



# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee


**To:** Planning Committee  
**From:** Wayne Craig  
Director, Development

**Date:** November 15, 2018  
**File:** RZ 17-771592


**Re:** Application by Interface Architecture Inc. for Rezoning at 10671, 10691, and 10751 Bridgeport Road from the "Single Detached (RS1/D)" Zone to the "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" Zone

### Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9935, for the rezoning of 10671, 10691, and 10751 Bridgeport Road from the "Single Detached (RS1/D)" zone to the "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone to permit the development of 24 townhouse units with right-in/right-out vehicle access to Bridgeport Road, be introduced and given first reading.

  
Wayne Craig  
Director, Development  
(604-257-4625)

WC:cl  
Att. 9

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Affordable Housing Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## Staff Report

### Origin

Interface Architecture Inc. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 10671, 10691, and 10751 Bridgeport Road from the “Single Detached (RS1/D)” zone to the “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)” zone, to permit a development containing 24 townhouse units with right-in/right-out vehicle access to Bridgeport Road (Attachment 1).

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

### Existing Site Condition and Context

A survey of the subject site is included in Attachment 3. The subject site is 4,434.7 m<sup>2</sup> in size and is located on the north side of Bridgeport Road, between McKessock Avenue and Shell Road. The existing dwellings are accessed via four driveway crossings on Bridgeport Road.

### Existing Housing Profile

The subject site currently consists of three lots; each containing a single-family dwelling that the applicant indicates is occupied and rented. The applicant indicates that there are no legal secondary suites in the dwellings. Each of the dwellings is proposed to be demolished at future development stage.

### Surrounding Development

Existing development immediately surrounding the subject site is as follows:

- To the North, are the rear portions of lots zoned “Single Detached (RS1/D)” that front McKessock Avenue and Shell Road (2408 McKessock Avenue, and 2755 Shell Road).
- To the South, immediately across Bridgeport Road, is a lot zoned “Town Housing (ZT17) – Bridgeport Road (Bridgeport Area)” at 3088 Airey Drive containing two-storey townhouses. In addition, there are three lots zoned “Single Detached (RS1/F)” at 10760, 10780 Bridgeport Road and 3033 Shell Road that are the subject of an active rezoning application to the “Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3)” zone, for which the proposed Zoning Amendment Bylaw received Third Reading at the Public Hearing held on September 4, 2018 (RZ 16-754158).
- To the East, are two lots zoned “Single Detached (RS1/D)” at 10811 and 10891 Bridgeport Road.
- To the West, is one lot zoned “Single Detached (RS1/D)” at 10651 Bridgeport Road.

### Existing Legal Encumbrances

There is an existing statutory right-of-way (SRW) registered on title of the properties for the sanitary sewer located in both the northeast and west portions of the land assembly. Encroachment into the SRW is not permitted.

As part of the proposed development, the Applicant is required to discontinue use of the existing sanitary service connections to the site (including cutting, capping, and removing existing connections and inspections chambers/leads). As part of the Servicing Agreement process, the Applicant is required to install new sanitary sewer along McKessock Avenue and Bridgeport Road to service the subject site.

The existing SRWs must remain on the subject site for continued access to the existing sanitary sewers providing service to the adjacent properties.

### **Related Policies & Studies**

#### Official Community Plan/Bridgeport Area Plan

The 2041 Official Community Plan (OCP) Land Use Map designation for the subject site is “Neighbourhood Residential”, which allows single-family dwellings, duplexes, and townhouses.

The subject site is also governed by the Bridgeport Area Plan. The Bridgeport Area Plan Land Use Map designation for the subject site is “Residential Area 2 (subject to the policies described in Section 3.1 and 4.0)” (Attachments 4 and 5), which allows low density townhouses. The Area Plan Policies include development criteria such as:

- the maximum permitted density (0.60 FAR subject to compliance with the City’s Affordable Housing Strategy);
- the minimum land assembly size and frontage (2,500 m<sup>2</sup>; 50 m on Bridgeport Road);
- avoiding residual sites, but that where a residual site is permitted it must enable viable future townhouse development with frontage on McKessock Avenue or Shell Road as demonstrated through a preliminary plan presented with the prior rezoning;
- preferred vehicle access off McKessock Avenue or Shell Road, with vehicle access off Bridgeport Road discouraged; and
- information about potential future road extension and pedestrian connectivity options for McKessock Place.

The proposed development is consistent with the land use map designations in the OCP and Bridgeport Area Plan.

The Applicant has submitted documentation indicating the efforts they have made to assemble with the adjacent property to the west to respond to the Area Plan policies to avoid residual sites and to secure vehicle access to McKessock Avenue rather than to Bridgeport Road (Attachment 6). The Applicant indicates that the outcome of those efforts was not successful and that the subject proposal responds to the Area Plan policies by restricting vehicle access to Bridgeport

Road to right-in/right-out movements and by demonstrating through a preliminary plan that the residual sites have viable future townhouse development potential (Attachment 7).

#### OCP Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development (ANSD) Policy

Consistent with the OCP, the ANSD Policy applies to the subject site, which is located within the “High Aircraft Noise Area (Area 2)”. In accordance with this Policy, all aircraft noise sensitive land uses may be considered except new single-family development that is not already supported by an existing OCP land use designation, Area Plan, or Single-Family Lot Size Policy.

As the proposed development at the subject site involves multi-family development, it is consistent with the ANSD Policy. Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant is required to register an aircraft noise sensitive use covenant on Title to address public awareness and ensure that noise mitigation, mechanical ventilation, and a central air conditioning system (or alternative) is incorporated into building design and construction.

#### Affordable Housing Strategy

Consistent with the City’s Affordable Housing Strategy, the applicant proposes to submit a cash-in-lieu contribution to the Affordable Housing Reserve fund in the amount of \$8.50 per buildable square foot prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw (i.e., \$234,082.00).

#### Public Art Program Policy

The applicant will be participating in the City’s Public Art Program by making a voluntary contribution to the City’s Public Art Reserve fund for City-wide projects on City lands. Since this Rezoning application was submitted in 2017, the applicable rate for the contribution is \$0.83 per buildable square foot; for a total contribution in the amount of \$22,858.00. This voluntary contribution is required to be submitted to the City prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

#### Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

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

#### **Public Consultation**

A rezoning sign has been installed on the subject property. In response to the placement of the rezoning sign on the property, the City met with and received written correspondence from several neighbouring residents who expressed their concerns about the redevelopment proposal. The nature of concerns and the City staff response to these concerns (in bold italics) is broken down into the following groups:

#### Concerns - residents at 2380 McKessock Avenue, 2408 McKessock, 2751 and 2755 Shell Road

- Implications of the subject proposal on the future redevelopment potential of their properties.
  - ***The Bridgeport Area Plan land use designation for the properties at 2380 McKessock Avenue, 2408 McKessock, 2751 and 2755 Shell Road is “Residential Area 1 (subject to***

*the policies described in Section 3.1 and 4.0)". This land use designation allows for either single-family lots (as per the applicable Lot Size Policy) or for townhouses subject to specific development criteria. The Applicant has submitted a concept plan (Attachment 7) to show how the neighbouring properties to the north of the subject site could redevelop for either single-family lots or townhouses in the future consistent with the Area Plan designation. Additional discussion on this subject is provided in the section of this report entitled "Future Neighbourhood Development Concept".*

- Potential water, storm, and sanitary servicing impacts to the property at 2380 McKessock Avenue at present or should they redevelop their property in the future.
  - *The water, storm, and sanitary servicing requirements associated with future redevelopment of 2380 McKessock Avenue would be analysed by City staff upon submission of a rezoning application for that property. City staff would undertake an analysis of the existing infrastructure in place at that time and its' capacity to service the proposed redevelopment of that property. If any improvements to/relocation of infrastructure was identified as part of that analysis, it would be undertaken at the developer's cost through a Servicing Agreement.*
- The desire by the resident of 2380 McKessock Avenue to see the boulevard and servicing improvements associated with the subject proposal undertaken prior to on-site construction.
  - *The subject proposal requires boulevard and servicing improvements to be made on McKessock Avenue and Bridgeport Road. These works must be designed and constructed by the Applicant through a Servicing Agreement, which must be entered into prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. The works associated with the Servicing Agreement are typically undertaken after on-site construction and servicing has been completed to avoid potential damage to the off-site works. Along with the Servicing Agreement process, the Applicant is required to submit a Construction Traffic and Parking Management Plan for review and approval by City staff prior to Building Permit issuance, which will address any disruptions due to construction.*

#### Concerns - resident at 10651 Bridgeport Road

Copies of written correspondence received from the resident of 10651 Bridgeport Road, as well as the City's acknowledgement of the correspondence, are included in Attachment 8. To summarize, the resident expressed the following concerns (the City staff response is shown in bold italics):

- The proposed vehicle access on Bridgeport Road, rather than from an alternate road such as McKessock Avenue or Shell Road, and the potential for increased traffic and vehicle/pedestrian safety on Bridgeport Road, as well as at the McKessock Avenue intersection.
  - *The Applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Study prepared by a professional engineer, which has been reviewed and the findings supported by Staff. Further information on this subject is provided in the section of this report entitled "Site Access, Parking, and Transportation Improvements".*
- Dissatisfaction with the applicant's efforts to assemble with their property at 10651 Bridgeport Road as a means to secure alternate vehicle access of McKessock Avenue, resulting in the creation of a residual lot at 10651 Bridgeport Road, and concern about the implications of this on their future redevelopment potential.

- *The Applicant has submitted documentation describing the efforts made to acquire the adjacent property to the west as a means to secure vehicle access from McKessock Avenue and to avoid the creation of a residual lot (Attachment 6). Since those efforts have been unsuccessful to-date, the subject proposal has been designed with right-in/right-out vehicle access to Bridgeport Road and to provide future shared vehicle access to 10651 Bridgeport Road via a statutory right-of-way for public access over the entire drive-aisle without the need to create an additional vehicle access point.*
- *A concept plan has also been prepared to show how the neighbouring property at 10651 Bridgeport Road could redevelop for townhouses in the future consistent with the Area Plan designation (Attachment 7). Additional discussion on this subject is provided in the section of this report entitled "Future Neighbourhood Development Concept".*

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant First Reading to the rezoning bylaw, the bylaw will be forwarded to a Public Hearing, where any area resident or interested party will have a further opportunity to comment.

Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the *Local Government Act*.

## **Analysis**

### Site Planning

This proposal is to develop 24 townhouse units on a development site that would be approximately 4,264 m<sup>2</sup> (45,899 ft<sup>2</sup>) in area after the required 2.3 m road dedication along the Bridgeport Road frontage. Conceptual development plans proposed by the applicant are included in Attachment 9.

The proposed site layout consists of:

- Two three-storey buildings; each containing four units, along Bridgeport Road and mid-way through the site.
- Four two-storey duplex buildings along the north end of the site.

All buildings have a north-south orientation and are arranged in east-west rows. The main unit entries for all buildings are proposed to face south; either onto Bridgeport Road, or onto the internal drive-aisles.

A common Outdoor Amenity Space is proposed in the middle of the site, as well as two passive outdoor seating areas; one with benches on either side of the pedestrian pathway in the north portion of the site, and one with balancing/seating logs in the southwest portion of the site under a large Douglas Fir tree that is to be retained.

Consistent with the OCP, the Applicant proposes to submit a contribution to the City prior to rezoning bylaw adoption in-lieu of the provision of common indoor amenity space on-site. Since this Rezoning application was submitted in 2017, and was in-stream at the time that City Council amended the OCP in February 19, 2018 to update the contribution rates, it may be subject to the former contribution rates if the rezoning bylaw is granted 1<sup>st</sup> reading by February 19, 2019.

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant 1<sup>st</sup> reading to the rezoning bylaw, the Applicant's contribution to the City would be in the amount of \$29,000 (i.e., \$1,000/unit for the first 19 units; plus \$2000/unit for the remaining five units).

#### Site Access, Parking, and Transportation Improvements

The Bridgeport Area Plan policies for townhouse proposals in "Residential Area 2" identify that:

- vehicle access may be preferably off McKessock Avenue or secondly, off Shell Road (with no primary access permitted off McKessock Place); and
- vehicle access off Bridgeport Road is discouraged.

As noted previously, the Applicant submitted documentation indicating that efforts were made in 2016 and 2018 to acquire the property to the west at 10651 Bridgeport Road as a means to secure vehicle access from McKessock Avenue, however City staff understands that those efforts have been unsuccessful to-date. The potential for securing vehicle access eastward to Shell Road is limited by a newer dwelling that was recently constructed at 10811 Bridgeport Road in 2013.

On this basis, the Applicant proposes vehicle access to the subject site off Bridgeport Road via a driveway crossing that is located approximately in the middle of the block between McKessock Avenue and Shell Road. The site plan and internal drive-aisle has been configured to enable future shared vehicle access to the adjacent properties to the east and west by way of a SRW for public-right-of-passage which is required to be registered on title prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. This helps to minimize the need to create additional vehicle access points off Bridgeport Road in the future.

The subject site's driveway crossing will be constructed with a triangular-shaped raised barrier curb island within the boulevard along Bridgeport Road to physically restrict vehicle movements to the site to right-in/right-out only. This will be further supplemented with turn restriction signage on-site and on Bridgeport Road. A centre-median on Bridgeport Road may be pursued to further reinforce the turn restrictions at the site access as part of the ultimate buildout of the Bridgeport Road and Shell Road intersection as road allowance becomes available through future redevelopment. The Applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Study in support of the proposed vehicle access off Bridgeport Road. Further details on the findings of the Traffic Impact Study are provided in the section of this report entitled "Traffic Impact Study".

To accommodate the raised barrier curb island, and for future road widening, the Applicant is required to provide a road dedication of 2.3 m along the entire south property line on Bridgeport Road. A Servicing Agreement is required to be entered into prior to rezoning bylaw adoption for the design and construction of the required works.

The Servicing Agreement design will also include improvements to the pedestrian environment through boulevard upgrades along Bridgeport road, to include (but is not limited to): a new 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk at the new property line with transition to the existing sidewalk to the east and west of the subject site, along with a new treed/grass boulevard (approximately 3.7 m wide) at the curb. This will create a wider buffer between the roadway and pedestrians along the site's frontage. As well, the number of conflict points will be reduced as a result of the sole

access to the site as pedestrians currently have to cross four driveways along the same stretch of Bridgeport Road.

Pedestrian access to the site from Bridgeport Road is proposed in the form of two defined pathways on either side of the drive-aisle entrance, which are proposed to be treated with paving stones to differentiate it from the driving surface. The pathways combine to form a single north-south pedestrian pathway through the middle of the site to enable a future public pedestrian connection between Bridgeport Road and McKessock Place, should the properties to the north of the subject site redevelop in the future, consistent with the Area Plan. Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant must register a SRW for public right-of-passage on title to secure the future potential public pedestrian connection between Bridgeport Road and McKessock Place.

Consistent with the parking requirements in Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, a total of 48 resident vehicle parking spaces are proposed; all of which are provided in a side-by-side arrangement. Of the required resident parking spaces, 50% are standard-sized spaces and 50% are small-sized spaces. A total of five visitor parking spaces are also proposed on-site; one of which is an accessible parking space. A total of 32 resident bicycle parking spaces (Class 1) are proposed within the garages of the units, while a bike rack for five visitor bicycle parking spaces (Class 2) is proposed outdoors at the entrance to the Outdoor Amenity Space.

#### Traffic Impact Study

The applicant submitted a Traffic Impact Study prepared by a professional engineer. The Study has been reviewed and the findings are supported by Staff.

The Study confirms that the proposed vehicle access at the subject site; with right-in/right-out restrictions to Bridgeport Road, does not negatively impact traffic operations and safety of the surrounding road network including the Bridgeport Road and McKessock Avenue intersection and the Bridgeport Road and Shell Road intersection. By being located near the centre of the site's frontage, the proposed vehicle access optimizes separation between the Shell Road and McKessock Avenue intersections. The study also identifies that the single proposed driveway crossing with turning restrictions presents fewer conflict points than the existing four all-movement driveways for the existing single-family dwellings on Bridgeport Road.

The Study finds that the development proposal generates a manageable increase in traffic volume over the existing four single-family dwellings and that this increase can be accommodated with the existing capacity of the adjacent road and transportation system.

Through redevelopment of the properties to the east and northeast of the subject site, a future vehicle connection to Shell Road may be possible for use by residents of the subject site via the internal drive-aisle. This will provide a more direct connection to Bridgeport Road for those leaving the site destined eastbound in the future.

#### Future Neighbourhood Development Concept

The applicant has submitted concept plans to show how the neighbouring properties to the west, east, and north of the subject site could redevelop in the future consistent with the Bridgeport



Area Plan land use designations (Attachment 6). The concept plans assist with responding to the concerns expressed by neighbouring residents about implications of the proposed rezoning application to future redevelopment potential of their properties. The concept plans show two scenarios for how the neighbouring properties could redevelop as per the Area Plan, as described below. An additional scenario for the property at 10651 Bridgeport Road to the west of the subject site is also described further below.

*Scenario # 1 – Single-Family Lots in “Residential Area 1” & Townhouses in “Residential Area 2”*

The concept plan entitled “Scenario # 1” shows that the properties designated as “Residential Area 1” to the north of the subject site can redevelop through rezoning and subdivision into single-family lots zoned “Single Detached (RS2/B)” as per Lot Size Policy 5448 (Attachment 10) off a cul-de-sac extension of McKessock Place, with a secondary emergency access route through the Shell Road and public pedestrian connectivity through to Bridgeport Road.

The concept plan also shows that the properties designated as “Residential Area 2” to the east and west of the subject site can redevelop for low density townhouses, with shared vehicle access through the subject site to Bridgeport Road by way of a SRW for public-right-of-passage, which is required to be registered on title prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. This avoids the need for additional vehicle access points off Bridgeport Road, McKessock Avenue, or Shell Road.

*Scenario # 2 – Townhouses in “Residential Area 1” and in “Residential Area 2”*

The concept plan entitled “Scenario # 2” shows that the properties designated as “Residential Area 1” to the north of the subject site can redevelop for low density townhouses with vehicle access off Shell Road, public pedestrian connectivity through to Bridgeport Road, and a slight road dedication to extend McKessock Place to provide a vehicle turnaround area (no vehicle access would occur to or from McKessock Place).

The concept plan remains unchanged for the properties designated as “Residential Area 2” to the east and west of the subject site, which can redevelop for low density townhouses, with shared vehicle access through the subject site to Bridgeport Road by way of a SRW for public-right-of-passage over the drive-aisle.

*Additional Scenario - 10651 Bridgeport Road*

Although it is not shown on the concept plan, the property at 10651 Bridgeport Road to the west of the subject site also has the potential to subdivide under the existing “Single Detached (RS1/D)” zone to create two lots fronting McKessock Avenue, consistent with Lot Size Policy 5448. A subdivision plan would be required with a formal subdivision application to verify zoning compliance, however, staff’s preliminary analysis is that the property would meet the minimum lot dimensions to subdivide after the road dedications required for frontage improvements.

Tree Retention/Replacement and Landscaping

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:

- 21 bylaw-sized trees (which include three hedgerows) on the subject property; and
- Three trees on neighbouring properties at 2408 McKessock Avenue and 2755 Shell Road.

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

- The large Douglas Fir on-site (Tree #958) is in good condition and should be retained and protected at 5.0 m out from the base of the tree to the east and 6.0 m out from the base of the tree to the north and south; with existing grade maintained within the protection zone.
- Trees # 959, 960, 961 and 965 on-site are in poor condition and are in conflict with the proposed development. These trees are recommended for removal and replacement.
- A row of four bylaw-sized trees on-site (Tree #963) is a remnant hedge with little landscape value, and should be removed and replaced.
- A row of three bylaw-sized trees on-site (Tree # 964), which have been historically topped, are located 0.6 m below the existing sidewalk grade and are not good candidates for retention. These trees should be removed and replaced.
- A row of nine bylaw-sized Cypress trees on-site (Tree # 967) exhibits sparse canopy, likely due to the historical installation of a retaining wall on the neighbouring property to the east. In addition, this species does not respond well to root disturbance/construction impacts. The proximity of the hedgerow to the proposed building would necessitate significant root and canopy loss. These trees should be removed subject to the provision of 18 replacement trees, of which a minimum of two must be 5.0 m high conifers (i.e., a 2:1 ratio for the nine trees removed).
- Three trees located on neighbouring property (Trees #001, 002, and 003) neighbouring property, are to be retained. Trees # 001 and 002 should be protected on-site at 0.8 m from the north property line and 3.0 m out from the base of the trees to the east and west, with existing grade maintained within the protection zone. Tree protection measures within the subject site are not required for Tree # N003, as the tree is located beyond influencing distance.
- Replacement trees should be specified at a 2:1 ratio as per the OCP.

#### *Tree Protection*

The large Douglas Fir (Tree # 958) on-site is to be retained and protected, as are the trees located on the neighbouring properties to the north (Trees #001, 002, and 003). The applicant has submitted a Tree Management Drawing showing the trees to be retained and the measures to be taken to protect them at development stage (Attachment 11). 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.

- A tree survival security in the amount of \$10,000 for Tree # 958. The security will be held until construction and landscaping is completed, an acceptable post-construction impact assessment report is received, and a site inspection is conducted to ensure that the tree has survived. The City may retain a portion of the security for a one-year maintenance period to ensure that the tree has survived.
- Prior to demolition of the existing dwellings 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 must remain in place until construction and landscaping on-site is completed.

### *Tree Replacement*

A total of 20 trees on-site are proposed to be removed [Trees # 959, 960, 961, 963 (4 trees), 964 (three trees), 965, and 967 (nine trees)]. In accordance with the 2:1 tree replacement ratio in the OCP, a total of 40 replacement trees are required to be planted and maintained on-site. The required replacement trees are to be of the following minimum sizes, based on the size of the trees being removed as per Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057:

# Replacement Trees	Minimum Caliper of Deciduous Replacement Tree	Minimum Height of Coniferous Replacement Tree
30	6 cm	3.5 m
2	8 cm	4.0 m
2	N/A	5.0 m
2	9 cm	5.0 m
4	10 cm	5.5 m

The Applicant's preliminary Landscape Plan illustrates that 44 trees of a variety of species and the required sizes are proposed. To ensure that the replacement trees are planted and maintained on-site, the applicant is required to submit a Landscaping Security in the amount of 100% of a cost estimate prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect (including installation and a 10% contingency) prior to issuance of a Development Permit.

### Energy Step Code

On July 16, 2018, Richmond City Council adopted BC Energy Step Code requirements for new residential developments. These new requirements apply to most Building Permit applications filed on or after September 1, 2018, except for developments with:

- a) A valid Development Permit.
- b) An acceptable Development Permit application submitted to the City by July 16, 2018.

Because this Rezoning application and the associated Development Permit application were received prior to July 16, 2018, this project may be constructed to meet the City's previous Townhouse Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Policy, so long as an acceptable Building Permit application for the development is submitted to the City by December 31, 2019. If this

deadline is not met, the development will be required to meet the City's Energy Step Code requirements.

Consistent with the previous Townhouse Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Policy, the Applicant has committed to achieving an EnerGuide Rating System score of 82 and to pre-ducting for solar hot water heating for the proposed development. As part of the Development Permit application review process, the applicant must submit a Building Energy Report prepared by a licensed energy auditor, satisfactory to the City, specifying the energy efficiency upgrades that will be implemented in the design and construction of the proposed townhouse development. Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant is required to register a legal agreement on Title to secure the commitments to install all energy-efficiency upgrade measures identified in the approved Building Energy Report.

#### Accessibility

The Applicant proposes to provide aging-in-place features in all of the units (e.g., blocking in washroom walls for future grab-bar installation beside toilets, tubs, and showers; stairwell handrails; and lever-type handles for plumbing fixtures and door handles). In addition, the Applicant proposes two Convertible Units in one of the two-storey duplex buildings in the northeast corner of the site (i.e., Building 3). Details of the accessible housing features will be reviewed at the future Development Permit stage.

#### Site Servicing

Prior to rezoning, the applicant is required to pay Servicing Costs and to enter into a Servicing Agreement associated with the design and construction of the following servicing improvements (including, but not limited to): water, storm, and sanitary service connections/removals/tie-ins, water meters, fire hydrants, and upgrading of the storm and sanitary sewer systems along portions of McKessock Avenue and Bridgeport Road. This is in addition to the required boulevard upgrades along Bridgeport Road, as described previously.

Further details on the scope of the servicing improvements are included in Attachment 12.

#### Variances Requested

The proposed development, as illustrated in the conceptual development plans in Attachment 9, is generally in compliance with the "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone in Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, with the exception of a variance request to reduce the minimum front yard (along Bridgeport Road) from 6.0 m to 4.7 m.

Staff is supportive of this variance request for the following reasons:

- It enables a deeper rear yard setback, which provides a more sensitive interface alongside adjacent single-family housing to the north.
- The road dedication and frontage improvements that are required with rezoning enable a more pedestrian oriented boulevard in front of the units along Bridgeport Road, complete with grass and trees between the new property line and the existing curb of the road.

- Although the front yard setback is reduced, the proposal maintains consistency with the minimum private outdoor space guidelines in the OCP through the provision of balconies on the second floor of the units along Bridgeport Road, facing north off the main living area.

### **Future Development Permit Application Considerations**

A Development Permit application is required for the subject proposal to ensure consistency with the design guidelines for townhouses contained within the OCP, and continued consideration of the existing neighbourhood context.

Further refinements to site planning, landscaping, and architectural form and character will be made as part of the Development Permit application review process, including (but not limited to):

- Refinement of the pattern and use of non-porous surface materials to enhance on-site permeability and strengthen on-site pedestrian circulation and future public pedestrian connectivity.
- Refinement of the proposed fencing/screening on-site.
- Demonstrating that all of the relevant accessibility features are incorporated into the design of the proposed Convertible Units, and that aging-in-place features will be incorporated into all units.
- Consideration of alternate locations for some of the proposed replacement trees to ensure no conflict with the vehicle drive-aisle in close proximity to the site's entry.
- Exploring additional design development to provide adequate building massing articulation along Bridgeport Road.
- Review of the proposed colour palette and exterior building materials.
- Reviewing the applicant's design response to the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).
- Gaining a better understanding of the proposed sustainability features to be incorporated into the project.
- Refining the concept for the off-site boulevard improvements along Bridgeport Road.

### **Financial Impact**

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

### **Conclusion**

The purpose of this application is to rezone the properties at 10671, 10691, and 10751 Bridgeport Road from the "Single Detached (RS1/D)" zone to the "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone, to permit a development containing 24 townhouse units with vehicle access to Bridgeport Road.

This proposal is consistent with the land use map designations for the subject site and relevant policies that are contained within the OCP and Bridgeport Area Plan.

The list of Rezoning Considerations is included in Attachment 12, which has been agreed to by the Applicant (signed concurrence on file).

It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9935 be introduced and given First Reading.



Cynthia Lussier  
Planner 1  
(604-276-4108)


CL:blg

- Attachment 1: Location Map/Aerial Photo
- Attachment 2: Development Application Data Sheet
- Attachment 3: Site Survey (showing the proposed land assembly)
- Attachment 4: Bridgeport Area Plan Land Use Map
- Attachment 5: Bridgeport Area Plan Land Use Map Excerpt – “Residential Area 1” & “Residential Area 2”
- Attachment 6: Documentation from Applicant
- Attachment 7: Future Neighbourhood Development Concept
- Attachment 8: Written correspondence from resident at 10651 Bridgeport Road
- Attachment 9: Conceptual Development Plans
- Attachment 10: Lot Size Policy 5448
- Attachment 11: Tree Management Drawing
- Attachment 12: Rezoning Considerations





City of  
Richmond



**SUBJECT  
PROPERTIES**



**RZ 17-771592**

Original Date: 05/30/17

Revision Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES





**RZ 17-771592**

**Attachment 2**

Address: 10671, 10691, and 10751 Bridgeport Road

Applicant: Interface Architecture Inc.

Planning Area(s): Bridgeport

	Existing	Proposed
<b>Owner:</b>	1085948 B.C. Ltd	To be determined
<b>Site Size:</b>	4,434.7 m <sup>2</sup>	4,264.1 m <sup>2</sup> (after 170.6 m <sup>2</sup> road dedication)
<b>Land Uses:</b>	Single-family housing	Townhouses
<b>OCP Designation:</b>	Neighbourhood Residential	No change
<b>Area Plan Designation:</b>	Residential Area 2	No change
<b>Zoning:</b>	Single Detached (RS1/D)	Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)
<b>Number of Units:</b>	3	24


On Future Site	Bylaw/Area Plan Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	0.60	0.59	None permitted
Buildable Floor Area (m <sup>2</sup> ):*	2,558.46 m <sup>2</sup> (27,539.03 ft <sup>2</sup> )	2,511.09 m <sup>2</sup> (27,030 ft <sup>2</sup> )	None permitted
Lot Coverage – Building:	Max. 40%	37.6%	None
Lot Coverage – Non-porous Surfaces:	Max. 65%	62.4%	None
Lot Coverage – Live Landscaping:	Min. 25%	25%	None
Minimum Lot Size:	2,500 m <sup>2</sup>	4,264.1 m <sup>2</sup>	N/A
Minimum Lot Width – Bridgeport Road:	50 m	74.18 m	N/A
Setback – Front Yard:	Min. 6.0 m	4.7 m	Variance requested
Setback – Side Yard (West):	Min. 3.0 m	3.0 m	None
Setback – Side Yard (East):	Min. 3.0 m	3.0 m	None
Setback – Rear Yard:	Min. 3.0 m	4.5 m	None
Building Height:	Max. 12.0 m Max. 3 storeys	12.0 m 3 storeys	None

On Future Site	Bylaw/Area Plan Requirement		Proposed	Variance
On-site Vehicle Parking Spaces – Regular (R) / Visitor (V):	Rate	Spaces	48 (R) and 5 (V) spaces	None
	2.0/unit (R) 0.2/unit (V)	Min. 48 (R) Min. 5 (V)		
On-site Accessible Vehicle Parking Spaces:	2% of required spaces (i.e., 1 space)		1 space	None
Tandem Vehicle Parking Spaces:	%	Spaces	N/A	None
	Max. 50% of required spaces	Max. 15		
Max. Small Cars:	50% (i.e., 24 spaces)		50% (24 spaces)	None
Total On-site Vehicle Parking Spaces:	53 spaces		53 spaces	None
On-site Bicycle Parking Spaces:		Rate	Spaces	None
	Class 1 (R)	1.25/unit	Min. 30	
	Class 2 (V)	0.2/unit	Min. 5	5 spaces
Max. Vertical Spaces:	33% of required spaces (i.e., 9 spaces)		8 spaces (+ 2 add'l spaces)	None
Total On-site Bicycle Parking Spaces:	35 spaces		37 spaces	None
Amenity Space – Indoor:	Min. 70 m <sup>2</sup>		Cash-in-lieu	N/A
Amenity Space – Outdoor:	Min. 6 m <sup>2</sup> /unit (i.e., 144 m <sup>2</sup> )		189.6 m <sup>2</sup>	N/A

Other: Tree replacement compensation required for loss of bylaw-sized trees.

**SURVEY PLAN OF PROPOSED LOT 1  
CURRENTLY LOTS 190, 191, PLAN 33687, AND WEST HALF LOT 101, PLAN 8212  
ALL OF SECTION 23, BLOCK 5 NORTH, RANGE 6 WEST  
NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT**

SCALE 1 : 250  
0 5 10  
All distances are in metres.



- NOTES:**
- Lot dimensions are deduced from field survey.
  - Elevations are based on the Geodetic Datum of Richmond and are derived from HPN#194 (02#2415) situated at in slab of Bath, Slough North pump station E of No. 5 Road, Richmond, B.C.
  - For elevation control, use control monument or head plugs in concrete sidewalk only.
  - All trees and stumps have been plotted as required by Richmond Bylaw 8557.
  - All elevations along curb lines are gutter levels.
  - All elevations along exterior faces of buildings are unless otherwise noted.
  - Symbols plotted are for illustrative purposes and are not representative of their true size.

- denotes standard iron post.
- ⊙ denotes lead plug.
- ⊗ denotes hydrant pole.
- ⊕ denotes lamp standard.
- ⊛ denotes top of well.
- ⊙ by denotes bottom of well.
- ⊗ denotes catch basin.
- ⊕ denotes manhole.
- ⊗ denotes water valve.
- ⊙ denotes tree.
- ⊛ denotes dip line radius (m).
- ⊕ denotes deciduous tree.
- ⊗ denotes diameter (cm).

**CIVIC ADDRESS**  
10671-10751 BRIDGEPORT ROAD  
RICHMOND, B.C.  
**ZONING:** RS1/D


**CERTIFIED CORRECT**  
DATED THIS 15TH DAY OF SEPT, 2018

**IVAN NGAN** B.C.L.S.  
**LNLS** METRO VANCOUVER LAND SURVEYORS  
4932 VICTORIA DRIVE, VANCOUVER, BC, V6P 3T6  
T 604.327.1535 WEB WWW.LNLS.CA

LOT 190 PID:003-681-292  
LOT 191 PID:006-950-035  
LOT 101 PID:007-529-392  
FILE:123911P2

Land Use Map – Bridgeport


Bylaw 9024  
2013/11/18





# City of Richmond

SUBJECT SITE



### LEGEND



Residential Area 1 (Subject to the policies described in Section 3.1 and 4.0)



Residential Area 2 (Subject to the policies described in Section 3.1 and 4.0)



## Bridgeport Area Plan Land Use Map Excerpt

Original Date: 11/01/18

Revision Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES

**From:** Keith Tough <tough.keith1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 15 November 2018 03:30 PM  
**To:** Lussier, Cynthia  
**Cc:** AZIM BHIMANI; Keith Tough  
**Subject:** RZ 17-771592 10671 - 10751 Bridgeport Rd  
**Attachments:** July 20 2018 CPS - Residential.pdf; CPS for 10651 Bridgeport.pdf

Cynthia Lussier  
Planner 1  
Development Applications Department  
City of Richmond  
6911 No, 3 Road  
Richmond BC V6Y 2C1

Hi Cynthia

Azim Bhimini has requested that I summarize my interactions with Mr Brian Cray, of 10651 Bridgeport Rd., with regards to Azim's efforts in trying to purchase Mr Cray's property.

I listed the property at 10671 Bridgeport Rd, for sale on Feb. 19, 2016. I was approached by Azim in the first week of March and he expressed his interest in purchasing this property if I could also get the neighbours at 10651 and 10691 to agree to sell their property. I was able to put together an acceptable agreement for both 10671 and 10691 Bridgeport to sell provided 10651 or 10751 Bridgeport Rd. also agreed to sell by April 30, 2016

I then approached Mr Cray with an offer to purchase under similar terms to 10671 and 10691 at a price of \$1,200,000. Mr Cray would not respond with a counteroffer. On March 15, 2016 I emailed Mr Cray another offer for \$1,500,000 with the same conditions as the previous offer. Again Mr Cray would not counteroffer in writing nor did he indicate verbally a price he would consider. He stated he was not interested in selling at that time and his plans were to remain there until he retired. Although he did indicate that if the buyer was willing to offer an amount that would fairly compensate him he would consider it.

Market value at that time in March of 2016 was around \$110 per sq. ft., This is based on the fact I had just sold 10671 and 10691 Bridgeport the previous week for \$108 per sq. ft. and \$111 per sq. ft. Therefore the offer for 10651 Bridgeport at \$1,500,000 was for a premium price of \$141 per sq. ft. Therefore the developers were very serious with their offer to purchase 10651 Bridgeport especially given it was a corner lot which is typically not as valuable as mid-block lots for townhouse developments. This is due to the need for increased setbacks and also off-site civil works.

At this point, Azim asked me to approach the owners of 10751 Bridgeport Rd., which I did. After about 3 weeks on negotiations with the owners of 10751 Bridgeport Rd being unwilling to agree to anything less than their premium asking price, Azim agreed to pay their price. This allowed for an assembly that meets the requirement of a minimum frontage of 50 metres which was enough to commence the development process.

In July of this year, Azim called to see if there was any change in Mr Cray's position. I said not to my knowledge but why don't you make him another offer. Which we did. I again emailed an offer of \$1,500,000 with much better terms and a reasonable completion date plus a \$100,000 deposit. I asked Mr Cray to look over the offer and then we could meet at his convenience to discuss. He called me the next day to let me know the price was still not anywhere near acceptable as he didn't think the city would allow access off Bridgeport. He also said that the planning department had assured him that he could subdivide his property into 2 lots or

possibly a multifamily development of 5 townhomes. So based on that he felt his property should be valued at a much higher figure.

I trust this summarizes the steps taken in the attempts to purchase Mr Cray's property. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

Keith Tough



Keith Tough

Associate Broker, Royal LePage Regency Realtor Ltd.

604.351.8933 | 604-943-7411 | [tough.keith1@gmail.com](mailto:tough.keith1@gmail.com)

[www.holleyandkeith.com](http://www.holleyandkeith.com) | 1333 56th St, Delta, BC V4L 2A6







Written correspondence from resident at  
10651 Bridgeport Road

## Lussier, Cynthia

---

**From:** brian cray <briancray@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 8 November 2018 08:45 AM  
**To:** Lussier,Cynthia; MayorandCouncillors; ken@interfacearchitecture.com  
**Subject:** RZ 17-771592

Dear Ms Lussier:

I did receive your previous email and before I went away on vacation, I wanted to reiterate some things, make some things more clear, and make a few additional comments.

While I am away, I do not have regular access to internet. While I will try to stay on top of this rezone, it might not be possible.

This rezone started when developers started by buying 10671 Bridgeport because my neighbor wanted to relocate. Then they looked at the adjoining properties. With me they gave me a verbal offer of \$1.2 million and then made a written offer of \$1.5 million in writing when I rejected the first offer. Then this year they made a pro forma written offer of the same amount \$1.5 million to satisfy the City that they had attempted to access Mckessock.

No where is the City requiring them to make a serious offer...both in terms of terms, and in price. All of the City of Richmond's calculations in terms of residual sites, access, and discouraging these things is based on this. In all the terms, this was not a cash offer but with terms that made it that I would be financing the offer until it closed many months down the road when certain things happened. Then with regards to the price, considering the geometry of my lot, it should be able to sub-divide into 2 stand alone single family lots, or 5 townhomes under the policy. Then you have to consider what a building lot is worth in Richmond and it is considerably more than \$1.5 million. In fact, BC Assessment Authority assessed my lot at \$1.625 as a developable single family lot before I reduced it under section 19(8) to \$1.175 million in its current use and being a long term resident. Is the City of Richmond advocating that I should take less than fair market development?

I have lived here for 20 years and along the way, staff produced a report and changed the policy for its use in my block in 2013. I will say again, staff wrote the report (including the numbers for the frontage and square footage to develop for townhomes and nothing requiring access away from Bridgeport). It only states discourage....a meaningless term as it is being used in the evaluation of this proposal.

In the report and in the OCP, which was all approved by Council, the following statements are made....

- Vehicle access off Bridgeport Road is discouraged
- Residual sites should be avoided
- Avoid situations where local roads intersect with arterial roads and reduce direct private access on arterial roads and to implement a regulated access bylaw for Bridgeport Road
- Improve sidewalks, pedestrian areas and walkways(in conjunction with new developments or infrastructure improvements)

-The main concern in the sub-area relate to traffic flow and parking. Bridgeport Road is a heavily used traffic artery and the multitude of traffic access points to individual lots, creates serious conflicts and impediments to traffic flow.

Last year, I contacted Transportation Department ([shingorani@richmond.ca](mailto:shingorani@richmond.ca)) by email. This person via a phone call, advised me that the policies and procedures followed will be what is in the Policy and OCP.

So at this minute, the rezone application is moving forward, getting close to public hearing, and I am leaving on a long vacation and will unlikely be available for it.

The applicants have only made a pro forma offer for my property and to get proper access, they are attempting to access Bridgeport Road directly with little traffic mitigation. Staff have told me that all they have to do is make an offer. They do not judge the offer. So the developer has done the minimum required under the Bylaws for staff to follow. That would appear to pave the way forward for approval of the development (24 townhomes) with direct access onto Bridgeport Road despite all the official policies of council. In the developers drawings, they have added a small triangle on the sidewalk to attempt to deny left turning out and in . I could suggest improvements to deny access over the double yellow line on Bridgeport Road if this development proceeds ....physical island, right turn bay, etc. But with the reading of the policies of council above, the staff writing the numbers in the report, and lack of attempt to gain proper access for the development, I believe that this development is not consistent with planning departments vision for Bridgeport Road as previously written in Policy and the OCP.

Sincerely yours,

Brian Cray

## Lussier, Cynthia

---

**From:** Lussier, Cynthia  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 October 2018 09:01 AM  
**To:** 'brian cray'  
**Subject:** RE: 10671 Bidgeport Road

Hello Mr. Cray,

Thank you for your correspondence dated September 30<sup>th</sup> (below) regarding the rezoning application at 10671, 10691, and 10751 Bridgeport Road (RZ 17-771592).

A copy of your correspondence will be included in the staff report to Planning Committee when the Rezoning application at this site is ready to move forward.

With respect to the concerns you have identified about a) the proposed vehicle access and traffic study; b) the redevelopment potential of your property; and c) the timeframe for when the proposal at the subject site might go forward, I can provide the following information:

- a) The traffic study requested by the City must be reviewed and concurred to by the City's Transportation Department staff before the proposal is able to move forward. The terms of reference for the traffic study are determined by the City's Transportation Department. The City's review of the traffic study submitted by the Applicant is currently on-going. If you would like to set up a time to view the traffic study, please let me know and I can arrange an appointment with the City's Transportation Department staff in case you have further questions.
- b) Should the Rezoning application at the subject site move forward, the City would consider the following redevelopment scenarios for your property:
  - i) a proposal for townhouses consistent with the Bridgeport Area Plan, with shared access through the neighbouring subject site; or
  - ii) a proposal for single-family lots fronting McKessock Avenue consistent with Lot Size Policy 5448 (note: this would require an application to amend the Area Plan).

The Applicant has submitted a preliminary concept plan showing the redevelopment potential of the neighbouring properties under the townhouse scenario. Please let me know if you would like to set up a time to meet to review the concept plan in person.

- c) The staff review of the Rezoning application at the subject site is on-going. Having recently received a revised submission from the Applicant, it is possible that the Rezoning application could advance to the Planning Committee of Council in the coming months. When a staff report to the Planning Committee is prepared for this Rezoning application, it will be available on the City's website for review through the following link: <https://www.richmond.ca/cityhall/council/agendas/planning.htm>. Should this Rezoning application be endorsed by the Planning Committee and City Council it would then move forward for consideration at a Public Hearing, at which time you would receive direct mail notification approximately 10 days in advance of the Hearing date and you are able to provide additional comments in writing by regular mail or by email up until the conclusion of the Hearing. All correspondence received as part of the Public Hearing process will be considered by City Council.

Please let me know if you have any questions in response to the information I've provided above.

Thanks,

Cynthia Lussier  
Planner 1  
[clussier@richmond.ca](mailto:clussier@richmond.ca)  
Tel. 604-276-4108  
Fax. 604-276-4052  
Development Applications Department  
City of Richmond  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond BC V6Y 2C1

## Lussier, Cynthia

---

**From:** brian cray <briancray@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 30 September 2018 05:13 PM  
**To:** Lussier, Cynthia  
**Subject:** 10671 Bidgeport Road

Dear Ms Lussier:

I wanted to reiterate a few things after our conversation last week.

You seemed not to appreciate the traffic issue when exiting the new proposed development. I would go back to the OCP..."The main concerns in the sub-area relate to traffic flow and parking. Bridgeport Road is a heavily used traffic artery and the multitude of traffic access points to individual lots, create serious conflicts and impediments to traffic flow.". Also, "Avoid situations where local roads intersect with arterial roads and reduce direct private access on arterial roads and to implement a regulated access bylaw for Bridgeport Road."

While on the outside you seemed to compare Bridgeport Road to Steveston Highway and development there able to access it directly. I don't know what the OCP states for that area, I only know what is official council policy as written for Bridgeport Road. That is what I have in my files and based my thinking on. Now if council wants to change it, I would assume that is possible, but staff should (I would say MUST) evaluate any proposed development by the OCP.

Now , I understand the City of Richmond has told the developer to hire a transportation engineer to assess Bridgeport Road to get around what is council policy. They get to choose which engineer is hired and mold the study. Not very independent.

That leads to the next point. If this is the only solution to there development access, then it might have to be done. But this developer, while assembling this parcel, went to City Hall and asked those questions and felt it did not need my property if it made an offer and could not purchase my parcel. And they did not try very hard. In 2016 they made a verbal offer of 1.2 million for a corner lot with the dimensions of 90ft frontage and 117ft deep. With that size, it is sub-dividable into 2 single family lots. They then wrote up a slightly improved offer of 1.5 million with poor terms in timing and payment of monies. Then this year they reiterated the 1.5 million offer to placate staff on that they made an offer. I guess the question is one of price and terms. Does any offer to buy my corner lot to provide access acceptable to the City of Richmond or does the concept of fair market and/or the concept that they might have to pay a premium to fair market? Or should I take less than the value of the property and that is what the City of Richmond means that they tried and can now directly access Bridgeport Road?

Going forward, I am going out of town for an extended period of time. This development has been going thru the process for over a year and is going to hit council while I am away. I find this to be extremely disappointing. I am very interested. I have many points to raise to the council directly and not being able to do it in person makes it more difficult.

And I have no idea how the fact that current councilors are in a conflict of interest has impacted this development, or how it will going forward.

If this development is approved, I have no idea what becomes of my property. Nothing in writing that shows me a road map of what can be done to develop my property in the future nor any zoning as it becomes a residual property (which the OCP also stated they are trying to reduce.

Sincerely yours,

Brian Cray

## Lussier, Cynthia

---

**From:** brian cray <briancray@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 21 July 2018 06:33 PM  
**To:** Lussier, Cynthia  
**Subject:** Fw: Offer to purchase 10651 Bridgeport from developer  
**Attachments:** July 20 2018 CPS - Residential.pdf; BridgeportMcKessock Area Plan & Land Use Designations.zip

Dear Ms. Lussier:

Late Friday I received this email from the developer with an offer from the developer. This offer has the same price as 2 years ago that I turned down very easily after their abortive \$1.2 million offer. Some of the terms have changed in regards to timing as their project is much further along.

I talked to the realtor for some time via phone. My impression is that this offer is a pro forma offer due to pressure from City Hall. He does not want nor need my property for his development. His opinion not mine.

I found my warning letter from BC Assessment. Preliminary value was \$1.629 million. I then applied section 19 8 where it allows for a less than market value assessment if certain criteria were met. At the end of the day, I was assessed at \$1.1 million. The original assessment is as a large single family lot. Not the best and highest use.

This new offer is the same as the one 2 years ago and under the assessed value as a single family lot. Not a real offer again.

Down the street one lot is for sale with a teardown at \$999,000 and not able to subdivide so a single family lot. And I have two of them...45 x 117. Then one close to it is for sale with a good 20 yo house at \$1.468 million and around the corner \$2.599 million (66x182) and a 20yo house but not able to subdivide. While their is nothing exactly comparable, must look and come up with some number.

I have no idea what developable lands to become townhouse is worth...but say \$500,000 per townhouse and that would put me at \$2.5 million. Or more per townhouse. or a bonus for access.

Just wanted to let you know what is going on and nothing has really changed except the developer has put A offer to me. Not a real offer but an offer. I would note that I would pay realtor fees again.

Sincerely yours

Brian Cray

---

**From:** Keith Tough <tough.keith1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** July 20, 2018 4:13 PM



To: brian cray

Subject: Offer to purchase 10651 Bridgeport from developer

Hi Brian


Please find attached an offer of \$1,500,000 for your property. Please have a look at it and if you are willing we could meet sometime in next few days. Other than Sunday afternoon as I have an open house.

Thanks

Keith



Keith Tough  
Associate Broker, Royal LePage Regency Realtor Ltd.  
604.351.8933 | 604-943-7411 | [tough.keith1@gmail.com](mailto:tough.keith1@gmail.com)  
[www.holleyandkeith.com](http://www.holleyandkeith.com) | 1333 56th St, Delta, BC V4L 2A6



**Lussier, Cynthia**

---

**From:** brian cray <briancray@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 17 July 2018 11:51 AM  
**To:** Lussier, Cynthia  
**Subject:** Re: 10651 Bridgeport Road

Dear Ms Lussier

With 2 plans from the developer with little change and major problems, and it seems staff is content with their proposal, another meeting at city hall with staff does not seem it would productive.

Other options would seem to me to be more productive.

Thank you for your time.

Brian Cray

## Lussier,Cynthia

---

**From:** Lussier,Cynthia  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 17 July 2018 09:19 AM  
**To:** 'brian cray'; MayorandCouncillors; ken@interfacearchitecture.com; eedmonds@richmond-news.com  
**Subject:** RE: 10651 Bridgeport Road

Hi Mr. Cray

Thank you for your additional correspondence dated July 12<sup>th</sup> (below) regarding the rezoning application at 10671, 10691, and 10751 Bridgeport Road (RZ 17-771592).

A copy of your correspondence will be included in the staff report to Planning Committee when the rezoning application for this site is ready to move forward.

If you would like to meet with me and the staff in the City's Transportation division to discuss your concerns further, please let me know.

Thanks,

Cynthia Lussier  
Planner 1  
clussier@richmond.ca  
Tel. 604-276-4108  
Fax. 604-276-4052  
Development Applications Department  
City of Richmond  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond BC V6Y 2C1

## Lussier, Cynthia

---

**From:** brian cray <briancray@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 12 July 2018 05:14 PM  
**To:** Lussier, Cynthia; MayorandCouncillors; ken@interfacearchitecture.com; eedmonds@richmond-news.com  
**Subject:** Re: 10651 Bridgeport Road

Dear Ms Lussier:

I understand the proposed development meets the minimum land assembly size and frontage guidelines for sites designated as "Residential Area 2". I would point out that this report (and adoption into bylaw by council) was written by staff and those numbers were known to staff and it allowed these 3 large properties to be developed on their own. So this part in the report that talks about discouraging access from Bridgeport is meaningless. Staff could have written the policy detail to make this happen but it appears it was meant to show concern about the access which is in keeping of Council Policy in the Tait area OCP but has no impact on actual development. In fact in this area of the OCP it clearly states that Bridgeport Road is a MAJOR arterial route and it is policy to deny direct access to Bridgeport Road where alternative local roads are available. So staff was remiss in how they wrote this originally.

The concern about these three large lots was well known. It was written about as far back as RZ 11-578325 when on the other side of Mckessock, an application to have Coach House designation (30ft lots) was asked for. I know because I was at those meetings. And when I asked about my lot, I was told and that report talks about the existing geometry of the lots in my block. In RZ-12610919 it talks about these three lots again..."there are three (3) deep lots on Bridgeport Road that lead lend themselves to more efficient use of the land than currently permitted by the existing Lot Size Policy". But I was told that I had to be part of the policy with those 3 large lots. I will say again, I know, because I was there.

So because of these concerns and the concerns of the residents, staff did a report and wrote up the numbers. So when you say you are just going by the numbers in the Policy you are correct but not the whole story. Staff guided what could be built, how access will be achieved by minimums and allowed this to happen. How is this discouraging access to Bridgeport that council has as a policy of?

Then in the OCP it talks about the need to implement an access bylaw to reduce the number of access point to Bridgeport Road. And where is this bylaw? I would assume staff never wrote one and sent to council to approve.

### Traffic Study

It is nice the developer has done a traffic study. It is the first that I have heard of that. Do you think that traffic has gone down since the OCP was developed? Do you think merging from a driveway for a Townhouse complex onto a busy Major arterial road is a good idea? Do you think traffic drives at the posted speed of 50KH? I will say it again, with a bus stop nearby, a side street where there is lots of traffic exiting Mckessock and the lane behind Bridgeport, and a train crossing, do you think this is a safe idea?

Island

In the new plan for this development, you are correct that there is a miniscule triangular island on the driveway (on the walkway where pedestrians and wheelchairs use). Do you think that is going to be effective in stopping left turns out of the driveway or left turns into the complex over the double yellow line? The double yellow line now does not stop traffic on Bridgeport from blocking the lane and waiting to turn now and they will just drive around this little island on the driveway. The only way to stop them doing this is to have some sort of barrier along the double yellow line. A merge lane along Bridgeport road on the north side in front of the complex would be appropriate. I say this after 33 years in municipal road construction but who am I.

#### Residual Sites

The Policy and the OCP talks clearly on the need to reduce residual sites. But again, staff wrote the report and guided the development and allowed only the three large lots to be developed, so the idea that the City is discouraging this is just plain horsehockey. Now the City is going to have to deal with the residents of the area who think they have been sold out by the City. My reading of the Policy says that the back area cannot be developed without the front lands, effectively orphaning them also. And the City has not effectively communicated what this means to all the affected residents/owners. I know when I was at one of the meetings of council, the Director of Planning quite clearly told me some things I cannot do with my property at the time with the new policy. And to how the developer must show how the orphaned sites can be developed, I find the plan to be completely inadequate in trying to achieve this.

Going forward, I have no faith in staff to address my concerns because of the past lack of competence in writing the Policy. And the developer has put to the City 2 plans and none of them addresses my concerns and staff seems to fall back to that policy that they wrote. I believe that the only way to get my point across is to take my concerns regarding the whole mess to the elected council (present council), and future members of council. I do not think that this is what was envisioned when staff wrote the new policy in 2013 and when it comes to approving this in the future, shall they side with the residents/owners who were promised more than what was delivered by staff...a 3 property policy that has not addressed their concerns for the future except to be orphaned which was what I said originally in a letter to council in 2012.

BTW....I noticed in the RZ 12-610919 rezone that Engineering Improvement Charge has been charged for all new houses on Mckessock Ave for "future frontage improvements to be constructed at such times that a majority of the block has redeveloped and contributed to funding the improvements". The whole block of Mckessock seems fully built with over 6 new homes and the pedestrians walk on the road to get to the bus stop near this development on Bridgeport Road and nothing has been done in the over 6 years since it was approved.

Sincerely yours,

Brian Cray

cc mayor and council  
Richmond News  
Interface Architecture

## Lussier, Cynthia

---

**From:** Lussier, Cynthia  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 11 July 2018 08:37 AM  
**To:** 'brian cray'  
**Subject:** RE: 10651 Bridgeport Road

Hi Mr. Cray,

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your email of July 5<sup>th</sup> (below) regarding the rezoning application at 10671, 10691, and 10751 Bridgeport Road (RZ 17-771592).

A copy of your submission will be included in the staff report to Planning Committee when the rezoning application at this site is ready to move forward.

With respect to some of the concerns you've identified below, I have provided some information and we can certainly meet in person to go over these items in more detail if you wish:

- The rezoning application is consistent with the minimum land assembly size and frontage guidelines for sites designated as "Residential Area 2" in the Bridgeport Area Plan (i.e., 2,500 m<sup>2</sup>, and 50 m on Bridgeport Road).
- While the guidelines in the Area Plan discourage vehicle access off Bridgeport Road, the guidelines do not prohibit direct access to Bridgeport Road. The rezoning application proposes vehicle access off Bridgeport Road with a raised barrier curb at the driveway crossing to physically restrict vehicle movements to right-in/right-out. The applicant has also submitted a traffic study, which is currently under review by the City's Transportation Department.
- Consistent with the Area Plan, where a redevelopment proposal results in the creation of residual lots (such as in this case), the City requires the applicant to demonstrate how those properties may redevelop in the future to their maximum potential identified in the Area Plan. The applicant has provided a preliminary concept illustrating how the neighbouring properties in "Residential Area 2" and "Residential Area 1" may redevelop in future, consistent with the Area Plan.

Please let me know if you would like to meet to discuss this further.

Thank you,

Cynthia Lussier  
Planner 1  
[clussier@richmond.ca](mailto:clussier@richmond.ca)  
Tel. 604-276-4108  
Fax. 604-276-4052  
Development Applications Department  
City of Richmond  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond BC V6Y 2C1

**Lussier, Cynthia**

---

**From:** Lussier, Cynthia  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 26 June 2018 02:37 PM  
**To:** 'brian cray'  
**Subject:** RE: 10671 Bridgeport Road

Hi Mr. Cray

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your email of June 21<sup>st</sup> (below).

A copy of your correspondence will be included in the staff report to the Planning Committee of Council when the rezoning application at this site is ready to move forward. Further revisions to the plans are required before the proposal will be ready to move forward.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Cynthia Lussier  
Planner 1  
[clussier@richmond.ca](mailto:clussier@richmond.ca)  
Tel. 604-276-4108  
Fax. 604-276-4052  
Development Applications Department  
City of Richmond  
6911 No. 3 Road  
Richmond BC V6Y 2C1

## Lussier, Cynthia

---

**From:** brian cray <briancray@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 5 July 2018 07:48 PM  
**To:** Lussier, Cynthia; MayorandCouncillors; eedmonds@richmond-news.com;  
ken@interfacearchitecture.com  
**Subject:** 10651 Bridgeport Road

Dear Ms Lussier:

I would like to refer to your email to me on June 26/18 regarding the Development at 10671 Bridgeport Road.

The email sent to you was not a full description of my issues with the development. So I will expand on it here.

### BACKGROUND

I have lived on this property for 20 years and lived in Richmond since 1975. I have been to many different meetings regarding the developments around me. This culminated in a staff report dated 11/18/2013 bylaw 9024 and Policy 5448. This bylaw regulated the development in an area bordered on Shell Rd, Bridgeport Rd, Mckessock Rd and to about Mckessock Place in the back. Then a couple of years ago, a developer bought 3 contiguous properties in the middle of the block and are now trying to develop them with access directly onto Bridgeport Rd with nothing more than a driveway. This will orphan the lots on Bridgeport to either side and back(residual sites).

### Development

In the staff report leading to the 2013 Bylaw and Policy change...it says:

..."Low density townhouses may be considered"..."subject to the following development requirements:". It goes on to say..."involve a minimum land assembly of 3000 m<sup>2</sup>"....involve a land assembly with at least 50 m of frontage on Bridgeport Road"...."involve a land assembly with at least 40 m of frontage on Shell Road". I don't know if it has to meet all these or just some of these but it does not meet the last one.

...."Residual sites should be avoided"...."Where a residual site is permitted, the residual site must enable viable future townhouse development with frontage to Shell Road, as demonstrated through preliminary plan presented with prior rezoning.". I do not see that residual sites should be avoided as being even considered. Because the developer bought the cheaper interior lots and while making an offer to me, his offer was insulting to me considering my lot configuration (90 feet of frontage and 117 feet deep) which could easily be subdivided into 2 lots and gaining a much higher sale value (fair market value). Never mind the issue of a corner lot with access and not being for sale. The second part of the Residual sites section talks about access to Shell Road and enable future townhouse development. I am not sure how to interpret it and how it applies.

...."Vehicle access may be preferable off Mckessock Ave, or secondly, off Shell Road". "Vehicle access off Bridgeport Road is discouraged". It would seem to me that the City of Richmond is bending over to allow this developer to access 24 townhomes now, and possible future townhomes next to the development directly onto Bridgeport Road with only a driveway. This area of Bridgeport has a bus stop near the proposed



driveway, a solid double center line, a traffic controlled intersection and another uncontrolled intersection (Mckessock Ave) all near this driveway with no proposed safety features. I will quote from the Tait area plan "2.2 Bridgeport Road"... "The main concern in the sub-area relate to traffic flow and parking. Bridgeport Road is a heavily used traffic artery and the multitude of traffic access points to individual lots, creates serious conflicts and impediments to traffic flow." It does not seem that the development is being discouraged from direct access to Bridgeport Road yet the area plan highlights the dangers quite clearly. Nor is there any plan to mitigate this issue with design if access is to be allowed. I have no idea how it could be done but the proposal is only using a driveway.

I would also like to point out that Residential Area 2 (the backlands) would be cut off and never be able to support townhomes under the existing policy due to the requirement that a land assembly must "involve a land assembly with at least 50 m frontage on Bridgeport Road". The existing development shows a pedestrian access point but not a vehicle access forever causing this area to be orphaned under this policy.

I would also like to point out that in section 4.0 Transportation section c) Avoid situations where local roads intersect with arterial roads and reduce direct private access on arterial roads and to implement a regulated access bylaw for Bridgeport Road". This development seems to be contrary to the policy laid out and I would be interested to know if a bylaw has ever been enacted after this 2009 report?

I would also like to point out in the plans provided to me, the area of my lot is only peripherally shown. There is no way to really see how my lot could be developed after being orphaned by this development. Also I have no information on how my lot or other lots would be considered for development in the future as we are all too small to do anything.

As we move forward to the fall election cycle, I will be quizzing all candidates for council on what there position is regarding encouraging development to access Bridgeport Road directly rather than discouraging it like the report talks about.

I should point out that in 2012 Planning Committee meeting (file RZ-610919) it states that leading up to the changes that

"Further consideration of rezoning and subdivision applications on a site by site basis without a better understanding of the available redevelopment options is problematic for the following reasons:

There are 3 large deep lots on Bridgeport Road that lend themselves to more efficient use of the land than that currently permitted by the existing Lot Size Policy

There is greater potential for some properties to be left as orphaned lots due their location and configuration

There is less chance of all property owners achieving the maximum benefit of their land"

Do you think that a developer taking the easiest and cheapest lots to buy but the hardest to access and the City of Richmond allowing this and the orphaning of the surrounding lots to be the goal of the 2012 staff report and the 2013 Bylaw? Do you think the staff report and new Bylaw allowed all of the things the City was trying to avoid actually happen?

I would like to thank you and ask for this to be put into the record for the this development. Please notify me of all upcoming meetings etc. Thank you.

Brian Cray  
10651 Bridgeport Road

cc

mayor and council  
Richmond News Editor E. Edmonds  
Interface Architecture Ken Chow

## Lussier, Cynthia

---

**From:** brian cray <briancray@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 21 June 2018 08:44 PM  
**To:** Lussier, Cynthia  
**Cc:** ken@interfacearchitecture.com; MayorandCouncillors  
**Subject:** 10671 Bridgeport Road

Dear Ms. Lussier:

Today I went up to City Hall and received a copy of the updated plans for the development at 10671 Bridgeport Road.

Tonight I went over the new plans. From what I can see, there have only been minor changes to the development.

My concerns continue to be the access for 24 units (average 2 vehicles per unit and associated service vehicles). All that is provided is a normal driveway directly onto Bridgeport Road. There is no plan for these vehicles to safely access this busy road. From the pedestrians walking on the sidewalk, to the traffic going fast suddenly confronted by merging vehicles. In both directions just feet away from Shell Road intersection with train tracks. While there is a double yellow line, the traffic will cross this line illegally or not be able to fully cross the lanes of traffic blocking the traffic. I would put it to you that this is unsafe and high percentages to create accidents.

Then we get into the orphan properties on either side. First, this will add to the number of vehicles using this access point. And the plans are very poor in showing how these properties would be developed.

Since this seem to be the final plans that are to be submitted, then there is only way forward....for me to speak clearly and loudly about this development before council. I would appreciate the dates and times for this.

I would also like to point out that in the staff report for this area, staff not once did mention accessing Bridgeport road for a development in this block...in fact they clearly mention Shell road or Mckessock for access. I know this because you wrote this report in response to my questioning at a public hearing what was the intention of the City in my block. I would also point out that when this development was first envisioned, I talked to the lady in Transportation and she said that the guidance for transportation issues caused by access, would be governed by the Policy paper which said nothing about it.

I wanted to put my feelings on this issue in writing and make them clear for all to understand.

Sincerely yours,

Brian Cray  
10651 Bridgeport Road  
Richmond BC

ps. I am going to send a copy to the Architecture Firm and to City Council for their information.

## Lussier, Cynthia

---

**From:** brian cray <briancray@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, 14 July 2017 05:42 PM  
**To:** Lussier, Cynthia  
**Subject:** RZ-17-771592  
**Attachments:** IMG\_0096.JPG; IMG\_0100.JPG; IMG\_0103.JPG; IMG\_0101.JPG; IMG\_0105.JPG

Dear Cynthia:

Tonight, after work, I took a few pics of the traffic...including backing up to Mckessock going eastbound and the traffic flow going westbound. And that is without a train blocking Shell.

The idea of another access onto Bridgeport seems to go against what staff would seem to want/encourage.

1. the width of the driveway would seem to cause a problem...if someone trying to enter the complex comes against an outbound vehicle, there will be a stopped vehicle on Bridgeport.
2. the one way flow within the complex will likely cause confusion and issues.
3. the access on the sides for future use will likely inhibit how these properties could develop if townhouses are developed.
4. the lack of widening the street where the complex is, will put the traffic issues on Bridgeport for those in the complex. There could be a transition lane for the right turners, there could be an island to reinforce the double yellow line (no crossing), or there could be a signal light.

Tonight, at rush hour, the traffic backed up to Mckessock. Then when the red light turns green for the westbound traffic takes off. So trying to exit this complex at this time, if trying to cross Bridgeport will be either stuck in driveway or blocking the westbound traffic. For traffic trying to enter using a right hand turn, will slow down blocking this traffic, and if turning left into the complex, will block traffic (illegal for the turning vehicle if blocking traffic). As it is designed now. Or unless the City requires the developer to engineer this intersection. Otherwise accidents are a guarantee due to poor planning/design and the City knew this.

I will add the pics.

Thank you

Brian Cray

ps. If I have more thoughts I will send them. Sometime this next week, I will come to City Hall for a quick meeting to get the full info on the development.



PH - 52



PH - 53



PH - 54

REVISIONS	
NOV 14, 2018	R2 SUBMISSION
SEP 21, 2018	R2 SUBMISSION
JULY 18, 2018	D9 SUBMISSION
MAY 14, 2018	RE-SUBMISSION
APRIL 26, 2017	R2 APPLICATION
CONSULTANTS	

**INTERFACE:**  
 Suite 220  
 10071-10751 Bridgeport Road  
 Richmond BC  
 Canada V6X 3G5  
 T 604 811 1142  
 F 604 811 1142  
 www.interfacearchitect.com

PROJECT	
Proposed 24-Unit Townhouse Development 10071-10751 BRIDGEPORT RD. RICHMOND, B.C.	
PROJECT NO.	102898D
SCALE	AS SHOWN
DATE	APR. 15, 2017
DRAWN BY	RYAN P. COLE
CHECKED BY	KYC
SHEET TITLE	PROJECT DATA AND SITE PLAN
DRAWING	A1.1

### ZONING SUMMARY

**Zoning Bylaw No. 8500**

**CIVIC ADDRESS:** 10071-10751 BRIDGEPORT ROAD, RICHMOND BC  
**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** ALL OF SECTION 2, BLOCK 5 NORTH, RANGE 6 WEST LOT 101 PLAN 612  
**LOT SIZE (ACRES):** 0.234 (10,317 SQ. FT.)  
**NET SITE:** 0.234 (10,317 SQ. FT.)  
**ADJACENT LOTS:** 10071-10751 BRIDGEPORT ROAD (EAST) LOT 101  
**ADJACENT LOTS:** 10071-10751 BRIDGEPORT ROAD (WEST) LOT 102

PERMITTED	PROPOSED (PROPOSED)
1) 1-2 STOREY (R15)	R15 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
2) 3-4 STOREY (R20)	R20 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
3) 5-6 STOREY (R25)	R25 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
4) 7-8 STOREY (R30)	R30 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
5) 9-10 STOREY (R35)	R35 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
6) 11-12 STOREY (R40)	R40 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
7) 13-14 STOREY (R45)	R45 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
8) 15-16 STOREY (R50)	R50 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
9) 17-18 STOREY (R55)	R55 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
10) 19-20 STOREY (R60)	R60 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
11) 21-22 STOREY (R65)	R65 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
12) 23-24 STOREY (R70)	R70 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
13) 25-26 STOREY (R75)	R75 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
14) 27-28 STOREY (R80)	R80 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
15) 29-30 STOREY (R85)	R85 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
16) 31-32 STOREY (R90)	R90 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
17) 33-34 STOREY (R95)	R95 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
18) 35-36 STOREY (R100)	R100 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
19) 37-38 STOREY (R105)	R105 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
20) 39-40 STOREY (R110)	R110 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
21) 41-42 STOREY (R115)	R115 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
22) 43-44 STOREY (R120)	R120 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
23) 45-46 STOREY (R125)	R125 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
24) 47-48 STOREY (R130)	R130 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
25) 49-50 STOREY (R135)	R135 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
26) 51-52 STOREY (R140)	R140 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
27) 53-54 STOREY (R145)	R145 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
28) 55-56 STOREY (R150)	R150 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
29) 57-58 STOREY (R155)	R155 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
30) 59-60 STOREY (R160)	R160 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
31) 61-62 STOREY (R165)	R165 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
32) 63-64 STOREY (R170)	R170 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
33) 65-66 STOREY (R175)	R175 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
34) 67-68 STOREY (R180)	R180 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
35) 69-70 STOREY (R185)	R185 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
36) 71-72 STOREY (R190)	R190 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
37) 73-74 STOREY (R195)	R195 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
38) 75-76 STOREY (R200)	R200 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
39) 77-78 STOREY (R205)	R205 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
40) 79-80 STOREY (R210)	R210 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
41) 81-82 STOREY (R215)	R215 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
42) 83-84 STOREY (R220)	R220 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
43) 85-86 STOREY (R225)	R225 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
44) 87-88 STOREY (R230)	R230 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
45) 89-90 STOREY (R235)	R235 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
46) 91-92 STOREY (R240)	R240 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
47) 93-94 STOREY (R245)	R245 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
48) 95-96 STOREY (R250)	R250 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
49) 97-98 STOREY (R255)	R255 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
50) 99-100 STOREY (R260)	R260 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
51) 101-102 STOREY (R265)	R265 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
52) 103-104 STOREY (R270)	R270 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
53) 105-106 STOREY (R275)	R275 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
54) 107-108 STOREY (R280)	R280 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
55) 109-110 STOREY (R285)	R285 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
56) 111-112 STOREY (R290)	R290 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
57) 113-114 STOREY (R295)	R295 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
58) 115-116 STOREY (R300)	R300 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
59) 117-118 STOREY (R305)	R305 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
60) 119-120 STOREY (R310)	R310 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
61) 121-122 STOREY (R315)	R315 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
62) 123-124 STOREY (R320)	R320 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
63) 125-126 STOREY (R325)	R325 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
64) 127-128 STOREY (R330)	R330 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
65) 129-130 STOREY (R335)	R335 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
66) 131-132 STOREY (R340)	R340 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
67) 133-134 STOREY (R345)	R345 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
68) 135-136 STOREY (R350)	R350 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
69) 137-138 STOREY (R355)	R355 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
70) 139-140 STOREY (R360)	R360 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
71) 141-142 STOREY (R365)	R365 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
72) 143-144 STOREY (R370)	R370 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
73) 145-146 STOREY (R375)	R375 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
74) 147-148 STOREY (R380)	R380 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
75) 149-150 STOREY (R385)	R385 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
76) 151-152 STOREY (R390)	R390 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
77) 153-154 STOREY (R395)	R395 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
78) 155-156 STOREY (R400)	R400 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
79) 157-158 STOREY (R405)	R405 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
80) 159-160 STOREY (R410)	R410 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
81) 161-162 STOREY (R415)	R415 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
82) 163-164 STOREY (R420)	R420 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
83) 165-166 STOREY (R425)	R425 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
84) 167-168 STOREY (R430)	R430 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
85) 169-170 STOREY (R435)	R435 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
86) 171-172 STOREY (R440)	R440 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
87) 173-174 STOREY (R445)	R445 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
88) 175-176 STOREY (R450)	R450 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
89) 177-178 STOREY (R455)	R455 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
90) 179-180 STOREY (R460)	R460 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
91) 181-182 STOREY (R465)	R465 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
92) 183-184 STOREY (R470)	R470 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
93) 185-186 STOREY (R475)	R475 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
94) 187-188 STOREY (R480)	R480 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
95) 189-190 STOREY (R485)	R485 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
96) 191-192 STOREY (R490)	R490 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
97) 193-194 STOREY (R495)	R495 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
98) 195-196 STOREY (R500)	R500 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
99) 197-198 STOREY (R505)	R505 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
100) 199-200 STOREY (R510)	R510 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
101) 201-202 STOREY (R515)	R515 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
102) 203-204 STOREY (R520)	R520 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
103) 205-206 STOREY (R525)	R525 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
104) 207-208 STOREY (R530)	R530 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
105) 209-210 STOREY (R535)	R535 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
106) 211-212 STOREY (R540)	R540 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
107) 213-214 STOREY (R545)	R545 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
108) 215-216 STOREY (R550)	R550 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
109) 217-218 STOREY (R555)	R555 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
110) 219-220 STOREY (R560)	R560 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
111) 221-222 STOREY (R565)	R565 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
112) 223-224 STOREY (R570)	R570 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
113) 225-226 STOREY (R575)	R575 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
114) 227-228 STOREY (R580)	R580 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
115) 229-230 STOREY (R585)	R585 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
116) 231-232 STOREY (R590)	R590 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
117) 233-234 STOREY (R595)	R595 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
118) 235-236 STOREY (R600)	R600 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
119) 237-238 STOREY (R605)	R605 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
120) 239-240 STOREY (R610)	R610 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
121) 241-242 STOREY (R615)	R615 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
122) 243-244 STOREY (R620)	R620 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
123) 245-246 STOREY (R625)	R625 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
124) 247-248 STOREY (R630)	R630 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
125) 249-250 STOREY (R635)	R635 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
126) 251-252 STOREY (R640)	R640 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
127) 253-254 STOREY (R645)	R645 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
128) 255-256 STOREY (R650)	R650 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
129) 257-258 STOREY (R655)	R655 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
130) 259-260 STOREY (R660)	R660 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
131) 261-262 STOREY (R665)	R665 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
132) 263-264 STOREY (R670)	R670 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
133) 265-266 STOREY (R675)	R675 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
134) 267-268 STOREY (R680)	R680 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
135) 269-270 STOREY (R685)	R685 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
136) 271-272 STOREY (R690)	R690 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
137) 273-274 STOREY (R695)	R695 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
138) 275-276 STOREY (R700)	R700 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
139) 277-278 STOREY (R705)	R705 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
140) 279-280 STOREY (R710)	R710 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
141) 281-282 STOREY (R715)	R715 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
142) 283-284 STOREY (R720)	R720 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
143) 285-286 STOREY (R725)	R725 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
144) 287-288 STOREY (R730)	R730 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
145) 289-290 STOREY (R735)	R735 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
146) 291-292 STOREY (R740)	R740 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
147) 293-294 STOREY (R745)	R745 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
148) 295-296 STOREY (R750)	R750 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
149) 297-298 STOREY (R755)	R755 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
150) 299-300 STOREY (R760)	R760 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
151) 301-302 STOREY (R765)	R765 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
152) 303-304 STOREY (R770)	R770 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
153) 305-306 STOREY (R775)	R775 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
154) 307-308 STOREY (R780)	R780 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
155) 309-310 STOREY (R785)	R785 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
156) 311-312 STOREY (R790)	R790 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
157) 313-314 STOREY (R795)	R795 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
158) 315-316 STOREY (R800)	R800 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
159) 317-318 STOREY (R805)	R805 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
160) 319-320 STOREY (R810)	R810 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
161) 321-322 STOREY (R815)	R815 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
162) 323-324 STOREY (R820)	R820 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
163) 325-326 STOREY (R825)	R825 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
164) 327-328 STOREY (R830)	R830 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
165) 329-330 STOREY (R835)	R835 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
166) 331-332 STOREY (R840)	R840 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
167) 333-334 STOREY (R845)	R845 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
168) 335-336 STOREY (R850)	R850 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
169) 337-338 STOREY (R855)	R855 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
170) 339-340 STOREY (R860)	R860 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
171) 341-342 STOREY (R865)	R865 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
172) 343-344 STOREY (R870)	R870 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
173) 345-346 STOREY (R875)	R875 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
174) 347-348 STOREY (R880)	R880 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
175) 349-350 STOREY (R885)	R885 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
176) 351-352 STOREY (R890)	R890 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
177) 353-354 STOREY (R895)	R895 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
178) 355-356 STOREY (R900)	R900 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
179) 357-358 STOREY (R905)	R905 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
180) 359-360 STOREY (R910)	R910 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
181) 361-362 STOREY (R915)	R915 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
182) 363-364 STOREY (R920)	R920 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
183) 365-366 STOREY (R925)	R925 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
184) 367-368 STOREY (R930)	R930 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
185) 369-370 STOREY (R935)	R935 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
186) 371-372 STOREY (R940)	R940 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
187) 373-374 STOREY (R945)	R945 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
188) 375-376 STOREY (R950)	R950 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
189) 377-378 STOREY (R955)	R955 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
190) 379-380 STOREY (R960)	R960 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
191) 381-382 STOREY (R965)	R965 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
192) 383-384 STOREY (R970)	R970 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
193) 385-386 STOREY (R975)	R975 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
194) 387-388 STOREY (R980)	R980 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
195) 389-390 STOREY (R985)	R985 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
196) 391-392 STOREY (R990)	R990 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
197) 393-394 STOREY (R995)	R995 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
198) 395-396 STOREY (R1000)	R1000 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
199) 397-398 STOREY (R1005)	R1005 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
200) 399-400 STOREY (R1010)	R1010 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
201) 401-402 STOREY (R1015)	R1015 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
202) 403-404 STOREY (R1020)	R1020 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
203) 405-406 STOREY (R1025)	R1025 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
204) 407-408 STOREY (R1030)	R1030 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
205) 409-410 STOREY (R1035)	R1035 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
206) 411-412 STOREY (R1040)	R1040 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
207) 413-414 STOREY (R1045)	R1045 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
208) 415-416 STOREY (R1050)	R1050 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
209) 417-418 STOREY (R1055)	R1055 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
210) 419-420 STOREY (R1060)	R1060 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
211) 421-422 STOREY (R1065)	R1065 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
212) 423-424 STOREY (R1070)	R1070 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
213) 425-426 STOREY (R1075)	R1075 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
214) 427-428 STOREY (R1080)	R1080 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
215) 429-430 STOREY (R1085)	R1085 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
216) 431-432 STOREY (R1090)	R1090 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
217) 433-434 STOREY (R1095)	R1095 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
218) 435-436 STOREY (R1100)	R1100 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
219) 437-438 STOREY (R1105)	R1105 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
220) 439-440 STOREY (R1110)	R1110 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
221) 441-442 STOREY (R1115)	R1115 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)
222) 443-444 STOREY (R1120)	R1120 PROPOSED LOW-DENSITY (TOWNHO



REVISIONS	
NOV 19, 2018	RE-COMMISSION
SEP 27, 2018	RE-COMMISSION
JULY 18, 2018	DR-COMMISSION
MAY 14, 2018	RE-SUBMISSION
APRIL 28, 2017	RE-APPLICATION
CONSULTANTS	
<p>INTERFACE:          Suite 200          1000-1075 Bridgeport Rd          Richmond BC          Canada V6X 3Z5          T 604 271 1142          F 604 271 1142          www.interfacehvac.com</p>	

PROJECT  
 Proposed 24-Unit  
 Townhouse Development  
 1075-1075 BRIDGEPORT RD  
 RICHMOND, BC

SCALE  
 AS SHOWN


DATE  
 APR. 15, 2017

DRAWN BY  
 KFC, RD

CHECKED BY  
 KFC

SHEET TITLE  
 FIRE FIGHTING PLAN  
 PARKING PLAN

DRAWING  
**A1.2**



- DRAWING NOTES:
- INTERNAL DRIVE AISLE TO BE ENGINEERED TO SUPPORT FIRE TRUCK @ 50,000 LBS
  - REFER TO TRAFFIC OPERATIONS ANALYSIS STUDY FOR TRUCK OPERATIONS AND SWEEP PATH DIAGRAMS (ISL ENGINEERING, NOV. 9, 2016)

Scale: 1/16"=1'-0"

FIRE FIGHTING/PARKING PLAN






© Copyright reserved. This drawing and design is the property of the firm and shall remain the property of the firm. No part of this drawing may be reproduced or used in any form without the prior written permission of the firm.

**o m g**  
**LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS**  
 Suite C100 - 4186 S.W. 11th Ave  
 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309  
 P. 954.294.0311 F. 954.294.0322

SEA

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	CHKD	APP'D
1	01/15/17	PRELIMINARY LAYOUT	MC		
2	01/25/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
3	02/02/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
4	02/09/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
5	02/16/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
6	02/23/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
7	03/02/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
8	03/09/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
9	03/16/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
10	03/23/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
11	03/30/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
12	04/06/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
13	04/13/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
14	04/20/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
15	04/27/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
16	05/04/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
17	05/11/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
18	05/18/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
19	05/25/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
20	06/01/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
21	06/08/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
22	06/15/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
23	06/22/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
24	06/29/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
25	07/06/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
26	07/13/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
27	07/20/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
28	07/27/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
29	08/03/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
30	08/10/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
31	08/17/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
32	08/24/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
33	08/31/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
34	09/07/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
35	09/14/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
36	09/21/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
37	09/28/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
38	10/05/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
39	10/12/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
40	10/19/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
41	10/26/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
42	11/02/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
43	11/09/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
44	11/16/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
45	11/23/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
46	11/30/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
47	12/07/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
48	12/14/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
49	12/21/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
50	12/28/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	CHKD	APP'D
1	01/15/17	PRELIMINARY LAYOUT	MC		
2	01/25/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
3	02/02/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
4	02/09/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
5	02/16/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
6	02/23/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
7	03/02/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
8	03/09/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
9	03/16/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
10	03/23/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
11	03/30/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
12	04/06/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
13	04/13/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
14	04/20/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
15	04/27/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
16	05/04/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
17	05/11/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
18	05/18/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
19	05/25/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
20	06/01/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
21	06/08/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
22	06/15/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
23	06/22/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
24	06/29/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
25	07/06/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
26	07/13/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
27	07/20/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
28	07/27/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
29	08/03/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
30	08/10/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
31	08/17/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
32	08/24/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
33	08/31/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
34	09/07/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
35	09/14/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
36	09/21/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
37	09/28/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
38	10/05/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
39	10/12/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
40	10/19/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
41	10/26/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
42	11/02/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
43	11/09/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
44	11/16/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
45	11/23/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
46	11/30/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
47	12/07/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
48	12/14/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
49	12/21/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		
50	12/28/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC		



PH - 59

PROJECT  
**24 UNIT TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT**  
 10671-10751 BRIDGEPORT ROAD  
 RICHMOND

DRAWING TITLE  
**LANDSCAPE PLAN**

DATE: 04/27/2017 DRAWING NUMBER: **L1**  
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"  
 DRAWN BY: [Name]  
 DESIGN BY: [Name]  
 CHECKED BY: [Name]  
 PLOT PROJECT NUMBER: 17-036

NO.	DATE	REVISION DESCRIPTION	BY
1	01/15/17	PRELIMINARY LAYOUT	MC
2	01/25/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
3	02/02/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
4	02/09/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
5	02/16/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
6	02/23/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
7	03/02/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
8	03/09/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
9	03/16/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
10	03/23/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
11	03/30/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
12	04/06/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
13	04/13/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
14	04/20/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
15	04/27/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
16	05/04/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
17	05/11/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
18	05/18/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
19	05/25/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
20	06/01/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
21	06/08/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
22	06/15/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
23	06/22/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
24	06/29/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
25	07/06/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
26	07/13/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
27	07/20/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
28	07/27/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
29	08/03/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
30	08/10/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
31	08/17/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
32	08/24/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
33	08/31/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
34	09/07/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
35	09/14/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
36	09/21/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
37	09/28/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
38	10/05/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
39	10/12/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
40	10/19/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
41	10/26/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
42	11/02/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
43	11/09/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
44	11/16/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
45	11/23/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
46	11/30/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
47	12/07/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
48	12/14/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
49	12/21/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC
50	12/28/17	REVISED LAYOUT	MC

CLIENT: KENNINGTON HOMES BRIDGEPORT PLACE LP

© Copyright reserved. This drawing and design is the property of pmg LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS and shall not be reproduced or used for other projects without the written permission.

**pmg**  
**LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS**  
 Suite C106, 4185 S&E Creek Drive  
 Richmond, BC V6X 2A6  
 P: 604.274.4031 F: 604.274.4022

SEA

PH - 60

NO.	DATE	REVISION DESCRIPTION	BY
1	2017.07.15	ISSUE FOR PERMIT	MM
2	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
3	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
4	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
5	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
6	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
7	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
8	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
9	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
10	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
11	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
12	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
13	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
14	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
15	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
16	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
17	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
18	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
19	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
20	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
21	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
22	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
23	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
24	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
25	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
26	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
27	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
28	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
29	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
30	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
31	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
32	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
33	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
34	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
35	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
36	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
37	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
38	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
39	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
40	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
41	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
42	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
43	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
44	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
45	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
46	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
47	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
48	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
49	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM
50	2017.07.15	REVISED PERMIT COMMENTS	MM

CLIENT: KENNINGTON HOMES BRIDGE CENTRE/LEFP

PROJECT:  
**24 UNIT TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT**  
 18671-10751 BRIDGEPORT ROAD  
 RICHMOND


DRAWING TITLE  
**PLANTING PLAN**

DATE: APR 17, 2017  
 SCALE: 1"=10'-0"  
 DRAWN BY: MM  
 DESIGN BY: MM  
 CHECK BY: MM

**L2**

OF 6

PAGE PROJECT NUMBER  
 17-036




17062.79

© Copyright Reserved. This drawing and design is the property of P&G LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS and shall not be reproduced or used in any form without the written permission.

**P&G LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS**  
 Suite C109 - 4188 Bridgeway Drive  
 Richmond, BC V6X 1A6  
 Phone: 604-274-9101 | Fax: 604-274-0022

304




1. 6' 0" HI. WOOD SCREEN AND 4\"/>


2. 6' HI. WOOD SCREEN AND 4\"/>

3. 6' HI. ALUMINUM FENCE AND GATE - BRIDGEPORT AVENUE


4. 6' 0\"/>



5. 1/2\"/>



6. 1/2\"/>



MODERN PARK BENCH, MODEL NUMBER: MAIL-5  
 BY WOODBONE SITE FURNISHINGS  
 ALUMINUM METAL SLATS, POWDER COAT BLACK  
 LONG LASTING STAINLESS STEEL HARDWARE



SUIT BENCH, SPBRGP-5  
 BY WOODBONE SITE FURNISHINGS  
 POWDER COAT BLACK METAL  
 PHONE: 604-626-0478

NOTE: ALL BENCHES AND BIKE RACKS TO BE INSTALLED PER MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS. SURFACE MOUNTED, ON MIN. 3\"/>

**PAVING PATTERN KEY**

	PATTERN A: ROADWAY PAVER: ECO PRIORITY PERMEABLE PAVERS, 80mm TH SUPPLIER: MUTUAL MATERIALS COLOUR: CHARCOAL PATTERN: RUNNING BOND, ALIGNED AS SHOWN
	PATTERN B: ROADWAY PAVER: ECO PRIORITY PERMEABLE PAVERS, 80mm TH SUPPLIER: MUTUAL MATERIALS COLOUR: SUMMIT BLEND PATTERN: COMBINATION #2, ALIGNED AS SHOWN
	PATTERN C: SIDEWALK PAVER: Permeable Holland SUPPLIER: MUTUAL MATERIALS COLOUR: CHARCOAL PATTERN: HERRINGBONE, ALIGNED AS SHOWN
	PATTERN D: PATIOS PAVER: VANCOUVER BAY ARCHITECTURAL SLABS 24x24 SUPPLIER: MUTUAL MATERIALS COLOUR: CHARCOAL PATTERN: STACKED BOND, ALIGNED AS SHOWN

- PAVING MATERIAL NOTES:**
- INTERNAL ROADWAY TO BE ASPHALT UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
  - UNIT ENTRY PATHWAYS AND INTERNAL DRIVEWAY APRONS TO BE BROOM FINISH CONCRETE, UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.

NO.	DATE	REVISION DESCRIPTION	BY
1	11/20/2024	2/24/2024	DA
2	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
3	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
4	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
5	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
6	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
7	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
8	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
9	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
10	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
11	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
12	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
13	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
14	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
15	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
16	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
17	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
18	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
19	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA
20	11/20/2024	11/20/2024	DA

PROJECT  
**24 UNIT TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT**  
 10671-10751 BRIDGEPORT ROAD  
 RICHMOND

DRAWING TITLE  
**LANDSCAPE DETAILS**

DATE: APR 27 2025 7:19  
 SCALE: VARIOUS  
 DRAWN: TD  
 DESIGN: TD  
 CHECK: MCV  
 DRAWING NUMBER: **L4**

P&G PROJECT NUMBER: 17-036

17062 2/P


© Copyright reserved. This drawing and design is the property of pmg Landscape Architects and may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of pmg.

**pmg**  
 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS  
 Scale 1/8" = 1'-0"  
 10671-10751 Bridgeport Road  
 Richmond, Virginia 23234  
 P: 804-281-1111 F: 804-281-1122

SDA

PH - 62

10651 BRIDGEPORT



DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HARDSCAPE AND CONVERSION TO SOFT LANDSCAPE CONDITIONS WITH THE TPZ UNDERTAKEN AND SUPERVISED BY PROJECT ARBORIST

A-A' SECTION AT TREE #958  
 L5  
 1/4" = 1'-0"

NO.	DATE	REVISION DESCRIPTION	DR
1	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
2	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
3	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
4	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
5	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
6	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
7	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
8	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
9	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
10	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
11	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
12	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
13	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
14	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
15	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
16	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
17	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
18	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
19	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR
20	11/14/14	REVISED PER COMMENTS	DR

CLIENT: BRISTOL HOMES BRIDGEPORT PHASE 1P

PROJECT: 24 UNIT TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
 10671-10751 BRIDGEPORT ROAD RICHMOND

DRAWING TITLE: LANDSCAPE SECTIONS

DATE: APR 27 2017  
 SCALE: AS NOTED  
 DRAWN BY: B  
 DESIGN BY: B  
 CHECKED BY: WCY  
 DRAWING NUMBER: L5  
 SHEET NUMBER: OF 6

PROJECT NUMBER: 17-436

175M-7.2P







# City of Richmond

# Policy Manual

Page 1 of 2

Adopted by Council: September 16, 1991

**POLICY 5448**

Amended By Council: February 20, 2012

File Ref: 4045-00

SINGLE-FAMILY LOT SIZE POLICY IN QUARTER-SECTION 23-5-6

**POLICY 5448:**

The following policy establishes lot sizes in a portion of Section 23-5-6, bounded by the **Bridgeport Road, Shell Road, No. 4 Road and River Drive:**

That properties within the area bounded by Bridgeport Road on the south, River Drive on the north, Shell Road on the east and No. 4 Road on the west, in a portion of Section 23-5-6, be permitted to rezone and subdivide in accordance with the provisions of Single Detached (RS1/B) in Zoning and Development Bylaw 8500, with the following provisions:

- (a) Properties along Bridgeport Road (between McKessock Avenue and Shell Road) and along Shell Road will be restricted to Single Detached (RS1/D) unless there is lane or internal road access in which case Single Detached (RS1/B) will be permitted;
- (b) Properties along Bridgeport Road between No. 4 Road and McKessock Avenue will be restricted to Single Detached (RS1/D) unless there is lane access in which case Compact Single Detached (RC2) and Coach Houses (RCH) will be permitted;
- (c) Properties along No. 4 Road and River Drive will be restricted to Single Detached (RS1/C) unless there is lane or internal road access in which case Single Detached (RS1/B) will be permitted;

and that this policy, as shown on the accompanying plan, be used to determine the disposition of future single-family rezoning applications in this area, for a period of not less than five years, unless changed by the amending procedures contained in the Zoning and Development Bylaw.



Rezoning and subdivision permitted as per **RS1/B** except:

1. River Drive: **RS1/C** unless there is a lane or internal road access, then **RS1/B**.
2. Shell Road: **RS1/D** unless there is a lane or internal road access, then **RS1/B**.
3. No. 4 Road: **RS1/C** unless there is a lane or internal road access then **RS1/B**.
4. Bridgeport Road: **RS1/D** unless there is a lane or internal road access then **RS1/B**.




Rezoning and subdivision permitted as per **RS1/D** unless there is a lane access then **RC2** or **RCH**.



## Policy 5448 Section 23, 5-6


Adopted Date: 09/16/91

Amended Date: 02/20/12



PH - 66

TREE ASSESSMENT DRAWING



TREE MANAGEMENT DRAWING

**LEGEND: TREE ASSESSMENT AND SYMBOLS:**

- 1. Tree to be removed
- 2. Tree to be preserved
- 3. Tree to be preserved with protection
- 4. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation
- 5. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation and preservation
- 6. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation and preservation and preservation
- 7. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation
- 8. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation
- 9. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation
- 10. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation

**LEGEND: TREE MANAGEMENT FOR PROJECT:**

- 1. Tree to be removed
- 2. Tree to be preserved
- 3. Tree to be preserved with protection
- 4. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation
- 5. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation and preservation
- 6. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation and preservation and preservation
- 7. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation
- 8. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation
- 9. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation
- 10. Tree to be preserved with protection and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation and preservation





FIGURE 1. SECTION - TREE # 958 - 1:50 SCALE




FIGURE 1. SECTION - TREE # 985 - 1:50 SCALE

**APPENDIX D AND E: TREE ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT DRAWINGS**

PROJECT: PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT  
 ADDRESS: 1071 TO 1073 BRIDGEPORT ROAD  
 CLIENT: HANOVER - BRIDGEPORT DEVELOPMENT  
 DATE: 07/17/2017  
 DRAWING NO: 1071-1073-APPENDIX D AND E

**ARBORTECH**

1071-1073 BRIDGEPORT ROAD, BRIDGEPORT, N.J. 07007  
 TEL: 908-221-1111 FAX: 908-221-1112  
 WWW.ARBORTECH.COM



**Address:** 10671, 10691, and 10751 Bridgeport Road

**File No.:** RZ 17-771592

**Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9935, the Applicant is required to complete the following:**

1. 2.3 m road dedication along the entire Bridgeport Road frontage.
2. Consolidation of all the lots into one development parcel (which will require the removal and/or demolition of the existing dwellings).
3. Submission of a Contract entered into between the applicant and a Certified Arborist for supervision of all works conducted within or in close proximity to the protection zone of the trees to be retained (Trees # 958 on-site, and #001, 002, 003 on the neighbouring properties to the north). The Contract must include the scope of work to be undertaken, including: the proposed number of site 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 assessment report to the City for review.
4. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of \$10,000 for Tree # 958 to be retained. The security will be held until construction and landscaping is completed, an acceptable post-construction impact assessment report is received, and a site inspection is conducted to ensure that the tree has survived. The City may retain a portion of the security for a one-year maintenance period to ensure that the tree has survived.
5. City acceptance of the Applicant's offer to voluntarily contribute \$0.83 per buildable square foot (2017 rate; e.g. \$22,858.00) to the City's Public Art Reserve fund.
6. City acceptance of the Applicant's offer to voluntarily contribute \$29,000 to the City in-lieu of the provision of on-site indoor amenity space (e.g. \$1,000/unit for the first 19 units; plus \$2,000/unit for the remaining 5 units).
7. City acceptance of the Applicant's offer to voluntarily contribute \$8.50 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$234,082.00) to the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund.
8. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
9. Registration of a legal agreement on title identifying that the proposed development must be designed and constructed to meet or exceed EnerGuide 82 criteria for energy efficiency and that all dwellings are pre-ducted for solar hot water heating.
10. Registration of an aircraft noise sensitive use covenant on title.
11. Registration of a legal agreement on title identifying that the building components of the proposed development (e.g., walls, windows) must be designed and constructed in a manner that mitigates potential aircraft noise to the proposed dwelling units (with doors and windows closed). Dwelling units must be designed and constructed to achieve:
  - a) CMHC guidelines for interior noise levels as indicated in the chart below:
 

Portions of Dwelling Units	Noise Levels (decibels)
Bedrooms	35 decibels
Living, dining, recreation rooms	40 decibels
Kitchen, bathrooms, hallways, and utility rooms	45 decibels
  - b) the ASHRAE 55-2004 "Thermal Environmental Conditions for Human Occupancy" standard (and subsequent updates as they may occur) for interior living spaces.
12. Registration of a statutory right-of-way on title for the purpose of public-right-of-passage over the entire internal drive-aisle to secure potential shared vehicle access to the adjacent properties to the east and west should they redevelop in the future.

13. Registration of a statutory right-of-way (SRW) for the purpose of public-right-of-passage over the entire north-south pedestrian pathway through the site to secure potential public pedestrian connection between Bridgeport Road and McKessock Place in the future (which is to include the installation of wayfinding signage on the subject property). Any works essential for public access within the required SRW are to be included in the Servicing Agreement (SA) and the maintenance & liability responsibility is to be clearly noted (i.e., Owner built/maintained). The design must be prepared in accordance with good engineering practice with the objective to optimize public safety and after completion of the works, the Owner is required to provide a certificate of inspection for the works, prepared and sealed by the Owner's Engineer in a form and content acceptable to the City, certifying that the works have been constructed and completed in accordance with the accepted design. The works are to be bonded for via the Landscaping Security associated with the Development Permit.
14. The submission and processing of a Development Permit\* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.
15. Enter into a Servicing Agreement\* for the design and construction of the following servicing and road improvements. Works include, but may not be limited to:

*Water Works:*

- Using the OCP Model, there is 359.0 L/s of water available at a 20 psi residual at the hydrant located at the frontage of 10671 Bridgeport Road and 484.0 L/s available at 20 psi residual at the hydrant located at the frontage of 10751 Bridgeport Road. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of 220 L/s.
- The Applicant is required to submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm the development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit designs at Building Permit stage.
- At the Applicant's cost, the City will:
  - Install a new water service connection off of the 200 mm AC water main along Bridgeport Road, complete with water meter. The meter will be located on site (e.g., mechanical room), and will require a Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) at the Applicant's cost to be finalized during the Servicing Agreement process.
  - Install fire hydrants off of the 200mm AC water main along the Bridgeport Road frontage, spaced as per City Standard.
  - Cut, cap and remove all existing water service connections and meters serving the development site along Bridgeport Road property frontage.

*Storm Sewer Works:*

- The Applicant is required to:
  - Remove the existing 600 mm diameter storm sewer from the existing manhole STMH3449 to STMH3188 along Bridgeport Road.
  - Install as replacement approximately 160 m of new 1050 mm storm sewer, complete with manholes spaced as per City standards. Tie-in via new manholes as replacement for the existing manholes STMH3449 and STMH3188 along Bridgeport Road.
  - Cut, cap, and remove the existing storm service connections and inspection chambers located within the proposed development along Bridgeport Road (STIC46551, STIC4126, STIC46530, STIC46529).
  - Cut and cap the existing storm service connections at the inspection chambers located on the east and west property line of the proposed development (STCN127820 & STCN24256). The existing inspection chambers shall be retained.
  - Install a new storm service connection, complete with an Inspection Chamber off of the proposed 1050 mm storm sewer along Bridgeport Road to service the proposed development.
- At the Applicant's cost, the City will complete all proposed storm sewer tie-ins to existing City infrastructure.

*Sanitary Sewer Works:*

- The Applicant is required to:
  - Not start onsite foundation construction or excavation prior to completion of rear yard sanitary works by City crews.
  - Install approximately 100 meters of new 200mm sanitary sewer complete with manholes along McKessock Avenue and Bridgeport Road, to service the proposed development. The proposed sanitary sewer along McKessock Avenue, approximately 40 m, shall tie into the existing manhole (SMH6174) and proposed sanitary manhole at the intersection of McKessock Avenue and Bridgeport Road. The proposed sanitary sewer along Bridgeport Road will continue from the intersection to the south east corner of the 10671 Bridgeport Road property.
  - Install a sanitary service connection, complete with an Inspection Chamber, off of the proposed 200 mm diameter sanitary line placed along Bridgeport Road.
- A capacity analysis or model run to be provided by the City at the Servicing Agreement stage is required to confirm whether downstream upgrades are required from SMH6147 to the McLennan pump station. If there are downstream capacity issues, the Applicant will be required to provide upgrades.
- At the Applicant's cost, the City will:
  - Cut and cap at main all existing sanitary service connections to the proposed site.
  - Remove all existing inspection chambers and sanitary leads connected to the proposed site and dispose offsite.
  - Complete all proposed sanitary sewer service connections and tie-ins.

*Frontage Works:*

An interim and ultimate functional road plan is required as part of the Servicing Agreement to confirm all road dedications and the works below:

- The Applicant is required to design and construct the following frontage improvements, including (but not limited to):
  - The subject site's driveway crossing with a triangular-shaped raised barrier curb island within the boulevard along Bridgeport Road to physically restrict vehicle movements to the site to right-in/right-out only. This will be further supplemented with turn restriction signage on-site and on Bridgeport Road.
  - A new 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk at the new property line with transition to the existing sidewalk to the east and west of the subject site, along with a new treed/grass boulevard (approximately 3.7 m wide) at the curb. All utility impacts or existing infrastructure conflicting with the frontage works as described above are to be relocated at the Applicant's cost.
- The Applicant is required to coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers to:
  - Remove or put underground private utility service lines (e.g., BC Hydro, Telus and Shaw) along the property frontages. The Applicant is required to coordinate with the private utility companies.
  - Determine if above ground structures are required and coordinate their locations (e.g. Vista, PMT, LPT, Shaw cabinets, Telus Kiosks, etc). These should be located onsite, as described below.
  - Pre-duct for future hydro, telephone and cable utilities along the frontages of the property.
- The Applicant is required to:
  - Relocate or replace the existing street lighting as required by the proposed frontage improvements.
  - Locate all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks required to service the proposed development within the developments site (see list below for examples). A functional plan showing conceptual locations for such infrastructure shall be included in the development process design review. Please coordinate with the respective private utility companies and the project's lighting and traffic signal consultants to confirm the right of way requirements 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 SRWs that shall be shown in the functional plan and registered prior to SA design approval:

BC Hydro Vista - Confirm SRW dimensions with BC Hydro

BC Hydro PMT – Approximately 4mW X 5m (deep) – Confirm SRW dimensions with BC Hydro

BC Hydro LPT – Approximately 3.5mW X 3.5m (deep) – Confirm SRW dimensions with BC Hydro

Street light kiosk – Approximately 2mW X 1.5m (deep)

Traffic signal controller cabinet – Approximately 3.2mW X 1.8m (deep)

Traffic signal UPS cabinet – Approximately 1.8mW X 2.2m (deep)

Shaw cable kiosk – Approximately 1mW X 1m (deep) – show possible location in functional plan. Confirm SRW dimensions with Shaw

Telus FDH cabinet - Approximately 1.1mW X 1m (deep) – show possible location in functional plan. Confirm SRW dimensions with Telus

*General Items:*

- The Applicant is required to:
  - Enter into 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.
  - Conduct pre and post construction elevation surveys of adjacent roads, underground utilities (e.g. manhole rims, manhole inverts, service boxes, etc.) and property lines to determine settlement amounts. At their cost, the Applicant is responsible for rectifying construction damage.
  - Provide, prior to start of site preparation works, a geotechnical assessment of preload, soil densification, foundation excavation and dewatering impacts on the existing utilities fronting the development site (ex. 150mm sanitary sewer on the east property line of 10671 Bridgeport Road, 150mm sanitary sewer along 10751 Bridgeport Road property line, and 600mm storm sewer along the Bridgeport Road property line) and provide mitigation recommendations. The mitigation recommendations if necessary (e.g., removal of the 600mm storm sewer and its replacement within the Bridgeport roadway, etc.) shall be constructed and operational, at developer's costs, prior to start of soil densification, pre-load and/or foundation excavation.
  - Conduct video inspections of adjacent storm sewer main along Bridgeport Road and 150mm sanitary sewers along the property line to confirm its condition are required prior to start of soil densification and preload and after preload removal to check for any impact due to construction or site preparation. At their cost, the developer is responsible for rectifying any impact due to construction or site preparation.

**Prior to a Development Permit application\* being forwarded to the Development Permit Panel for consideration, the Applicant is required to:**

- Complete an acoustical and thermal report 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

- Complete a proposed townhouse energy efficiency report and recommendations prepared by a licensed Energy Advisor which demonstrates how the proposed construction will meet or exceed the required townhouse energy efficiency standards (EnerGuide 82 or better).

**Prior to Demolition Permit\* issuance, the Applicant must complete the following requirements:**

- Installation of tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained (Trees # 958 on-site, and #001, 002, 003 on the neighbouring properties to the north). 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 must remain in place until construction and landscaping on-site is completed.

**Prior to Building Permit\* issuance, the Applicant must complete the following requirements:**

- Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
- Incorporation of sustainability measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes (i.e., EnerGuide 82 criteria for energy efficiency and pre-ducting for solar hot water heating).
- 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.
- 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 original on file)

Signed

PHate71





Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500
Amendment Bylaw 9935 (RZ 17-771592)
10671, 10691, 10751 Bridgeport Road

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

- 1. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following areas and by designating it "LOW DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTL4)".

P.I.D. 003-691-292

Lot 190 Section 23 Block 5 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 33687

P.I.D. 006-950-035

Lot 191 Section 23 Block 5 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 33687

P.I.D. 007-529-392

West Half Lot 101 Fractional Section 23 Block 5 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 8212

- 2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9935".

FIRST READING

NOV 26 2018

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

ADOPTED



MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER