the new building market rental units with market rents or non-market rental units with moderate income housing rents. | $\square$ Yes <br> $\square$ No |
| Relocation Assistance: <br> (Only required for tenants with tenancy of $1+$ years) <br> - Accommodation must meet the tenant's needs <br> - Accommodation should be located in Richmond or in another location at the tenant's discretion <br> - Rents at the new location should not exceed CMHC average area rents for Richmond | All eligible tenants will be offered the option of assistance with identifying alternate accommodations: <br> - providing letter of references to the tenants. <br> - three options will be offered that are comparable with the average market rent and unit type, unless otherwise agreed to; <br> - where possible, options will be tailored to the tenant's needs (e.g. pet-friendly, accessible, smoke-free, etc.); | $\begin{array}{ll}\square & \text { Yes } \\ \square & \mathrm{No}\end{array}$ |
| Compensation: <br> (Only required for tenants with tenancy of $1+$ years) <br> - 3 months' free rent or lump sum equivalent | Three months' free rent or lump sum equivalent at the discretion of the tenant. | $\square$ Yes <br> $\square$ No |
| Communication with Tenants: | - Ongoing communication regarding the progress of the development and tenant relocation process. <br> - Provision of a primary point of contact for tenants <br> - Prioritize assistance for those who need it most | $\square$ Yes <br> $\square$ No |

Appendix A
Tenant Relocation Report - Appendix B
8880 Cook \& 8751 Citation Drive, Richmond


## OCP Consultation Policy

Staff have reviewed the proposed OCP amendments, with respect to the Local Government Act and the City's OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy No. 5043 requirements and recommend that this report does not require referral to external stakeholders. The table below clarifies this recommendation as it relates to the proposed OCP amendment.

| Stakeholder | Referral Comment (No Referral necessary) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) | No referral necessary because the Land Reserve is not affected. |
| Richmond School Board | A courtesy referral has been forwarded to Richmond School Board. <br> None of the proposed OCP amendments affect the density allowed <br> on this site since bonus density for rental housing is supported by <br> the current OCP. The School District reviewed the proposal and <br> concluded that it has no objections to the proposed land use <br> changes. A formal referral to Richmond School Board is not required <br> by the consultation policy. |
| The Board of Metro Vancouver | No referral necessary because the Regional District is not affected. |
| The Councils of adjacent Municipalities | No referral necessary because adjacent municipalities are not <br> affected. |
| First Nations (e.g., Sto:lo, Tsawwassen, <br> Musqueam) | No referral necessary because First Nations are not affected. |
| TransLink | No referral necessary because the proposed amendments will not <br> result in significant road network changes. |
| Port Authorities (Vancouver Port <br> Authority and Steveston Harbour <br> Authority) | No referral necessary because the Port is not affected. <br> Vancouver International Airport Authority <br> (VIAA) (Federal Government Agency) <br> Richmond Coastal Health AuthorityNo referral necessary because the proposed amendments do not <br> affect Transport Canada's maximum permitted building height or the <br> OCP Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development (ANSD) Policy. |
| Stakeholder | No referral necessary because the Health Authority is not affected. |
| Community Groups and Neighbours referral Comment (No Referral necessary) <br> Government Agencies | Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the <br> Local Government Act |
| No referral necessary because Federal and Provincial Government <br> Agencies are not affected. |  |



PLN - 82


| DRAMNG KEY |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| survey by BCLSLand Surveyor) <br> Extent of drip line of existing tree recommended for removal (location from survey by BCLSLand Surveyor) | 1918 Tree Number comesponds to table on BC LSSurvey and Tree Tags in Field <br> D Dead Tree <br> Existing site condition per BCLS Site Survey <br> Proposed site condition percurrent architectural site plan |  |



| $\dot{\circ}$ <br>  <br>  <br>  | Species |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underline{U} \\ & \text { 士 } \\ & \text { 茴 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Field Observations | \％ | \％ | ： | $\begin{array}{lll}  & 9 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | 䂝 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ONSIE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1851 | Prunusvar． （chemy） |  | 65 | 8 | 8 | Co－dominant leaders． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | c） |
| 1852 | C hamaecyparis （false cypress） |  | 64 | 11 | 18 | Reduced vigor． 60 \％LC R． |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 1853 | Prunusvar． <br> （chemy） |  | 47 | 7 | 8 | Multiple Ganoderma conks at lower trunk．Watersprouts．Dieback from top． |  | $\checkmark$ |  | － |  | c） |
| 1854 | unidentified deciduous <br> （unidentified） | 6 | 34 | 6 | 8 | Otherstems 10，10， 9.1 stem dead．Poor structure．Suppressed by adjacent trees． Next to powerpole． |  | － |  | － |  | c） |
| 1855 | llex var． <br> （holly） | 2 | 27 | 6 | 8 | Suppressed by adjacent trees． Asymmetrical crown． 2 Co－dominant leaders． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | a） |
| 1856 | Thuja occidentalis （white cedar） | 2 | 37 | 4 | 11 J | J oint crown Asymmetrical crown． Phototropic lean 100 \％LC R． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | c） |
| 1857 | Thuja plicata （westem red cedar） |  | 94 | 13 | 26 | 2 Co－dominant leaders．Reduced vigor．J oint crown． 95 \％LC R． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1858 | Pseudotsuga menziesii <br> （Douglasfir） |  | 31 | 9 | 26 ＇ | J oint crown $90 \%$ LC R．Dieback （minimal）lowercrown． 3 m from retaining wall． |  |  |  | $\bullet \bullet$ |  |  |
| 1859 | Acerpalmatum （J apanese maple） | 3 | 28 | 6 | 6 | Suppressed by adjacent trees． Asymmetrical crown．Surface root（s）． |  |  |  | $\bullet \bullet$ |  |  |
| 1860 | Prunusvar． （chery orplum） |  | 28 | 7 | 7 | Surface root（s）．Along retaining wall． Heavily pruned．Poorstructure． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1861 | Prunusvar． （chery orplum） |  | 22 | 6 | 6 | Surface root（s）．Heavily pruned．Poor structure．Asymmetrical crown． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1862 | Pinuscontorta <br> （lodgepole pine） |  | 40 | 8 | 3 | C orected lean． 2 m from building． Dieback（minimal）．Asymmetrical crown． $85 \%$ LC R． |  |  |  | $\bullet \leqslant$ |  |  |
| 1863 | Cedrusatlantica <br> （atlascedar） |  | 63 | 7 | 3 | Asymmetrical crown．Limbed up on bulding side．Woundwood development is moderate．Poor structure．Reduced vigor．80\％LC R． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1864 | Cedrus atlantica <br> （atlascedar） |  | 33 | 7 | 3 | Asymmetrical crown．Limbed up on bulding side．Woundwood development is moderate．Poor structure．Reduced vigor．65\％LC R． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1865 | Cedrus atlantica <br> （atlascedar） |  | 45 | 8 | 3 | Asymmetrical crown．Limbed up on bulding side．Woundwood development is moderate．Poor structure．Reduced vigor．65\％LC R． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1866 | Prunusvar． （chemy） |  | 21 | 7 | 10 | Heavily pruned．Poorstructure．C lose to building．Surface root（s）． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1867 | Prunusvar． （chery） |  | 30 | 9 | 10 | Heavily pruned．Poorstructure． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1868 | Prunusvar． （chemy） |  | 21 | 6 | 10 | Heavily pruned．Poorstructure． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1869 | Acervar． （maple） | 2 | 40 | 7 | 11 | Ram＇shom from base to 2 m above ground．Asymmetrical crown． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1870 | Acervar． （maple） | 3 | 52 | 9 | 10 | Asymmetrical crown． $10 \mathrm{~cm} \varnothing$ stem dead middle crown． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1871 | Acervar． <br> （maple） |  | 38 | 10 | 10 | Asymmetrical crown．Histroically dropped structural limbs．Potential decay column mid crown．C lose to building． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |


|  | Species |  | $\begin{aligned} & E \\ & U \\ & \frac{1}{\omega} \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Field Observations | す | $\frac{1}{8}$ | $\stackrel{: 1}{\mathbb{K}}$ | $\begin{array}{lll}  & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{x} \end{array}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1872 | Cedrusatlantica (atlascedar) |  | 41 | 9 | 3 | Limbed up to 65\%LC R. Dieback lower crown. Pruning wound(s). Woundwood development isgood. |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1873 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 36 | 9 | 15 | J oint crown. Surface root(s). Heaving pavement. 80 \%LC R. Deadwood in lowercrown. |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1874 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 40 | 10 | 15 | J oint crown. Surface root(s). Heaving pavement. 80 \%LC R. Deadwood in lowercrown. |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1875 | Pinuscontorta <br> (lodgepole pine) |  | 35 | 10 | 15 | J oint crown. Surface root(s). Heaving pavement. 80 \%LC R. Deadwood in lowercrown. |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1876 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 40 | 11 | 15 | J oint crown. Surface root(s). Heaving pavement. 80 \%LC R. Deadwood in lowercrown. |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1877 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 30 | 8 | 15 | J oint crown. Surface root(s). Heaving pavement. 80 \%LC R. Deadwood in lowercrown. |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1878 | Prunus var. (chemy) |  | 28 | 9 | 10 | Surface root(s). Poorstructure. Watersprouts from roots. |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1879 | Prunus var. (chery) |  | 25 | 7 | 10 | Surface root(s). Poorstructure. Watersprouts from roots. |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1880 | Prunus var. (chemy) |  | 23 | 8 | 9 | Surface root(s). Poorstructure. Watersproutsfrom roots. |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1881 | Acervar. (maple) | 2 | 39 | 7 | 10 | Phototropic lean. Asymmetrical crown. Included bark. |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1882 | Acervar. <br> (maple) | 4 | 38 | 7 | 10 | Included bark. Otherstems $10 \mathrm{~cm} \varnothing$. $12 \mathrm{~cm} \varnothing$ Pruning wound(s) 1 m above ground. Woundwood development is poor. Girdling root(s). |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1883 | Cedrusdeodara <br> (deodarcedar) |  | 51 | 8 | 22 | C orrected lean. C lose to building. Asymmetrical crown. Limbed up on building side. Poorstructure. J oint crown. $60 \% \mathrm{LC}$ R. |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1884 | Cedrusdeodara (deodarcedar) |  | 47 | 9 | 22 | C orected lean. C lose to building. Asymmetrical crown. Limbed up on building side. Poorstructure. J oint crown. $90 \%$ LC R. |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1885 | Cedrusdeodara <br> (deodarcedar) |  | 52 | 10 | 22 | C orected lean. C lose to building. Asymmetrical crown. Limbed up on building side. Poorstructure. J oint crown. 85 \%LC R. |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1886 | Acervar. <br> (maple) |  | 35 | 11 | 9 | Girdling root(s). Asymmetrical trunk. Included bark. Asymmetrical crown. Pruning wound(s). Woundwood development is poor. Surface root(s). |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1887 | Acerplatanoides (Norway maple) |  | 28 | 9 | 12 | C orrected lean. Sub-dominant. Deadwood lowercrown. |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | - b) |
| 1888 | Quercus rubra <br> Northem red oak |  | 61 | 19 | 26 | Surface root(s). Asymmetrical trunk, flat on north side. C orected lean. J oint crown. Asymmetrical crown. Dieback lowercrown. |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | - b) |
| 1889 | Quercus rubra <br> Northem red oak |  | 57 | 15 | 29 | Surface root(s). C orrected lean. J oint crown. Asymmetrical crown. Dieback lowercrown. |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  | - b) |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ò } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\otimes} \end{aligned}$ | Species |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { 士 } \\ & \text { 亩 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \varepsilon \\ \vdots \\ \dot{\vdots} \\ \hline \mathbf{g} \\ \mathbf{9} \end{gathered}$ | Field Observations | \％ | \％ | 衣 | 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 |  | 近 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1890 | Quercusrubra <br> Northem red oak |  | 58 | 18 | 27 | Surface root（s）．C orected lean．J oint crown．Asymmetrical crown．Dieback lowercrown． |  |  |  | － |  | －b） |
| 1891 | Quercusrubra <br> Northem red oak |  | 60 | 18 | 26 | Surface root（s）．J og mid trunk．Reaction wood good．Asymmetrical crown． Dieback middle crown．Hanger． |  |  |  | － |  | －b） |
| 1892 | Quercusrubra Northem red oak |  | 66 | 22 | 37 | J oint crown．Dieback lowercrown． |  |  |  | － |  | －b） |
| 1893 | Quercusrubra Northem red oak |  | 55 | 16 | 41 | J oint crown．Asymmetrical crown． Dieback lowercrown．Hanger． |  |  |  | － |  | －b） |
| 1894 | Quercusrubra Northem red oak |  | 48 | 12 | 43 | Joint crown．Asymmetrical crown． Dieback lowercrown．Hanger． |  |  |  | － |  | －b） |
| 1895 | Quercusrubra Northem red oak |  | 58 | 18 | 42 | J oint crown．Asymmetrical crown． Dieback lowercrown．Hanger． |  |  |  | － |  | －b） |
| 1896 | Quercusrubra Northem red oak |  | 65 | 18 | 44 | Joint crown．Asymmetrical crown． Dieback lowercrown．Hanger． |  |  |  | － |  | －b） |
| 1901 | Thuja plicata （westem red cedar） |  | 21 | 4 | 12 | Joint crown．Asymmetrical crown． Deadwood innercrown． $100 \%$ LC R． |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| 1902 | Thuja plicata （westem red cedar） |  | 26 | 5 | 12 | Joint crown．Asymmetrical crown． Deadwood innercrown． $100 \%$ LC R． |  |  |  | － |  |  |
| 1903 | Thuja plicata （westem red cedar） |  | 26 | 6 | 12 | Joint crown．Asymmetrical crown． Deadwood innercrown． $100 \%$ LC R． |  |  |  | － |  |  |
| 1904 | Pinuscontorta <br> （lodgepole pine） |  | 23 | 5 | 6 | Main leader previously removed． Woundwood development is poor． Suppressed by adjacent trees． 80 \％LC R at 1 m above ground． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | c） |
| 1905 | Pinuscontorta （lodgepole pine） |  | 72 | 14 | 15 | Subdominant leaderleaning on street light． $70 \%$ LC R． |  |  |  | － |  | c） |
| 1906 | Pinuscontorta （lodgepole pine） |  | 29 | 7 | 15 | J oint crown Asymmetrical crown． Deadwood lowercrown． $80 \%$ LC R． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | c） |
| 1907 | Pinuscontorta （lodgepole pine） |  | 26 | 7 | 15 | J oint crown Asymmetrical crown． Deadwood lowercrown． $85 \%$ LC R． Phototropic lean． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | c） |
| 1908 | Pinuscontorta （lodgepole pine） |  | 34 | 9 | 15 | J oint crown Asymmetrical crown． Deadwood lowercrown． $80 \%$ LC R． Phototropic lean． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1909 | Pinuscontorta （lodgepole pine） | 2 | 56 | 10 | 15 | J oint crown Asymmetrical crown． Deadwood lowercrown． $90 \%$ LC R． Phototropic lean． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1910 | Pinuscontorta （lodgepole pine） |  | 30 | 7 | 15 | J oint crown Asymmetrical crown． Deadwood lowercrown． 85 \％LC R． Phototropic lean． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | c） |
| 1911 | Pinuscontorta （lodgepole pine） |  | 21 | 6 | 15 | Phototropic lean．Asymmetrical crown． Deadwood lowercrown．Joint crown． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | c） |
| 1912 | Pinuscontorta （lodgepole pine） |  | 40 | 9 | 15 | Phototropic lean．Asymmetrical crown． Deadwood lowercrown．J oint crown． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | － |  |  |
| 1913 | Pinuscontorta （lodgepole pine） |  | 41 | 9 | 15 | Phototropic lean．Asymmetrical crown． Deadwood lowercrown．Joint crown． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | － |  |  |
| 1914 | Pinuscontorta （lodgepole pine） |  | 30 | 7 | 15 | Phototropic lean．Asymmetric al crown． Deadwood lowercrown．Joint crown． |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ò } \\ & \text { Q } \\ & \text { din } \end{aligned}$ | Species |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { t } \\ & \text { ( } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Field Observations | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ס } \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | ঃ |  | \% | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{9}{6} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{\tilde{x}} \end{aligned}$ | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1915 | Pinus contorta <br> (lodgepole pine) |  | 50 | 8 | 15 | Deadwood lowercrown. Reduced vigor. J oint crown. Hanger. Heavily pruned. |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | b) |
| 1916 | Pinus contorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 29 | 8 | 15 | Deadwood lowercrown. Reduced vigor. J oint crown. Hanger. Heavily pruned. |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | b) |
| 1917 | Pinus contorta <br> (lodgepole pine) | 2 | 67 | 10 | 15 | Deadwood lowercrown. Reduced vigor. J oint crown. Hanger. Heavily pruned. Lhistoric ally large structrual limb dropped. |  |  | $\bullet$ | - |  | b) |
| 1918 | Corylus var. <br> (hazel and filbert) | 3 | 48 | 10 | 7 | Deadwood substantial. Dead codominant leaders. Decay column. Reduced vigor. |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | c) |
| 1919 | Corylusvar. <br> (hazel and filbert) | 5 | 52 | 9 | 7 | Otherstems $10 \mathrm{~cm} \varnothing$. One co-dominant leaderis dead. Decay column. Reduced vigor. |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1920 | Piensjaponica (J apanese pieris) | 2 | 24 | 9 | 5 | Deadwood innercrown. Reduced vigor. |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - |  |  |
| 1921 | Acervar. (maple) | 3 | 36 | 6 | 7 | Previously heavily pruned. Poor structure. |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - |  |  |
| 1922 | Pinus contorta (lodgepole pine) | 2 | 57 | 8 | 16 | J oint crown. Deadwood minimal lower crown. Asymmetrical crown. |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| 1923 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) | 2 | 82 | 13 | 18 | Included bark. Joint crown. Deadwood innercrown. Ivy on lowertrunk. |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
| 1924 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 35 | 6 | 14 | Sweep. Asymmetric al crown. J oint crown. Deadwood innnercrown. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| 1925 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) | 2 | 75 | 10 | 16 | Included bark. J oint crown. Deadwood in crown. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1926 | Pinus contorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 48 | 10 | 13 | Phototropic lean J oint crown. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1927 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 35 | 8 | 9 | Heavy phototropic lean. J oint crown. |  |  | - | - |  | c) |
| 1928 | Cedrusdeodara (deodarcedar) |  | 70 | 20 | 21 | C orrected lean. Asymmetrical crown. J oint crown. 2 subdominant leaders. Surface root(s). |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| 1929 | Cedrusdeodara (deodarcedar) |  | 50 | 12 | 21 | Asymmetrical crown. J oint crown. Deadwood in crown. Surface root(s). |  |  |  |  |  | c) |
| 1930 | Cedrusdeodara (deodarcedar) |  | 60 | 17 | 21 | J oint crown. Surface root(s). Deadwood in crown. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1931 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) |  | 34 | 8 | 7 | Part of hedge. | * |  |  | * |  |  |
| 1932 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) |  | 37 | 8 | 7 | Part of hedge. | * |  |  | $\star$ |  |  |
| 1933 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) |  | 21 | 4 | 7 | Part of hedge. Asymmetrical crown. | * |  |  | $\div$ |  |  |
| 1934 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) |  | 32 | 5 | 7 | Part of hedge. Asymmetrical crown. 80\%dead. |  | - |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 1935 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) |  | 30 | 4 | 8 | Part of hedge. Asymmetrical crown. 90\%dead. |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| 1936 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) | 2 | 27 | 5 | 8 | Part of hedge. Asymmetrical crown. 60\%dead. Reduced vigor. |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| 1937 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) |  | 25 | 5 | 8 | Part of hedge. Asymmetrical crown. Reduced vigor. $100 \%$ LC R. |  | - |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |


|  | Species |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underline{U} \\ & \frac{1}{\omega} \\ & \text { } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Field Obsenvations | \% | \% | $\frac{: 2}{\mathbb{\pi}}$ | \% |  |  | 을 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1938 | Thuja plicata <br> (westem red cedar) | 2 | 34 | 5 | 8 | Part of hedge. Asymmetrical crown. Reduced vigor. $100 \%$ LC R. |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1939 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) |  | 14 | 5 | 9 | Part of hedge. Asymmetrical crown. $100 \%$ LC R. |  |  | * |  |  |  |  |
| 1940 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) |  | 22 | 5 | 9 | Part of hedge. Asymmetrical crown. $100 \%$ LC R. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1941 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) | 2 | 36 | 5 | 9 | Part of hedge. Asymmetrical crown. $100 \%$ LC R. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1942 | Thuja plicata <br> (westem red cedar) |  | 35 | 6 | 9 | Part of hedge. Asymmetrical crown. $100 \%$ LC R. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1943 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) |  | 20 | 4 | 9 | Part of hedge. Asymmetrical crown. $100 \%$ LC R. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1944 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) |  | 36 | 5 | 9 | Part of hedge. Asymmetrical crown. 100\%LC R. |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1945 | Pinuscontorta <br> (lodgepole pine) |  | 30 | 7 | 15 | Girdling root(s). Asymmetrical crown. J oint crown. Previously heavyly pruned. Deadwood lowercrown. Surface root(s). $80 \%$ LCR. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1946 | Pinuscontorta <br> (lodgepole pine) |  | 29 | 7 | 13 | Asymmetrical crown. J oint crown. C orected lean. Deadwood lower crown. Surface root(s). $80 \%$ LC R. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1947 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 30 | 8 | 14 | J oint crown deadwood lowercrown. Surface root(s). $80 \%$ LC R. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1948 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 34 | 7 | 14 | J oint crown. Deadwood. Reduced vigor. Surface root(s). 75 \% LC R. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1949 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 31 | 7 | 13 | J oint crown. Deadwood. Reduced vigor. Surface root(s). 60 \%LC R. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 46 | 10 | 15 | Included bark. J oint crown. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | c) |
| 1951 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) |  | 29 | 6 | 12 | Reduced vigor. C orected lean. Base nearbuilding. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1952 | Thuja plicata (westem red cedar) | 2 | 23 | 4 | 5 | Heavily pruned. Decay column. Suppressed by adjacent trees. Poor structure. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1953 | Acervar. (maple) | 3 | 29 | 4 | 5 | Heavily pruned. Suppressed by adjacent trees. Poorstructure. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1954 | Acervar. (maple) | 2 | 43 | 8 | 12 | Reduced vigor. 2 C o-dominant leaders. Base nearbuilding. Included bark. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 54 | 13 | 9 | Dieback (minimal). Phototropic lean. Ivy on lowertrunk. 70 \%LC R. J oint crown. | - |  |  |  |  |  | c) |
| 1956 | Pinuscontorta <br> (lodgepole pine) |  | 45 | 9 | 20 | Dieback (minimal). Phototropic lean. Ivy on lowertrunk. $70 \%$ LC R. J oint crown. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 1957 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 86 | 12 | 10 | 2 Co-dominant leaders at 2 m above ground. Ivy on lowertrunk. 85 \%LC R. J oint crown. |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 1958 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) |  | 49 | 12 | 23 | 3Co-dominant leaders at 2 m above ground. Ivy on lowertrunk. 85 \%LC R. J oint crown. Asymmetrical crown. |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ | c) |
| 1959 | Pinuscontorta (lodgepole pine) | 2 | 82 | 12 | 20 | Deadwood minimal. Ivy on lowertrunk. 85 \%LC R. J oint crown. |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ | c) |




## ATTACHMENT 9

April 28, 2022

To: City of Richmond

Re: $\quad 8880$ Cook Rd and 8761 Citation Drive - Energy Step Code Performance

This letter is to confirm that GBL are aware of the City of Richmond's Energy Step Code requirements for Part 3 buildings.

The above mentioned rental residential building will be designed and constructed to the energy efficiency targets set out in the BC Energy Step Code that will be in place at the time
 of the Building Permit application.

Best regards,


Amela Brudar
ARCHITECT AIBC, MRAIC, LEED AP
Principal

## Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10396, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. (OCP Amendment) Final Adoption of OCP Amendment Bylaw 10395.
2. (Subdivision) Registration of a subdivision plan for the subject site that satisfies the following conditions:

- Approximately 5.07 m road dedication along the entire Cook Road frontage;
- Approximately 6.34 m road dedication along the entire Garden City Road frontage;
- Approximately 5.93 m road dedication along the entire Citation Drive frontage;
- Approximately 5.86 m road dedication along the entire Pimlico Way frontage;
- Minimum $4 \mathrm{~m} \times 4 \mathrm{~m}$ corner cuts on all intersections where public roads intersect;
- Road dedications to accommodate the interim and ultimate road design described under the Servicing Agreement section below; and
- Exact widths are to be confirmed with survey information and functional road plan to be submitted by the applicant as part of the Development Permit.

3. (City Centre Impacts) Registration of a legal agreement on title stipulating that the development is subject to potential impacts due to other development that may be approved within the City Centre including without limitation, loss of views in any direction, increased shading, increased overlook and reduced privacy, increased ambient noise and increased levels of night-time ambient light.
4. (Tenant Relocation Plan) Registration of a legal agreement(s) regarding the developer's commitment to implement the proposed Tenant Relocation Plan. Language should be included in the legal document to confirm adherence to the Tenant Relocation Plan prior to any demolition construction activity on site.
5. (Aircraft Noise) Registration of an aircraft noise sensitive use covenant on title.
6. (Flood Construction Level) Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
7. (Market Rental Units) Entering into the City's standard Market Rental Agreement and registration of a Covenant to secure the provision of market rental housing, to the satisfaction of the City. The terms shall indicate that they apply in perpetuity and provide for, but will not be limited to, the following requirements:
a) All market rental housing units shall be maintained under single ownership (within one air space parcel or one strata lot or legal agreement to the satisfaction of the Director of Development; subdivisions into individual strata lots are prohibited).
b) The imposition of any age-based restrictions on occupants of any market rental housing unit is prohibited.
c) Occupants of the market rental units shall enjoy full and unlimited access to and use of all on-site indoor amenity spaces provided for residents of the building and outdoor amenity spaces provided on the lot as per OCP, City Centre Area Plan, and Development Permit* requirements, at no additional charge (i.e. no monthly rents or other fees shall apply for the casual, shared, or exclusive use of any amenities).
d) The terms of the market rental agreement shall indicate that they apply in perpetuity, that no more than prevailing market rent will be charged, and provide for the following Unit Mix and Basic Universal Housing (BUH) standard compliance or as otherwise determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development through an approved Development Permit*.
$\qquad$

| Unit Type | Number of Units* | BUH Units as a \% of the total number of units |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Studio | 50 | $18 \%(50$ units $)$ |
| 1 Bedroom | 102 | $38 \%(102$ units $)$ |
| 2 Bedroom | 72 | $26 \%(72$ units $)$ |
| 3 Bedroom | 15 | $6 \%(15$ units) |
| Townhouse (2 bed) | 29 |  |
| Townhouse (3 bed) | 4 |  |
| Total: | 272 | $88 \%(239$ units) |

* The number of units and unit mix will be confirmed to the satisfaction of the City through the DP* process. The proposed unit mix is indicated in the table; however, based on approved design, the unit mix may be varied provided that at least $40 \%$ of market rental units have 2 or more bedrooms so they are suitable for families with children (e.g. "family-friendly" units), in keeping with the City's Market Rental Housing Policy.

8. (Moderate Income Rental Units) The City's acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute towards moderate income rental housing, in the form of moderate income rental units, constructed to a turnkey level of finish, at the sole cost of the developer, the terms of which voluntary contribution shall include, but will not be limited to, the registration of a Moderate Income Housing Agreement and Covenant on Title to secure the affordable housing units. The form of the Moderate Income Housing Agreement and Covenant shall be agreed to by the developer and the City prior to final adoption of the subject rezoning; after which time, only the Housing Covenants may be amended or replaced and any such changes will only be permitted for the purpose of accurately reflecting the specifics of the Development Permit* and other non-material changes resulting thereof and made necessary by the Development Permit* approval requirements, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development. The terms of the Moderate Income Housing Agreement and Covenant shall indicate that they apply in perpetuity and provide for, but will not be limited to, the following requirements.
a) The required minimum floor area of the moderate income rental units shall be equal to a combined habitable floor area of at least $3,417.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(36,786 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$, excluding standard Floor Area Ratio (FAR) exemptions, for the provision of approximately 66 moderate income rental units.
b) All moderate income rental units shall be maintained under single ownership (within one air space parcel or one strata lot or legal agreement to the satisfaction of the Director of Development; subdivisions into individual strata lots are prohibited).
c) The developer shall, as generally indicated in the table below:
i) enforce the maximum rental rates and income thresholds secured through the Moderate Income Housing Agreement registered on title and will verify all tenant household incomes using personal income tax documents.
ii) confirm ongoing compliance with income and rental rate requirements through the Statutory Declaration process.
iii) achieve the Project Targets for unit mix, minimum unit size, and Basic Universal Housing (BUH) standard compliance or as otherwise determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development through an approved Development Permit*.

| Unit Type | Minimum Unit Size (ft ${ }^{2}$ ) | Number of Units (1) | Maximum <br> Monthly Unit Rental ${ }^{(2)}$ | Total Max. Household Income ${ }^{(3)}$ | BUH Units as a \% of the total number of units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Studio | 400 | 42 | \$1,438 | \$57,500 | 63\% (42 units) |
| 1 Bedroom | 535 | 10 | \$1,438 | \$57,500 | 15\% (10 units) |
| 2 Bedroom | 741 | 7 | \$1,725 | \$69,000 | 11\% (7 units) |
| 3 Bedroom | 980 | 2 | \$2,000 | \$80,000 | 3\% (2 units) |
| Townhouse (2 bed) | 741 | 4 | \$1,725 | \$69,000 |  |
| Townhouse (3 bed) | 980 | 1 | \$2,000 | \$80,000 |  |
| Total: |  | 66 |  |  | 92\% (61 units) |

$\qquad$

1. The number of units and unit mix will be confirmed to the satisfaction of the City through the $\mathrm{DP}^{*}$ process. The proposed unit mix is indicated in the table; however, based on approved design, the unit mix may be varied provided that at least $15 \%$ of the moderate income rental units have 2 bedrooms and $5 \%$ of the moderate income rental units have 3 bedrooms, in keeping with the objectives of the City's Affordable Housing Strategy.
2. Based on BC Housing's Housing Income Limits (HILs). The maximum monthly rents may be adjusted in accordance with the Moderate Income Housing Agreement.
3. Based on BC Housing's Housing Income Limits (HILs). The maximum household income may be adjusted in accordance with the Moderate Income Housing Agreement.
d) Finishing in all moderate income rental units should be of similar quality/appearance to market rental units.
e) The developer shall,
i) not impose restrictions on the age of tenants within any moderate income rental unit;
ii) allocate at least 27 residential parking spaces to the moderate income rental units and ensure at least of $50 \%$ of these parking stalls be standard parking spaces or accessible parking space.
iii) allocate at least 1.25 Class-1 bicycle parking spaces for each moderate income rental studio units and at least 2 Class- 1 bicycle parking spaces for each of the other types of moderate income rental units.
iv) not require moderate income rental tenants to pay any of the following fees:

- move in/move out fees;
- any fees for the use of parking spaces and Class-1 bicycle parking spaces allocated to the exclusive use of moderate income rental tenants;
- any fees for the use of common property, common spaces or amenities; or
- any fees for the use of sanitary sewer, storm sewer, water or other utilities;
v) allow moderate income rental tenants and any of their visitors to have full access to all on-site common indoor and outdoor amenity spaces that are available to residents of the market rental units contained within the same building as the moderate income rental units;
vi) not permit a moderate income rental unit to be subleased or for the tenancy agreement to be assigned.
vii) not permit a moderate income rental unit to be used for short-term rental purposes (for example, units rented through Airbnb or VRBO), or any other purposes that do not constitute a permanent residence of an eligible tenant.

9. (Mini-Pocket Parks) Granting of an approximately $380 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(4,095 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ statutory right-of-way for the purposes of publicly accessible open spaces (mini-pocket parks) along the periphery of the development, as generally shown on Schedule 1, to the satisfaction of the Director of Parks Services. Exact configurations and dimensions are to be confirmed as part of the Development Permit* process; additional design guidelines are included in Schedule 2 under Parks Servicing Works requirement. The owners are responsible for the maintenance \& liability within the required statutory right-of-way (SRW). Any works essential for public access within the SRW are to be included in the Servicing Agreement (SA). The design must be prepared in accordance with City specifications \& standards and the construction of the works will be inspected by the City concurrently with all other SA related works. Works to be secured via SA.
10. (Parking Reduction Strategy) Registration of legal agreement on title securing the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute, at the owner's cost, towards various transportation-related improvements and secure parking for various uses in compliance with Zoning Bylaw requirements and transportation demand management (TDM) parking reductions, to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation, including, but not limited to, the following:
a) All residential parking spaces are unassigned and assignment is managed by the property manager.
b) Transit Pass Program: Execution and completion of a transit pass program, including the following method of administration and terms:
i) Provide one year of two-zone monthly transit passes for $100 \%$ of the dwelling units ( 338 units).
ii) Enter into a security agreement and submission of a Letter of Credit in the amount of $\$ 50,000$. The Letter of Credit will be released at the time of $100 \%$ subscription of the transit pass program, i.e. all 338 units have utilized the one year 2-zone pass.
$\qquad$
iii) The owner or property manager is to provide documentation on an annual basis for the subscription of the transit passes until such time that they have been exhausted. The owner is not responsible for the monitoring of use of transit passes but only noting number of "subscribed" users to the program, until full unit count is exhausted over a period of one year;
iv) If the transit pass program is not fully subscribed within one year, the program is to be extended until the equivalence of the costs of the full one year transit pass program has been exhausted. Should not all transit passes be utilized by the end of the second year, the remaining funds equivalent to the value of the unsubscribed transit passes are to be transferred to the City of Richmond for alternate transportation demand management measures at the City's discretion.
v) The availability and method of accessing the two-zone transit passes is to be clearly explained in the tenancy agreements and any rental materials.
c) Car Share Parking: Registration of a restrictive covenant and Statutory Right-of-Way(s) on title, or alternative legal agreement, subject to the final approval of the Director of Transportation, securing the owner's commitment to provide a car share facility and car share equipment to a car share operator or the City, at no cost to the car share operator or the City, both as the case may be, the terms of which shall be generally as follows:
i) a minimum of two (2) car share parking spaces within the development, along with pedestrian and vehicular access, designed, constructed, equipped and maintained by the owner, at the owner's cost, to be:
(1) co-located and located on the ground level of the parkade;
(2) provided with satisfactory pedestrian access;
(3) designed to be safe, convenient and universally-accessible;
(4) provided with design features, decorative finishing, lighting and signage, as determined through the Development Permit* and Servicing Agreement* processes;
(5) each provided with one EV quick-charge ( 240 volt) charging station for it's exclusive use;
(6) accessible to all intended users (e.g. general public, car share operator personnel and car share operator members) at no added cost;
(7) accessible to all intended users as follows:

- general public - 365 days a year for a time period equalling the lengthiest combination of standard business hours and the standard operating hours of local rapid transit; and
- car share operator personnel and members - 365 days a year for a 24 hours per day (e.g. code entry);
(8) identify the car share stalls in the Development Permit plans;
(9) identify the car share stalls in the Building Permit plans; and
(10) prior to building inspection permitting occupancy, provide wayfinding and stall identification signage for the car share stalls, to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation;
ii) terms of agreement between the owner and the car share operator which shall include:
(1) a minimum contractual period for the provision of car share services of three years from the first date of building occupancy; and
(2) additional provisions as negotiated by the owner and car share operator (e.g. maintenance, repair and replacement by car share vehicles by the car share operator), or as required by the City, subject to the approval of the Director of Transportation;
iii) supporting submissions provided to the City (Transportation Department) as follows:
(1) prior to the Public Hearing, a copy of the letter of intent addressed to the owner from the car share operator outlining the terms of the provision of car sharing services;
(2) prior to Development Permit issuance, a copy of the draft contract between the owner and the car share operator describing the terms of the provision of car sharing services;
(3) prior to building inspection permitting occupancy, a copy of the executed contract between the owner and the car share operator describing the terms of the provision of car sharing services;
iv) granting of a Public Right of Passage Statutory Right of Way, in favour of the City, to secure the car share spaces and the vehicular and pedestrian accesses, subject to the final dimensions established by the surveyor on the basis of functional plans completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation; and
$\qquad$
v) in the event that the car-share facilities are not operated for car-share purposes as intended via the subject rezoning application (e.g., operator's contract is terminated or expires), transfer control of the car-share facilities, to the City, at no cost to the City, with the understanding that the City at its sole discretion, without penalty or cost, shall determine how the facilities shall be used going forward.
d) Car share memberships: Registration of a restrictive covenant on title, or alternative legal agreement, subject to the final approval of the Director of Transportation, securing the owner's commitment to provide a car share membership for all 338 units throughout the life of the program, at the owner's cost.
e) Enhanced Bicycle Facilities: The developer/owner shall, at its sole cost, design, install, and maintain on the lot, to the satisfaction of the City as determined via the Development Permit*:
i) Bicycle maintenance and repair facility: one facility for the shared use of all the residents of all the buildings, including bicycle repair stand (with tools); foot pump, and faucet, hose and drain for bicycle washing. A note is required on the Development Permit* and Building Permit*. Appropriate signage is required.
ii) E-bike and e-scooter storage: provision of a shared e-bike and e-scooter parking within the parking structure with outlets/chargers to support charging of e-bikes and e-scooters.
iii) "No development" shall be permitted, restricting Development Permit* issuance for any building on the lot, until the developer provides for the required enhanced bicycle facilities.
iv) No Building Permit* shall be issued for a building on the lot, in whole or in part, until the developer provides for the required enhanced bicycle facilities and a letter of confirmation is submitted by the architect assuring that the facilities satisfy all applicable City's requirements.
v) "No occupancy" shall be permitted, restricting final Building Permit inspection granting occupancy for any building on the lot, in whole or in part, until the required enhanced bicycle facilities are completed and have received final Building Permit inspection granting occupancy.
f) Shared Bike and Micro Mobility Station: Registration of a restrictive covenant and Statutory Right-of-Way(s) on title, or alternative legal agreement, subject to the final approval of the Director of Transportation, securing the owner's commitment to provide a shared e-bike and e-scooter parking corral on the site at no cost to the operator or the City.
g) Delivery vehicle parking: Registration of a legal agreement on Title to ensure additional delivery vehicle parking for e-commerce vans (Amazon, etc.) and food delivery vehicles will be provided on site, and to outline the operation of the parkade gate to provide access to the delivery vehicle parking, and encourage use of visitor parking on site during day time hours (i.e., from 8 am to 7 pm ).

11. (Bicycle Parking) Registration of a legal agreement on title ensuring that:
a) conversion of any of the bicycle parking storage rooms and bicycle maintenance and repair facility into habitable space or general storage area is prohibited; and
b) all of the bicycle parking storage rooms must be available for shared common use and for the sole purpose of bicycle storage.
12. (District Energy Utility) Registration of a restrictive covenant and statutory right of way and/or alternative legal agreement(s), to the satisfaction of the City, securing the owner's commitment to connect to District Energy Utility (DEU) and granting the statutory right of way(s) necessary for supplying the DEU services to the building(s), which covenant and statutory right of way and/or legal agreement(s) will include, at minimum, the following terms and conditions:
a) No building permit will be issued for a building on the subject site unless the building is designed with the capability to connect to and be serviced by a DEU and the owner has provided an energy modelling report satisfactory to the Director of Engineering.
b) If a low carbon energy plant district energy utility (LCDEU) service area bylaw which applies to the site has been adopted by Council prior to the issuance of the development permit for the subject site, no building permit will be issued for a building on the subject site unless:
i. the owner designs, to the satisfaction of the City and the City's DEU service provider, Lulu Island Energy Company Ltd. (LIEC), a low carbon energy plant to be constructed and installed on the site, with the capability to connect to and be serviced by a DEU; and
ii. the owner enters into an asset transfer agreement with the City and/or the City's DEU service provider on terms and conditions satisfactory to the City to transfer ownership of the low carbon energy plant to the

City or as directed by the City, including to the City's DEU service provider, at no cost to the City or City's DEU service provider, LIEC, on a date prior to final building inspection permitting occupancy of the first building on the site. Such restrictive covenant and/or asset transfer agreement shall include a warranty from the owner with respect to the on-site DEU works (including the low carbon energy plant) and the provision by the owner of both warranty and deficiency security, all on terms and conditions satisfactory to the City;
c) The owner agrees that the building(s) will connect to a DEU when a DEU is in operation, unless otherwise directed by the City and the City's DEU service provider, LIEC.
d) If a DEU is available for connection and the City has directed the owner to connect, no final building inspection permitting occupancy of a building will be granted unless, and until:
i. the building is connected to the DEU;
ii. the owner enters into a Service Provider Agreement for that building with the City and/or the City's DEU service provider, LIEC, executed prior to depositing any Strata Plan with LTO and on terms and conditions satisfactory to the City; and
iii. prior to subdivision (including Air Space parcel subdivision and Strata Plan filing), the owner grants or acquires, and registers, all Statutory Right-of-Way(s) and/or easements necessary for supplying the DEU services to the building.
e) If a DEU is not available for connection, but a LCDEU service area bylaw which applies to the site has been adopted by Council prior to the issuance of the development permit for the subject site, no final building inspection permitting occupancy of a building will be granted unless and until:
i. the City receives a professional engineer's certificate stating that the building has the capability to connect to and be serviced by a DEU;
ii. the building is connected to a low carbon energy plant supplied and installed by the owner, at the owner's sole cost, to provide heating, cooling and domestic hot water heating to the building(s), which energy plant will be designed, constructed and installed on the subject site to the satisfaction of the City and the City's service provider, LIEC;
iii. the owner transfers ownership of the low carbon energy plant on the subject site, to the City or as directed by the City, including to the City's DEU service provider, LIEC, at no cost to the City or City's DEU service provider, on terms and conditions satisfactory to the City;
iv. prior to depositing a Strata Plan, the owner enters into a Service Provider Agreement for the building with the City and/or the City's DEU service provider, LIEC, on terms and conditions satisfactory to the City; and
v. prior to subdivision (including Air Space parcel subdivision and Strata Plan filing), the owner grants or acquires, and registers, all additional Covenants, Statutory Right-of-Way(s) and/or easements necessary for supplying the services to the building and the operation of the low carbon energy plant by the City and/or the City's DEU service provider, LIEC.
f) If a DEU is not available for connection, and a LCDEU service area bylaw which applies to the site has not been adopted by Council prior to the issuance of the development permit for the subject site, no final building inspection permitting occupancy of a building will be granted until:
i. the City receives a professional engineer's certificate stating that the building has the capability to connect to and be serviced by a DEU; and
ii. the owner grants or acquires any additional Statutory Right-of-Way(s) and/or easements necessary for supplying DEU services to the building, registered prior to subdivision (including Air Space parcel subdivision and strata plan filing).
13. (Tree Compensation) City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily plant two large specimen trees on site and contribute $\$ 20,000$ to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the removal of a 94 cm caliper Western Red Cedar tree (tag\# 1857) and a 31 cm caliper Douglas Fir tree (tag\# 1858) located along Cook Road. Planting location, size and species of the proposed specimen trees are to be determined through the Development Permit* process.
14. (On-Site Replacement Trees) Submission of an on-site landscape plan for the subject project site that includes at least 263 replacement trees for the removal of 131 bylaw sized tree on-site. Replacement trees shall be provided and planted as per Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057. The developer will be required to provide $\$ 750$ to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for each and any number of trees short of the required 263 replacement trees included within the Development Permit* landscape plans.
15. (Arborist Contract) Submission of a Contract entered into between the applicant and a Certified Arborist for supervision of any on-site works conducted within the tree protection zone of the trees to be retained. The Contract should include the scope of work to be undertaken, including: the proposed number of site monitoring inspections, and a provision for the Arborist to submit a post-construction assessment report to the City for review.
16. (Tree Survival Security) Enter into a legal agreement and Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of $\$ 150,000$ for the 15 trees (tag\# 1852, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1956, 1957, 1958 and 1959) to be retained. No Tree Survival Security will be returned until the post-construction assessment report, confirming the protected trees survived the construction, prepared by the Arborist, is reviewed by staff. The security is to be released $50 \%$ upon project completion inspection confirming tree survival and $10 \%$ after FIVE year maintenance period inspection confirming tree survival.
17. (Servicing Agreement) Enter into a Servicing Agreement* for the design and construction of the Engineering, Transportation and Parks 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, the Engineering, Transportation and Parks works in Schedule 2.
18. (Development Permit) The submission and processing of a Development Permit* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.

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

1. (Replacement Trees) Incorporation of 263 replacement trees in the Development Permit* plans (including landscape plan and landscaping cost estimates) to replace the removal of 131 bylaw sized trees on site, or a combination of the provision of replacement trees onsite and City's acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for each replacement tree not able to be accommodated onsite.
2. (Aircraft Noise) Complete acoustical and thermal reports and recommendations prepared by an appropriate registered professional, which demonstrates that the interior noise levels and noise mitigation standards comply with the City's Official Community Plan and Noise Bylaw requirements. The standard required for air conditioning systems and their alternatives (e.g. ground source heat pumps, heat exchangers and acoustic ducting) is the ASHRAE 55-2004 "Thermal Environmental Conditions for Human Occupancy" standard and subsequent updates as they may occur. Maximum interior noise levels (decibels) within the dwelling units must achieve CMHC standards follows:

| Portions of Dwelling Units | Noise Levels (decibels) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Bedrooms | 35 decibels |
| Living, dining, recreation rooms | 40 decibels |
| Kitchen, bathrooms, hallways, and utility rooms | 45 decibels |

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

1. Provide written confirmation and supporting documents to demonstrate that the proposed Tenant Relocation Plan has been implemented.
2. Installation of appropriate tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained as part of the development prior to any construction activities, including building demolition, occurring on-site.

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

1. Confirm that "Land Use Contract (LUC 025)" has been discharged from the subject site.
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.
$\qquad$
3. Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
4. If applicable, payment of latecomer agreement charges, plus applicable interest associated with eligible latecomer works.
5. Obtain a Building Permit (BP) for any construction hoarding. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a public street, the air space above a public street, or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For additional information, contact the Building Approvals Department at 604-276-4285.

## Note:

* This requires a separate application.
- Where the Director of Development deems appropriate, the preceding agreements are to be drawn not only as personal covenants of the property owner but also as covenants pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act.

All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall have priority over all such liens, charges and encumbrances as is considered advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall, unless the Director of Development determines otherwise, be fully registered in the Land Title Office prior to enactment of the appropriate bylaw.

The preceding agreements shall provide security to the City including indemnities, warranties, equitable/rent charges, letters of credit and withholding permits, as deemed necessary or advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements shall be in a form and content satisfactory to the Director of Development.

- Additional legal agreements, as determined via the subject development's Servicing Agreement(s) and/or Development Permit(s), and/or Building Permit(s) to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering may be required including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, de-watering, drilling, underpinning, anchoring, shoring, piling, pre-loading, ground densification or other activities that may result in settlement, displacement, subsidence, damage or nuisance to City and private utility infrastructure.
- Applicants for all City Permits are required to comply at all times with the conditions of the Provincial Wildlife Act and Federal Migratory Birds Convention Act, which contain prohibitions on the removal or disturbance of both birds and their nests. Issuance of Municipal permits does not give an individual authority to contravene these legislations. The City of Richmond recommends that where significant trees or vegetation exists on site, the services of a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) be secured to perform a survey and ensure that development activities are in compliance with all relevant legislation.
[signed copy on file]
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## Schedule 2

## Servicing Agreement Works

## A. Engineering Servicing Works

A servicing agreement is required to design and construct the following works.

## 1) Water Works:

a) Using the OCP Model, there is $910.0 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ of water available at a 20 psi residual at the Cook Road frontage. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of 220 $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{s}$. Subject to the modeling results, the developer will be required to upgrade the existing water main complete with hydrants as per city specifications along the west side of Pimlico Way and south side of Citation Drive. The new water main diameter will be confirmed through the servicing agreement design.
b) Additional hydrants are required along Pimlico frontage to meet the City's standards.
c) The Developer is required to coordinate with Richmond Fire Rescue to confirm whether fire hydrants are required along the west side of Garden City Road. If required by RFR, the necessary water main and hydrant installations shall be reviewed by Engineering and added to the servicing agreement scope.
d) At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:
i) Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm 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 building designs.
ii) Review hydrant spacing on all road frontages and install new fire hydrants as required to meet City spacing requirements for the proposed land use.
iii) Provide a right-of-way for the water meter. Minimum right-of-way dimensions to be the size of the meter box (from the City of Richmond supplementary specifications) + any appurtenances (for example, the bypass on W2o-SD) +0.5 m on all sides. Exact right-of-way dimensions to be finalized during the servicing agreement process.
e) At Developer's cost, the City will:
i) Complete all tie-ins for the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

## 2) Storm Sewer Works:

a) At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:
i) Provide an erosion and sediment control plan for all on-site and off-site works, to be reviewed as part of the servicing agreement design.
ii) Subject to a capacity analysis and Transportation requirements, provide a storm sewer along the west side of Garden City Road.
iii) Provide 600 mm storm sewers along Pimlico Way, in the roadway. With connection to the existing 600 mm storm sewer on Cook Road, complete with manhole to City standards.
iv) Provide 600 mm storm sewers along Citation Drive, in the roadway. With connection to new storm sewer on Pimlico Way and Garden City Rd if required.
b) At Developer's cost, the City will:
i) Complete all tie-ins for the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

## 3) Sanitary Sewer Works:

a) At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:
i) Provide a sanitary sewer on Cook Road. Extent of the new sanitary sewer will be from the west property line of the Cook Road frontage to the City's new Eckersley B Sanitary Pump Station at 8600 Cook Rd. Alignment of the sanitary sewer will be in the same alignment as the new gravity sewer constructed as part of the new Eckersley B Sanitary Pump Station. The new sanitary sewer main diameter will be confirmed through the servicing agreement design.
b) At Developer's cost, the City will:
i) Complete all tie-ins for the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

## 4) Street Lighting:

a) At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:
i) Review street lighting levels along all road and lane frontages, and upgrade as required.
ii) Coordinate with the City Planner for pole and luminaire specifications for this project.

## 5) General Items:

a) At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:
i) Complete other frontage improvements as per Transportation requirements.
ii) Subject to Transportation's requirements, the existing overhead lines (e.g., BC Hydro, Telus, Shaw, etc.) and poles, street lights and hydrants along the Cook Road frontage may conflict with the ultimate sidewalk alignment. Relocate as required the overhead lines and poles, street lights and hydrants.
iii) The cost to relocate, if required for the overhead lines and poles and street lights along the Cook Road frontage, shall be included in the servicing agreement security. Written confirmation from BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers are required to confirm the relocation cost.
iv) Existing traffic signal box and BC Hydro Box along the Garden City frontage, south of Cook Road, shall be related into the proposed development site.
v) Coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers:
(1) To pre-duct for future hydro, telephone and cable utilities along all road frontages.
(2) Before relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the property frontages.
(3) To underground overhead service lines.
vi) Locate/relocate all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks required to service the proposed development and proposed undergrounding works, and all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks located along the development's frontages, within the developments site (see list below for examples). A functional plan showing conceptual locations for such infrastructure shall be included in the development design review process. Please coordinate with the respective private utility companies and the project's lighting and traffic signal consultants to confirm the requirements (e.g., statutory right-of-way dimensions) and the locations for the aboveground structures. If a private utility company does not require an aboveground structure, that company shall confirm this via a letter to be submitted to the City. The following are examples of statutory right-of-ways that shall be shown on the architectural plans/functional plan, the servicing agreement drawings, and registered prior to SA design approval:

- BC Hydro PMT - $4.0 \times 5.0 \mathrm{~m}$
- BC Hydro LPT - $3.5 \times 3.5$ m
- Street light kiosk $-1.5 \times 1.5 \mathrm{~m}$
- Traffic signal kiosk $-2.0 \times 1.5 \mathrm{~m}$
- Traffic signal UPS - $1.0 \times 1.0 \mathrm{~m}$
- Shaw cable kiosk - $1.0 \times 1.0$ m
- Telus FDH cabinet - $1.1 \times 1.0 \mathrm{~m}$
vii) Provide, prior to start of site preparation works or within the first servicing agreement submission, whichever comes first, a preload plan and geotechnical assessment of preload, dewatering, and soil preparation impacts on the existing utilities fronting the development site and provide mitigation recommendations.
viii) Provide a video inspection report of the existing UTILITIES along the ROAD frontages prior to start of site preparation works or within the first servicing agreement submission, whichever comes first. A follow-up video inspection, complete with a civil engineer's signed and sealed recommendation letter, is required after site preparation works are complete (i.e. pre-load removal, completion of dewatering, etc.) to assess the condition of the existing utilities and provide recommendations to retain, replace, or repair. Any utilities damaged by the pre-load, de-watering, or other ground preparation shall be replaced or repaired at the Developer's cost.
ix) Conduct pre- and post-preload elevation surveys of all surrounding roads, utilities, and structures. Any damage, nuisance, or other impact to be repaired at the developer's cost. The post-preload elevation survey shall be incorporated within the servicing agreement design.
x ) Monitor the settlement at the adjacent utilities and structures during pre-loading, dewatering, and soil preparation works per a geotechnical engineer's recommendations, and report the settlement amounts to the City for approval.
i) Submit a proposed strategy at the building permit stage for managing excavation de-watering. Note that the City's preference is to manage groundwater onsite or by removing and disposing at an appropriate facility. If this is not feasible due to volume of de-watering, the Developer will be required to apply to Metro Vancouver for a permit to discharge into the sanitary sewer system. If the sanitary sewer does not have adequate capacity to receive the volume of groundwater, the Developer will be required to enter into a de-watering agreement with the City wherein the developer will be required to treat the groundwater before discharging it to the City's storm sewer system.
ii) Not encroach into City rights-of-ways with any proposed trees, retaining walls, or other nonremovable structures. Retaining walls proposed to encroach into rights-of-ways must be reviewed by the City's Engineering Department.
iii) Coordinate the servicing agreement design for this development with the servicing agreement(s) for the adjacent development(s), both existing and in-stream. The developer's civil engineer shall submit a signed and sealed letter with each servicing agreement submission confirming that they have coordinated with civil engineer(s) of the adjacent project(s) and that the servicing agreement designs are consistent. The City will not accept the $1^{\text {st }}$ submission if it is not coordinated with the adjacent developments. The coordination letter should cover, but not be limited to, the following:
(a) Corridors for City utilities (existing and proposed water, storm sewer, sanitary and DEU ) and private utilities.
(b) Pipe sizes, material and slopes.
(c) Location of manholes and fire hydrants.
(d) Road grades, high points and low points.
(e) Alignment of ultimate and interim curbs.
(f) Proposed street lights design.
iv) 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, 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.


## B. Transportation Works:

The Developer is to enter into a Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of the frontage improvements (as generally shown in Appendix 1 and as described below) and other Transportationrelated works described below. All works are to be completed at the cost of the Developer and to the satisfaction of the City. A functional road plan and Transportation Impact Assessment are required based on the following comments:

## 1) Offsite Frontage Improvement Requirements

## General Notes:

1. Reinstate/back-fill street signage and pavement marking affected by the frontage works.
2. The exact dimensions of the frontage works are to be determined based on legal surveys and the functional road plan design process.
3. Consult Parks on the requirements for tree protection/placement including tree species and spacing as part of the frontage works and design off site works to accommodate tree preservation requirements and Transportation elements as noted.
4. Consult Engineering on lighting and other utility requirements as part of the frontage works.

## Cook Road

1. Along the Cook Rd. site frontage, construct a new frontage. The new frontage works must transition to meet the existing frontage treatments to the east and west of the subject site, i.e. curb and crosswalk alignment. The frontage improvements are to have the following cross-section (measuring southwards from existing north curb line):
a. 6.4 m -wide travel lane
b. 3.2 m -wide travel lane
c. 3.25 m -wide travel lane
d. 0.15 m -wide curb and gutter
e. 3.0 m -wide grass $/$ tree boulevard and 3.7 m -wide multi-use path, OR 1.5 m -wide grass $/$ tree boulevard, 2.0 m -wide bike lane (width includes 0.15 m concrete buffer strips), 1.25 m wide grass/tree boulevard and 2.0 m -wide sidewalk

## Garden City Road

1. Along Garden City Road, construct a new frontage. The new frontage must transition to meet the new and existing frontage treatments to the north and south respectively of the subject site. The frontage improvements are to have the following cross-section (measuring westward from existing west curb line):
a. 1.5 m -wide grass/tree boulevard
b. 1.8 m -wide bike lane
c. 1.5 m -wide grass/tree boulevard
d. 2.0 m -wide sidewalk

## Citation Drive

1. Along Citation Drive, construct a new frontage. The new frontage must transition to meet the new and existing frontage treatments to the north and south respectively of the subject site. The frontage improvements are to have the following cross-section (measuring northwards from existing south curb line):
a. 2.75 m -wide travel lane
b. 3.1 m -wide travel lane
c. 2.3 m -wide parking lane
d. 0.15 m -wide curb and gutter
e. 1.5 m -wide grass/tree boulevard
f. 3.0 m -wide multi-use path

## Pimlico Way

1. Along Pimlico Way, construct a new frontage. The new frontage must transition to meet the new and existing frontage treatments to the north and south respectively of the subject site. The frontage improvements are to have the following cross-section (measuring eastwards from existing west curb line):
a. 4.8 m -wide travel lane
b. 3.9 m -wide travel lane
c. 2.5 m -wide parking lane
d. 0.15 m -wide curb and gutter
e. 1.5 m -wide grass/tree boulevard
f. 2.0 m -wide sidewalk

## Pimlico Way \& Citation Drive Traffic Circle

A functional plan of the Pimlico Way \& Citation Drive traffic intersection and adjacent roadways is required to demonstrate improvements to the intersection traffic flow. These requirements are to be finalized through the functional plan design review.

## 2) Traffic Signals Improvements

The following improvements to traffic signals are required:

1. Cook Road \& Pimlico Way
a. Traffic signal warrant for Cook Road and Pimlico Way.
b. New overhead special crosswalk at Cook Road and Pimlico Way or, coordination of off site frontage and signal works with existing pedestrian signal as required.
2. Cook Road \& Garden City Road
a. New traffic signal cabinet to be located within a ROW on the development property.
b. New UPS backup power system cabinet to be located within a ROW on the development.
c. New LED street light luminaires.
d. New LED street name signs.
e. New traffic cameras (4).
f. Installation of a new westbound left turn arrow.

## 3) Site Access

Vehicle access from Pimlico Way is supported, subject to the following:

1. All existing driveways along the subject development to be closed permanently.
2. Vehicle access to the subject development is to be provided by a single mid-block driveway on Pimlico Way.
3. The location and design of the site access is to be confirmed through functional plans and Transportation Impact Study.

## Parks Servicing Works

The Developer is to enter into a Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of the proposed publicly accessible open spaces (mini-pocket parks) along the periphery of the development. All works
are to be completed at the cost of the Developer and to the satisfaction of the City. Detailed design are required based on the following comments:

1. Public open spaces may be provided:

- at locations which create neighbourhood links through the development to a nearby park and/or greenway (existing/future) ;
- at prominent cross-roads with southern exposure and/or access to sunlight; and/or
- at locations where existing landscape features are to be retained on site.

2. Public open spaces on site should be provide in one area and designed to encourage social gathering, facilitate informal recreation, and provide a sense of place.
3. The applicant will be responsible to design, construct and provide ongoing maintenance to all elements within these areas, including drainage, irrigation for planting areas, any required servicing, lighting (if required), etc.
4. Given that these pocket areas along Cook Road, Pimlico Way and Citation Drive are along vehicular roadways where roadway light standards are expected along the sidewalk, additional pedestrian level lighting is not requested for these secured public open space areas. However, if that is not the case and lighting is insufficient, the applicant will be required to provide pedestrian level lighting to these areas for public safety from dusk to dawn. These pedestrian level lights are to be designed and constructed in such a way that minimizes or avoids glaring and any adverse impact to the adjacent residents.









## Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 Amendment Bylaw 10395

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

1. Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Schedule 2.10 (City Centre Area Plan), is amended:
a) At Section 3.2.5 Sub-Area B.1, by deleting the following:
"Capstan Station Bonus
Development sites for which net density is permitted to exceed 2.0 FAR in the Capstan Station Bonus area may be considered under 3.2.6 Sub-Area B.2."; and replacing it with:
"Density Consideration
Development sites for which net density is permitted to exceed 1.2 FAR may be considered under 3.2.6 Sub-Area B.2.";
b) At Section 3.2.6 Sub-Area B.2, by deleting the following:

## "Capstan Station Bonus and Spires Road Area

Development sites in these areas for which net density is permitted to exceed 2.0 FAR may be considered under 3.2.7 Sub-Area B.3.";
and replacing it with:
"Density Consideration
Development sites for which net density is permitted to exceed 2.0 FAR may be considered under 3.2.7 Sub-Area B.3."
c) At Section 3.2.7 Sub-Area B.3, by deleting the following:

## "Capstan Station Bonus

Development sites for which net density is permitted to exceed 3.0 FAR in the Capstan Station Bonus area may be considered under 3.2.8 Sub-Area B.4.";
and replacing it with:
"Density Consideration

Development sites for which net density is permitted to exceed 3.0 FAR may be considered under 3.2.8 Sub-Area B.4."
d) At Section 4.0 Implementation \& Phasing Strategies, Policy 4.1(n), by deleting the existing text:
"Furthermore, as determined to the satisfaction of the City, the applicable density bonus may be increased on a site-specific basis for rezoning applications that provide additional affordable housing and/or market rental housing to address community need.";
and replacing it with:
"Furthermore, as determined to the satisfaction of the City, the applicable density bonus may be increased and alternative housing forms may be considered, on a site-specific basis for rezoning applications that provide additional affordable housing and/or market rental housing to address community need."
2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 10395".
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ADOPTED

# Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 <br> Amendment Bylaw 10396 (RZ 21-932698) 8880 Cook Road/8751 Citation Drive 

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

1. That the Mayor and Clerk are hereby authorized to execute any documents necessary to discharge "Land Use Contract (LUC 025)", having charge number RD19308, including all amendments, modifications and extensions to charge number RD19308 from the following area:
P.I.D. 030-506-981

Parcel A Sections 9 and 10 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan EPP83741
2. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 3.4 [Use and Term Definitions] by adding the following new definitions in the correct alphabetical order:
a) "Moderate income rental unit means a dwelling unit that is subject to a moderate income rental housing agreement"; and
b) "Moderate income rental housing agreement means an agreement in a form satisfactory to the City that limits the occupancy of the dwelling unit that is subject to the agreement to persons, families and households that qualify for moderate income housing based on their household income level, that restricts the occupancy of the dwelling unit to rental tenure, and that prescribes a maximum rental rate and rate of increase of rental rate for the dwelling unit."
3. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 18.32 [Low Rise Apartment and Town Housing (ZLR32) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)] by:
a) Deleting all references to the "area identified as "B" on Diagram 1, Section 18.32.4.7";
b) Deleting the label " B " identifying the area as " B " on Diagram 1, Section 18.32.4.7; and
c) Making numbering, text and graphic amendments as required to accommodate the identified bylaw amendments.
4. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by inserting as Section 18.44 thereof the following:

## " 18.44 Low Rise Rental Apartment (ZLR44) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)

18.44.1 Purpose

This zone provides for low rise residential rental tenure apartment housing and compatible secondary uses. Additional density is provided to achieve, among other things, City objectives in respect to moderate income rental units, and market rental units.
18.44.2 Permitted Uses

- housing, apartment
- housing, town


### 18.44.3 Secondary Uses

- boarding and lodging
- home business


### 18.44.4 Permitted Density

1. For the purpose of this zone, the calculation of floor area ratio is based on a site area of $11,392 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.
2. The maximum floor area ratio is 0.6 together with an additional 0.1 floor area ratio, provided that the additional floor area is used entirely to accommodate indoor amenity space.
3. Notwithstanding Section 18.44.5.1, the reference to " 0.6 " is further increased to a higher floor area ratio of " 2.10 " provided that:
a) the owner provides moderate income rental units on the site, having a combined building area of at least $3,417.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ or 0.3 FAR, whichever is greater, which building area shall comprise the combined habitable space of the total number of moderate income rental units and a proportional share of the floor area of common space in the building (e.g., circulation and lobbies), excluding the building area of market rental units and indoor amenity space;
b) the owner enters into a moderate income rental housing agreement with respect to the moderate income rental units and registers the moderate income rental housing agreement against title to the lot and files a notice in the Land Title Office;
c) the owner provides market rental units on the site, having a combined building area of no more than $20,505.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ or 1.8 FAR, whichever is less, which building area shall comprise the combined habitable space of the total number of market rental units and a proportional share of the floor area of common space in the building (e.g., circulation and lobbies), excluding the building area of moderate income rental units and indoor amenity space; and
d) the owner enters into a market rental agreement with respect to the market rental units and registers the market rental agreement against title to the lot and files a notice in the Land Title Office;

### 18.44.5 Permitted Lot Coverage

1. The maximum lot coverage for buildings is $60 \%$.
2. No more than $80 \%$ of a lot may be occupied by buildings, structures and non-porous surfaces.
3. $20 \%$ of the lot area is restricted to landscaping with live plant material.
18.44.6 Yards \& Setbacks
4. The minimum setback from any road is 3.0 m .

### 18.44.7 Permitted Heights

1. The maximum height for buildings is 15.0 m , except this may be increased to 25.0 m if a proper interface is provided with adjacent buildings and areas secured by the City for road and park purposes, as specified in a Development Permit approved by the City.
2. The maximum height for accessory buildings is 5.0 m .
3. The maximum height for accessory structures is 12.0 m .

### 18.44.8 Subdivision Provisions/Minimum Lot Size

1. The minimum lot area is $11,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.
18.44.9 Landscaping \& Screening
2. Landscaping and screening shall be provided according to the provisions of Section 6.0.
18.44.10 On-Site Parking and Loading
3. On-site vehicle and bicycle parking and loading shall be provided according to the standards set out in Section 7.0, except that:
a) the minimum number of parking spaces shall be:
i) for moderate income rental unit residents: 0.4 parking spaces per dwelling unit;
ii) for market rental unit residents: 0.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit;
iii) for visitor parking: 0.16 parking spaces per dwelling unit; and
b) the minimum number of Class 1 on-site bicycle parking spaces for apartment housing units with one or more bedrooms shall be 1.9 spaces per dwelling unit.
c) The minimum number of on-site loading spaces required for residential uses is one medium size loading space.

### 18.44.11 Residential Rental Tenure

1. A dwelling unit located anywhere in this zone shall only be used for residential rental tenure.

### 18.44.12 Other Regulations

1. Telecommunication antenna must be building-mounted and located a minimum 20.0 m above the ground (i.e., on a roof of a building).
2. In addition to the regulations listed above, the General Development Regulations in Section 4.0 and the Specific Use Regulations in Section 5.0 apply.
3. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following area and by designating it "Low Rise Rental Apartment (ZLR44) - Brighouse Village (City Centre)":
P.I.D. 030-506-981

Parcel A Sections 9 and 10 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan EPP83741.
6. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10396".
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