



To: Planning Committee
From: Wayne Craig
Director of Development

Date: February 24, 2014


File: RZ 12-605038

Re: Application by Yamamoto Architecture Inc. for Rezoning at 7120, 7140, 7160, 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240 and 7260 Bridge Street, and 7211, 7231 and 7271 No. 4 Road from "Single Detached (RS1/F)" to "Single Detached (ZS14) – South McLennan (City Centre)" and "Town Housing (ZT70) – South McLennan"


Staff Recommendation

1. That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 Amendment Bylaw 9106, to: re-designate the eastern 62 m of 7120, 7140, 7160, 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240 and 7260 Bridge Street from "Residential, Historic" to "Residential, 2 ½ Storeys" in the Land Use Map in Schedule 2.10D (McLennan South Sub-Area Plan); and to amend the Character Area Key Map in Schedule 2.10D (McLennan South Sub-Area Plan) for the same portion of the site from "Single Family" to "Townhouse 2 ½ Storeys", be introduced and given first reading;
2. That Bylaw 9106, having been considered in conjunction with:
 - The City's Financial and Capital Program; and
 - The Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;are hereby found to be to be consistent with said program and plans in accordance with Section 882 (3) of the Local Government Act;
3. That Bylaw 9106, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is hereby found not to require further consultation; and

- 4. That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9107, to: create “Town Housing (ZT70) – South McLennan”; to rezone the eastern portions of 7120, 7140, 7160, 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240 and 7260 Bridge Street, and the lots at 7211, 7231 and 7271 No. 4 Road from “Single Detached, (RS1/F)” to “Town Housing (ZT70) – South McLennan”; and to rezone the western 28 metres of 7120, 7140, 7160, 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240 and 7260 Bridge Street from “Single Detached, (RS1/F)” to “Single Detached (ZS14) – South McLennan (City Centre)”; be introduced and given first reading.


 Wayne Craig
 Director of Development

DJ/BK:blg
 Att.

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

Staff Report

Origin

Yamamoto Architecture Inc. has applied to create a new site-specific townhouse zone “Town Housing (ZT70) – South McLennan” and to rezone the eastern portions of 7120, 7140, 7160, 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240 and 7260 Bridge Street, and the lots at 7211, 7231 and 7271 No. 4 Road from “Single Detached, (RS1/F)” to this new “Town Housing (ZT70) – South McLennan” zone to permit a 78-unit townhouse complex on the east of site, extending to No. 4 Road. The applicant has also applied to rezone the western 28 m of the properties at 7120, 7140, 7160, 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240, and 7260 Bridge Street, from “Single Detached (RS1/F)” to “Single Detached (ZS14) – South McLennan (City Centre)”, to permit the creation of seven (7) single detached properties fronting Bridge Street (**Attachment 1**). An amendment to the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan, Schedule 2.10D of the Official Community Plan is also required.

Findings of Fact

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

Surrounding Development

To the North:

- At 9699 Sills Avenue, a 45-unit, two-storey townhouse complex, zoned “Low Density Townhouses (RTL3)”.
- At 7195 and 7191 No. 4 Road, Single-Family Dwellings zoned “Single Detached (RS1/F)”.

To the East: Across No. 4 Road, a Single Detached Dwellings zoned “Agriculture (AG1)”.

To the South:

- At 7280 and 7300 Bridge Street, two storey Single Detached Dwellings, zoned “Single Detached (RS1/F)”.
- At 7311 and 7315 No. 4 Road, Single Detached Dwellings zoned “Single Detached (RS1/F)”.
- At 7331 No. 4 Road, a 22-unit, two-storey townhouse complex, zoned “Town Housing (ZT16) – South McLennan and St. Albans Sub-Area (City Centre)”.

To the West: Across Bridge Street, Single Detached Dwellings zoned “Single Detached (RS1/F)”.

Related Policies & Studies

Richmond Official Community Plan (OCP) – Schedule 1

The Richmond Official Community Plan (OCP) designates this subject site as “Neighbourhood Residential (NRES)” in its 2041 Land Use Map. This permits single-family, two-family and multiple family housing (specifically townhouses). The proposed development would be consistent with the “Neighbourhood Residential (NRES)” land use designation.

McLennan South Sub-Area Plan – Schedule 2.10D

The McLennan South Sub-Area Plan Land Use Map (**Attachment 3**) designates the land use of the subject properties as:

- Bridge Street properties: “Residential, Historic Single-Family”, 2 ½ storeys maximum 0.55 base floor area ratio (F.A.R.). Lot Size along Bridge and Ash Streets: Large-sized lots (e.g. 18 m/59 ft. minimum Frontage and 550 m²/ 5,920 ft² minimum area).
- No. 4 Road properties: “Residential, 2 ½ storeys” typical (3 storeys maximum), predominately Triplex, Duplex, Single Family 0.55 base F.A.R.

To support this proposal, an OCP Amendment is required to amend Schedule 2.10D; to amend the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan as follows:

1. Redesignation of the rear portion of the site fronting onto Bridge Street from “Residential (Historic)” to “Residential (2 ½ Storeys)” and a related amendment to the Sub-Area Plan Land Use Map.

The western portion (62 m) of the rear of the subject lots that front onto Bridge Street of the proposed townhouse project is currently designated in the Sub-Area Plan for single family use. To allow the proposed townhouse development to proceed, the land use designation of the area must be amended from “Residential (Historic)” to “Residential (2 ½ Storeys)”, and a map change is also required.

2. Amendment to the Character Area Key Map to support the changes to the Land Use Map identified in (1).

The Character Area Key map in the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan identifies the same portion of the site for single-family, duplex and tri-plex uses. An amendment to this map to reflect the proposed townhouse use is required.

Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

In accordance with the City’s Flood Management Strategy, the minimum allowable elevation for habitable space is 2.9 m GSC or 0.3 ms above the highest crown of the adjacent road. A Flood Indemnity Covenant is to be registered on Title prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

Affordable Housing Strategy

In accordance with the City’s Affordable Housing Strategy, information to either building and supplying affordable housing units, or voluntary contributions to the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund have been forwarded to the applicant. Details on the applicant’s response to these requirements are provided later in this report.

Buffer to Agricultural Lands

In accordance with official Community Plan, a landscape buffer will be provided along the No. 4 Road frontage of the site, providing an interface to the lands on the east side of No.4 Road, which are located within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) and are zoned “Agriculture (AGR)”. A 6.0 m setback is proposed for townhouse units on No. 4 Road, and details of the landscaping / buffering will be finalized through the Development Permit, including review of the proposed landscape plan for the buffer by the City of Richmond’s Agricultural Advisory Committee.

Consultation

Official Community Plan (OCP): The proposed rezoning and OCP amendment is consistent with City policies regarding consultation. This application was not referred to School District No. 38 (Richmond) because it does not have the potential to generate 50 or more school aged children. According to OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, which was adopted by Council and agreed to by the School District, residential developments which generate less than 50 school aged children do not need to be referred to the School District (e.g., typically around 295 multiple-family housing units). This application only involves 78 multiple-family housing units.

The proposed development site does not fall within an aircraft noise area, and therefore the application has not been referred to the Vancouver International Airport.

General Public: The applicant held a Public Information Meeting on December 18, 2013, at the nearby General Currie Elementary School. The proponent placed advertisements in four (4) consecutive editions of the Richmond Review on Dec 6th, 11th, 13th and 18th, 2013, and conducted a Canada Post mail drop to all of the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan area (approximately 4,600 residences), including the immediately surrounding neighborhood. Approximately 20 people attended the meeting. Concerns from those in attendance were largely related to on-street parking impacts arising from the additional density, traffic generation and improvements on Bridge Street. The applicant has provided a summary report of the Public Information Meeting (**Attachment 6**).

In response to the comments raised at the meeting, staff note that the eastern frontage of Bridge Street, including two lots not part of the application (at 7280 and 7300 Bridge Street) will be improved with gutter, curb, boulevard and sidewalk. Parking impacts should be minimal, as each unit features a side-by-side double garage and on-site visitor's parking spaces are provided in accordance with the requirements of the Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500. The proposed development will see the construction of a new east-west connector road which will connect Bridge Street east to No. 4 Road. In addition, a new portion of LeChow Street will be constructed through the site, which will allow ready access to the east-west connector road. The bulk of traffic will likely use the connector to access No. 4 Road, rather than using streets to the west of the site. Those cars that do leave the site and move west will have little impact on existing single family lots to the west as Sills Avenue and Shields Avenue allow access to Granville Road and General Currie while bypassing the majority of adjacent single family lots.

Staff are of the opinion that the site design and transportation changes made since the public information meeting effectively address the concerns raised.

Public Input

A notice board is posted on the subject property to notify the public of the proposed development. In addition to the comments provided at the open house, staff have received a number of responses from the public in relation to this application. Adjacent property owners have raised concerns regarding the land use change from single-family residential to townhouse.

In response to the notice board on the subject site, staff received written correspondence on two occasions from the owner of an adjacent lot at 7280 Bridge Street (**Attachment 6**). Primary

concerns of the resident are the proposed use and density of the townhouse site, and the changed character of the lots fronting onto Bridge Street. The resident specifically mentioned his concern that the lots on Bridge Street not be less than 18 m in width. The seven (7) proposed residential lots have a minimum width of 20.5 m and depth of 26.9 m. The resident also made specific comments regarding the transition from the proposed townhouses and single family lots on Bridge Street. The applicant has been made aware of these concerns and has made design revisions to the height and massing of proposed units which would be adjacent to this lot.

Staff also received an email from the resident at 7231 Bridge Street raising concerns with the proposed re-designation to townhouse to allow increased density, and resulting traffic and street parking concerns. The resident has also requested that the west side of Bridge Street be upgraded, but staff note that this is beyond the scope of this application, and upgrades to the west will be achieved when those lands re-develop.

Should this application receive first reading, a Public Hearing will be scheduled.

Analysis

The application analysis is set out in two (2) parts to clarify the proposed amendments to the OCP and the proposed rezoning bylaw.

PART 1 – OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN (OCP) AMENDMENT TO THE MCLENNAN SOUTH SUB-AREA PLAN (SCHEDULE 2.10D) AMENDMENT (BYLAW 9106)

The McLennan South Sub-Area Plan establishes a framework for the evolution of this area into an important City Centre residential neighbourhood. The plan aims to respect many of the area's features, including its traditional single-family character and mature landscape, while still providing opportunity for a variety of new housing types.

The current land use designations in the Sub-Area Plan would allow the single family homes on large lots on the west of the site – lots fronting onto Bridge Street – to remain, while providing for subdivision potential of the rear (east) of these properties, which would front onto a new road (LeChow Street) as identified in the Plan. The McLennan South Sub-Area Plan would allow townhouse development for the lands located between LeChow Street and No. 4 Road, with a new avenue to connect LeChow Street to No. 4 Road, providing access to townhouse sites. **Attachment 3** provides the current land use designations and proposed road alignments in the area. The applicant will be constructing a full-width east-west connector road from LeChow Street to No. 4 Road, which will improve vehicle and pedestrian connectivity in the neighbourhood.

The extent of the applicant's proposed amendment to the Official Community Plan is illustrated in **Attachment 4**. The proposed development (**Attachment 5**) will require a designation change for the eastern 62 m portion of the lots fronting Bridge Street extending east toward the future alignment of LeChow Street. The applicant proposes the amendment to the Sub-Area Plan for an area of approximately 10,800 m² (116,315 ft²). The Sub-Area Plan designation for the western portion of the lands fronting onto Bridge Street (an area 28 m deep) will not be changed.

The proposed townhouse designation permits the on-site preservation of 9 trees, which would not likely be possible if the lands were to be rezoned and subdivided for single family lots, as single family lots have a larger permitted footprint on each lot and the required floor-proofing grade

change. The proposed re-designation of a portion of the site to permit townhouses allows for a more site specific building envelope, and the requirement for on-site outdoor amenity area provides the opportunity to preserve trees on the site. An indoor amenity area will be provided, and the applicant has offered that this amenity space will be heated and cooled by a geothermal system. Registration of a legal agreement to ensure this is a consideration of final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

Maintaining the Single Family Designation on the lands fronting Bridge Street achieves a key objective of the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan: to ensure large single family lots are maintained on Bridge Street. In addition, the proposed townhouse design features two-storey units along the rear yards of the single family lots in order to enhance the interface between land uses.

Staff support the proposed re-designation, as the project would maintain a single-family interface to the west, and the townhouse designation is consistent with the overall goals of the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan.

PART 2 – REZONING BYLAW 9107 TO REZONE THE WESTERN 28 M OF THE SITE FROM RS1/F TO SINGLE DETACHED (ZS14) – SOUTH MCLENNAN (CITY CENTRE), AND REZONE THE EASTERN PORTION TO ZT70 FOR 78 TOWNHOUSE UNITS .

Proposed Zoning to Single Detached (RS1/E) and Town Housing (ZT70) – South McLennan

The proposed rezoning from “Single Detached RS1/F” zone to “Single Detached (ZS14) – South McLennan (City Centre)” zone for the western portion of the lots fronting onto Bridge Street allows the subdivision of these properties to create lots with a minimum depth of 24 m. The current “Single Detached RS1/F” zone requires a minimum depth of 45 m, and the proposed resulting lots would not conform. Staff support the proposed rezoning, as the “Single Detached (ZS14) – South McLennan (City Centre)” lots would result in lots keeping in the general character of single-family lots in the area. The ZS14 Zone has been used to allow subdivision of a number of properties in the surrounding area.

The rezoning of the eastern portion of the site from “Single Detached RS1/F” zone to the proposed new “Town Housing (ZT70) – South McLennan)” zone would permit the proposed 78-unit townhouse project, and associated on-site amenity space. The “Town Housing (ZT70) – South McLennan)” zone has been based on the “Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3)” zone, with a minor increase in floor area ratio from 0.7 to 0.72, and minor reduction in required setbacks to public roads.

Transportation and Site Access

To support the implementation of the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan, the applicant has worked closely with staff to resolve transportation-related issues to arrive at a land use proposal and road concept consistent with the road network envisioned in the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan (**Attachment 5**).

East – West Connector Road

A new intersection will be created on No. 4 Road between Granville Avenue and Blundell Road, through the dedication and construction of an as-yet unnamed east-west connector road from No.4 Road west to LeChow Street. A full width road will be constructed and the intersection at No. 4 Road will feature a new traffic signal provided by the developer.

The proposed road alignment of this new east-west road has been designed to avoid impacts on the properties at 7191 and 7195 No. 4 Road, maintaining their development potential, as well as providing the required access to the proposed townhouse development. A dedication of 16.95 m along the northern edge of the site is required, and a Servicing Agreement will be entered into to secure full road construction, curb and gutter, grassed boulevard with street trees, and sidewalk all on the south side of the road dedication fronting the site. The applicant has agreed to provide a gravel path along the north side of the east-west connector road for pavement stability and additional setback, while maintaining the future redevelopment potential of 7191 and 7195 No. 4 Road. When these adjacent sites develop at higher densities in the future, final road dedication and required construction will be secured from those properties through a rezoning application and Servicing Agreement.

LeChow Street

The applicant has agreed to dedicate 10.65 m of land off for LeChow Street along the east portion of the site (the rear of the parent properties which currently front onto Bridge Street). The applicant has proposed an interim road design that will not include the standard grass and tree boulevard, but a sidewalk, curb and gutter and a road where the applicant will construct a road wide enough to support two-way traffic movement and a sidewalk within the dedicated lands, directly adjacent to the western edge of 7191 and 7195 No. 4 Road. The full road will be constructed when 7191 and 7195 No. 4 Road are re-developed.

The applicant has provided a final design and a cost estimate for the ultimate works to change the interim condition of the west side of LeChow Street to the City standard, and has agreed to provide a cash contribution in the amount of \$80,000 for these works. The City's Engineering Department has reviewed the cost estimate and agrees that its value is appropriate. The contribution will be payable prior to the adoption of rezoning.

LeChow Street will also be dedicated through the subject site extending south from the east-west connector road, and will be provided in a 12 m road dedication with curb and gutter, grass boulevard on the west side, and sidewalk on the west side. The dedication of this portion of LeChow Street is consistent with the road concept outlined in the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan.

Shields Avenue

A single parcel remains south of the proposed OCP amendment and rezoning, which is not included in the development proposal located at 7300 Bridge Street. The applicant has prepared a future development concept for this lot which illustrates that there is potential for a combination of two-storey townhouses and single-family lots for this parcel. In addition, the developer will provide a cash contribution of \$89,000 towards the future construction of the north portion of Shields Avenue, in recognition that the bulk of traffic on the future through road of Shields Avenue will be generated by the proposed townhouse project, and to further enhance the development potential of this adjacent parcel. The City's Engineering Department has reviewed the cost estimate and has agreed that the estimate is sufficient to proceed with the rezoning, but that final details regarding the deposit will be determined at the Servicing Agreement to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering. This deposit will be payable prior to the adoption of rezoning.

Sills Avenue

The applicant will construct a portion of Sills Avenue along the north property line of the site, completing the road construction that was partially completed as part of a previous townhouse redevelopment at 9699 Sills Avenue. During the rezoning stage of this development (RZ 05-319627), the applicant at the time dedicated 7.50 m and made a financial contribution to the City for the purpose of providing funds to a future developer to build the full width road and frontage works of LeChow Street.

Engineering

The City's Engineering Department has determined the scope of upgrades to existing services and the extent of new services that are required to service the proposed development, as listed below. Further details will be specified at the Servicing Agreement stage.

Storm

- Upgrade the existing storm sewer from the southern property line of 7280 Bridge Street to Sills Avenue.
- Construct a new storm sewer along the east-west connector road connecting to the new LeChow Street storm sewer and the existing system on No. 4 Road.
- Construct a new storm sewer along LeChow Street from Shields Avenue to the existing system at Sills Avenue.

Sanitary

- The developer is responsible for constructing new sanitary sewers within road dedications as required to service the development site that will connect to the existing sanitary sewer system. Calculations for pipe sizing will be verified during the Servicing Agreement.

Water

- The developer is responsible for constructing new water mains within road dedications as required to service the development site that will connect to existing water mains on Bridge Street, Shields Avenue and No. 4 Road.

The developer is also responsible for the burial of hydro wires on existing utility poles.

Affordable Housing

The applicant will make a voluntary contribution to the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund consistent with the City's Affordable Housing Strategy. The voluntary contribution is based on \$2.00 per buildable square foot for townhouse units, and \$1.00 per buildable square foot for single family dwellings, calculated by the proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of the townhouse units (0.7 FAR), and the allowed floor area ratio for the single family lots. The calculated contribution is \$217,610 for townhouse units and \$21,362 for single family dwellings, for a total affordable housing contribution of \$238,972, which is payable prior to the adoption of rezoning.

Amenity Space

The applicant is proposing a 529 m² outdoor amenity area in the south-west corner of the site, which will include lawn area, play space and 100 m² indoor amenity building. The size of the outdoor amenity and the indoor amenity room both meet the minimum requirements of the OCP.

The area is intended to function as a central gathering space for the townhouse complex. The indoor amenity area will be heated and cooled by a geothermal system. A legal agreement to secure this facility is a condition of rezoning.

Trees

The applicant has provided an arborist's report (**Attachment 7**) for the existing trees on the eleven (11) subject properties. A total of 241 on-site trees have been identified and assessed. A total of 9 trees will be retained through the proposed development, and the remainder of the trees will be removed. Of the 241 trees identified, 57 trees are located within required road dedication areas and are exempt from replacement requirements, and the balance of trees are either in poor condition, or in conflict with proposed building envelopes or with the internal roadways. Taking into account the 57 trees in road dedication areas and the nine (9) retained trees, a total of 175 removed trees require compensatory planting or cash-in-lieu of on-site trees.

The applicant proposes to retain a total of 9 trees on site, clustered around the outdoor amenity area at the south-west of the site. These trees are: 8 conifers (a mix of spruce and fir) and one sweetgum. Installation of protective tree fencing around these trees will be a condition of rezoning.

In addition to trees in conflict with roads and building envelopes, the City's flood proofing requirements require the applicant to raise building grades to a minimum flood construction level (FCL) of 2.9 m Geodetic Survey of Canada (GSC). This will require soil deposit / fill, which further impacts the ability to preserve trees on the site. The applicant is able to work with site grading around the proposed amenity area to save trees as there is flexibility with building locations and slab elevations that cannot be achieved elsewhere on the site. With the additional open space around the amenity building, the existing grade of approximately 1.7m GSC can be gradually interfaced with landscaping and grading to meet the overall site grade requirements for flood proofing to 2.9 m GSC, an minimize impacts on the trees.

With a 2:1 replacement ratio, a total of 350 replacement trees are required. There is insufficient space on the townhouse site and the proposed seven (7) single family lots to accommodate this number of trees. The applicant is proposing to replant 178 trees on the townhouse site and three trees per single family lot, for a total of 199 trees. A cash contribution in the amount of \$75,500 will be a condition of rezoning, as cash-in-lieu of required replacement trees.

Discharge of Restrictive Covenant BB0681427

A restrictive covenant was registered on the Title of 7160 Bridge Street in 2008 as part of an earlier subdivision application to create the lot. This covenant specified a minimum flood construction elevation of 0.9 m Geodetic Survey of Canada (GSC) elevation. Since that time, the minimum flood construction elevation for this area is 2.9 m GSC. The new minimum flood construction level will be secured by a new legal agreement registered on Title, and the existing legal agreement should be discharged as a condition of rezoning approval.

Public Art

In response to the City's commitment to the provision of Public Art, the developer is considering providing a piece of Public Art to the site. An option is to provide a voluntary contribution at a rate of approximately \$0.77/ft² based on maximum FAR (\$83,780) to secure participation in the program. The voluntary contribution is payable prior to the adoption of the rezoning application. Provision of Public Art will be done through the coordination between the developer and the City's Public Art Coordinator.

Universal Access

To assist in ensuring accessibility is an option for residents of the townhouse area, the applicant has notified the City that they will be identifying townhouse units for conversion to Universal access for wheelchair accessibility. These units will be identified and the design reviewed during the Development Permit review. Some of the items that are included during the construction of these units are:

- Providing wider doors to facilitate wheelchair movement through the unit.
- Set heights for accessing electrical outlets.
- Ensure greater clearances for easier access to items such as bathroom fixtures.
- Pull-out door and cabinets in kitchens.

All townhouse units are to provide aging in place features such as additional blocking in bathroom walls for the future installation of grab bars, lever door handles, and wide door openings to facilitate access for walkers and wheelchairs. Details on these features will be provided in on the Development Permit drawings.

Form of Development

The developer proposes to construct a total of 78 townhouse units on the site: 33 two-storey units and 45 three-storey units, to be constructed around a combination of public and private roads. Including a new north-south alignment of LeChow Street through the site. The developer's proposed form of development generally conforms to the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan

Development Permit (DP) approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Development for the proposal is required prior to rezoning adoption. At DP stage, among other things, the following will be addressed:

- Overall appropriateness to the form and character of the proposed townhouse units and the indoor amenity building.
- Detailed architectural, landscaping and open space design.
- Detailed design of road cross sections, including alignment of sidewalks, curbs, and boulevards.
- Referral of the landscape design to the City's Agricultural Advisory Committee for review of the No. 4 landscape scheme and buffering of lots in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) on the east side of No. 4 Road.

In addition to the townhouses proposed, the western portion of the parent lots will be subdivided into seven (7) single-family lots under the "Single Detached (ZS14) – South McLennan (City Centre)" zone. A Development Permit is not required for these single-family lots.

The proposed development exceeds the bylaw requirement for on-site parking, by providing a side-by-side two-stall garage for every unit. The ultimate design of the roadways abutting the townhouse portion of the development have been widened to allow for parking on both sides of the street.

Financial Impact

As a result of the proposed development, the City will take ownership of developer contributed infrastructure assets such as roadworks, waterworks, storm sewers, sanitary sewers, street lights, street trees and traffic signals.

The anticipated operating budget impact for the ongoing maintenance of these new infrastructure assets is estimated to be \$15,000, and this will be considered as part of the 2015 Operating budget, should these works be constructed and turned over to the City by 2015.


Conclusion

The subject development is generally consistent with the intent and goals of the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan; for a higher density residential neighbourhood, serviced by a functional road network. The proposed re-designation of the east portion of the parent lots fronting onto Bridge Street maintains a single-family transition to the existing single-family lots to the west of the site, while the proposed townhouse portion of the development is consistent with other recent multiple-family residential projects in the area. The applicant has worked closely with staff to provide the required road dedications to meet the traffic and circulation needs of this area.

It is recommended that Richmond Official Community Plan Amendment 7100 Bylaw 9106 to amend the land use designations for the site from "Residential, Historic" to "Residential, 2 ½ Storeys" in the existing Alexandra Neighbourhood Land Use Map in Schedule 2.10D (McLennan South Sub-Area Plan); and to amend the existing Character Area Key Map in Schedule 2.10D (McLennan South Sub-Area Plan) for same portion of the site from "Single Family" to "Townhouse 2 ½ Storeys", be introduced and given first reading be introduced and given first reading.

It is further recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9107 to rezone the western 28 m of the site from "Single Detached, (RS1/F)" to "Single Detached (ZS14) – South McLennan (City Centre)"; to create "Town Housing (ZT70) – South McLennan)", and rezone the remainder of the site from "Single Detached, (RS1/F)" to "Town Housing (ZT70) – South McLennan)" be introduced and given first reading.


Barry Konkin
Program Coordinator, Development
(604-276-4138)



DJ/BK:blg

Attachments:

- Attachment 1: Location Map
- Attachment 2: Development Application Data Sheet
- Attachment 3: Existing McLennan South Sub-Area Plan Land Use Map
- Attachment 4: Proposed OCP Amendment Map
- Attachment 5: Conceptual Development Plans
- Attachment 6: Public Information Meeting – Summary Information and Other Public Correspondence
- Attachment 7: Arborist's Report – Tree Survey Plan
- Attachment 8: Conditional Rezoning Requirements




Original Date: 05/04/12
 Revision Date: 07/25/13
 Note: Dimensions are in METRES


RZ 12-605038



City of Richmond



PROPOSED
 REZONING



RZ 12-605038

Original Date: 05/04/12

Amended Date: 07/25/13

Note: Dimensions are in METRES

**RZ 12-605038****Attachment 2**

Address: 7120, 7140, 7160, 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240, 7260 Bridge Street and
7211, 7231, 7271 No. 4 Road

Applicant: Yamamoto Architecture Inc.


Planning Area(s): McLennan South Sub-Area Plan (Schedule 2.10D)





	Existing	Proposed
Owner:	Hui Yuan Investments (Canada) Ltd. & Mao Hua Chen	
Site Size (m²):	18,293 m ² overall site	14,440 m ² townhouse site 3,906 m ² for single-family lots
Land Uses:	Single Detached	Single Detached and Townhouses
OCP Designation:	Neighbourhood Residential	No change
Area Plan Designation:	Residential, Historic and Residential 2 ½ Storeys	Re-designation of a portion of the site from Residential, Historic to Residential 2 ½ Storeys
Zoning:	Single Detached (RS1/F)	Single Detached (RS1/E) and Town Housing (ZT70)
Number of Units:	One Dwelling per Lot	7 Single Detached Lots 78 Townhouse Units

Proposed Single Detached Lots (RS1/E Zone)	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Lot Size (min. dimensions):	18.0 m width 24.0 m depth 550 m ² area	None	none
Proposed Townhouses (Proposed ZT 70 Zone)	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Density (FAR):	0.72	0.70	none permitted
Lot Coverage – Building	40% (maximum)	40%	none
Lot size	No minimum	No minimum	none
Setback – No. 4 Road:	Min. 6.0 m	Min. 6.0 m	none
Setback – Sills Avenue:	Min. 4.5 m	Min. 4.5 m	none
Setback – LeChow Street:	Min. 3.0 m	Min. 3.0 m	none
Setback East-West connector road:	Min. 3.0 m	Min. 3.0 m	none
Setback – Rear (west) yard:	Min. 3.0 m	Min. 3.0 m	none
Setback – Side (South) yard:	Min. 3.0 m	Min. 3.0 m	none
Height (m):	12.0 m (maximum)	12.0 m	none

Proposed Single Detached Lots (RS1/E Zone)	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Off-street Parking Spaces – Regular (R) / Visitor (V):	1.4 (R) and 0.2 (V) per unit	2.0 (R) and 0.2 (V) per unit	none
Amenity Space – Indoor:	100 m ² (minimum)	100 m ²	none
Amenity Space – Outdoor:	6.0 m ² per unit (minimum)	6.78 m ² per unit	none


Land Use Map Bylaw 7892
2005/04/18




 <p>Residential, Townhouse up to 3 storeys over 1 parking level, Triplex, Duplex, Single-Family 0.75 base F.A.R.</p>	 <p>Residential, Historic Single-Family, 2 ½ storeys maximum 0.55 base F.A.R., Lot size along Bridge and Ash Streets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large-sized lots (e.g. 18 m/59 ft. min. frontage and 550 m²/ 5,920 ft² min. area) <p>Elsewhere:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium-sized lots (e.g. 11.3 m/ 37 ft. min. frontage and 320 m²/ 3,444 ft² min. area), with access from new roads and General Currie Road; <p>Provided that the corner lot shall be considered to front the shorter of its two boundaries regardless of the orientation of the dwelling.</p>	<p>■ ■ ■ ■ Trail/Walkway</p>
 <p>Residential, 2 ½ storeys typical (3 storeys maximum) Townhouse, Triplex, Duplex, Single-Family 0.60 base F.A.R.</p>		<p>C Church</p>
 <p>Residential, 2 ½ storeys typical (3 storeys maximum), predominantly Triplex, Duplex, Single-Family 0.55 base F.A.R.</p>		<p>P Neighbourhood Pub</p>

Note: Sills Avenue, Le Chow Street, Keefer Avenue, and Turnill Street are commonly referred to as the “ring road”.

Proposed OCP Amendment



 **PROPOSED OCP PLAN AMENDMENT**
 PURPLE INDICATES CHANGE IN LAND USE FROM
 SINGLE FAMILY TO TOWNHOUSE

STATISTICS:

CIVIC ADDRESS: 7211 - 7271 NO. 4 ROAD & 7120 - 7260, 7300 BRIDGE STREET

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: CD

ZONING: CD

LOT AREA: GROSS: 246,119 SQ. FT. (22,865 SQ.M.)
NET: 155,884 SQ. FT. (14,482 SQ.M.)

MAX. LOT COVERAGE: 155,884 SQ. FT. x 40% = 62,354 SQ. FT.
PROPOSED: 5932.5 SQ. FT. (BUILDINGS)
1952.0 SQ. FT. (AMENITY BUILDING)
8878.5 SQ. FT. (ELECTRICAL ROOMS)
TOTAL 60794.5 SQ. FT. (38.9%)

MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT: 12.0 M (THREE STOREYS)
PROPOSED: 11.9 M (THREE STOREYS)

SETBACKS:

WEST PORTION OF SITE: PROPOSED:

FRONT YARD SETBACK (EAST - LECHOW ST): 4.0 M
SIDE YARD SETBACK (EAST - LECHOW ST): 3.0 M
EXT. FRONT YARD SETBACK (NORTH - SILLS AVE): 6.0 M
EXT. SIDE YARD SETBACK (NORTH - SILLS AVE): 4.5 M
SIDE YARD SETBACK (SOUTH): 7.5 M
SIDE YARD SETBACK (WEST): 3.0 M

EAST PORTION OF SITE: PROPOSED:

FRONT YARD SETBACK (WEST - LECHOW ST): 3.0 M
EXT. SIDE YARD SETBACK (NORTH - E-W CONNECTOR): 4.5 M
REAR YARD SETBACK (SOUTH): 4.5 M
SIDE YARD SETBACK (SOUTH): MIN. 2.0 M
REAR YARD SETBACK (EAST - NO. 4 ROAD): 6.0 M

F.A.R.:

PROPOSED FLOOR AREA: 108,470 SQ. FT. (0.695 FAR)
MAX. ALLOWED GARAGE AREA: 538.2 SQ. FT. x 78 UNITS = 41,878.6 SQ. FT.

PROPOSED FLOOR AREA:

UNIT TYPE	FLOOR AREA	UNITS	SQ. FT.
UNIT 16 AS (3 BRG + DEN)	1450.0 SQ. FT.	33	47850.0 SQ. FT.
UNIT 18 (3 BRG)	1100.0 SQ. FT.	9	9900.0 SQ. FT.
UNIT 20 (3 BRG)	1395.0 SQ. FT.	38	50955.0 SQ. FT.
SUBTOTAL		78	108470.0 SQ. FT. (80.3%)

ADDITIONAL AREA:

ELEC. ROOMS: = 356.0 SQ. FT.
TOTAL = 108470.0 SQ. FT. (68.5%)

TOTAL NET AREA = 108,114 SQ. FT.
TOTAL SALEABLE = 115,970 SQ. FT.

PARKING:

REQUIRED:	2.0 SPACES x 78 UNITS	= 156 SPACES (RESIDENTS)
	0.2 SPACES x 78 UNITS	= 15.6 SPACES (VISITORS)
TOTAL		= 171.6 SPACES
PROVIDED:	2 CAR GARAGES x 78 UNITS	= 156 SPACES (RESIDENTS)
	OPER. VISITORS PARKING	= 16 SPACES (VISITORS)
TOTAL		= 172 SPACES

NOTE: 1 ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACE IS PROVIDED.

REQUIRED BICYCLE:	1.25 SPACES x 78 UNITS	= 97.5 SPACES (CLASS 1)
	0.2 SPACES x 78 UNITS	= 15.6 SPACES (CLASS 2)
TOTAL		= 113.1 SPACES

PROVIDED BICYCLE:	2 SPACES x 20 GARAGES	= 40 SPACES (CLASS 1)
	1 SPACE x 58 GARAGES	= 58 SPACES (CLASS 1)
	BICYCLE RACK	= 16 SPACES (CLASS 2)
TOTAL		= 114 SPACES

AMENITY AREA


REQUIRED	INDOOR	: MIN. 100 SQ.M. (1076 SQ. FT.)
	OUTDOOR	: 468 SQ.M. (5037 SQ. FT.)
PROVIDED	INDOOR	: 100 SQ.M. (1076 SQ. FT.)
	OUTDOOR	: 529 SQ.M. (5700 SQ. FT.)

PRIVATE OUTDOOR SPACE: MIN. 30 SQ.M. PER UNIT

Yamamoto Architecture Inc.

1211-7271 NO. 4 ROAD & 7120-7260, 7300 BRIDGE STREET, MISSISSAUGA, ONT. L4V 1R7
TEL: 905-271-7272 FAX: 905-271-2527

PROJECT		DRAWING TITLE	
TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT		STATISTICS	
SCALE	DATE	DATE	DATE
TEXT: 1/2" = 1' 0"	NOV. 2014		
TYPICAL	TY		
CHECKED			
PROJECT NO. 11		SHEET NO. A0.1	



PLN - 65

SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1/32"=1'-0"

Yamamoto
Architecture Inc.

PROJECT
TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE
SITE PLAN

SCALE	DATE	BY	CHECKED
1/32"=1'-0"	NOV. 14, 2011	YAMAMOTO	YAMAMOTO
PROJECT NO.			A1.0
DRAWING NO.			1118


1251 - 7011 WALKER BLVD. #100 TORONTO, ONT. M3J 1K7
416-291-1187
WWW.YAMAMOTOARCHITECTURE.COM

NO.	DATE	REVISIONS

LEGEND:

-  TOWNHOUSE LOTS 156,894 SF - 63%
-  SINGLE FAMILY LOTS 41,512 SF - 17%
-  DEDICATIONS 46,723 SF - 20%

GROSS SITE AREA: 246,119 SF
 NET SITE AREA OF S.F. & T.H.: 197,396 SF



PLN - 66

SITE AREA OVERLAYS
 SCALE: 1/32"=1'-0"



Yamamoto Architecture Inc.

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION

PROJECT: TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT

CLIENT: 1711-1271 90A J. B. & J. B. 2704, LLC
 1708 MARSH C. MEMPHIS, A.C.

DATE: 08.06.2014


SCALE: 1/32"=1'-0"

CHECKED: [Signature]


PROJECT TITLE: SITE AREA OVERLAYS

SHEET NO.: A1.0a


TOTAL SHEETS: 11/08



SITE SECTION 1



SITE SECTION 2



SITE SECTION 3

PLN 68

Yamamoto Architecture Inc.

PROJECT: TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT
 DRAWING TITLE: SITE SECTIONS




SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"
 DATE: FEB. 06, 2014
 DRAWN BY: [Name]
 CHECKED BY: [Name]

PROJ. NO.: A1.2
 PROJ. IN.: 1100

NO.	DATE	REVISIONS

1000 WEST WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE 200, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106-1000
 TEL: 734.769.4400 FAX: 734.769.4401
 WWW.YAMAMOTOARCHITECTURE.COM

THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF YAMAMOTO ARCHITECTURE INC. IT IS TO BE USED ONLY FOR THE PROJECT AND SITE SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED HEREON. IT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED, COPIED, OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF YAMAMOTO ARCHITECTURE INC.



PLN 69

2	APR 24, 2020	GENERAL EDITION
1	JAN 28, 2020	PERMISSIONS
NO.	DATE	REVISION
COMPLETION		

PROJECT
TOWNHOUSE
DEVELOPMENT


1000 N. WINDY HILL
ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

Yamamoto
Architecture Inc.

DATE: 04/24/2020
DRAWING TITLE: ELEVATIONS


SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"	SHEET NO.:
DATE: FEB. 28, 2017	A4.1
DRAWN BY:	PROJECT NO.:
CHECKED BY:	119

ROOF EDGE
 EL. +13.75M (+45.75)
 FIN. FLOOR
 EL. +15.00M (+49.00)
 FIN. FLOOR
 EL. +15.00M (+49.00)
 FIN. FLOOR
 EL. +15.00M (+49.00)
 FIN. FLOOR
 EL. +15.00M (+49.00)
 FIN. FLOOR
 EL. +15.00M (+49.00)



BUILDING 5
 BUILDING 6
 NORTH ELEVATION - SILLS AVENUE
 TYP. SIDE ELEVATION

ROOF FROM
 EL. +13.75M (+45.75)
 FIN. FLOOR
 EL. +15.00M (+49.00)
 FIN. FLOOR
 EL. +15.00M (+49.00)
 FIN. FLOOR
 EL. +15.00M (+49.00)



BUILDING 5
 BUILDING 6
 SOUTH ELEVATION - INTERNAL DRIVEWAY
 TYP. SIDE ELEVATION

PLN - 70


NO.	DATE	REVISION
1	10/15/2021	CONTRACT
2	11/15/2021	PERMITS
3	12/15/2021	FINAL DESIGN

PROJECT
 TOWNHOUSE
 DEVELOPMENT
 YAMAMOTO ARCHITECTURE INC.
 ARCHITECTS
 1000 W. 10TH AVE. SUITE 100
 DENVER, CO 80202

SCALE
 1/4" = 1'-0"
 DATE
 FEB. 28, 2023
 DRAWN BY
 YAMAMOTO ARCHITECTURE INC.
 ELEVATIONS


SCALE	DATE	CHECKED	PROJECT NO.
1/4" = 1'-0"	FEB. 28, 2023		100

A4.2



BUILDING 25: EAST ELEVATION - NO. 4 ROAD

BUILDING 26: EAST ELEVATION - NO. 4 ROAD



BUILDING 25 & 26: WEST ELEVATION - DRIVEWAY

TYP. SIDE ELEVATION

ROOF FINISH
EL. 13.200 (42.97)

1ST FLOOR FINISH
EL. 12.800 (42.30)

2ND FLOOR FINISH
EL. 12.400 (41.63)

3RD FLOOR FINISH
EL. 12.000 (40.96)

FINISHED FLOOR
EL. 11.700 (40.29)

FINISHED FLOOR
EL. 11.300 (39.62)

ROOF FINISH
EL. 13.200 (42.97)

1ST FLOOR FINISH
EL. 12.800 (42.30)

2ND FLOOR FINISH
EL. 12.400 (41.63)

3RD FLOOR FINISH
EL. 12.000 (40.96)

FINISHED FLOOR
EL. 11.700 (40.29)

FINISHED FLOOR
EL. 11.300 (39.62)

PLN -71

2	APR 28, 2020	FINAL REVIEW
1	JAN 28, 2020	2D DIMENSIONS
NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
COMMENTS		

PROJECT
TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT


SCALE
1/8" = 1'-0"

Yamamoto Architecture Inc.


DATE
NOV 20, 2019

SCALE	1/8" = 1'-0"
DATE	NOV 20, 2019
DRAWN BY	CP
CHECKED	YH


A4.3



BUILDING 27A NORTH ELEVATION - EAST / WEST CONNECTOR



BUILDING 27B NORTH ELEVATION - EAST / WEST CONNECTOR



BUILDING 28 NORTH ELEVATION - EAST / WEST CONNECTOR

ROOF EDGE
EL. +10.0250 (4+30)

TOP OF ABOVE FINISHES
EL. +10.0000 (4+30)

FIRST FLOOR
EL. +1.0000 (0+40)

SECOND FLOOR
EL. +2.0000 (0+40)

FINISH FLOOR
EL. +1.0000 (0+40)

FINISHED FLOOR
EL. +1.0000 (0+40)

ROOF EDGE
EL. +10.0250 (4+30)

TOP OF ABOVE FINISHES
EL. +10.0000 (4+30)

FIRST FLOOR
EL. +1.0000 (4+40)

SECOND FLOOR
EL. +2.0000 (4+40)

FINISH FLOOR
EL. +1.0000 (4+40)

FINISHED FLOOR
EL. +1.0000 (4+40)

ROOF EDGE
EL. +10.0250 (4+30)

TOP OF ABOVE FINISHES
EL. +10.0000 (4+30)

FIRST FLOOR
EL. +1.0000 (4+40)

SECOND FLOOR
EL. +2.0000 (4+40)

FINISH FLOOR
EL. +1.0000 (4+40)

FINISHED FLOOR
EL. +1.0000 (4+40)

PLN 72

NO.	DATE	REVISION
1	JAN. 20, 2023	PP. ELABORATION

PROJECT
TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT

PREPARED BY
YAMAMOTO ARCHITECTURE, INC.

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

DATE: FEB. 08, 2019

DRAWN BY: JF

CHECKED BY: JF

SHEET NO. **A4.4**


TOTAL SHEETS: 118

- LEGEND**
- Site Area: 100' x 150' = 15,000 SF
 - Site Area: 100' x 200' = 20,000 SF
 - Site Area: 100' x 300' = 30,000 SF
 - Site Area: 100' x 400' = 40,000 SF
 - Site Area: 100' x 500' = 50,000 SF
 - Site Area: 100' x 600' = 60,000 SF
 - Site Area: 100' x 700' = 70,000 SF
 - Site Area: 100' x 800' = 80,000 SF
 - Site Area: 100' x 900' = 90,000 SF
 - Site Area: 100' x 1000' = 100,000 SF

Scale: 1" = 10'-0"
North Arrow: [Symbol]
Client: [Redacted]
Project: [Redacted]
Date: [Redacted]

Townhouse Development
7211-7271 No. 4 Rd. & 7170-7260,
7300 Bridge St. Richmond, B.C.

Landscape
Plan



Preliminary Plant Schedule


KEY	CITY	BOTANICAL NAME
AP	27	Asarum canadense
AC	21	Aster multiflorus
LS	31	Linum catharticum
MC	35	Moronegalea ovata
SA	37	Saxifraga oppositifolia
SI	37	Silybum marianum
BA	37	Baccharis arbuscula
CA	37	Carex acutiformis
DA	37	Dryas octopetala
EA	37	Eryngium yuccifolium
FA	37	Fragaria virginiana
GA	37	Gaultheria procumbens
HA	37	Habenaria sp.
IA	37	Impatiens sp.
JA	37	Juncus sp.
KA	37	Kalmia latifolia
LA	37	Linnaea borealis
MA	37	Mentha spicata
NA	37	Najas sp.
OA	37	Oxalis sp.
PA	37	Phlox sp.
QA	37	Quercus sp.
RA	37	Ranunculus sp.
SA	37	Saxifraga sp.
TA	37	Taraxacum officinale
UA	37	Urtica dioica
VA	37	Viola sp.
WA	37	Waldsteinia sp.
XA	37	Xanthoxylum sp.
YA	37	Yucca sp.
ZA	37	Zinnia sp.

NOTES

1. All dimensions are in feet and inches.
2. All dimensions are to the centerline of the planting area.
3. All dimensions are to the centerline of the planting area.
4. Refer to specification for general conditions, materials and installation requirements.

PLN - 73


Attendees at Public Information Meeting - December 18, 2013



Legend
● Attendees

February 21, 2014
Prepared by Oskar Beller

This document is the property of the City of Richmond. It is to be used for the purposes intended and only for the information contained herein. It is not to be distributed, copied, or reproduced in any form without the express written permission of the City of Richmond. All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced without the express written permission of the City of Richmond.



PLN -74

Konkin, Barry

From: Aydin Kilic [unimageltd@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, 17 February 2014 02:01
To: Konkin, Barry
Subject: Updated Public Consultation Summary
Attachments: No4_Bridge_PC Feedback_Dec 2013.pdf; Postal Report.pdf; Tear Sheet_Richmond Review RIRN131206_A11 (1).pdf; MailOut Final Proof public_notice-20131127-12x6-03.pdf

Hi Barry,

As follows:

Location:

General Currie Elementary School (Gymnasium)
8220 General Currie Road
Richmond, B.C. V6Y 1M1

Time:

5pm-8pm on December 18th

Public Consultation Event Summary:

The developer provided a Q+A format with 2 sets of about 8 boards displayed in the gym. Refreshments were offered for all attendees, and included vegetarian sandwiches, noodle boxes, a variety of baked goods, and water and coffee. Present were Aydin Kilic (Development Manager), Taizo Yamamoto (Architect), David Kozak (Civil Engineer), Joseph Fry and Tawab Hlimi (Landscape Architects) David Johnson was in attendance on behalf of the City of Richmond.

Attendance

15 attendees signed in. However it seemed as if there were 20-25 attendees pass throughout the duration of the event. It was apparent not all attendees signed in.

The first attendees arrived at right at 5pm, approximately 6 people not appearing to be one group. This number increased to over 10 shortly. Approximately half of all attendees arrived within the first hour, after which people started leaving. There was a lull in attendance between 6-7pm, after which the remaining half of attendees arrived steadily through the course of the event until the end.

Comments from the Developer:

The team representing the developer attempted to explain the proposed OCP amendment, no one contested this, with the exception of Shawn Sandhu towards the end of the event. However Mr. Sandhu did not follow up with a written response. Verbally most people were concerned with parking on the street because of the influx of more vehicles, however we advised that with all units having side-by-side parking, each unit would truly have 2 parking stalls (in tandems people typically only park one car and use the rest for storage, and park their second car on the street creating spill over). All attendees seemed to appreciate the proposed development did not includes any homes with tandem parking units, and also that approximately 40% of the townhomes were 2 story units. One individual was concerned about who would pick up the leaves from all the extra trees being planted as part of the landscaping plan. The developer advised the strata would be responsible for on-site maintenance, and the City would be responsible for public areas.

Written feedback:

4 written letters were submitted by attendees and received by City Hall. The most common comment was that residents expected Bridge St. to be upgraded as part of this development (which of course the relevant portions thereof the developer is required to do), the other main concern was the additional traffic and concern for the impact of higher density on street parking (again all units have 2 car garages, so the typical impact on street parking in tandem parking townhome projects do not apply here). None of the comments objected the proposed OCP amendment.

Presentation Content:

Along with the architectural site plan and color landscape plan, the functional road layout was also displayed. The following introduction and proposal summarized the context of the consultation for attendees:

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Open House is to inform you about a development proposal in the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan and to receive your feedback through a comment sheet.

Our proposal will require an amendment to the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan as well as a rezoning application to allow the proposed single family and townhouse development. A Public Hearing will be required before the project can be approved.

The proposed project is located at:

7120, 7141, 7160, 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240, and 7260 Bridge Street; and 7221, 7195, 7211, and 7231 No.4 Road

Reference number is RZ 12-605038.

The proposed development on this site will supply:

1. Seven Single Family Lots fronting Bridge Street;
2. 78 townhouses to the east of the Single Family Lots to No.4 Road; and
3. Roads to provide access from Bridge Street to No.4 Road, and to the proposed townhouse site.

Your comments will be presented to Council as part of the Rezoning Application

PROPOSAL

Our proposal will require amendments to the neighbourhood plan to change the land use designation in the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan on the rear portion of the existing single family lots fronting on Bridge Street from Residential Historic Single Family to Residential Townhouse to allow for the development of townhouses. The second amendment is to change the North-West connection of LeChow Street through the site from a dedicated street to a Right-Of-Way.

If our application is approved by Richmond City Council, we will be creating:

7 Single Family Lots

78 Townhouse Units

Public Notification:

Newspaper (Richmond Review):


Ads were run in 4 consecutive editions of the Richmond Review on Dec 6th, 11th, 13th and 18th. The information includes a rezoning application summary and the proposed OCP amendment, along with the time, date and location of the public consultation. A tear-sheet is attached.

Mail (Canada Post):

The information included a rezoning application summary and the proposed OCP amendment, along with the time, date and location of the public consultation.

A notice on 6"x9" flyer stock was distributed along all of the mail routes that pass through the mapped area identified in the McLennan South Sub-Area Plan, plus all addresses along the mail routes portion that extended past McLennan South boundaries. This is visually represented on page 2 of the Canada Post report (and shown below).

This totaled to 4,767 residences, as detailed on page 3 of the Canada Post report.



Best Regards,
Aydin

From: Konkin, Barry [<mailto:BKonkin@richmond.ca>]
Sent: Friday, February 07, 2014 3:43 PM
To: 'Aydin Kilic'
Subject: Public consultation summary

Aydin –

I hate to ask for more on this, but can you please put together a quick summary of the public information meeting in December?

Location
Time
Number of people attending
Comments provided
Any written comments received.

Regards,

Barry Konkin
Program Coordinator, Development
City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road

letters

Rats meet cats

Editor:
Re: "Fight against rats is a 'never-ending battle,'" *Richmond Review*, Nov. 29.

Let me pen an encomium to my dear, dear friend Nicolette. I have known this youngster for just over eight years now.

An inquisitive, affectionate dear little creature, she patrols our backyard in her never-outmoded, stylish, black and white fur coat.

Athletic from birth, she would, I recall, lift her arm and casually snatch a fly as it went by. She would catch it with no difficulty at all.

She had an unpleasant habit, it's true, of popping it straight into her mouth.

But I digress. I remember vividly the day my husband asked, "How long has that been there?", indicating the lifeless body of *rattus rattus* on the rug's edge and carefully guarded by Nico. Sometimes the bodies were alive (mice, thankfully, not rats) and it was clear she was trying her utmost to train us. Or at least, to give us some of the fun of the chase. But in the end, it is Nico who is the best of our family at rodent control. The other three cats don't "do" rat! Though they are happy to do "mouse."

All hail to *felis catus*! Why don't more of us use them for what they were domesticated to do?

Richmond

Herring sale was a great idea

Editor:
This year I had a privilege to donate to B.C. Children's Hospital by buying herrings in Steveston. What an amazing idea.

I just would like to thank you to all fishermen, organizers, sponsors and very hard working volunteers for very well organized event and job very well done. Amazing job.

Chimwack

Time to deal with epidemic rat problem

Editor:
Having read Mr. Campolongo's comments about the "never ending battle" with rats in the city it is yet time the city was held up as one of the worst offenders at creating the problem and doing nothing in the way of prevention.

Let's start looking at some hard facts, ugly though they may be. The city ripped out all of the vegetation and shrubs along Railway to create the new bike trail—all of the ditches and shrubs along that route were homes for our ugly little friends and where do you think those rats went? Into the adjacent neighbourhoods looking to set up new homes.

Walk along the seawall at Garry Point at twilight and the rocks are alive with rats. The city has built community gardens all over Richmond, but when the sun goes down those gardens are setting out a feast for every rat in the city.

We drop old houses and dig up those properties, driving all the little creature that have set up

housekeeping in them into all of the surrounding neighborhoods and yet, after everything the city has set before these nasty vermin as food and fodder the city does nothing but refer you to a pest control company when you call with concerns. There is absolutely no rodent control program in the City of Richmond despite all of the underlying health concerns rats create.

We have a problem, an epidemic of rats. Our city can fund sending a posse of councillors and friends off on another "Sister City" trip half way round the world but can't seem to find the funds nor the interest to do anything about the very significant rat issue this city has and will face in ever increasing amounts. This is part of the ugly side of any city, but most cities don't choose to sweep it under the rug like Richmond does, and we are now starting to reap the rewards of years of not addressing this issue and it is only going to get worse.

Richmond

Invitation to Attend a Public Open House - South McLennan Area

Hui Yuan Investments (Canada) Inc. is hosting and invites you to attend the following Open House to learn about and comment on its proposed project involving 78 Townhouses and seven (7) new Single Family Lots.

Purpose of Open House:	To inform the public regarding a proposed project involving: (1) 78 Townhouses, and (2) seven new Single Family Lots To ask the public to complete a public survey
Date:	Wednesday, December 18, 2013
Time:	5pm to 8pm
Location:	General Currie Elementary School Gymnasium 8220 General Currie Road, Richmond, BC

Open House Agenda:

- 5pm - Start, mingle, review information,
- 6pm - 7pm - A short presentation by Developer, followed by a Q and A session,
- 7pm - 8pm - Mingle, ask more questions, public asked to complete Survey,
- 8pm - Closing


Note: City staff will be attending the Open House, as technical observers

Location of Proposed Development:

- The Affected Development Sites are:
- Bridge Street: 7120, 7140, 7160, 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240 and 7260
 - No 4 Road: 7211, 7195, 7211 and 7231

Project Details:

- The Project Rezoning Reference is RZ 12-605038
- The project will require amendments to the South McLennan Sub-Area Plan and Zoning Bylaw
- A Public Hearing will be required before the project is approved.
- The public survey findings will be presented to Council as part of the rezoning application.
- The proposed project involves the above 12 properties (e.g., over 5.5 acres), existing houses that are not currently occupied, and consolidating and re-subdividing properties.



For information, please contact:

For Hui Yuan Investments: Aydin Kilic, email: unimagelt@gmail.com, Tel: 778-883-4774
For City Staff: David Johnson, email djohnson@richmond.ca, Tel: 604-276-4193

PLN - 78

Better Grades Happier Kids



Grade 1 - 12

It can start happening today! With Oxford's personalized programs and low teacher-student ratio, your child will see results almost immediately.

- Improved Confidence
- Higher Self-Esteem



604-233-5566

7380 WESTMINSTER HWY., RICHMOND

(near Minoru Blvd.)

www.oxfordlearning.com



Half Day Phonics Program

(Ages 3-6 yrs)

Oxford's Little Readers® half day programs offer an enriched, individualized curriculum introducing three to six year olds to reading.



READING | WRITING | MATH | FRENCH | STUDY SKILLS

Backstage Pass

NEWS FROM BEHIND THE SCENES



Settling the Score in *The King and I*

In Gateway's upcoming production of *The King and I*, Musical Director Christopher King will bring the gorgeous score to life. Beyond his talents in the orchestra pit, Christopher is also a huge musical theatre buff who knows plenty of little known facts about the show.

Here are Christopher's top three insider stories about the music in *The King and I*:

The Magic of Orchestration

Though Rodgers and Hammerstein wrote the songs, it's orchestrator Robert Russell Bennett who selected the specific instruments to be played in particular moments. Chris beams: "he used traditional sounds mixed with Asian influences to great effect."

Why Anna Sings (Almost) All the Songs

The famous actor Gertrude Lawrence read "Anna and the King of Siam" and asked her lawyer to get Rodgers and Hammerstein to adapt it into a musical for her. This is why the story is so heavily focused on Anna and why she sings almost every song. Anna's songs also have limited vocal range because Gertrude had "a nasty penchant for singing out of tune"—the limited range minimized the risk of notes going awry.

It Holds All the Hits

The King and I holds the greatest number of hits in one show. "Getting to Know You," "Shall We Dance?" and "Whistle a Happy Tune" are instantly recognizable.

To hear the beloved music live at Gateway, book your tickets to *The King and I!* Tickets available at tickets.gatewaytheatre.com.

Rodgers & Hammerstein's

The King and I



GATEWAY THEATRE

DECEMBER 5-31, 2013

Buy Tickets! Box Office 604.270.1812
www.gatewaytheatre.com


Invitation to Attend a Public Information Meeting for a proposed Official Community Plan amendment and rezoning application at 7120, 7140, 7160 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240 and 7260 Bridge Street and 7211, 7195, 7211 and 7231 No. 4 Road

Hui Yuan Investments (Canada) Inc invites you to attend the meeting to review:

1. The proposed OCP amendment would change the back of the lots between Bridge Street and the planned LeChow Street from Single Detached to support townhouses.
2. 7 new single family homes on Bridge Street; and
3. A proposed 78 unit townhouse development.

City of Richmond Rezoning Application: RZ 12-605038

The goal of this proposed development is to complement the existing single and multi-family dwellings in the neighborhood, and create the infrastructure required to support this increased density.



The proposed site includes 12 existing properties over 5.5 acres with existing homes on these lands are not currently occupied. The lands will be consolidated and re-subdivided to allow the proposed development.

This development will include the required construction of roads to access the proposed townhouse site.

**Date: Wednesday, December 18th
Time: 5pm-8pm
Location: General Currie Elementary School Gymnasium,
8220 General Currie Road, Richmond, BC, V6Y 1M1**

Please attend the public house on Wednesday, December 18, 2013 from 5-8pm at General Currie Elementary School Gymnasium.

Your Targeting Report

Mailing Campaign Details

12-03-2013



Mailing ID 2JI9V17425133719026

Thank you for taking advantage of our targeting service - a one stop solution designed to help you get the most out of your direct mail campaigns.

- Anonymous Precision Targeter users will have their reports saved and accessible for 30 days from the day the report has been generated.
- Signed-In Precision Targeter users will have their reports saved and accessible for 13 months from the day the report has been generated.

Inside, find comprehensive insight into your selected trade area, including:

Address Attributes	Houses, Apartments and Farms
Number of Mail Pieces	4767
Urban / Rural	All
Estimated Delivery Cost	\$ 763.13
Delivery Mode (Route Type)	Letter Carrier (LC), Rural Route (RR), Suburban Service (SS), General Delivery (GD), Lock Box (LB), Call For (CF), Motorized Route (MR), Direct (DR)
Valid for Mailings From	13-11-15 To 13-12-12
Householder Types	Consumer's Choice

Not only does the attached report provide an in-depth look at your chosen trade area, it also harnesses the power of data analytics to help maximize your return on investment (ROI) by providing you with:

- A Route Ranking report that prioritizes your postal route selections based on your demographic criteria, enabling you to deliver your message to the people most likely to respond;
- A Postal Station Summary report that indicates the facilities responsible for your mailing;
- Maps, Impact Assessment, and many other campaign-enhancing resources.

Do you want to further improve your direct mailings? Take advantage of our suite of data and targeting solutions:

LIST SERVICES
With access to over 13 million addresses, Canadian Post offers one of the most comprehensive lists of accurate Canadian addresses. Also, choose one of two new list selects: New Addresses and New Occupants - and you can even time your mailings to the recency of the actual move date with Hotline selects!

DATA SERVICES
With the help of Smart Data Cleaner you can improve your address accuracy, identify movers and suppress duplicate records to ensure clean, current and accurate mail files - in doing so you will have less undeliverable mail and improved ROI.


ANALYTICS
Our analytics experts will work with you to ensure your consumer data delivers optimal results. For example, we can help identify highest-potential customers and prospects through penetration analysis, location intelligence, segmentation, modeling and profiling.

Questions? Contact your Canada Post Sales Representative or our Commercial Service Network at 1-866-757-5480.

Your Targeting Report

Route Ranking Report

Reaching the right people with the right message is a key driver of campaign success. The map below shows your selected trade area and the routes that make up your coverage. The routes are colour coded according to the penetration of your selected demographic variable(s) to show how closely it matches your ideal prospect.



Your Targeting Report

Route Ranking Report



Below you will find your Route Ranking Report, which provides you with a tabular view of the routes within your trade area ranked according to the value of the selected demographic variable(s). By looking at the "Cumulative Penetration" and the "Cumulative Points of Call" columns, you can easily determine which routes you need to target in order to meet your desired quota.

FSA	Delivery Mode (Route)	Depot	All Points Of Call	Cumulative Points of Call	High Demand (HD)
V6Y	LC0207	RICHMOND LCD 22	1399	1399	
V6Y	LC0208	RICHMOND LCD 22	1201	2600	
V6Y	LC0206	RICHMOND LCD 22	964	3564	
V6Y	LC0205	RICHMOND LCD 22	575	4139	
V6Y	LC0217	RICHMOND LCD 22	346	4485	
V6Y	LC0219	RICHMOND LCD 22	267	4752	
V6Y	LB0001	RICHMOND RPO GARDEN CITY	15	4767	

Copyright © Canada Post Corporation, 2012

Source: Derived from Statistics Canada, 2006 Census Profile (94-568-X) and 2006 Census Dissemination Area Boundary File (91-169-X).

No confidential information about an individual, family, household, organisation or business has been obtained from Statistics Canada

Canada Post Confidential - This report is provided for use in accordance with the terms of use available at <http://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/personal/help/legal.jsf>. Any other use is strictly prohibited. This report is provided "as is" and Canada Post disclaims any warranty whatsoever. All rights not expressly granted are reserved by Canada Post and its licensors. This report may be used only during the validity period noted above and must be destroyed following the expiry of such validity period.

Your Targeting Report

Postal Station Summary



To avoid transportation charges, you may want to deposit your Unaddressed Admail™ directly at each postal station responsible for your mailing. The table below provides you with a list of post offices where you need to induct your mailing, and how many pieces must be deposited at each location.

	HOUSES	APARTMENTS	FARMS	BUSINESSES	TOTAL POINTS OF CALL
--	--------	------------	-------	------------	----------------------

RICHMOND LCD 22 , 8520 RIVER RD RICHMOND BC V6Y 3K0

TOTAL	2666	2086	0	0	4752
--------------	------	------	---	---	------

RICHMOND RPO GARDEN CITY , 180-8780 BLUNDELL RD RICHMOND BC V6Y 3Y0

TOTAL	15	0	0	0	15
--------------	----	---	---	---	----

GRAND TOTAL	2681	2086	0	0	4767
--------------------	------	------	---	---	------

Copyright © Canada Post Corporation, 2012

Source: Derived from Statistics Canada, 2006 Census Profile (94-568-X) and 2006 Census Dissemination Area Boundary File (91-169-X).

No confidential information about an individual, family, household, organisation or business has been obtained from Statistics Canada

Canada Post Confidential - This report is provided for use in accordance with the terms of use available at <http://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/personal/help/legal.jsf>. Any other use is strictly prohibited. This report is provided "as is" and Canada Post disclaims any warranty whatsoever. All rights not expressly granted are reserved by Canada Post and its licensors. This report may be used only during the validity period noted above and must be destroyed following the expiry of such validity period.

Public Open House – South McLennan Neighbourhood
 December 18, 2013

Name	Address
Jim DAVIS	9560 GRANVILLE AVE
Anthony Pfitzenmaier	7191 No. 4 RD
Audrey Pfitzenmaier	" " "
GORDIAL S Dale BAH	7251 ASH ST.
S. McBurney	7171 Bridge
David Yu	7151 BRIDGE
Dave Jew	7511 #4 ROAD
GARY Honigsmann	5755 No. 3RD
DENIS WUNDERLICH	8160 No. 4 ROAD
SHAWN SANDHU	7280 BRIDGE ST RWS
M Honigsmann	7191 #4 RD.
VIEGI DER	9100 GENERAL CURRIE DR.
KEN DER	10891 BANBERTON DR.

Public Open House - South McLennan Neighbourhood
 December 18, 2013

Name	Address
Cathy Huang	9699 Sills Ave
Norma Wan	8060 Jones Rd
Carl Bamberford	Ken Oak

Johnson, David (Planning)

From: Erika Stiegelmar [erika.stiegelmar@shaw.ca]
Sent: Monday, 23 December 2013 12:04
To: Johnson, David (Planning)
Subject: Proposals for the South McLennan Neighbourhood - comments

Dear Sir,

As an owner of 7191 Bridge Street I wish to make these comments:

Because the proposed development on the East side of Bridge Street will be higher density than the

west side and therefore create more traffic and parking on both sides of Bridge Street I feel the developer

should cover the cost of ALL street improvements for both East and West sides of the street.

Yours sincerely, Rudolf Stiegelmar

Johnson, David (Planning)

From: Lal, Sangita [RH] [Sangita.Lal@vch.ca]
Sent: Monday, 23 December 2013 10:51
To: Johnson, David (Planning)
Subject: Proposed amendment to south McLennan area plan

We own property in the above mentioned area and we are directly across the street, on bridge road, from the empty lots where there will be houses and townhouses built. We have no problem with the plans, but we would like the development across our place to take care of the street and sidewalk construction. The people who own the empty lots across the street from our house have caused us a lot of worry in the past because of the squatters who lived there and the houses went on fire numerous times as well as accumulating junk outside their houses. Bridge street has to be improved as the street has many bumps and uneven foundation and I think it will be pointless to build new homes with such a terrible road in front of it. Our parking is already very limited and having so many new people live in this area, I would like to see better parking plans. Thank you for taking the time out to listen to our comments. We live on 7211 bridge street, our names are Raj and Sangita Lal. Our telephone number is 604-313-8555 if you need to contact us. My email is sangita.lal@vch.ca.

Allan and Sandra McBurney
7171 Bridge St.
Richmond, B.C. V6Y 2S6

December 23, 2013
City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, B.C. V6Y 2C1

Attention: David Johnson

Re: Public information meeting December 18, 2013
Proposed changes to South McLennan Area Plan

As requested, we are writing to set out our concerns regarding the proposed development on the east side of Bridge Street.

While the proposed access to No. 4 Road should help, it probably goes without saying that the increased density will also mean more traffic on Bridge Street. We also feel that with the proposed change in zoning for the east side of Bridge Street, there will be more need of parking for the new development. Not only do we expect that residents and visitors to this sizeable townhouse complex will be using Bridge Street for extra parking, but the single family owners along the east side of Bridge will have minimal setback for driveway, and so will need to make more use of Bridge Street for parking than the existing properties on the west side with much larger set-backs and more parking for vehicles on our lots.

We believe that the ones who are mostly going to be using the parking on the west side of Bridge Street will be the owners of these townhouses and new single family dwellings. We therefore feel that the developer for these properties should pay for the improvements on both sides of Bridge Street. The developer is getting a significant bonus in being allowed to build townhouses where the area plan said that none would be built, the city is getting the higher density that it desired when the area plan was introduced, but all that the existing residents are getting is more traffic, more competition for street parking when needed, and cars chewing up our grass boulevards. Plus, should we choose to develop the back portion of our properties (and the City has made clear that this will not be for townhouses), we will be expected to pay for the sidewalk and improvements to the west side of Bridge Street, which the buyers of our back lots will have no direct benefit from whatsoever. The users should pay, and the users will mostly be the buyers of properties in this new development across the street.

We also feel that 5 days is not enough time to have this comment form returned, especially at this time of year. It is not right that the developer call this meeting a week before Christmas and then expect to have all comments back within 5 days. After all, the developer has owned most of these properties for many years and never shown any concern for the residents of the area. Now all of a sudden the developer would like everything pushed through.

Allan and Sandra McBurney

Public Open House--South McLennan Neighbourhood
December 18, 2013

The Purpose is to seek your opinion on the proposed amendments to the South McLennan Area plan and the Zoning Bylaw of the subject properties.

Name: Maria Honigman

Address: 7191 Number 4 Road, Richmond

Do you own property within the South McLennan area? Yes

Comments:

City of Richmond Rezoning Application: RZ 12-605038

I have concerns about the E-W Connector, or New Avenue depending on which map you look at and Lechow Road. In the past, during the community meetings regarding other developments in the area, there was repeated mention of a Ring Road, which included Lechow, Sills and Shields Avenues. During those meetings, it was stated that none of the roads should connect to Number 4 Road. For that reason there are a number of emergency access roads in place now in the more recent developments to the North of this proposal with chains across to prevent drivers from accessing Number 4 Road. Because this developer, Hui Yuan Investments, was not willing to acquire properties that would include land where the Ring road would be located, they simply changed the road to access Number 4 Road. Because they were not willing to acquire land bordering Lechow how are they now able to simply narrow Lechow Road and wait for future developments to widen the road to an acceptable width? And when will that be? I know for a fact that 7195 Number 4 Road has been on the market off and on for a number of years at current market value and yet, they did not attempt to acquire it.

I am also concerned about the amount of misinformation between the public announcements. The board posted on Number 4 Road had different information, involving different lots than the public invitation posted in the Richmond Review December 13, 2013 as well as the invitation sent to my house. The lots involved are, specifically 7271 and 7195 No. 4 Road--7271 is listed on the Rezoning Board on Number 4 Road as being a lot involved in the rezoning process, but it's not in the invitation sent to my house, nor is it in the invitation posted in the Richmond Review. At the same time, the property at 7195 No. 4 Road is listed on the Invitation sent to my house and in the Invitation in the Richmond Review, but not listed on the rezoning board. Which is correct? This conflicting information will affect the number of replies or voices of concern from the local residents as to which invitation they read. But the biggest concern is that all three invitations neglected to show the new access road to Number 4 Road so many residents in the area were not alarmed by the proposal and therefore might not be voicing an opinion.

Also, on the board on Number 4 Road, there is mention of “approximately 100 townhouse units” whereas on the invitation sent to my house, it states 78 townhouses while in the newspaper invitation it states 78 townhouses and 7 new single family lots. Why the discrepancy between all three public invitations? And again, how can the public possibly understand what the proposal actually is when there are so many discrepancies.

Your meeting took place surprisingly during the busy week before Christmas and for some reason you expected the replies during the week of Christmas, which is again going to affect the number of replies from the local residents.

Konkin, Barry

From: Shawn S [shawns@vmo.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, 07 March 2012 15:00
To: MayorandCouncillors; Jackson, Brian; Johnson, David (Planning)
Subject: Development of McLennan South

City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, B.C.V6Y 2C1

Re: Development of McLennan South

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to follow up with my meeting on 20 February with David Johnson at the City of Richmond. We discussed the current zoning and development applications for the large parcel of land north of Shields Avenue along the east side of Bridge Street.

I recognize that the City has a need to offer affordable housing options to Richmond's growing community and Developers need suitable areas of land to build such housing. However, I want to remind Council and the Planning Department that a comprehensive analysis and public consultation was done prior to the Community Plan amendment in early 2004. This consultation found that the local residents were not pleased with the proposed changes to the original OCP but we accepted the proposal to introduce multi-family developments to the perimeter areas only and the construction of a Ring Road network to handle traffic concerns.

We accepted the plan with the understanding that the Single Family appeal of McLennan South would be maintained, specifically on Bridge Street where a minimum lot frontage of 18 meters gives the neighborhood a distinct character appeal. Consequently many of the current residents chose to root themselves in this community by investing significant funds into our primary residences to support the City's vision and area plan.

Since then a number of Single Family developments and additional roads have been introduced and the current residents are trying to understand the need to compromise certain elements of the OCP in order to allow development to occur. I want to emphasize that my fellow neighbors and I will strongly oppose any further deviation from the current OCP for this area, namely the introduction of multi-family residences located outside the perimeter of Bridge Street. We feel that such deviation will diminish the appeal of the larger single family homes as well as raise safety concerns resulting from increased traffic and parking. Also, the transition between multi-family and single family homes will be lost.

I am surprised by the reluctance of the owners of this large parcel of land to further their single family development application and further troubled by information that a former City of Richmond Councilor, Kiichi Kumagai, may have been retained by the owners as a consultant to assist in rezoning this land to multifamily.

I hope Council, the Director of Planning and the Area Planner will recognize the importance of maintaining the unique character of this McLennan South area and support the local area residents by sending a clear message to developers that you will not support multi-family development applications for this area.

Regards,

Shawn Sandhu
7280 Bridge St,
Richmond, BC
778-891-7347



City of Richmond

6911 No. 3 Road,
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1
www.richmond.ca

March 16, 2012
File: 08-4105-06-01/2012-Vol 01

Planning and Development Department
Policy Planning
Fax: 604-276-4052

Mr. Shawn Sandhu
7280 Bridge Street
Richmond, BC
V6Y 2S7

Dear Mr. Sandhu:

Re: Letter of March 7, 2012 – Development of McLennan South


Thank you for your letter of March 7, 2012 which outlines your concerns over the pattern of development you have experienced in your community of South McLennan.

As you are aware, the Area Plan of South McLennan guides future growth and development in the area (McLennan South Sub-Area Plan – Schedule 2.10D). As indicated in your letter, this plan did go through a comprehensive analysis and public consultation with local residents who accepted the plan to allow multi-family development along the perimeter of the neighbourhood, while keeping the single-family character within the interior of the neighbourhood. This includes maintaining wider lots for properties fronting Bridge and Ash Streets to be at least 18 meters (approximately 59 feet) wide.

The rezoning application you identified in your letter (RZ 07-378654) currently proposes 24 lot single-family subdivision. The information we currently have is in keeping with the neighbourhood plan and would not require an amendment to the Official Community Plan (OCP). For example, all proposed lots meet the lot width and area requirements, including the current lot widths for those fronting Bridge Street would maintain their current width of 19.2 meters (approximately 63 feet). Should we receive changes to the proposal, we will ensure that the Bridge Street lots will remain large lot single-family and the lots will meet the current minimum lot width and area requirements in the OCP. Should any part of a new proposal not meet the neighbourhood plan, an amendment to the OCP will be required. This includes a separate bylaw for the amendment, neighbour notification and a Public Hearing, where the public can express their views on the proposal. Ultimately, City Council will make the decision whether such a proposed OCP amendment is accepted.

To date, the current application has not proceeded to Planning Committee or City Council as we are awaiting a response from the applicant. Should you require further information on the progress of this application, please feel free to contact Mr. David Johnson, Planner 2 at 604 276-4193.

Yours truly,



Brian J. Jackson, MCIP
Director of Development

BJ:dj

cc: Mayor and Council
Gail Johnson, Clerks Department
David Johnson, Planning and Development

Re: Rezoning Application- File No. RZ12-605038

Attention: City of Richmond Planning & Development Department-

To whom it may concern;

It has been brought to my attention that there was supposed to have been a document given to the property owners on the west side of Bridge Street, north of General Currie and south of Sills Avenue regarding an opportunity to comment on the rezoning of property on the east side of Bridge Street.

Since I've not seen this document, I wish to express my thoughts on the subject.

Realizing that the rezoning application on the east side of Bridge is asking for increased density, including a residential format that is not in the original community plan, there will be a dramatic increase in vehicular traffic and on street parking. This will increase the already overtaxed strain on the on street parking on both sides of Bridge Street. This is extremely evident by observing the congested design of the on street parking design that has been implemented on Bridge Street, immediately south of Granville, making navigating between parked cars hazardous and nearly impossible with opposing traffic.

One must realize that with the proposed increased density, including lots fronting on the east side of Bridge Street, parking on the street will be monopolized by the east side of Bridge Street residents providing another situation of excessive congestion which west side residents do not benefit from, but will only create a large inconvenience. Current parking conditions just south of Granville on Bridge Street can attest to that.

The parking and vehicular traffic issues I've identified above, along with the proposed increase in density will only diminish our many years of a quiet and peaceful life style we've all come to enjoy here on Bridge Street.

If the proposed project in for rezoning with its increased density, which favours the City of Richmond coffers/ tax base, is allowed to proceed, it would only be reasonable that the numerous long time residents on the west side of Bridge Street be compensated by the Developer and/or the City of Richmond, by installing the required curb, gutter and lighting standards on the west side of Bridge Street at the expense of the Developer.

Thanks for addressing this matter in an affirmative manner.

Yours Truly

Calvin and Maryann Radom

7231 Bridge Street, Richmond, BC.

Email:cmradom@shaw.ca

Arborist Report

Preliminary Tree Preservation Plan

Rezoning Application

7120/40/60/80 Bridge Street
7200/20/40/60/80 Bridge Street
7211/31/71 No. 4 Road
Richmond, BC

Prepared for: Hui Yuan Investment (Canada) Ltd.
Prepared by: VanArbor Vegetation Consulting Ltd.
Ken Bell, P.Ag.
Date: March 23, 2012

Table of Contents

	Page
Summary.....	2
Introduction.....	2
Background.....	2
Assignment.....	2
Limits of Assignment.....	2
Purpose and Use of the Report.....	2
Observations.....	3
Testing and Analysis.....	3
Discussion.....	4
Preliminary Tree Preservation Plan	5
Conclusion.....	7
Photograph 1.....	8
Appendix 1: Topograph Tree Survey.....	9
Appendix 2: Site Plan.....	10
Appendix 3: Tree Inventory and Evaluation.....	11
Appendix 4: Summary Tree Remove / Preservation Schedule.....	20
Appendix 5: GIS Aerial Photograph.....	22
Assumptions and Limiting Conditions.....	23
Qualifications of Author.....	25

Summary

Hui Yuan Investment (Canada) Ltd. is proposing to rezone ten residential properties at 7120/40/80 Bridge Street, 7200/20/40/60 Bridge Street, 7211/31/71 No. 4 Road Richmond, BC in order to develop one hundred-one townhome units and five residential building lots. This arborist report documents 255 on and off-site protected-sized trees and proposes a Preliminary Tree Preservation Plan. The Preliminary Tree Preservation Plan proposes to preserve twenty-five trees and remove 230 trees.

Introduction

Background

Hui Yuan Investment (Canada) Ltd. is seeking permission from the City of Richmond to rezone ten residential properties at 7120/40/80 Bridge Street, 7200/20/40/60 Bridge Street, 7211/31/71 No. 4 Road from single-family housing district, Subdivision Area to Townhome District in order to construct one hundred-one townhomes and five single family lots. The assembled properties contain protected-size trees. The City of Richmond requires an arborist report and Preliminary Tree Preservation Plan to accompany the rezoning application in order to comply with City of Richmond Tree Protection Bylaw 8057 and development policies.

Assignment

Provide an arborist report to:

1. Document protected size trees associated with the proposed rezoning application.
2. Provide a written report documenting findings of the tree survey investigation.
3. Propose a Preliminary Tree Preservation Plan.

Limits of the Assignment

1. VanArbor's assessment on February 2, 2012 is based on visual inspection of the trees and site conditions from ground level. I did not climb trees or excavate the root zone of trees.
2. This report does not provide a tree replacement schedule.
3. This report is not valid for Development Permit or Building Permit applications.
4. It is beyond the scope of this report to provide detailed tree preservation specifications.

Purpose and use of report

1. To accompany the Rezoning Permit application.
2. Provide compliance with City of Richmond Tree Protection Bylaw 8057 and Planning-development policies.

Observations

There are ten residential building lots at 7120/40/80 Bridge Street, 7200/20/40/60 Bridge Street, 7211/31/71 No. 4 Road. The building lots contain a mix of mature landscape trees and a variety of shrubs, and a large woodlot containing a mixture of native conifer and deciduous trees. Ornamental Beech trees grow in the grass strip boulevard along No. 4 Road and there is a hedge growing in the municipal road easement along Bridge Street. There are overhead utilities (BC Hydro single phase and secondary powerlines, cable and telus) along Bridge Street. The topography of the building lots is flat. The existing grade elevations along Bridge Street nearly match the building lots. However, the existing building-lot elevations along No. 4 Road are significantly lower than the No. 4 Road roadway. Near-surface soil conditions are shallow and I suspect there is a high water table over majority of the site; I observed standing water in several locations. There is a bird nest in Birch tree # 245 and at least one bird nest in the woodlot trees. There are no natural water features or other significant environmental features to report.

Testing and Analysis

I assessed the trees and site conditions on January 26, 2012. Tree assessments include health and structural condition ratings, and viability for tree preservation. Individual trees are field identified with a numerical survey tag attached to the lower tree trunk. Street trees growing along No. 4 Road and protected-size trees growing in the woodlot are not field identified with survey tags.

Appendix 1 Arborist Topograph Tree Survey provided by Louis Ngan Land Surveying shows the location of on and off-site trees, buildings at the time of the survey and other relevant topographic information. I annotated the topograph survey with tree numbers, dripline circles and condition ratings (poor, moderate, good or combination of two ratings)

Appendix 2 Arborist Site Plan shows the on and off-site trees in moderate and good condition, tree numbers, tree removal symbols, tree protection barrier fences, dripline circles, proposed building envelopes and interior roadway system, existing spot elevation, various dimensions, arborist annotations and notes.

Appendix 3 is the Tree Inventory and Evaluation that documents the protected-size trees. Tree numbers listed in the inventory correspond with the tree numbers on Appendix 1 and 2 drawings. The inventory lists: tree number, species, diameter breast height (dbh) size, condition rating, crown spread, observations, comments and proposed preservation recommendations.

Appendix 4 is a summary-schedule listing trees proposed for preservation or removal.

Appendix 5 contains a GIS Aerial Photograph showing existing site conditions and the locations of underground off-site services.

Discussion

Hui Yuan Investment (Canada) Ltd. is proposing to consolidate and rezone ten existing residential properties in order to develop one hundred-one townhomes and five residential building lots. The layout of the proposed development includes eighteen buildings, an interior roadway system, infrastructure, parking and two amenity areas.

Appendix 1 Arborist Topograph Tree Survey shows existing buildings, spot elevations, on & off-site trees, hedgerows and the woodlot. There are 255 on and off-site trees and hedges associated with the proposed development. The woodlot contains 148 native trees and covers approximately 30% of the development area. There are 93 landscape trees growing on the existing building lots, separate from the woodlot trees. I have annotated the drawing to differentiate trees that are in good, moderate and poor condition; trees in good health and structural condition have thick dripline circles. The dripline circles around each tree are the approximate crown spread dimensions.

It should be noted that the grade-elevation of the existing building sites along No. 4 Road is significantly lower (≥ 80 cm) than the No. 4 Roadway grade-elevation. The development will likely be required to elevate the building sites in order to comply with the Flood Plain Bylaw.

Appendix 2 Site Plan shows the architectural layout scheme of the proposed development and trees that are moderate and good condition. The drawing also shows tree protection zone (TPZ) barrier fences surrounding the trees that are good candidates for preservation. The development proposes to preserve:

1. Thirteen on-site trees
2. Existing conifer hedges surrounding the residential lot at 7160 Bridge Street
3. Off-site trees growing along the edge of the woodlot on lots 7300 Bridge Street and 7195 No. 4 Road
4. Off-site Municipal trees growing in the boulevard grass-strip along No. 4 Road

All other on and off-site trees and hedges are proposed for removal to enable the development layout scheme. The tree remove symbols shown in the Site Plan indicate trees in moderate and good condition proposed for removal. Off-site trees and hedges proposed for removal include:

1. Hedge of trees/shrubs currently growing in the Municipal boulevard adjacent to 7040 and 7060 Bridge Street (See photograph 1).
2. Tree # OS216 located on the north property line of 7160 Bridge Street. This tree is in poor condition and should be removed to enable the proposed development. It is important to note that the Planning Department will likely require written permission from the registered owner of 7160 Bridge Street in order to authorize the removal of the tree.

Appendix 3 Tree Inventory and Evaluation documents 255 on and off-site trees associated with the proposed development. There are 241 on-site trees and 14 off-site trees.

Appendix 4 provides a summary that tallies the number of trees proposed for preservation and removal. The development proposes to preserve 13 on-site trees and remove 228 on-site trees;

remove two off-site trees (#OS216, OS4) and preserve twelve off-site trees. On and off-site trees proposed for removal are in poor condition or conflict with the proposed architectural layout scheme.

It is important to note that the majority of landscape trees (excluding woodlot trees) are in poor condition. Table 1 shows the number and percentage of on-site landscape trees (not including woodlot trees) and their relative condition ratings. Fifty-two percent of the landscape trees are in poor condition.

Table 1

Condition rating	Poor	Poor – moderate	Moderate	Moderate – good	Good
Total trees = 93	48	9	23	2	11
Percentage	52%	10%	25%	2%	12%

Appendix 5 shows the aerial GIS photograph of the assembled properties and existing underground services. Due to the scope of the proposed development, the City of Richmond Planning and Engineering Departments will likely require the Civil Engineer to complete a technical review of the proposed rezoning application. The technical review will provide a listing of infrastructure upgrades and servicing requirements for the proposed development. The result of the technical review will help determine conflicts (if any) and the viability of preserving trees near infrastructure upgrades along Bridge Street.

In accordance with City of Richmond Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057, trees proposed for removal are replaced with new trees. In this case, the development is proposing to remove 230 trees; 228 on-site trees and 2 off-site trees. The development proposes to negotiate with the City of Richmond to determine the appropriate number of replacement trees or provide cash-in-lieu to compensate for trees proposed for removal. The project Landscape Architect should specify the locations and species of replacement trees.

Preliminary Tree Preservation Plan

The *Preliminary Tree Preservation Plan* and planning consideration for the proposed rezoning application include, but are not limited to the following details:

1. Preserve thirteen on-site trees shown in the Appendix 2 Arborist Site Plan shown and proposed for preservation in Appendix 3 and 4.
2. Remove 228 on-site trees; 80 landscape trees + 148 woodlot trees proposed for removal in Appendix 3 and 4.
3. Remove off-site tree # OS216 located on the North property line at 7160 Bridge Street.

- The development requires written permission from the owner of 7160 Bridge Street authorizing the removal of the tree.
4. Remove the following off-site trees located on Municipal easements:
 - Off-site tree # OS4 located on proposed Lechow Street roadway easement.
 - Off-site hedgerow located in Municipal road easement adjacent to 7040 and 7060 Bridge Street.
 - i. The development requires written permission to remove trees and hedge from City of Richmond Parks Department.
 5. Preserve twelve off-sites trees shown in the Appendix 2 Arborist Site Plan shown and proposed for preservation in Appendix 3 and 4.
 6. The development negotiates with the City of Richmond to determine the appropriate number of replacement trees or provide cash-in-lieu to compensate for trees proposed for removal.
 7. Project arborist (VanArbor) collaborates with the design team (Architect, Civil Engineer, Landscape Architect, Municipal Planners and Engineers, Developer, Project Superintendent, etc.) during the Development Building Permit application processes.
 - The design team review this report.
 - All drawings provided by the design team are to show the preservation trees, TPZ and Arborist Preservation notes
 8. The project arborist evaluate and provide tree preservation specifications to the following plans:
 - Demolition plans
 - Pre-load operations
 - Site plans
 - Improvement plans (i.e.) street improvement, underground utility upgrades
 - Grade plans
 - Drainage and erosion control plans
 - Landscape construction, planting and irrigation plans
 - Utility plans
 - Geotechnical (soil) reports and plans
 - Construction plans and documents
 9. It is standard practice to erect the barrier fences around preservation trees prior to pre-construction operations. Appendix 2 Arborist Site Plan shows locations of tree protection zone (TPZ) barrier fences.
 - Barrier fence to be constructed in accordance with Municipal guidelines.
 - The barrier fence should be placed at least one meter outside the dripline of preservation trees.
 - Maintain the barrier fence in good condition throughout the construction period.
 - i. The development may dismantle the barrier fence during landscape installation.
 10. Architects and Civil Engineers should plan that all construction take place outside the TPZ barrier fences; (e.g.) no trenching or digging inside TPZ.

11. The Civil Engineer should conduct a capacity analysis to determine whether the sanitary, water and storm drainage systems require improvements / upgrading to determine conflicts (if any) and the viability of preserving trees near infrastructure upgrades along Bridge Street.
12. Drawings prepared by allied consultants (including architectural, civil, electrical, landscape and off-site utility companies) show the preservation trees, tree protection zones and tree preservation information.
13. The project arborist submit the final Tree Protection and Preservation Plan as part of the Development and Building Permit processes.
14. The Project arborist should monitor the trees and site conditions throughout the construction period. The purpose of the monitoring is to:
 - Advise and facilitate completion of project
 - Assist with changes in the field
 - Monitor tree health and site condition and apply appropriate treatments
 - Communicate with the project superintendent and contractors
 - Identify appropriate work procedures around trees
 - Monitor activity around trees
15. The Project Arborist should provide the following services during the post-construction and maintenance phase of development:
 - Consultation and continuity in transition period following construction.
 - Evaluate trees following construction.
 - Provide needed remedial treatments.
 - Sign-off project.

Conclusion

Hui Yuan Investment (Canada) Ltd. is proposing to rezone ten existing residential properties at 7120/40/80 Bridge Street, 7200/20/40/60 Bridge Street, 7211/31/71 No. 4 Road in order to construct one hundred-one townhomes and five single family lots. There are 255 trees associated with the proposed development. The development is proposing to preserve thirteen on-site trees, preserve twelve off-site trees and remove 230 trees. Trees proposed for removal include trees growing in a woodlot that contains 148 native trees. The development proposes to negotiate with the City of Richmond to determine the appropriate number of replacement trees or provide cash-in-lieu to compensate for trees proposed for removal. The preliminary tree preservation plan details planning considerations. VanArbor expects to collaborate with allied planning professionals (Engineer, Architect, Landscape Architect, etc.) during the Development and Building Permit application processes and help ensure the successful tree preservation during and after the construction period.

Photograph 1



Photograph 1: Shows a hedgerow of off-site trees proposed for removal. These trees are located in the roadway easement adjacent to 7040 and 7060 Bridge Street. The development requires the permission from City of Richmond Parks Department to authorize the removal of the hedge.


Appendix 1

Arborist Topograph Tree Survey

SURVEY PLAN OF PROPOSED LOT 1
SECONDLY BLOCK, MOOREVILLE 6 WEST
NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT, PLAN 808

SCALE: 1" = 20'


- Legend: Tree candidates for preservation
- Good candidates
 - Moderate candidates
 - Poor condition & Poor candidates



Drawing annotations (text, tree numbers, dipline circles) by VanArbor, February 10, 2012

THE ABOVE DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF VAN ARBOR CONSULTANTS, INC. AND IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF VAN ARBOR CONSULTANTS, INC.

Appendix 2
Arborist Site Plan



Legend:
 Tree Removal Symbol

Arborist Site Plan annotations by VanArbor March 23, 2012

SITE PLAN

CONTEXT PLAN SCALE: N.T.S.

PROJECT

Yamamoto Architecture Inc.

NO.	DATE	REVISIONS

DRIVING TITLE: growing_title-1, drawing_title-2

SCALE: SHEET NO. sheet_no., TOTAL SHEETS total_sheet_no., TOTAL SHEETS total_sheet_no., PROJECT NO. proj_no.

DESIGNED: *(signature)*
 CHECKED: *(signature)*
 DRAWN: *(signature)*

Appendix 3

Tree Inventory and Evaluation

7120/40/80 Bridge Street
 7200/20/40/60 Bridge Street
 7211/31/71 No. 4 Road
 Richmond, BC

Tree #	Species	DBH ¹ (cm)	Condition ²	Crown spread radius (m)	Observations / Comments	Proposed Tree Preservation Recommendation
On-site Trees						
208	Pine	40	Moderate	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open grown tree standing on the NW corner of the development area ≈20 meters tall; 50% LCR Growing in shallow ground conditions and high water table Growing in 10 meter dedication 	Preserve
211	Western red cedar	44	Moderate	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree in good health condition and moderate structural condition; crown merges with neighbouring trees resulting in asymmetrical crown-shape Tree located too close to proposed building to be considered for preservation 	Remove

¹ DBH size of tree (cm) is measured at 1.4 meters above base in accordance to City of Richmond Tree Protection Bylaw and recorded to the nearest centimeter, unless indicated in observations / comments column.

² Condition rating: the consolidation of health, structure and vigor of the tree. The condition of a tree is expressed as either poor, moderate or good, compared to specimens that are ideal for that species

Tree #	Species	DBH ¹ (cm)	Condition ²	Crown spread radius (m)	Observations / Comments	Proposed Tree Preservation Recommendation
212	Holly	25	Poor	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suppressed crown tree growing under neighbouring tree canopies Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
213	Oak	≈80	Poor		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipal off-site tree BCH pruned for overhead utility clearance Growing next to storm drain in ROW ≈ 20 meters tall with phototropic lean towards the development area 	Remove
214	Cherry	29	poor	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree growing next to Pyramid cedar hedge Tree in poor condition and poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
215	Cherry	≈40	Poor	n/a	Tree is dead and covered with climbing Rose vine	Remove
217	Malus sp.	27+ 25(.6) +25(.6)= 57	Poor – moderate	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trunk has a lean and ground exhibits heave Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
218	Western red cedar	≈45+ 30(.6) +30(.6) = 81	Moderate – good	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree has 100% LCR; nice specimen tree Tree located in proposed roadway 	Remove
220	Malus sp.	20	Poor	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree has 20° trunk lean, root heave Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
221	Birch	44	Moderate	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree has good shape; however 2 dead branches in upper crown; 100% LCR Growing in shallow ground conditions and high water table Tree crown conflicts with building 	Remove
233	Cherry	34	Poor	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree diseased and has a trunk lean Growing in shallow ground conditions and high water table 	Remove
234	Clump birch	≈75	Moderate	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple trunk tree joined at base; poor structure, good health condition Located within existing off-site hedge Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove

Tree #	Species	DBH ¹ (cm)	Condition ²	Crown spread radius (m)	Observations / Comments	Proposed Tree Preservation Recommendation
235	Clump birch	≈75	Moderate	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple trunk tree joined at base; poor structure, good health condition Located within existing off-site hedge Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
239	Western red cedar	≈35	Poor	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree trunk leans and ground exhibits root heave; leader has forked branches Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
240	Birch	33	Poor	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree has dead leader; phototropic lean Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
241	Birch	44	Poor	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree has dead leader at top of crown; phototropic lean Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
242	Clump birch	≈20+16=36	Poor	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree has dead leader at top of crown; phototropic lean Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
243	Clump birch	≈20+16=36	Poor	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree has dead leader at top of crown; phototropic lean Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
244	Clump birch	≈75	Poor	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree has dead leader at top of crown; phototropic lean Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
245	Clump birch	≈55	Poor	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree has poor structure; trunks have phototropic leans Poor candidate for preservation Bird nest in crown 	Remove
246	Pine	53	Moderate	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree has natural trunk lean orientated southwards ≈40% LCR; ≈ 22 meters tall Sited in shallow ground conditions and high water table Tree too large to safely preserve considering dense 	Remove

Tree #	Species	DBH ¹ (cm)	Condition ²	Crown spread radius (m)	Observations / Comments	Proposed Tree Preservation Recommendation
247	Pine	≈25	Poor – moderate		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> development and raising site grades Located at edge of dedication area Not suitable candidate for preservation Tree has bow sweep root crown with large exposed roots on ground surface Shallow ground conditions and high water table Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
248	Birch	33	Poor	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three trees growing in a row along property line fence; crowns merge together 	Remove
249	Birch.	34				
250	Birch	28			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dead branches in crown; tree have phototropic leans over property line fence and tree branch debris falls in neighbouring yard Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
276	Spruce	53	Good	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree located at 7240 Bridge Street 75% LCR, ≈ 13 meters tall 	Preserve
7054	Oak	45	Moderate	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree in good health condition, moderate structural condition; not a good specimen quality tree; ≈ 12 meters tall Tree growing in water receiving area; shallow soil and high water table ground conditions Tree growing in open ground conditions Tree located near property line and buildable building envelop Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
7055 A	Cedar hedgerow	28	Moderate	3 - 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hedgerow consists of two distinct hedgerow plantings along south property line of 7160 Bridge Street Cedar hedge A: Lead tree in hedgerow next to roadway is 28 cm Ø; all other trees are smaller Ø Trees clearly sited on proposed development side 	Preserve

Tree #	Species	DBH ¹ (cm)	Condition ²	Crown spread radius (m)	Observations / Comments	Proposed Tree Preservation Recommendation
7056	8 trees in Hemlock hedge	≤ 30	Moderate	4	<p>of the property line as indicated by survey corner pin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees planted on 2' foot centres; crowns fully merge; ≈ 7 meters tall; trees pruned (topped) in past to reduce height; trees have multiple leader branches Outside crowns may be pruned to marginally reduce crown spread size 8 trees growing in a hedgerow; crowns merge; trees relatively young and in good health condition; ≈ 10 meters tall Drainage manhole next to lead tree in ROW Tree grows into allowable building envelope; trees will grow much larger and conflict with building in future; poor candidates for preservation 	Remove
7057	Hemlock	45	Good	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% LCR; crown merges with Spruce tree # 276 Tree growing in allowable building envelope area; cannot develop building lot without significant conflicts 	Remove
7058	Cherry	21 + 18(.6) = 40	Poor	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree has codominant trunks attached at 1 meter above base; tree crown merged with neighbouring off-site hedge Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
7059	3 spruce trees	40	Good	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 trees growing together along property line; 1.5 meter stall Trees in good health and structural condition; provides good screenage to neighbouring property 	Preserve
		28				Preserve
		55				Preserve
7060	6 Conifer Conifer	48	Good	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Six conifer trees (Western red cedar + Spruce) in a 	Preserve
		43				Preserve

Tree #	Species	DBH ¹ (cm)	Condition ²	Crown spread radius (m)	Observations / Comments	Proposed Tree Preservation Recommendation
	Conifer	45			hedgerow	Preserve
	Conifer	27			• 100% LCR on south side of crowns	Preserve
	Conifer	37			• Trees located in proposed amenity area	Preserve
	Conifer	20				Preserve
7061	Birch	≈ 30	Poor – moderate	5	• Seven Birch growing together in a hedgerow	Remove
	Birch	≈ 30			• Few trees have clump root crowns (multiple trunks)	Remove
	Birch	≈ 30			• Few trees exhibit crown die-back	Remove
	Birch	≈ 30			• Trees poor candidates for preservation	Remove
	Birch	≈ 30				Remove
	Birch	≈ 30				Remove
7062	Chestnut	28	Moderate	3	• Unique small specimen type trees ~ 5 meters tall	
					• Requires minor pruning	
7063	Birch	31	Poor	4	• Tree exhibits crown die-back	Remove
					• Poor candidate for preservation	
7064	Hazel nut	24+8+8=32	Moderate	5	• Old shrubs with multiple stems	Remove
					• Poor candidate for preservation	
7065	Hazel nut	24+8+8=32	Moderate	5	• Old shrubs with multiple stems	Remove
					• Poor candidate for preservation	
7066	Malus sp.	36	Poor	6	• Tree in poor health	Remove
					• Tree growing in a well	
					• Poor candidate for preservation	
7067	Purple leaf plum	64	Poor	6	• Tree size measured 50 cm above base	Remove
					• Very old tree in poor health and structural condition	
					• Poor candidate for preservation	
7068	Pear	22+20(.6)+15 (.6)=41	Poor	4	• Old tree growing below existing grade in a well	Remove
					• Tree in poor health	

Tree #	Species	DBH ¹ (cm)	Condition ²	Crown spread radius (m)	Observations / Comments	Proposed Tree Preservation Recommendation
7069	Pear	25	Moderate	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor candidate for preservation Relatively small stand alone tree in the middle of proposed development Grade elevation of trees is significantly lower than existing sidewalk grade elevation Tree located in proposed interior roadway 	Remove
7070	Plum	26	Moderate	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree size measured 70 cm above base Tree not a quality specimen tree Grade elevation of trees is significantly lower than existing sidewalk grade elevation; shallow ground high water table conditions Not a good candidate for preservation Tree located in proposed interior roadway 	Remove
7071	Sweetgum	25	Moderate – good	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relatively small landscape tree standing alone in the middle of the proposed development Good candidate for preservation; too big to be effectively transplanted with tree spade 	Preserve
7072	24 Hemlock 1 Pine	≤ 30	Poor	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hedgerow of trees planted ≤ 1 meter apart; most trees topped in distant past at ≈ 3 meters above base; crowns merge Poor candidates for preservation 	Remove
7073	Cherry	28	Poor	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree size measured 70 cm above base Old, relatively stand alone tree in the middle of proposed development Grade elevation of trees is significantly lower than sidewalk grade elevation; shallow ground high water table conditions Poor candidate for preservation 	Remove
7074	Cherry	≈ 40	Poor	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Old, relatively stand alone tree in the middle of proposed development 	Remove



City of Richmond

Rezoning Considerations

Development Applications Division
6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Address: 7120, 7140, 7160, 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240, 7260 Bridge Street and 7211, 7231, 7271 No. 4 Road

File No.: RZ 12-605038

Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9107, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. Final Adoption of OCP Amendment Bylaw 9106.
2. Road dedication for the following:
 - a) East-west connector road: approximately 1,764.8 m², including dedication of between 16.95 and 20 m for this road.
 - b) Lechow Street: approximately 1,928 m², including dedication of 10.65 m along the east property line of the townhouse site; dedication of 12 m through the site; and dedication of 7.5 m along the east property line at the south of the site.
 - c) Sills Avenue: approximately 829.6 m², including dedication of 10.m.

***NOTE:** all final dedications and ultimate dimensions are to be confirmed through a functional design to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation and the Director of Engineering.
3. Payment of \$80,000 towards future road works on LeChow Street (between east-west connector road and Sills Avenue).
4. Payment of \$89,000 towards future construction of north half of Shields Avenue. Final value of the cash-in-lieu payment is subject to minor adjustments based on a functional design approved by the Director of Transportation and the Director of Engineering.
5. Discharge of Legal Agreement No. BB0681427 from the Title of 7160 Bridge Street.
6. Consolidation of all the east-most lots and the rear 64 m of the lots fronting Bridge Street into two development parcels (which will require the demolition of the existing dwellings).
7. Consolidation of the lots fronting Bridge Street into one development parcel. Any future subdivision must be consistent with the "Single Detached (ZS14) – South McLennan (City Centre)" zone, with a maximum of seven (7) single family lots. Submission of DCC's (City & GVS&DD), School site acquisition charges, and Utility charges etc. Will be required as part of this subdivision application.
8. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on Title of all lots.
9. Registration of a legal agreement on Title of the townhouse site to ensure that the on-site indoor amenity space is heated and cooled through a geothermal system.
10. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$0.77 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$83,780) to the City's Public Art fund, if provision of public art on the site is not possible. .
11. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$2.00 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$217,610) for the townhouse portion of the site and contribute \$1.00 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$21,362) for the single family portion of the site to the City's affordable housing fund. The total affordable housing contribution for the project will be \$238,972.
12. Installation of protective tree fencing around the nine (9) trees to be retained adjacent to the proposed outdoor amenity space.
13. Payment of \$75,500 cash-in-lieu of on-site tree replacement.
14. The submission and processing of a Development Permit* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.

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

- a) Enter into a Servicing Agreement* for the design and construction of works on the Bridge Street, No.4 Road frontage, Sills Avenue frontage, and LeChow Street. Any items under the Servicing Agreement (SA) which may be eligible for DCC credits will be determined through the SA review and approval process. Should a subdivision of the single family lots fronting onto Bridge Street be submitted prior to a building permit for the townhouse site, a separate Servicing Agreement (SA) application will be required for servicing of those lots and the works required on Bridge Street. Works include, but may not be limited to:

Storm:

The developer is responsible for the following frontage works:

- a) Bridge St. - Upgrade existing storm sewer from existing manhole STMH5174 (south property line of 7280 Bridge St.) to existing manhole STMH113666 (Sills Ave) with a length of approximately 174 m to a min. 600 mm.
- b) "East-West Connector" - Construct a min. 600 mm storm sewer from LeChow St. to No. 4 Rd. and connect to new system on LeChow St. and existing system on No. 4 Rd.
- c) LeChow St. - Construct a min. 600 mm storm sewer from Sills Ave. to Shields Ave. and connect to existing system on Sills Ave. at existing manhole STMH 113669 & Shields Ave. with a manhole and new system on "East-West Connector" with a manhole. Approximately 15 m of existing 300 mm storm sewer from existing manhole STMH 113669 to existing manhole STMH 113671 is to be removed.

Note: the pipe size may be reduced along LeChow St. between "East-West Connector" and Shields Ave. to due to design parameters and site constraints; to be determined during the review of the Servicing Agreement design.

Sanitary:

- a) The developer is responsible for constructing sanitary sewers as required to service the development site within the dedicated roads (Sills Ave., LeChow St. and "East-West Connector") and connect to the existing sanitary sewer system. Sizing is to be based on the greater of a) 200 mm and b) OCP size, as per City requirements. Calculations for sizing the proposed sanitary sewers are to be included in the Servicing Agreement design.
- b) The east half of the development site (i.e. east of LeChow St.) is to connect to the sanitary sewer along the No. 4 Rd. frontage.
- c) Existing 3.0 m wide R.O.W along No. 4 Rd. frontage to be discharged and replaced with a 5.0 m wide R.O.W along the entire No. 4 Rd. frontage.

Water:

- a) Using the OCP Model, there is 577 L/s available at 20 psi residual on No. 4 Rd. and 294 L/s available at 20 psi residual on Bridge St. Based on your proposed rezoning, your site requires a minimum fire flow of 220 L/s.
- b) The developer is responsible for constructing a "looped" water system consisting of 200 mm diameter watermains within the dedicated roads (Sills Ave., LeChow St. and "East-West Connector") and connection to the existing watermains on No. 4 Rd., Bridge St. and Shields Ave. will be required.
- c) Once you have confirmed your building design at the Building Permit stage, you must submit fire flow calculations signed and sealed by a professional engineer based on the Fire Underwriter Survey to confirm that there is adequate available flow.

Additional Engineering Requirements:

- a) 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.
- b) The developer is responsible for the under-grounding of the existing private utility pole line and/or the installation of pre-ducting for private utilities, subject to concurrence from the Private Utility Companies. Thru the Servicing Agreement and detail design, Private Utility Companies may require additional space for their infrastructure

(kiosks, vista, transformers, LPTs, PMTs); this may include rights-of-ways on the development site to minimize impact on public space.

- c) Given the soil conditions in the area, the following is required:
 - i) Geotechnical assessment for all Servicing Agreement works.
 - ii) A minimum 2 year maintenance period for Servicing Agreement.
- d) Proposed City infrastructure (road, curb & gutter, boulevard, sidewalk, street lighting and utilities) to be located within road dedications.
- e) Street lighting is required for all interim and permanent road and sidewalk works, the extent of which is to be assessed by the developer's consultants during the service agreement process.
- f) The configuration for the "Ultimate" layout of LeChow St., "East-West Connector" and Shields Ave. to be shown on the key plan of the Servicing Agreement drawings.
- g) The developer is required to provide cash in lieu for the removal of the "Interim" works and construction of the "Ultimate" works along the development site frontage of LeChow St. and "East-West Connector".
- h) The developer is required to design and construct works within the existing LeChow St. road dedication, just north of Shields Ave.

Note: Alterations maybe required to existing curb & gutter on Shields Ave.

Transportation Requirements:

Enter into a Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of the following frontage improvements:

- a) New Traffic Signal at No. 4 Rd. and New E-W Collector Rd: Upgrade the intersection of No. 4 Rd. and the new collector road (min.11.2 m pavement width) with traffic signals to include but not limited to the following:
 - i) Signal pole, controller, base and hardware
 - ii) Pole base (City Centre decorative pole & street light fixture)
 - iii) Video Detection, conduits (Electrical & Communications) and signal indications, and communications cable, electrical wiring and service conductors
 - iv) APS (Accessible Pedestrian Signals)
- b) Sills Av.: Roadworks include, but not limited to the design and construction of the following:
 - i) Curb extension at the intersection with Bridge St. on the north side of Sills Ave.
 - ii) Removal of the existing north curb and gutter with possible sidewalk alteration
 - iii) Dedicate 10m along the entire north edge of 7120 Bridge Street to complete Sills Avenue with 4m x 4m corner cuts at Bridge St. and Lechow St. Also a proper corner radius curve (approx. 14m to be confirmed by Servicing Agreement design connecting Sills Ave. to Lechow St.)
 - iv) 1.5m wide grass and tree boulevard (north side)
 - v) 11.2 m pavement width
 - vi) Concrete curb and gutter (south side)
 - vii) 1.5 m wide grass and treed boulevard (south side)
 - viii) 1.8 m concrete sidewalk (south side)

NOTE: Works may also include upgrade of street lighting to Sills Avenue frontage

- c) Bridge St.: Along the entire site frontage from Sills Ave. to Shields Ave., widen Bridge St. pavement to 8.5 m, construct new curb and gutter with 1.75 m concrete sidewalk at property line and remaining to new curb to be grass and treed boulevard. Frontage works to extend past site to south property line of 7300 Bridge St.
- d) No. 4 Rd.: Restore No. 4 Rd. frontage to standard 1.5 m concrete sidewalk at property line with min. 1.5 m grass and treed boulevard, where existing driveways are to be closed and/or substandard cross section exists. Upgrade street lighting as part of signal work and may also be required as part of frontage works along No. 4 Road.
- e) Lechow St. (north): based on the functional plan, dedicate 10.65m (to be confirmed at SA stage) across the entire east edge of the development sites abutting LeChow Street from Sills Ave. to the new E-W Collector road on the north end and at the south from Shields Ave. along the east property lines of 7260/7300 Bridge St.

PLN - 115

Initial: _____

Roadworks include but not limited to the following, for the ultimate cross section (from Sills Ave. to north property line of 7191 No. 4 Rd:

From East property line:

- i) 1.75 m concrete sidewalk
- ii) 1.5 m wide grass and treed boulevard
- iii) Concrete curb and gutter
- iv) Minimum 11.2 m wide pavement
- v) Concrete curb and gutter
- vi) 1.5 m wide grass and treed boulevard
- vii) 1.75 m concrete sidewalk

From this point South, Interim Lechow St. works to include:

From west property lines of 7191 and 7195 No. 4 Rd:

- i) 1 m gravel shoulder
- ii) minimum 6 m asphalt pavement
- iii) Temporary curb and gutter
- iv) 1.5 m clear and unobstructed temporary asphalt walkway.

7180/7200 Bridge St.: Additional road dedication will be required along the east property lines for the proper curve radius required to connect Lechow St. to the future E-W collector road. See 'bulge' area on functional plan. The additional dedication is required to make the road functional for two-way vehicular traffic turning movements.

- f) Lechow St. (south): Dedicate 7.5 m along the entire east property line of the development properties fronting Lechow St. (southern end connecting to Shields Ave.)

To accommodate vehicular and pedestrian connectivity, the interim design for the south end of Lechow St. will be constructed as a pedestrian facility and once 7300 redevelops, the ultimate design will allow for vehicles. The interim works from Shields Ave. to the site entry include:

From the west property line of 7331 No. 4 Rd:

- i) 1.5 m concrete sidewalk at PL, not in ROW
- ii) 1.5 m grass and treed blvd.
- iii) curb and gutter
- iv) 8.5 m pavement width or interim pavement width south of 7300 Bridge St.
- v) new curb and gutter
- vi) 1.5 m grass and treed blvd.
- vii) 1.5 m concrete sidewalk

As much as possible of the above works are required to be constructed from Shields Ave. to the site entry, to facilitate pedestrian access.

- g) E-W Collector Rd.: Road dedication varies from 16.95 m to 20 m based on functional plan, along north edge of development sites fronting the new E-W Collector Rd.

4 m x 4 m corner cut at the intersection of No. 4 Rd.

Roadworks include, but not limited to the following:

From the north PL:

- i) minimum 1 m gravel shoulder
- ii) 11.2 m pavement width
- iii) curb and gutter (south side)

- iv) 1.5 m grass and treed boulevard
- iv) 1.75 m concrete sidewalk

h) Lechow St. (within site): Dedicate 12m of road between the proposed E-W Collector Road and the proposed development's south property line.

Roadworks include, but not limited to the following:

Install street name signs at the corner of Lechow Street and the E-W Connector Rd.

From the East PL of the road:

- i) 1.5 m concrete sidewalk
- ii) 1.5 m grassed and treed boulevard
- iii) 0.15 m curb and gutter
- iv) 7.7 m pavement width
- v) 0.15 m curb and gutter
- vi) 1 m grassed buffer

- b) Submission of a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to the Transportation Division. 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.
- c) Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
- d) Submission of DCC's (City & GVS&DD), School site acquisition charges, and Utility charges etc.
- e) 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 Division 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

Date



Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw OCP Bylaw 7100
Amendment Bylaw 9106 (RZ 12-605038)
7120, 7140, 7160, 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240, and 7260 Bridge Street and
7211, 7231, and 7271 No. 4 Road

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

- 1. Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw OCP Bylaw 7100 is amended by repealing the existing Character Area Map on page 41 of Schedule 2.10D thereof of the following area and replacing it with "Schedule A attached to and forming part of Bylaw 9106".
2. Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw OCP Bylaw 7100 is amended by repealing the Land Use Map on page 42 of Schedule 2.10D thereof and replacing it with "Schedule B attached to and forming part of Bylaw 9106"
3. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw OCP Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 9106".

FIRST READING

PUBLIC HEARING

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

ADOPTED


Horizontal lines for recording dates and actions for each reading stage.

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED by BIC
APPROVED by Manager or Solicitor

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER


Land Use Map



<p>Residential Townhouse up to 3 storeys over 1 parking level, Triplex, Duplex, Single-Family 0.75 base F.A.R.</p>	<p>Residential, Historic Single-Family, 2 ½ storeys maximum 0.55 base F.A.R., Lot size along Bridge and Ash Streets: • Large-sized lots (e.g. 18 m/59 ft. min. frontage and 550 m²/5,920 ft² min. area). Elsewhere: • Medium-sized lots (e.g. 11.3 m/37 ft. min. frontage and 320 m²/3,444 ft² min. area), with access from new roads and General Currie Road; Provided that the corner lot shall be considered to front the shorter of its two boundaries regardless of the orientation of the dwelling.</p>	<p>■ ■ ■ ■ Trail/Walkway</p> <p>C Church</p> <p>P Neighbourhood Pub</p>
<p>Residential, 2 ½ storeys typical (3 storeys maximum) Townhouse, Triplex, Duplex, Single-Family 0.60 base F.A.R.</p>		
<p>Residential, 2 ½ storeys typical (3 storeys maximum), predominantly Triplex, Duplex, Single-Family 0.55 base F.A.R.</p>		

Note: Stills Avenue, Le Chow Street Keefer Avenue, and Turnill Street are commonly referred to as “ring road”

Character Area Key Map



	Area A 3 storey Townhouse over parking		Areas C1, C2 Clusters of Predominantly Single-Family, Duplex, Triplex Units	C	Church
	Areas B1, B2 Townhouse - 2 ½ storeys typical (3 storeys maximum)		Areas D1, D2, D3 Single-Family	P	Neighbourhood Pub

Note: Sills Avenue, Le Chow Street, Keefe Avenue, and Turnill Street are commonly referred to as the "ring road".



**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500,
Amendment Bylaw 9107 (RZ 12-605038)
7120, 7140, 7160, 7180, 7200, 7220, 7240 and 7260 Bridge Street; and
7211, 7231 and 7271 No. 4 Road**

The Council of the City of Richmond enacts as follows:

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by:

a. Inserting the following at the end of the table contained in Section 5.15.1:

Zone	Sum Per Buildable Square Foot of Permitted Principal Building
"ZT70	\$2.00"

2. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by inserting as Section 17.70 thereof the following:

"17.70 Town Housing (ZT70) – South McLennan

17.70.1 PURPOSE

The **zone** provides for **town housing** and other compatible uses.

17.70.2 PERMITTED USES

- **child care**
- **housing, town**

17.70.3 SECONDARY USES

- **boarding and lodging**
- **community care facility, minor**
- **home business**

17.70.4 PERMITTED DENSITY

1. The maximum **floor area ratio** is 0.40, together with an additional 0.1 **floor area ratio** provided that it is entirely used to accommodate **amenity space**.
2. Notwithstanding Section 17.70.4.1, the reference to "0.40" shall be increased to 0.72 if the **owner**, at the time **Council** adopts a zoning amendment bylaw to

include the **owner's lot** in the ZT70 **zone**, pays into the **affordable housing reserve** the sum specified in Section 5.15 of this bylaw.

17.70.5 MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE

1. Maximum **Lot Coverage**: 40% for all **buildings**.

17.70.6 MINIMUM SETBACKS FROM PROPERTY LINES

1. **Public Road Setback**:
 - a) 6.0 m from No. 4 Road.
 - b) The minimum setback to any other **road** is 4.5 m, which can be reduced to 3.0 m, as specified by a Development Permit approved by the **City**.
2. The minimum **rear yard** is 3.0 m.
3. The minimum **interior side yard** is 3.0 m.

17.70.7 MAXIMUM HEIGHTS

1. The maximum **height** for **buildings** is 12.0 m, but not exceeding 3 **storeys**.
2. The maximum **height** for **accessory buildings** is 6.0 m.
3. The maximum **height** for **accessory structures** is 9.0 m.

17.70.8 SUBDIVISION PROVISIONS/MINIMUM LOT SIZE

1. There are no minimum **lot width**, **lot depth** or **lot area** requirements.

17.70.9 LANDSCAPING AND SCREENING

1. **Landscaping** and **screening** shall be provided according to the provisions of Section 6.0.

17.70.10 OTHER REGULATIONS

1. In addition to the regulations listed above, the General Development Regulations in Section 4.0 and the Specific Use Regulations in Section 5.0 apply.”

- 3. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the area shown as Area "A" on "Schedule A attached to and forming part of Bylaw 9107" and by designating that portion shown as Area "A" on "Schedule A attached to and forming part of Bylaw 9107" as "**Single Detached (ZS14) – South McLennan (City Centre)**"
- 4. 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 that portion shown as Area "B" on "Schedule A attached to and forming part of Bylaw 9107" and by designating that portion shown as Area "B" on "Schedule A attached to and forming part of Bylaw 9107" as "**Town Housing (ZT70) – South McLennan**".
- 5. This Bylaw is cited as "**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9017**".

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED

ADOPTED


CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED by <i>AK</i>
APPROVED by Director or Solicitor <i>AK</i>

MAYOR


CORPORATE OFFICE



City of
Richmond



LEGEND	
Area A	to be rezoned to ZS14
Area B	to be rezoned to ZT70



RZ 12-605038

Original Date: 02/07/14
 Revision Date: 02/19/14
 Note: Dimensions are in METRES