## Report to Committee

To: Planning Committee<br>Date: July 11, 2018<br>From: Wayne Craig<br>File: RZ 16-754046 Director, Development<br>Re: Application by'Bismark Consulting Ltd. for Rezoning at 9091 \& 9111 No. 2 Road from Single Detached (RS1/E) to Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)

## Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9880, for the rezoning of 9091 and 9111 No. 2 Road from "Single Detached (R S1/E)" to "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)", be introduced and given first reading.


Wayne Craig
Director, Development
WC: jr


Att. 5

| REPORT CONCURRENCE |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Routed To: | CONCURRENCE | Concurrence of GENERAL MANAGER |
| Affordable Housing | $\boxed{y y y}$ |  |

## Staff Report

## Origin

Bismark Consulting Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 9091 and 9111 No. 2 Road from the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" zone to the "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone, to permit the development of 8 townhouse units with vehicle access from No. 2 Road (Attachment 1).

## Project Description

The subject properties have a total combined frontage of 40.2 m ( 131 ft. ) and are proposed to be consolidated into one development parcel. The proposal includes eight three-storey townhouse units, in four duplex buildings. The proposed floor area ratio (FAR) is 0.6 . The preliminary site plan, building elevations, and landscape plan are provided in Attachment 2.

## Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details about the development proposal is provided in Attachment 3.

## Existing Housing Profile

There are two existing single family dwellings on the subject site, which will be demolished. One dwelling is currently tenanted, and the other is vacant due to the poor condition of the building. The applicant has confirmed that there are no existing secondary suites in either dwelling.

## Surrounding Development

Development surrounding the subject site is as follows:
To the North and West: Two-storey townhouses on a lot zoned "Low Density Townhouses (RTL1)," with access from Lackner Crescent.

To the South: Three single family dwellings on lots zoned "Single Detached (RS2/B)," with access from Maple Road. The existing single family dwellings are not likely to redevelop in the near future given their development history. These three properties are the result of a rezoning application, which was given final adoption by Council on October 12, 2010 (RZ 09-497038).

To the East: A single family dwelling and a duplex dwelling on lots zoned "Single Detached (RS1/E)," with access from No. 2 Road.

## Related Policies \& Studies

## Official Community Plan

The subject site is located in the Blundell planning area, and has an Official Community Plan (OCP) designation of "Neighbourhood Residential." The proposed rezoning is consistent with this designation.

## Arterial Road Policy

The subject site is designated for "Arterial Road Townhouses" in the Arterial Road Housing Development Map. The proposed rezoning is consistent with this designation.

## Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

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

## Public Consultation

A rezoning sign has been installed on the subject property. Staff have not received any comments from the public about the rezoning application in response to the placement of the rezoning sign on the property.

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant $1^{\text {st }}$ reading to the rezoning bylaw, the bylaw will be forwarded to a Public Hearing, where any area resident or interested party will have an opportunity to comment. Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the Local Government Act.

## Analysis

## Built Form and Architectural Character

The applicant proposes eight townhouse units arranged in four duplexes on a T-shaped drive aisle. The west coast modern architectural style informs the choice of architectural details and cladding materials.

Building massing is generally consistent with the intent of the Development Permit guidelines, with site planning and design that responds to the unique site context. Arterial Road Townhouse developments typically have a rear yard interface with single family dwellings, and a side yard interface with either single family dwellings or other townhouses. This site interfaces with the rear yard of single family dwellings to the south, with the side yard of existing townhouses to the west, and with the internal drive aisle of townhouses to the north.

The rear yards of the two southern duplexes abut the rear yards of the neighbouring single family dwellings to the south. The applicant has addressed staff concerns with overlook and shadowing by stepping back the building massing at each storey, from 4.5 m on the ground floor, 6.2 m on the second storey, and 9.2 m on the third storey. No south-facing outdoor space or windows are
proposed on the third storey, which eliminates potential overlook into the rear yards of the adjacent single family dwellings. The third storey is set back significantly and is located partially under the eaves of the roof, giving each duplex the appearance of a two-storey dwelling. This massing is consistent with the guidelines for Arterial Road Townhouses contained in the OCP, which suggest that the building height be no more than two storeys within 7.5 m of a lot line shared with a property that contains a single family dwelling.

The two northern duplexes are oriented with units fronting No. 2 Road and the internal drive aisle. The side yards of the units interface with the drive aisle of the two-storey townhouse units to the north. The rear yard of the units on the northwest of the site interface with the side yard of the adjacent townhouse units. The building is stepped back on the third storey to provide articulation and a less imposing vertical mass, and no west-facing balconies are proposed. Bumped out architectural features on the second storey of each duplex cluster provide building articulation and break up the vertical mass.

Further refinement of the site plan and architectural character of the proposed development will occur through the Development Permit process.

## Existing Legal Encumbrances

There is an existing 3.0 m wide Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) for municipal utilities across the entire rear (east) property line, which will be unaffected by the proposed rezoning and ensuing development of the site. The applicant is aware that encroachment into the SRW is not permitted.

## Transportation and Site Access

Vehicle access is proposed from a driveway located in the middle of the property frontage. The proposed driveway location is approximately 100 m from the intersection of No. 2 Road and Francis Road, and approximately 48 m from the intersection of No. 2 Road and Maple Road. These distances are consistent with the Arterial Road Townhouse Development Requirements.

Parking is provided on site for the eight townhouse units, one secondary suite, and visitors, at rates consistent with Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 . Seven of the eight townhouse units have side by side garages for two vehicles and Class 1 bicycle parking. The eighth townhouse unit has two vehicle parking spaces in a tandem arrangement and Class 1 bicycle parking located in the garage. Two visitor parking stalls and one stall for exclusive use of the secondary suite are located outside. $100 \%$ of the vehicle parking spaces for residents are to feature an energized outlet capable of providing Level 2 charging or higher.

Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant must register a statutory right of way (SRW) across the drive aisle and driveway access to No. 2 Road, to provide alternative vehicle access for future redevelopment to the north.

Staff have identified No. 2 Road for future road widening to accommodate dedicated left turn lanes. Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant is required to dedicate 2.0 m of the entire No. 2 Road frontage for future road widening. Road widening will not be completed through this application, and the dedicated area is to remain as part of the landscaped boulevard until road widening occurs.

## Tree Retention and Replacement

The applicant has submitted a Certified Arborist's Report; which identifies on-site tree species, assesses tree structure and condition, and provides recommendations on tree retention and removal relative to the proposed development. The Report assesses 29 bylaw-sized trees on the subject property.

The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has reviewed the Arborist's Report and Tree Management Plan (Attachment 4), conducted on-site visual assessment, and supports the Arborist's recommendations, with the following comments:

- One tree located in the southeast corner of the site (Tree \#1) is in good condition and is proposed to be retained and protected. It will be located in the proposed front yard. Provide tree protection as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03
- Six trees located in the southwest corner of the site (Trees \# 10-15) are in good condition and proposed to be retained and protected. They will be located in the proposed shared outdoor amenity area. Provide tree protection as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.
- 4 trees located on site (Tree \# 16-19) are in good condition, but will be negatively impacted by the proposed grade changes to outdoor amenity area. Remove and replace.
- 18 trees located on site (Tree \# 2-9, 20-29) are either dead, dying (sparse canopy foliage), infected with fungal blight, or exhibit structural defects such as cavities at the main branch union and co-dominant stems with inclusions. As a result, these trees are not good candidates for retention and should be removed and replaced.
- Replacement trees should be specified at $2: 1$ ratio as per the OCP.


## Tree Protection

Seven trees located on site (Tag \# 1, 10-15) are to be retained and protected. The applicant has submitted a tree protection plan showing the trees to be retained and the measures taken to protect them during development stage (Attachment 4). To ensure that the trees identified for retention are protected at development stage, the applicant is required to complete the following items:

- Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, submission to the City of a contract with a Certified Arborist for the supervision of all works conducted within or in close proximity to tree protection zones. The contract must include the scope of work required, the number of proposed monitoring inspections at specified stages of construction, any special measures required to ensure tree protection, and a provision for the arborist to submit a postconstruction impact assessment to the City for review.
- Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, submission of a $\$ 40,000$ Tree Survival Security.
- Prior to demolition of the existing dwelling on the subject site, installation of tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained. Tree protection fencing must be installed to City standard in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03 prior to
any works being conducted on-site, and remain in place until construction and landscaping on-site is completed.


## Tree Replacement

The applicant wishes to remove 22 on-site trees (Tag \# 2-9, 16-29). The 2:1 replacement ratio would require a total of 44 replacement trees. The applicant has agreed to plant 19 trees in the proposed development. The required replacement trees are to be of the following minimum sizes, based on the size of the trees being removed as per Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057.

| No. of Replacement Trees | Minimum Caliper of Deciduous <br> Replacement Tree | Minimum Height of Coniferous <br> Replacement Tree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 11 cm | 6 m |
| 6 | 10 cm | 5.5 m |
| 7 | 9 cm | 5 m |

To satisfy the $2: 1$ replacement ratio established in the OCP, the applicant will contribute $\$ 12,500$ to the City's Tree Compensation Fund in lieu of the remaining 25 trees that cannot be accommodated on the subject property after redevelopment.

## Variance Requested

The applicant requests to vary the provision of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:

- Reduce the minimum lot width on a major arterial road from 50.0 m to 40.1 m .

The subject site is composed of two lots resulting from the recent redevelopment of the property at the corner of No. 2 Road and Maple Road. There is no possibility of lot consolidation with additional properties to the north or south at this time.

- Reduce the front yard setback from 6.0 m to 4.5 m .

The Arterial Road Guidelines for Townhouses in the OCP support a reduced front yard setback where a larger rear yard interface is deemed necessary, provided that there is an appropriate interface with neighbouring properties. As the rear yard of the subject site abuts the side yard of the neighbouring townhouses, the applicant has provided a deeper side yard setback between the proposed townhouses and the existing single family dwellings to the south. Additionally, until No. 2 Road is widened the proposed townhouses will be set back 9.2 m from the back of the existing curb due to the required road dedication.

- Allow one small car parking stall in each of the side-by-side garages in seven of the units, and one small car parking space for the proposed secondary suite ( 8 small car stalls total).

Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 permits small car parking spaces only when more than 31 parking spaces are proposed on site. The proposed 8-unit townhouse project will provide 17 residential and two visitor parking spaces on site. Transportation staff

# support the proposed variances to allow one small car parking space in each of the seven side-by-side double car garages, and one small parking space for the proposed secondary suite. The eighth unit will have two regular car parking spaces in a tandem arrangement. 

## Affordable Housing Strategy

As per the City's Affordable Housing Strategy, townhouse rezoning applications received prior to July 24,2017 are required to provide a cash-in-lieu contribution of $\$ 4.00$ per buildable square foot towards the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund. The applicant proposes to make a cash-in-lieu contribution of $\$ 40,480$.

In addition to the cash-in-lieu contribution, the applicant proposes to construct a secondary suite in one of the townhouse units. Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant must register three legal covenants ensuring that:

- No final Building Permit inspection will be granted until a secondary suite is constructed to the satisfaction of the City, in accordance with the BC Building Code and the City's Zoning Bylaw;
- A surface parking stall is assigned to the secondary suite, and that the parking stall will be for the sole use of the secondary suite; and
- That the secondary suite cannot be stratified or otherwise held under separate title.


## Townhouse Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy/BC Energy Step Code

Council is currently considering Bylaws to implement BC Energy Step Code requirements for all new construction in Richmond. Should the Bylaws be adopted by Council, all Development Permit (DP) applications received after the date of bylaw adoption will be subject to the BC Energy Step Code requirements. Where a DP application is received before the adoption, the developer may apply for a Building Permit (BP) in compliance with the energy efficiency requirements in force at the time of the application, provided that the BP application is received prior to December 31, 2019.

The applicant has committed to achieving an EnerGuide Rating System (ERS) score of 82 and to provide pre-ducting for solar hot water heating for the proposed development. As part of the Development Permit application review process, the applicant is required to submit an evaluation report by a Certified Energy Advisor (CEA) providing details about the specific construction requirements that are needed to achieve this rating.

Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant is required to register a restrictive covenant on Title, specifying that all units are to be built and maintained to ERS 82 or higher, as detailed in the CEA's evaluation report, and that all units are to be solar hot water-ready. The covenant is not required should the application not meet the grandfathering provisions described above, as the development will need to comply with the BC Energy Step Code requirements in place at the time of the BP application.

## Amenity Space

The applicant is proposing a cash contribution in-lieu of providing the required indoor amenity space on-site. Council Policy 5041 allows applicants for rezoning applications received prior to February 28,2018 to choose to provide a cash contribution of $\$ 1,000$ per unit for developments up to 19 units. The applicant has agreed to provide an $\$ 8,000$ cash contribution.

Shared outdoor amenity space will be provided on-site. Based on the preliminary design, the size of the proposed outdoor amenity space complies with the Official Community Plan (OCP) requirements of $6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ per unit. The proposed amenity space is located in the rear yard at the end of the drive aisle. The play and gathering areas are grade separated from the driving surface, with landscaping providing additional separation and screening. The play area features natural materials, including logs and boulders. A ramp is proposed to ensure that the shared outdoor amenity space is accessible. Staff will work with the applicant at the Development Permit stage to ensure the configuration and design of the outdoor amenity space meet the Development Permit Guidelines contained in the OCP.

## Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant is required to enter into a Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of the required site servicing and frontage improvements, as described in Attachment 5. Frontage improvements include, but may not be limited to, the following:

- 2.0 m wide road dedication across the entire No. 2 Road frontage for future road widening.
- Removal of the existing sidewalk next to the curb along No. 2 Road and replacement with a new 1.5 m wide landscaped boulevard and 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk along the property line, with connections to the existing sidewalk north and south of the subject site. The area between the boulevard and existing curb is to be planted with grass only. A 0.3 m wide SRW for public rights-of-passage is required in order to achieve the full sidewalk and boulevard widths.
- Removal of the two existing driveways, removal and replacement of concrete curb and gutter as required, and installation of a new driveway for the proposed townhouse development.

The applicant is also required to pay DCC's (City \& Metro Vancouver), School Site Acquisition Charge, Address Assignment fees, and the costs associated with the completion of the required site servicing works as described in Attachment 5.

## Development Permit Application

A Development Permit application is required to be processed to a satisfactory level prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. Further refinements to architectural, landscape, and urban design will be completed as part of the Development Permit application review process, including, but not limited to the following:

- Compliance with the Development Permit Guidelines for multi-family developments and arterial road townhouses in the OCP;
- Refinement of the proposed building form and architectural features to achieve sufficient variety in design and create an interesting streetscape along No. 2 Road;
- Review of the size and species of on-site replacement trees to ensure bylaw compliance and to achieve an acceptable mix of coniferous and deciduous trees on site;
- Refinement of the shared outdoor amenity area design, including the choice of play equipment, to create a safe and vibrant environment for children's play and social interaction;
- Review of relevant accessibility features, including aging-in-place features in all units, and the provision of a convertible unit; and,
- Review of a sustainability strategy for the development proposal, including measures to achieve an EnerGuide Rating Systems (ERS) score of 82 or BC Energy Step Code, as required.

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

## Financial Impact or Economic Impact

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

## Conclusion

The purpose of this application is to rezone 9091 and 9111 No. 2 Road from the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" zone to the "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone, to permit the development of 8 townhouse units with vehicle access from No. 2 Road.

The rezoning application complies with the land use designation and applicable policies contained within the OCP for the subject site. Further review of the project design will be completed as part of the Development Permit application review process.

The list of rezoning considerations is included in Attachment 5, which has been agreed to by the applicant (signed concurrence on file).

It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9880 be introduced and given first reading.


Jordan Rockerbie
Planning Technician
JR:rg
Attachment 1: Location Map and Aerial Photo
Attachment 2: Conceptual Development Plans
Attachment 3: Development Application Data Sheet
Attachment 4: Tree Management Plan
Attachment 5: Rezoning Considerations
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LANDSCAPE
DETAILS

## City of Richmond

Address: 9091 \& 9111 No. 2 Road
Applicant: Bismark Consulting Ltd.
Planning Area(s): Blundell

|  | Existing | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Owner: | 1151418 BC Ltd. | To be determined |
| Site Size $\left(\mathbf{m}^{2}\right):$ | $1,649 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $1,567 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(82 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\right.$ road dedication) |
| Land Uses: | Single-family residential | Multiple-family residential |
| OCP Designation: | Neighbourhood Residential | No Change |
| Zoning: | Single Detached (RS1/E) | Low Density Townhouses (RTL4) |
| Number of Units: | 2 Single-Family Dwellings | 8 Townhouses + 1 Suite |


| On Development Site | Bylaw Requirement | Proposed | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | Max. 0.60 | 0.60 | None permitted |
| Buildable Floor Area: | Max. $940 \mathrm{~m}^{\mathbf{2}}\left(10,120 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)^{*}$ | $940 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(10,120 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)^{*}$ | None permitted |
| Lot Coverage - Building: | Max. 40\% | 36.9\% | None |
| Lot Coverage - Non-porous: | Max. 65\% | 59.7\% | None |
| Lot Coverage - Landscaping: | Min. 25\% | 25.6\% | None |
| Lot Area: | N/A | 1,567 m ${ }^{2}$ | None |
| Lot Width: | 50.0 m | 40.2 m | Variance required |
| Lot Depth: | 35.0 m | 38.5 m | None |
| Setbacks - Front: | 6.0 m | 4.5 m | Variance required |
| Setbacks - Rear: | Min. 3.0 m | 4.5 m | None |
| Setbacks - Side: | Min. 3.0 m | North Side: 3.2 m <br> South Side: 4.5 m | None |
| Height: | 12.0 m (3 storeys) | 10.6 m | None |
| Off-street Parking Spaces Regular (R) / Visitor (V): | $2(\mathrm{R})$ and $0.2(\mathrm{~V})$ per unit, plus $1(\mathrm{R})$ for secondary suite/s | $2(\mathrm{R})$ and $0.25(\mathrm{~V})$ per unit, plus $1(R)$ for secondary suite/s | None |
| Off-street Parking Spaces Total: | 17 (R) and $2(\mathrm{~V})$ | 17 (R) and $2(\mathrm{~V})$ | None |


| On Development Site | Bylaw Requirement | Proposed | Variance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tandem Parking Spaces: | Permitted - Maximum of $50 \%$ <br> of required spaces | 2 (i.e. $12.5 \%$ ) | None |
| Small Car Parking Space | None permitted when fewer <br> than 31 spaces are provided <br> on site | 8 (i.e. $47 \%$ ) | Variance <br> required |
| Bicycle Parking Spaces - <br> Class 1: | 1.25 per dwelling unit | 1.25 per dwelling unit | None |
| Bicycle Parking Spaces - <br> Class 2: | 0.2 per dwelling unit | 0.2 per dwelling unit | None |
| Bicycle Parking Spaces - <br> Total: | 10 (Class 1) and 2 (Class 2) | 10 (Class 1) and 2 (Class 2) | None |
| Amenity Space - Indoor: | Min. | Cash-in-lieu | None |
| Amenity Space - Outdoor: | $6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ per unit (i.e. $48 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ) | $52.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | None |

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

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



## Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9880, the applicant is required to complete the following:

1. 2.0 m road dedication along the entire No. 2 Road frontage.
2. Consolidation of all the lots into one development parcel (which will require the demolition of the existing dwellings).
3. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of $\$ 40,000$ for the 7 on-site trees (Tree \# 1, 10-15) to be retained.
4. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute $\$ 12,500$ to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of replacement trees within the City.
5. Submission of a Contract entered into between the applicant and a Certified Arborist for supervision of any on-site works conducted within the tree protection zone of the trees to be retained. The Contract should include the scope of work to be undertaken, including: the proposed number of site monitoring inspections, and a provision for the Arborist to submit a post-construction assessment report to the City for review.
6. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
7. Contribution of $\$ 1,000$ per dwelling unit (e.g. $\$ 8,000$ ) in-lieu of on-site indoor amenity space.
8. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute $\$ 4.00$ per buildable square foot (i.e. $\$ 40,480$ ) to the City's affordable housing fund.
9. Registration of a legal agreement on Title or other measures, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, to ensure that:
a) No final Building Permit inspection is granted until one secondary suite is constructed on site, to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the BC Building Code and the City's Zoning Bylaw;
b) One surface parking stall is assigned to the unit with a secondary suite, and that the parking stall will be for the sole use of the secondary suite of the unit; and
c) The secondary suite cannot be stratified or otherwise held under separate title.
10. Registration of a legal agreement on title prohibiting the conversion of the tandem parking area into habitable space.
11. Registration of a legal agreement on title identifying that the proposed development must be designed and constructed to meet or exceed EnerGuide 82 criteria for energy efficiency and that all dwellings are pre-ducted for solar hot water heating, unless the development is required to achieve the BC Energy Step Code at the time a Building Permit application is received.
12. Registration of a statutory right-of-way (SRW), and/or other legal agreements or measures, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, over the entire area of the proposed driveway entry from No. 2 Road and the internal north-south manoeuvering aisle, in favour of future residential development to the north. Language should be included in the SRW document that the City will not be responsible for maintenance or liability within the SRW.
13. The granting of a 0.3 m wide statutory right-of-way (SRW) for public rights-of-passage along the entire east property line (No. 2 Road frontage) for the proposed new sidewalk. The SRW area is to be measured from the new property line following the required road dedication.
14. The submission and processing of a Development Permit* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.
15. Enter into a Servicing Agreement* for the design and construction of required site servicing and frontage improvements. Works include, but may not be limited to, the following:

## Water Works:

- Using the OCP Model, there is $386 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ of water available at a 20 psi residual at No 2 Rd Frontage. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of $220 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$.
- The Developer is required to:
- Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm the development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage Building designs.
- Install a new water service connection off of the existing 200 mm AC watermain along No 2 Rd to service the proposed townhouse development. The meter shall be part of the onsite Mechanical design.
- Remove the two existing water service connections at No 2 Rd Frontage.
- At the Developers cost, the City is to:
- Perform tie-ins, cutting, and capping of all proposed works to existing City infrastructure.


## Storm Sewer Works:

- The Developer is required to:
- Remove existing service connections and accompanying inspection chambers and leads at No 2 Rd Frontage.
- Install a new service connection complete with new Inspection Chamber off of existing storm box culvert on No 2 Rd to service the proposed townhouse development.
- At the Developers cost, the City is to:
- Perform tie-ins, cutting, and capping of all proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

Sanitary Sewer Works:

- The Developer is required to;
- Cut, cap and remove the two existing service connections off of existing 200 mm rear-yard sanitary main.
- Install a new sanitary service connection off of existing 200 mm rear-yard sanitary main to service the proposed townhouse development.
- Provide 1 m wide Utility Statutory Right of Way extending from the existing 3m utility Statutory Right of Way along the entire west property line of the proposed site. Do not place any permanent structures or trees within the Statutory Right of Way.
- Provide a 1.5 m by 1.5 m Utility Statutory Right-of-Way on the south west corner of the proposed development. Do not place any permanent structures or trees within the Statutory Right of Way.
- Do not start onsite building construction prior to completion of rear-yard sanitary works.
- At Developer's cost, the City is to:
- Perform tie-ins, cutting, and capping of all proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

Frontage Improvements:

- The Developer is required to:
- Design and construct the frontage improvements including, but limited to, the following:
- Removal of the existing sidewalk and backfill of the remaining area between the existing curb and the new sidewalk to provide a 3.5 m wide grass boulevard with street trees. The 2.0 m road dedication area is to be planted with grass only. A root barrier is to be installed between the 2.0 m grass boulevard and the 1.5 m grass and tree boulevard.
- Construct a new 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk behind the 3.5 m wide boulevard, with tie-in to the existing sidewalk north and south of the development site. A 0.3 m wide PROP SRW is required to achieve the full sidewalk width.
- All existing driveways along the No. 2 Road frontage are to be closed permanently. The developer is responsible for the removal of the existing driveway let-downs and replacement with barrier curb and gutter, boulevard, and concrete sidewalk per the standards described above.
- Construct a new single vehicle access to City design standards.
- Construct a concrete bus pad ( $2.9 \mathrm{~m} \times 9.0 \mathrm{~m}$ ) with electrical pre-ducting conduits at the No. 2 Road/Maple Road northbound bus stop. The bus pad is to be constructed to meet accessible bus stop design standards.
- Consult Parks on the requirements for tree replacements, including tree species and spacing as part of the frontage works.
- Consult engineering on lighting and other utility requirements as part of the frontage works.
- Coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers:
- When relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the property frontages.
- To determine if above ground structures are required and coordinate their locations (e.g. Vista, PMT, LPT, Shaw cabinets, Telus Kiosks, etc.). These should be located onsite.

General Items:

- The Developer is required to:
- Enter into, if required, additional legal agreements, as determined via the subject development's Servicing Agreement(s) and/or Development Permit(s), and/or Building Permit(s) to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering, including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, dewatering, drilling, underpinning, anchoring, shoring, piling, pre-loading, ground densification or other activities that may result in settlement, displacement, subsidence, damage or nuisance to City and private utility infrastructure.
- Complete Road Restoration in compliance with Bylaw 7869 due to any road cuts made in No 2 Rd.


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

1. Submission of a Landscape Plan, prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development. The Landscape Plan should:

- comply with the guidelines of the OCP's Arterial Road Policy and should not include hedges along the front property line;
- include a mix of coniferous and deciduous trees;
- include the dimensions of tree protection fencing as illustrated on the Tree Retention Plan attached to this report; and
- include the 19 required replacement trees with the following minimum sizes:

| No. of Replacement Trees | Minimum Caliper of Deciduous <br> Replacement Tree | Minimum Height of Coniferous <br> Replacement Tree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 11 cm | 6 m |
| 6 | 10 cm | 5.5 m |
| 7 | 9 cm | 5 m |

2. Complete a proposed townhouse energy efficiency report and recommendations prepared by a Certified Energy Advisor which demonstrates how the proposed construction will meet or exceed the required townhouse energy efficiency standards (EnerGuide 82 or better), in compliance with the City's Official Community Plan.

Prior to Development Permit* issuance, the developer must complete the following requirements:

1. Submission of a Landscape Security based on $100 \%$ of the cost estimate provided by a Landscape Architect, including all hard and soft materials, installation, and a $10 \%$ contingency.
$\qquad$

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

1. Installation of appropriate tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained as part of the development prior to any construction activities, including building demolition, occurring on-site.

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

1. Submission of a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to the Transportation Department. Management Plan shall include location for parking for services, deliveries, workers, loading, application for any lane closures, and proper construction traffic controls as per Traffic Control Manual for works on Roadways (by Ministry of Transportation) and MMCD Traffic Regulation Section 01570.
2. Incorporation of energy efficiency, CPTED, sustainability, and accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
3. If applicable, payment of latecomer agreement charges, plus applicable interest associated with eligible latecomer works.
4. Obtain a Building Permit (BP) for any construction hoarding. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a public street, the air space above a public street, or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For additional information, contact the Building Approvals Department at 604-276-4285.

## Note:

* This requires a separate application.
- Where the Director of Development deems appropriate, the preceding agreements are to be drawn not only as personal covenants of the property owner but also as covenants pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act.
All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall have priority over all such liens, charges and encumbrances as is considered advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall, unless the Director of Development determines otherwise, be fully registered in the Land Title Office prior to enactment of the appropriate bylaw.
The preceding agreements shall provide security to the City including indemnities, warranties, equitable/rent charges, letters of credit and withholding permits, as deemed necessary or advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements shall be in a form and content satisfactory to the Director of Development.
- Additional legal agreements, as determined via the subject development's Servicing Agreement(s) and/or Development Permit(s), and/or Building Permit(s) to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering may be required including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, de-watering, drilling, underpinning, anchoring, shoring, piling, pre-loading, ground densification or other activities that may result in settlement, displacement, subsidence, damage or nuisance to City and private utility infrastructure.
- Applicants for all City Permits are required to comply at all times with the conditions of the Provincial Wildife 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.


# Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9880 (RZ 16-754046) 9091 \& 9111 No. 2 Road 

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

1. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 , is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following area and by designating it "LOW DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTL4)".
P.I.D. 004-234-499

Lot 1 Section 25 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 17904
P.I.D. 004-062-477

Lot 2 Section 25 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 17904
2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9880".

FIRST READING
A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON
SECOND READING
THIRD READING
JUL 232018
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED
ADOPTED

| Jesson, Claudia |  | To Public Haaring Date:Sept.4,2018 Itam 4 Do. Bulaw 9880 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From: | Kiki [mkiki@vip.sina.com](mailto:mkiki@vip.sina.com) |  |
| Sent: | Wednesday, 22 August 2018 23:19 |  |
| To: | CityClerk |  |
| Subject: | Regarding the 9091 \& 9111 No. 2 R | Issue |

From Yang Liu
5793 Maple Rd. No. 2 Road.

We strongly against the rezoning, because of 2 reasons:
1, The entrance/exit of that townhouse will both be in No. 2 road, which will highly affect the safety driving of current No. 2 road vehicles, and may cause more traffic accidents.

2, It will highly affect the privacy of existing owners, since it may remove part of the current trees, and built higher/similar buildings overlooking our house. In addition, that will cause future devaluation of our houses.

Please kindly consider our concerns and reject this rezoning proposal.

Best Regards,

Kiki Liu


