



To: Planning Committee
From: Raul Allueva
Director of Development

To Planning - July 6, 2004

Date: June 11, 2004

RZ 04-268223

File: 12-8060-20-7737 Xr 4045-00

Re: APPLICATION BY SILVERADO HOMES LTD. FOR REZONING AT 5411 AND 5431 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1-0.6)

Staff Recommendation

- 1) That Lot Size Policy 5420, adopted by Council on October 16, 1989 and last amended on August 21, 1995, be forwarded to a Public Hearing with a recommendation that the Policy be amended to exclude the following properties:
 - 5071 Steveston Hwy through to and including 5751 Steveston Hwy.;
 - 10040 Railway Ave. through to and including 10720 Railway Ave.;
 - 5020 Williams Rd. through to and including 5720 Williams Rd.;
 - 10011, 10031, 10040, 10880 Lassam Gate;
 - 5020, 5011, 5031 Hollymount Gate, and;
 - 10020, 10040, 10031 Hollycroft Gate.

- 2) That Bylaw No. 7737, for the rezoning of 5411 and 5431 Steveston Hwy. from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.

Raul Allueva
Director of Development

RV:dcB
Att. 4

FOR ORIGINATING DIVISION USE ONLY

CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER

Staff Report

Origin

Silverado Homes Ltd. has applied for permission to rezone 5411 and 5431 Steveston Highway (Section 36-4-7) from Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E) to Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6) in order to permit each property to be subdivided into two new single-family residential lots with access to a future new lane along the northern property line. A location map is provided in **Attachment A**. The proposed subdivision layout is shown in **Attachment 2**.

Findings of Fact

Item	Existing	Proposed
Owner	- 5411 Steveston Hwy. Victorino Urgello Orcullo Bernadette Conde Orcullo - 5431 Steveston Hwy. Margot Spronk David Edward Dougherty	To be determined
Applicant	Silverado Homes Ltd.	same
Site Size	- 5411 Steveston Hwy. 1012 m ² (10893.43 ft ²) approx. - 5431 Steveston Hwy. 1008 m ² (10850.38 ft ²)	4 lots of approximately 429.52 m ² (4623.47 ft ²) each. A laneway of approximately 301.92 m ² (3249.95 ft ²) will be created.
Land Uses	Single-Family Residential	same
OCP Designation	Neighbourhood Residential	same
Area Plan Designation	Single-Family	same
702 Policy Designation	Policy No. 5420 Subdivision as per R1/B with lane or internal access	Proposed to exclude the subject property and other selected properties fronting or adjacent to Steveston Highway, Railway Avenue and Williams Road.
Zoning	R1/E	R1-0.6

Surrounding Development

- The subject properties are bordered by large lot (R1/E) single-family residential properties to the west.
- To the east, across Lassam Road, are two older homes on large lots (R1/E) with a duplex behind them.
- Immediately to the north are two small (R1/A) single-family residential lots and a mixture of R1/E and R1/B lots as one proceeds north along Lassam Road.

- On the south side of Steveston Highway are mid to large sized lots under Land Use Contract No. 157.

Related Policies & Studies

Lot Size Policy

Single-Family Lot Size Policy No. 5420, adopted by Council August 21, 1995, permits subdivision within the designated area (refer to **Attachment B**) to R1/B except for the following provisions:

- Williams Road – R1/C unless there is a lane or internal access then R1/B;
- Railway Avenue & Steveston Highway – R1/E unless there is lane or internal access then R1/B.

Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy and the Lane Establishment Policy

The Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy No. 7017 establishes how redevelopment will be managed and prioritized along arterial roads outside the City Centre. Specific provisions allow for small lot single-family developments with the provision of specified improvements such as laneways.

The Lane Establishment Policy No. 5038 requires applicants for rezoning in specified areas (e.g. certain arterial routes) to provide land and pay for, or construct, lanes.

The Rezoning proposal for 5411 and 5431 Steveston Hwy. is consistent with both the Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy and the Lane Establishment Policy.

Consistent with similar applications along arterials in other locations, properties fronting onto the arterials in the vicinity of the proposed rezoning are excluded from their respective lot size policies. If approved, the following properties (see also **Attachment C**) would be excluded from Lot Size Policy No. 5420:

- 5071 Steveston Hwy. through to and including 5751 Steveston Hwy.;
- 10040 Railway Ave. through to and including 10720 Railway Ave.;
- 5020 Williams Rd. through to and including 5720 Williams Rd.;
- 10011, 10031, 10040, 10880 Lassam Gate;
- 5020, 5011, 5031 Hollymount Gate, and;
- 10020, 10040, 10031 Hollycroft Gate.

Consultation

Community Notice

As part of the process of excluding properties from an existing lot size policy, a notification letter (**Attachment 1 plus Attachments A, B & C**) was sent to all those properties within Lot Size Policy 5420 in Section 36-4-7. To the date of this staff report, staff have received approximately a dozen calls regarding the notification letter. The callers have typically owned

property along one of the arterial roads proposed for removal from the Policy and have been asking how the change affects their specific property.

Three letters have been received in response to the mail out notice. These appear in **Attachment 3**.

The owner of 10631 Hollymount Drive, Mr. Elvyn Wittensleger, submitted a letter and met with staff on May 27th, 2004, to discuss his concerns. Mr. Wittensleger did not have concerns with either the proposed subdivision, or the principle of a laneway along the back of the properties, however, he is opposed to having the lane extended to the vicinity of the existing neighbourhood pub at 5031 Steveston Hwy. (at the corner of Railway Ave. and Steveston Hwy.). Mr. Wittensleger notes that currently people park all along Railway Ave. to go to the pub. If a laneway is opened too close to the operation he anticipates that it will result in excessive vehicle traffic from people looking for parking spaces, increased noise and vandalism by people using the lane after the pub closes, and an increase in security concerns for the general neighbourhood. Mr. Wittensleger indicated that he would not be opposed to a future laneway connecting to Steveston Highway but not too close to the pub.

The owners of the adjacent site to the north at 10771 Lassam Road, Kathy and Glen Smale, submitted a letter stating concerns about the introduction of the lane and the associated noise, lighting and pollution that it would generate adjacent to their lot. They indicate that they were not opposed to the 4 lot subdivision, but are specifically against the addition of "another road". They specifically noted concerns about the lane making its way toward the pub and liquor store at 5031 Steveston Hwy.

The third letter was received from the owner of 10060 Lassam Road, Michael Li. Mr. Li is seeking to have the Lot Size Policy exclusion extended to include his property in order to permit him to redevelop his lot and the neighbouring property at 10040 Lassam Road. His concern is that if 10040 Lassam Road is excluded, it may preclude his ability to redevelop his property in conjunction with the neighbouring lot to the north.

Staff Comments on the Rezoning Application

Engineering/Design

Development Application staff support the Rezoning application. The proposed land assembly includes a corner property, which enables the lane to be constructed at subdivision stage. Prior to final adoption, a 6 m lane dedication is required along the north edge of both lots. The developer should be advised that:

1. Access to the new corner lot is to the lane only and not permitted to Lassam Road - a covenant to this effect will be required at Subdivision stage; and,
2. There is an existing power pole at the north edge of this site on Lassam Road with an anchor that crosses exactly where the lane is required. Relocation of this pole and the anchor

approximately 7 m south is at the developer's sole cost and responsibility, and again will be done via the Subdivision stage.

No other concerns with the Rezoning.

With the future Subdivision, items 1 & 2 above are required. Access to the three non-corner lots is controlled (lane only) via Bylaw 7222, so no additional covenants are required. The developer is to design and construct the lane via our standard Servicing Agreement at their sole cost. Works normally required, but not limited to, include a 5.1 m wide lane surface with roll curb and gutter on both sides, storm sewer, laneway street lighting and construction of a 2 m cedar fence along the north edge - fence to be on neighbour's property, so will need the owner's permission. (However, this lane has good potential as a pilot for our proposed Grass Swale lane standard, which the developer is being strongly encouraged to consider as an option over our current standard noted above.) No other concerns.

Policy Planning

The proposed Rezoning is consistent with both the Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy and the Lane Establishment Policy. The fact that the properties lay adjacent to Lassam Road allows for immediate lane access to these properties and removes their accesses to Steveston Highway making this a very supportable redevelopment from the technical standpoint.

The concerns expressed by Mr. Wittensleger, and to a degree by Mr. and Mrs. Smale, regarding the laneway running by the pub and liquor store, have been discussed with Transportation staff. While noting that the actual determination of where the laneway will come out will occur when the development configuration in the vicinity of the pub has been decided, one possible response could be that the lane access be from Steveston Hwy. a reasonable distance away from the pub. Properties adjacent to, or near the pub could be serviced by a short dead-end lane. Transportation staff also note that the City does not typically encourage lane access along roads which have designated bike routes, such as Railway Avenue. Policy Planning staff recommend that the future lane not run adjacent to the pub and liquor store without a compelling reason to do so.

The proponent is currently reviewing the feasibility of undertaking the construction of the rear lane using the proposed Grass Swale lane standard. To the time of writing this staff report no decision has yet been made by the applicant on whether to proceed with this approach or simply to follow the current City lane standard. Application of the Grass Swale standard may mitigate some of the concerns raised by the Smale's.

Analysis

From a technical standpoint, this is a relatively straight forward rezoning application with the added bonus of being situated to take advantage of a lane access immediately. Removal of as many driveway accesses as possible from Steveston Hwy. is seen as having significant vehicular safety benefits and adds considerably to the merits of this application. The concerns raised regarding the eventual placement of the lane access near the neighbourhood pub should be examined with any future applications in the vicinity of the pub. As noted earlier, alternative alignments for the lane should be considered.

Staff have recommended that properties along Williams Road and Railway Avenue be excluded from the Single-Family Lot Size Policy No. 5420 in addition to those properties along Steveston Highway. This is consistent with previous practice in other 702 Lot Size Policy reviews. It is also noted that in terms of single-family redevelopment potential, a relatively small number of properties along Williams Road and Railway Avenue will be in a position to capitalize upon this without consolidation as many of the properties are already small in width.

Staff have reviewed the concerns raised by Mr. Li and note that there are more than thirty other properties along the length of Lassam Road which have similar lot dimensions. As the Lassam Road Lot Size Policy was adopted in 1995, that Policy could be challenged by an application for rezoning. Given the number of other similar sized properties and the age of the existing policy, staff recommend that the exemption not be extended to include 10060 Lassam Road but rather, that the owner consider making an application for rezoning through which the balance of Lassam Road can be examined through a review of the Lot Size Policy for the area.

The applicant has agreed to the Rezoning Conditional Requirements shown in **Attachment 4**.

Options

Two options are appropriate:

- Option 1: Approve the proposed amendments to Single-Family Lot Size Policy No. 5420 and approve the application for the rezoning of 5411 and 5431 Steveston Hwy to R1-0.6. (*Recommended*).
- Option 2: Reject the application for rezoning and retain the Single-Family Lot Size Policy No. 5420 as it currently exists.

Financial Impact

No immediate financial impacts.

Conclusion

Staff have reviewed the application for rezoning of 5411 and 5431 Steveston Hwy to R1-0.6. Based upon the technical review and the limited community response to the notification letter, staff are supportive of the rezoning application.

 David Brownlee
Planner 2



See **Attachment 4** for conditional rezoning requirements before final reading of Bylaw 7737.

DCB:cas



City of Richmond

6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1
 Telephone (604) 276-4000
 www.city.richmond.bc.ca

May 6, 2004

Urban Development Division
 Fax: (604) 276-4177

File:

Dear Resident:

Re: Notice: To Exclude The Following Properties From Single-Family Lot Size Policy 5420:

- 5071 Steveston Hwy. through to and including 5751 Steveston Hwy.;
- 10040 Railway Ave. through to and including 10720 Railway Ave.;
- 5020 Williams Rd. through to and including 5720 Williams Rd.;
- 10011, 10031, 10040, 10880 Lassam Gate;
- 5020, 5011, 5031 Hollymount Gate, and;
- 10020, 10040, 10031 Hollycroft Gate.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of a proposed rezoning application along Steveston Highway and a proposed change to the Single-Family Lot Size Policy for your area.

An application to rezone **5411 and 5431 Steveston Hwy** to permit subdivision into four (4) single-family, R1-0.6 size lots (width of approximately 12.58 m (41.27 feet)) with a laneway has been received by the City of Richmond (see **Attachment A** for a location map). The application is contrary to the existing Single-Family Lot Size Policy 5420 (shown in **Attachment B**) that was adopted by Council in 1989. Policy 5420 currently permits subdivision of lots along Steveston Hwy. to R1/E size lots (minimum average width of 18 m (59.06 feet)) unless there is a lane or internal access that permits subdivision to R1/B size lots (minimum average width of 12 m (39.37 ft)). Note that in addition to the above requirements corner lots are required to have an additional 2 m (6.56 ft) in width.

New Approach

In the fall of 2000, Council approved a new approach to better manage residential development along arterial roads. Under this new approach Council will now consider the subdivision of single-family residential lots along major roads independently of the Single-Family Lot Size Policy and process. The reason is to eliminate an inconsistency. Specifically, it does not make sense to use the Single-Family Lot Size Policy process to restrict single-family lot sizes along arterial roads on one hand, when on the other hand, the Official Community Plan encourages more intensive residential development (e.g. smaller lots, duplexes & townhouses) along arterial roads.

For areas with existing Single-Family Lot Size Policies, this new approach means that:

- where the Policy has been in place for over five years, all single-family residential rezoning applications along arterial will be evaluated on their own merits; and
- Council will also determine whether or not to remove this existing Lot Size Policy.

Specifics

This letter is to inform you that:

1. the existing Single-Family Lot Size Policy No. 5420 (**Attachment B**) is proposed to be amended to exclude those properties identified above (also see the map in **Attachment C**) in order that various sizes of single-family lots can be considered for redevelopment; and;
2. the rezoning application for **5411 and 5431 Steveston Hwy** will be reviewed on its own merits.

You should note that this does not imply that staff and/or Council automatically support the proposed rezoning or future rezonings. It just means that the review process has been simplified. The subject rezoning and future applications will continue to receive the same attention and scrutiny as all other rezoning applications.

What this means to you

The proposal to repeal Lot Size Policy 5420 and the proposed rezoning of **5411 and 5431 Steveston Hwy** is expected to be considered concurrently by Planning Committee and Council in June, 2004. In addition, if the application proceeds, you will be receiving a letter from the City Clerk's Department advising you when the application will be heard at Public Hearing which will likely be held in July, 2004.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the above, please contact me at (604)276-4200 or in writing at the address above.

Yours truly,

David Brownlee
Planner 2

DCB:cas



City of Richmond

Policy Manual

Page 1 of 2

Adopted by Council: October 16, 1989
 Amended by Council: August 17, 1992
 Lassam Rd. Adopted by Council: August 21, 1995

POLICY 5420

File Ref: 4045-00

SINGLE-FAMILY LOT SIZE POLICY IN QUARTER-SECTION 36-4-7

POLICY 5420:

The following policy establishes lot sizes for the area, bounded by **Steveston Highway, Railway Avenue, Williams Road and the rear of the properties located along No. 2 Rd.** in Section 36-4-7:


That properties within the area bounded by Steveston Highway, Railway Avenue, Williams Road and the rear property lines of the properties located along No. 2 Rd. (Section 36-4-7), be permitted to subdivide in accordance with the provisions of Single-Family Housing District (R1/B) in Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300, with the following provisions:

- (a) If there is no lane or internal road access, then properties along Railway Avenue and Steveston Highway will be restricted to Single-Family Housing District (R1/E);
- (b) Properties along Williams Road will be permitted Single-Family Housing District (R1/C) unless there is lane or internal road access in which case Single-Family Housing District (R1/B) will be allowed;
- (c) The Policy for the properties along Lassam Rd. (as cross-hatched on the attached map) was adopted on August 21, 1995;

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

Note: Council adopted the above noted Single-Family Lot Size Policy, with an amendment clarifying that the western boundary of the policy area is the middle of Railway Avenue.

Note: There are two adoption dates for two separate portions of Policy 5420.



Subdivision permitted as per **R1/B** (date of adoption 08/21/95).



Subdivision permitted as per **R1/B** (date of adoption 10/16/89).


1. Williams Road - R1/C unless there is a lane or internal access then R1/B
2. Railway Avenue & Steveston Highway - R1/E unless there is lane or internal access then R1/B.



Policy 5420

Section 36-4-7

Adopted Date: 10/16/89
 Amended Date: 08/17/92
 Lassam Rd.
 Adopted Date: 08/21/95
 Note: Dimensions are in METRES




-  Subdivision permitted as per **R1/B** (date of adoption 08/21/95).
-  Subdivision permitted as per **R1/B** (date of adoption 10/16/89).
-  Lots proposed for Exclusion



Proposed Policy 5420

Section 36-4-7

Adopted Date: 10/16/89
 Amended Date: 08/17/92
 Lassam Rd.
 Adopted Date: 08/21/95
 Note: Dimensions are in METRES



Proposed Subdivision

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

Elvyn Wittensleger of 10631 Hollymount Drive - Letter dated May 25th, 2004

Kathy and Glen Smale of 10771 Lassam Road – Letter dated June 8, 2004

Michael Li of 10060 Lassam Road – Letter dated June 7, 2004

Mr: ELVYN C. WITTENSLEGER
10631 HOLLYMOUNT DRIVE,
RICHMOND, B.C. V7E-4Y3.
CANADA. 25th May/2004.
PH: Res: 604-277-8454.

THE CITY OF RICHMOND,
THE PLANNING COMMITTEE, : Council,
CITY CLERK'S DEPARTMENT.

MADAM/SIR,

I thank you, for your letter/notice, regarding ^{the} proposed change in Single Family lot size policy, from 5071 - 5751 Steveston Hwy and future lane access, with new property developments.

I would like to bring together, some concerns, that should be noted, especially on the stretch of Steveston Hwy and No 2 Road with regards, to new developments of properties with lane access ^{Railway}. The corner of Steveston Hwy and Railway, is also, very unique as we have the commercial properties of a Neighbourhood Pub and an adjoining liquor store/outlet.

(a) Parking, is an issue, along Railway / Steveston Hwy ^{upto} on Friday / Saturday and national sports nights. This stretch, also has a defined bicycle lane. Parking and noise could become a fact on any long lane access with future developments, parallel with Steveston Hwy.

(b) The concerns of crime and vandalism of city or private property in this unique stretch of Steveston Hwy [between rail and No 2 Road] needs to be looked at closely as future development proposals are submitted to our city of Richmond.

As a sincere Richmond / Steveston resident, for many years these sincere concerns of my family and our future, planned and safer neighbourhood, is very valuable to all of us in our city of Richmond.

Thanking You, In Sincerity and neutrality, Mr. E.C. Wittensleger. ^{g.w}
with our genuine concerns and opinions.

June 8, 2004

10771 Lassam Road
Richmond, B.C.
V7E 2C2

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

Dear Sirs:

Re: File # RZ 04-268223, Silverado Homes Ltd. and 5411 & 5431 Steveston Highway

My wife and I have lived at 10771 Lassam Road for the past 19 years, plan to continue to reside in our home and are directly affected by the aforementioned application. Our property, 1 SEC 36 BLK 4N RG7W PL 68413, has 168.85 feet at the northern perimeter of the properties in question. Put another way, we stand the most to lose by this proposal with respect to the development of a lane along the entire length of our property. We believe that it is inequitable and unreasonable to have a long term resident subjected to the noise, air pollution and lighting while the new property owners would be subjected to approximately only a quarter of the same distance. While we do not oppose the development of 4 homes, we do oppose the building of just another road, which will inevitably wind its way to the beer and liquor store and pub and all the palaver that brings to a so-called quiet and established residential neighborhood.

It seems to us that the developer and City bear the onus to consider not only the path of least resistance but also of the cost, both in terms of dollars and property, as it applies to those who either sold the property or would purchase the rezoned property. While some may not be desirous of an entrance off Steveston Highway, City Council has already granted its approval for same along Steveston near Gilbert. In that situation, more of the developed property may have been used to accommodate such an arrangement but at least the neighbors to the north were not adversely affected and the developers or purchasers more likely than not bore the cost of creating sound barriers along Steveston Highway. Surely the safety issue was explored and found to have been satisfied or the properties would not have been rezoned in the first place. We see no such consideration in this application just more blacktop, more safety concerns for us and our property (far easier access) and the elimination of existing trees, green space and wild life.

Kathy and I have lived to foster the development of gardens and all the beauty that brings to the community and frankly we find a blacktop solution repugnant and unnecessary. If the developer raises the land so too will the lane and accompanying houses. The aging existing fence alone now becomes inadequate to maintain even a modicum of privacy or to abate the noise level from Steveston Highway. Cutting down all of the trees and placing no barriers between the highway and our home, except the new houses themselves, only exacerbates the situation. The 'consideration' in this application

appears to be a one-sided affair and one of cost and convenience with little or no consideration to the long-term taxpayers and residents of a City that prides itself with its gardens and flowers.

We therefore encourage Council to consider alternative approaches to the lane development proposal, such as suggested in this letter and to provide the neighbors so affected by such developments with some dignity and say in continuing to make Richmond 's residential areas quiet, private, safe and green. Kathy and I would welcome and questions or comments you may have with respect to this submission. We would also like to know how we can find out who on Council voted for, against, abstained or were absent from the voting on this rezoning application. Finally, where can we obtain information related to noise bylaws, particularly related to residential building?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "K. Smale / G. Smale".

Kathy and Glen Smale (604) 274-5511.

June 7, 2004

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

Attention: Mr. David Brownlee
Planner

Dear Sir,

Re: Notice to exclude properties from Single-family Lot Size Policy 5420

I refer to your letter of the above subject dated May 6, 2004. I am, Michael Li, owner of 10060 Lassam Road, Richmond. The purpose of this letter is to ask for your consideration to include 10060 Lassam Road as one of the properties to be excluded from the Single-family Lot Size Policy 5420.

Considering the age of my house, I already have a plan to redevelop my house together with my north side neighbour to sub-divide the two properties to R1/B. With the new approach mentioned in your letter, I have to drop my plan as I can only sub-divide my house with the north side neighbour whose house is with similar age as mine. The house located at my south side is a newer house. If the new approach is being approved, my house seems being isolated as I cannot redevelop my house with my north side neighbour and my south side neighbour's house is much newer.

Hopefully, you will consider my request for exclusion together with 10040 Lassam Road.

I look forward to your favourable reply.

Yours faithfully,


Michael Li
Owner of 10060 Lassam Road

Conditional Rezoning Requirements 5411 and 5431 Steveston Hwy RZ 04-268223

Please sign and return this form to **Holger Burke** at fax # 604-276-4052.

Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 7737, the developer is required to complete the following requirements:

1. 6m lane dedication along the entire 5411 and 5431 Steveston Highway northern property line.


The developer is further advised that:

1. Access to the new corner lot is to the lane only and not permitted to Lassam Road - a covenant to this effect will be required at Subdivision stage; and,
2. There is an existing power pole at the north edge of this site on Lassam Road with an anchor that crosses exactly where the lane is required. Relocation this pole and the anchor approximately 7m south is at the developer's sole cost and responsibility, and again will be done via Subdivision stage.

With the future Subdivision, items 1 & 2 above are required. Access to the three non-corner lots is controlled (lane only) via Bylaw #7222, so no additional covenants are required. The developer is to design and construct the lane via our standard Servicing Agreement* at their sole cost. Works required, but not limited to, include a 5.1 m wide lane surface with roll curb and gutter on both sides, storm sewer, laneway street lighting and construction of a 2 m cedar fence along the north edge - fence to be on neighbour's property, so will need the owner's permission. (Also, this has good potential as a pilot for our proposed Grass Swale lane standard; not a requirement but the developer can choose this option over our current standard noted above.)

* Note: This requires a separate application.


Signed _____


Date _____



**Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300
Amendment Bylaw 7737 (RZ 04-268223)
5411 AND 5431 STEVESTON HWY**

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

- Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300 is amended by repealing the existing designation of the following areas and by designating them **SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1-0.6)**:

P.I.D. 011-227-761

Lot 7 Section 36 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 6648

P.I.D. 012-345-997

Parcel "A" (Reference Plan 7853) Lot 9 Section 36 Block 4 North Range 7 West
New Westminster District Plan 1748

- This Bylaw may be cited as **“Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300, Amendment Bylaw 7737”**.

FIRST READING

PUBLIC HEARING

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED for content by originating dept.
HB
APPROVED for legality by Solicitor

MAYOR

CITY CLERK