

Development Permit Panel

Council Chambers, City Hall 6911 No. 3 Road Wednesday, November 30, 2016 3:30 p.m.

Minutes

Motion to adopt the minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on November 16, 2016.

1. Development Permit 16-727168 (REDMS No. 5124252)

APPLICANT: Pritam Samra

PROPERTY LOCATION: 7311 No. 5 Road

Director's Recommendations

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of a singlefamily dwelling with an attached garage on a site with an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) designation at 7311 No. 5 Road, and zoned Agriculture (AG1).

2. Development Permit 16-741981 (REDMS No. 5217500)

APPLICANT: Townline Gardens Inc.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 10780 No. 5 Road

Director's Recommendations

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

- 1. Permit the construction of one (1) 10-storey residential building and three (3) 3storey residential buildings at 10780 No. 5 Road on a site zoned "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) – The Gardens (Shellmont)"; and
- 2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - (a) For the most westerly building (Building E1), increase the maximum height over a parkade structure from six (6) storeys and 25.0 m, to ten (10) storeys and 33.6 m; and
 - (b) For the most westerly building (Building E1), increase the allowable projection of unenclosed balconies into a side yard setback abutting the Agricultural Land Reserve, from a maximum of 0.9 m to 1.8 m.
- 3. New Business
- 4. Date of Next Meeting: December 14, 2016
- 5. Adjournment



Minutes

Development Permit Panel Wednesday, November 16, 2016

Time:	3:30 p.m.
Place:	Council Chambers Richmond City Hall
Present:	Joe Erceg, Chair Cathryn Volkering Carlile, General Manager, Community Services Peter Russell, Senior Manager, Sustainability and District Energy

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes

It was moved and seconded That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on October 26, 2016, be adopted.

CARRIED

1. Development Permit 15-695475 (REDMS No. 4836052)

APPLICANT: 0884100 BC Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 9611, 9631 and 9651 Blundell Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

To permit the construction of 14 townhouse units at 9611, 9631 and 9651 Blundell Road on a site zoned "Town Housing (ZT-60) – North McLennan (City Centre)".

Applicant's Comments

Piyush Sanghadia, Yamamoto Architecture Inc., provided background information on the proposed development, noting that (i) the subject site is a consolidation of three lots and the last site to be developed in the block, (ii) the proposed development is comprised of 14 townhouse units clustered in five buildings, (iii) buildings fronting the street have twostorey end units, (iv) the original proposal for a triplex along the north property line has been broken down into a duplex and one detached unit, (v) street fronting units have direct access to the sidewalk and are provided with separate entry porches and gates and fencing along the sidewalk, (vi) rear buildings are setback 4.5 meters from the north property line, (vii) the outdoor amenity area is proposed to be located opposite the site entry, (viii) the development is designed to achieve an EnerGuide rating of 82 and pre-ducted for solar hot water heating, (ix) each building includes vertical components with changes in material, and (x) there are two proposed colour schemes for the building blocks.

In response to queries from the Panel, Mr. Sanghadia advised that the proposed sustainability features for the project including the use of energy star appliances and double glazing are part of meeting the target of EnerGuide 82 rating for the project.

Denitsa Dimitrova, PMG Landscape Architects, briefed the Panel on the main landscaping features of the project and highlighted the following:

- each townhouse unit will have a private yard with landscaping, a patio and lawn area;
- a 42-inch height transparent wood fence and gates to individual townhouse front entries provide a pedestrian-oriented streetscape character along Blundell Road and Bridge Street;
- a six-foot high solid wood fence provides separation from adjacent properties to the north and east;
- an arbour with vines is proposed at each walkway connecting to the sidewalk;
- a trellis with vines on the east property line provides an end treatment to the eastwest internal drive aisle;
- the outdoor amenity area includes a children's play area with play equipment for children aged 2 to 5 years, mail kiosks and a bench for caregivers;
- short-term bicycle parking stalls are located next to Building 4 and adjacent to the east property line; and
- the entry driveway, visitor parking stalls, walkways and a portion of the internal drive aisle will be treated with permeable pavers.

In response to queries from the Panel, Ms. Dimitrova stated that (i) a strip of shrub planting provides screening to the visitor parking stalls from the adjacent children's play area, (ii) wood fiber ground surface treatment is proposed for the children's play area, and (iii) a 42-inch high picket fence and shrub planting provide separation to the children's play area from the internal drive aisle.

Staff Comments

Wayne Craig, Director, Development, advised that (i) one convertible unit will be provided for the proposed development, (ii) no variances are being proposed for the subject application, and (iii) there will be a Servicing Agreement for frontage improvements on Blundell Road and Bridge Street.

Panel Discussion

In response to a query from the Panel, Mr. Sanghadia advised that the proposed preducting for solar hot water heating will be done for all individual units in preparation for future installation of a solar water heating system.

In response to a query from the Panel whether it is possible to fully install the solar water heating system at the outset rather than pre-ducting the townhouse units, Jackson Lee, 0884100 BC Ltd., advised that (i) the cost of installing a solar water heating system will have to be determined first, (ii) more research needs to be done regarding the efficiency of harnessing solar energy in Richmond's weather, and (iii) a high efficiency water heating system using gas powered boilers is currently being proposed for the townhouse units.

In response to a query from the Panel whether the applicant has considered incorporating high voltage electric vehicle charging in indoor car garages, Mr. Lee noted that (i) from a market demand perspective, provision for electric car charging in the subject development was not considered by the applicant, and (ii) the applicant will investigate the feasibility of installing a 240-volt receptacle for electric vehicle charging in individual indoor car garages.

Discussion ensued regarding the need for the applicant to enhance the project's proposed sustainability features prior to the development application moving forward to Council. Staff was then directed to work with the applicant to investigate the possibility of enhancing the project's sustainability features including installation of a solar water heating system during project construction or provision for electric vehicle charging.

Correspondence

None.

Gallery Comments

None.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of 14 townhouse units at 9611, 9631 and 9651 Blundell Road on a site zoned "Town Housing (ZT-60) – North McLennan (City Centre)".

CARRIED

2. Date of Next Meeting: November 30, 2016

3. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded *That the meeting be adjourned at 3:50 p.m.*

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Wednesday, November 16, 2016.

Joe Erceg Chair Rustico Agawin Auxiliary Committee Clerk



Report to Development Permit Panel

To: Development Permit Panel

From: Wayne Craig Director, Development Date: November 9, 2016 File: DP 16-727168

Re: Application by Pritam Samra for a Development Permit at 7311 No. 5 Road (Referral from July 13, 2016 Development Permit Panel Meeting)

Staff Recommendation

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of a single-family dwelling with an attached garage on a site with an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) designation at 7311 No. 5 Road, and zoned Agriculture (AG1).

Wayne Craig

Director, Development

DCB:blg

Att. 2

Staff Report

Origin

Pritam Samra has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to develop a single-family dwelling with a detached garage at 7311 No. 5 Road on a 2,023 m² (21,776 ft²) site with an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) designation at 7311 No. 5 Road. The site is zoned "Agriculture (AG1)", and is currently vacant as the previous dwelling was removed.

The site will not require a rezoning as the proposed use conforms to the existing "Agriculture (AG1)" zoning.

A Staff Report was reviewed by Development Permit Panel at the meeting on July 13, 2016 (Attachment 2) and the application was referred back to staff. In response to the referral, the applicant has revised the proposal to relocate the septic field, house and garage, and has reduced the paved area to lessen the impact to the ESA. The revised site plan and landscape plans are provided in the Development Permit plans that accompany this report.

Background

The following referral motion was carried at the July 13, 2016 Development Permit Panel meeting:

"That DP 16-727168 be referred back to staff to work with the applicant to consider redesigning the proposed development in order to lessen its impact to the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) within the subject site."

This supplemental Staff Report provides the response to the referral, a summary of the revisions made to the development proposal, and presents the revised Development Permit that staff are recommending for issuance.

Development Information

Please refer to this Staff Report and the revised Development Permit plans that accompany this report for information regarding the modifications made to the proposal in order to address the Development Permit Panel's referral motion.

Please refer to the original Staff Report dated June 21, 2016 (Attachment 2) for information pertaining to surrounding development, zoning compliance, site planning issues, and the analysis of the arborist report.

The revised landscaping submission takes into account a revised biologist report and landscaping plan (Keystone Environmental report dated November 7, 2016).

Analysis

Revisions to the House and Garage Siting

In response to the Panel's recommendation to redesign the proposed development in order to lessen its impact to the ESA, the applicant has modified the design as follows:

- The port cochere has been removed from the front of the house.
- The septic field has relocated out of the ESA to the maximum extent possible leaving an encroachment into the ESA of 9.7 m^2 .
- Septic tanks in the front yard setback will be buried entirely below ground. These tanks are integral to the system allowing the sewage material to begin breaking down before being pumped out to the septic field.
- The relocated septic field and septic tanks have been reviewed and approved by Vancouver Coastal Health.
- The garage, which was previously located at the rear of the house, has now been reduced in size and relocated to the front of the house.
- The area of paving stones reduced at the rear of the house to avoid encroachment into the ESA.
- The house will be pulled slightly westward to accommodate the new garage location at the front of the house.
- The house and permeable surfaces now encroach into the ESA by 30.6 m^2 .

These modifications will reduce the encroachment into the ESA from 300 m² (3,229 ft²) as originally proposed to 40.3 m² (434 ft²) reducing the encroachment into the ESA by approximately 259.7 m² (2,795.4 ft²) from the initial proposal.

Landscape Modifications

The revised landscaping and enhancement plans provide for:

- Installation of a protective fence and sediment control measures around the entire edge of the ESA during construction.
- No storm water discharges into the ESA unless approved by the City.
- Removal of invasive species; (i.e. Himalayan Blackberry and Japanese Knotweed).
- Landscaping at the side and front of the house is excluded from the ESA compensation required.
- Total compensation/enhancement planting of 80.6 m² (867.57 ft²); with a selection of native plants and trees for an enhancement planting ratio of 2:1.

Modifications to the Development Permit Considerations

Given the significant reduction to the ESA encroachment the Development Permit Considerations have also been revised as follows:

• Receipt of a Letter of Credit for landscaping and monitoring by the owner over a one-year period in the amount of \$2,080.38 inclusive of a 10% contingency. The original monitoring

requirement was for a three-year period but is reduced as the amount of compensation is now much smaller and does not warrant the extra monitoring.

- Submission of an acceptable tree removal permit and replacement securities for removal and replacement of four (4) off-site trees on the neighbouring lot as identified in the Arbourtech Consulting report dated February 16, 2016. (No change from the original requirement).
- Submission of proof that protective fencing has been installed to protect the remaining ESA. (No change from the original requirement).
- Registration of an agreement on Title ensuring that the environmental enhancements will be maintained and not removed. (No change from the original requirement).

Conclusions

In response to the Development Permit Panel's referral, the design and location of the house, garage, paving stones and septic tank have been adjusted; resulting in a much reduced encroachment into the Environmentally Sensitive Area on this property.

The proposed single-family dwelling development conforms with the intent of the Development Permit Guidelines of the Official Community Plan (OCP) and meets the zoning requirements under the "Agriculture (AG1)" zone. Staff recommend that the Development Permit be issued.

David Brownlee Planner 2 (604-276-4200)

DCB:blg

The following are to be met prior to forwarding this application to Council for approval:

- Receipt of a Letter of Credit for landscaping and monitoring over a one-year period in the amount of \$2,080.38 inclusive of a 10% contingency.
- Submission of an acceptable tree removal permit and replacement securities for removal and replacement of four (4) off-site trees on the neighbouring lot as identified in the Arbourtech Consulting report dated February 16, 2016.
- Submission of proof that protective fencing has been installed to protect the remaining ESA.
- Registration of an agreement on Title ensuring that the environmental enhancements will be maintained and not removed.

November 9, 2016

Prior to future Building Permit issuance, the developer is required to complete the following:

- The applicant is required to obtain a Building Permit for any construction hoarding associated with the proposed development. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a street, or any part thereof, or occupy the air space above a street, or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For further information on the Building Permit, please contact Building Approvals Department at 604-276-4285.
- If applicable, submission of a construction traffic and parking management plan to the satisfaction of the City's Transportation Department (<u>http://www.richmond.ca/services/ttp/special.htm</u>).
- If applicable, payment of latecomer agreement charges associated with eligible latecomer works.



Number of Units:

Development Application Data Sheet Development Applications Department

1

DP 16-727168		Attachment 1
Address: 7311 No. 5 Road		
Applicant: Pritam Samra	Owner	Pritam Samra and Baljit Samra
Planning Area(s): East Richmond		,
Floor Area Gross: <u>590.34 m² (6,35</u> 2	2.2 ft ²)	
	Existing	Proposed
Site Area:	2,023 m ²	Same
Land Uses:	Agriculture	Same
OCP Designation:	Agriculture	Same
Zoning:	Agriculture (AG1)	Same

0 (previous SFD removed)

	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.6 FAR	0.3	none permitted
Lot Coverage:	No Maximum	34.1%	None
Setback – Front Yard:	Min. 6.0 m	More than 6.0 m	None
Setback – Side Yard:	Min. 1.2 m	1.2 m	None
Setback – Side Yard:	Min. 3.0 m	3.65 m	None
Setback – Rear Yard:	Min. 6.0 m	More than 6.0 m	None
Height (m):	Max. 10.5 m and 2.5 storeys	9.2 m	None
Lot Size:	820 m ²	2,023 m ²	None
Flood Construction Elevation	2.9 m GSC	2.475 m GSC	None
Total off-street Spaces:	2.0	4.0	None



Report to Development Permit Panel

To: Development Permit Panel

From: Wayne Craig Director of Development
 Date:
 June 21, 2016

 File:
 DP 16-727168

Re: Application by Pritam Samra for a Development Permit at 7311 No. 5 Road

Staff Recommendation

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of a single-family dwelling with a detached garage on a site with an Environmentally Sensitive Area designation at 7311 No. 5 Road, on a site zoned Agriculture (AG1).

Wayne Craig

Director of Development

DCB:blg

Staff Report

Origin

Pritam Samra has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to develop a single-family dwelling with a detached garage at 7311 No. 5 Road on a 2,023 m² (21,776 ft²) site with an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) designation at 7311 No. 5 Road. The site is zoned "Agriculture (AG1)", and is currently vacant as the previous dwelling was removed.

The site will not require a rezoning as the proposed use conforms to the existing "Agriculture (AG1)" zoning.

Development Information

The development proposal involves the construction of a single-family dwelling with a detached garage and a new driveway. The front 50 m of the site are proposed to be filled to accommodate the 590.34 m² (6,352.2 ft²) house and to address the flood construction elevation requirements. A separate soil fill application is not required where the area of fill is less than 0.2 ha. The rear portion of the lot will be retained at the existing grades, but replacement and upgrading of the existing septic field will encroach into the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) which currently covers approximately half of the site (985 m²).

A detailed report by Keystone Environmental (report dated Jun 8, 2016) indicates that the development project will result in identifiable negative impacts to the environmentally sensitive features on the site over an area of approximately 300 m². A mitigation/compensation plan to address the proposed encroachment is outlined later in this report.

Please refer to the attached Development Application Data Sheet (Attachment 1) for a comparison of the proposed development data with the relevant bylaw requirements.

Background

Development surrounding the subject site is as follows:

- To the north and south: Lots of similar size (approximately 1,656 m² to 2,023 m²) all zoned Agriculture (AG1) and containing single-family dwellings.
- On the east side of No. 5 Road: are large (typically 13,100 m² to 30,400 m² sized lots) zoned Agriculture (AG1). These lots are either farmed or tree covered.
- To the west: A heavily treed, 20 m wide, un-opened roadway designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA). West of that are large farmed lots (typically 2.73 ha [6.74] in size) zoned "Agriculture (AG1)".

Rezoning and Public Hearing Results

Rezoning is not required for this application as the use conforms to both the Official Community Plan and the existing Agricultural (AG1) zoning.

Staff Comments

The proposed scheme attached to this report has satisfactorily addressed the Environmentally Sensitive Area issues and other staff-comments identified as part of the review of the subject Development Permit application.

Zoning Compliance/Variances

The application is in compliance with both the "Agriculture" land use designation in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and to the site's "Agriculture (AG1)" zoning designation. No variances are being requested through this application.

Analysis

Site Planning Issues

The applicant proposes to raise the front of the property slightly above the grade of the adjacent properties to the north and south and a retaining wall system and storm drainage will be required as part of the Building Permit plan submission.

The house, detached garage and driveway are all accommodated within the 50 m maximum setback from No. 5 Road as per the Agriculture (AG1) zone. Compensation planting will be provided.

Arborist Report

An Arborist Report prepared by Arbortech Consulting (report dated February 16, 2016) indicates the presence of 10 bylaw-sized trees on the site and in the vicinity of the proposed residential construction. All of these trees are European Birch species. The report notes that nine (9) of the 10 bylaw-sized trees have pre-existing defects, health constraints, or are considered hazardous and the Arborist has recommended that all nine (9) trees be removed and replacement trees be provided. The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has concurred with the Arborist's assessment and has noted that the Birch trees have bronze birch borer infestations which have made these trees unsuited for retention.

The Arborist Report also notes that four (4) European Birch trees on the adjacent site to the south are within "influencing distance of the project". These trees have been assessed as in "poor condition". The report recommends that these trees also be removed, subject to the adjacent owner's permission. The applicant has indicated that the adjacent owner has agreed to have these trees removed and the applicant will make an application for tree removal and replacements. A requirement is included in the Development Permit Considerations for submission of an acceptable tree removal permit and replacement securities. The trees must be retained if authorization is not obtained from the adjacent owners.

Biologist Report

An Environmentally Sensitive Area assessment and planting plan was prepared by Keystone Environmental for the site (report dated June 8, 2016).

The report indicates that approximately 49% (985 m²) of the site is currently designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA). Detailed ground-truthing by Keystone Environmental indicates that the actual area of sensitive habitat on site (after accounting for invasive species

June 21, 2016

encroachment and prior impacts from the single family use) is approximately 746 m². The proposed development will encroach into this remaining ESA by approximately 300 m² in order to accommodate the placement of the house, driveway and the septic field. The total ESA area to be retained will be approximately 440 m².

The required compensation planting plan includes approximately 295 native shrubs and 22 trees. The replacement trees include four (4) Paper Birch, two (2) Shore Pine, three (3) Black Hawthorn, and 13 Western Red Cedar. The proposed replacement planting will exceed the Official Community Plan 2 for 1 ratio and will also address a prior tree removal permit replacement requirement of three trees.

The proposed landscaping plan shows that the majority of the planting will occur at the rear of the site supplemented by new planting along the northern property line and the property frontage adjacent to No. 5 Road. Removal of invasive species such as Himalayan Blackberry and Japanese Knotweed are also contemplated in the enhancement plan. The planting report indicates that the total area proposed for planting will be 310 m^2 exceeding the area of encroachment by approximately 10 m^2 . The proposed ESA response aims to improve the quality of the habitat at this site by retaining higher value vegetation, removing undesirable invasive vegetation and planting enhancement aimed at diversifying the mix of native plants and making the habitat better suited to a wider variety of birds and animals.

The biologist's report outlines a monitoring and maintenance package for both the construction period and post construction that will allow the owner to properly maintain and allow the new plantings to establish. The report recommends an ongoing environmental monitoring period of three years; with annual reporting to the City during that period. Keystone reports that the cost for the plant materials, installation and three years of monitoring will amount to \$5,713.75 The Development Permit Considerations include requirements submission of a landscape security in the amount of \$6,285.13 (including a 10% contingency), submission of a contract with a Qualified Environmental Professional to undertake the three years of monitoring and registration of a legal agreement to ensure that the ESA planting is not removed.

Conclusion

Staff recommend support for the Development Permit application as the proposed planting compensation and enhancement plan adequately addresses and offsets the anticipated impacts to the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) features on the subject site.

David Brownlee Planner 2 (604-276-4200)

DCB:blg

The following are to be met prior to forwarding this application to Council for approval:

• Receipt of a Letter-of-Credit for landscaping and monitoring over a 3 year period in the amount of \$6,285.13.

June 21, 2016

- 5 -

- Receipt of a contract with a Qualified Environmental Professional to undertake the 3 year monitoring as outlined in the report by Keystone Environmental dated June 8, 2016.
- Submission of an acceptable tree removal permit and replacement securities for removal and replacement of four (4) off-site trees on the neighbouring lot as identified in the Arbourtech Consulting report dated February 16, 2016.
- Submission of proof that protective fencing has been installed to protect the ESA as indicated on the Planting Plan (Plan #2).
- Registration of an agreement on Title ensuring that the Environmental enhancements will be maintained and not removed.

NOTE: staff to ensure that landscape estimates include a 10% contingency cost.

Prior to future Building Permit issuance, the developer is required to complete the following:

• The applicant is required to obtain a Building Permit for any construction hoarding associated with the proposed development. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a street, or any part thereof, or occupy the air space above a street or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For further information on the Building Permit, please contact Building Approvals Department at 604-276-4285.

• Submission of a construction traffic and parking management plan to the satisfaction of the City's Transportation Department (<u>http://www.richmond.ca/services/ttp/special.htm</u>).

• If applicable, payment of latecomer agreement charges associated with eligible latecomer works.



Development Application Data Sheet

Development Applications Department

Attachment 1

DP 16-727168

Address: 7311 No. 5 Road

Applicant: Pritam Samra

Owner: Pritam Samra and Baljit Samra

Planning Area(s): East Richmond

Floor Area Gross: <u>590.34 m² (6,352.2 ft²)</u>

	Existing	Proposed
Site Area:	2,023 m ²	Same
Land Uses:	Agriculture	Same
OCP Designation:	Agriculture	Same
Zoning:	Agriculture (AG1)	Same
Number of Units:	0 (previous SFD removed)	1

	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.6 FAR	0.3	none permitted
Lot Coverage:	No Maximum	34.1%	None
Setback – Front Yard:	Min. 6.0 m	More than 6.0 m	None
Setback – Side Yard:	Min. 1.2 m	1.2 m	None
Setback – Side Yard:	Min. 3.0 m	3.65 m	None
Setback – Rear Yard:	Min. 6.0 m	More than 6.0 m	None
Height (m):	Max. 10.5 m and 2.5 storeys	9.2 m	None
Lot Size:	820 m ²	2,023 m ²	None
Flood Construction Elevation	2.9 m GSC	2.475 m GSC	None
Total off-street Spaces:	2.0	, 4.0	None



Development Permit

		No. DP 16-727168
To the Holder:	PRITAM SAMRA	
Property Address:	7311 NO. 5 ROAD	
Address:	7311 NO. 5 ROAD RICHMOND, BC V6Y 2V2	

- 1. This Development Permit is issued subject to compliance with all of the Bylaws of the City applicable thereto, except as specifically varied or supplemented by this Permit.
- 2. This Development Permit applies to and only to those lands shown cross-hatched on the attached Schedule "A" and any and all buildings, structures and other development thereon.
- 3. Subject to Section 692 of the Local Government Act, R.S.B.C.: buildings and structures; off-street parking and loading facilities; roads and parking areas; and landscaping and screening shall be constructed generally in accordance with Plans #1 to #2 attached hereto.
- 4. Sanitary sewers, water, drainage, highways, street lighting, underground wiring, and sidewalks, shall be provided as required.
- 5. As a condition of the issuance of this Permit, the City is holding the security in the amount of \$6,285.13 to ensure that development is carried out in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Permit. Should any interest be earned upon the security, it shall accrue to the Holder if the security is returned. The condition of the posting of the security is that should the Holder fail to carry out the development hereby authorized, according to the terms and conditions of this Permit within the time provided, the City may use the security to carry out the work by its servants, agents or contractors, and any surplus shall be paid over to the Holder. Should the Holder carry out the development permitted by this permit within the time set out herein, the security shall be returned to the Holder. The City may retain the security for up to three years after inspection of the completed landscaping in order to ensure that plant material has survived.
- 6. If the Holder does not commence the construction permitted by this Permit within 24 months of the date of this Permit, this Permit shall lapse and the security shall be returned in full.

Development Permit No. DP 16-727168

To the Holder:PRITAM SAMRAProperty Address:7311 NO. 5 ROADAddress:7311 NO. 5 ROADRICHMOND, BC V6Y 2V2

7. The land described herein shall be developed generally in accordance with the terms and conditions and provisions of this Permit and any plans and specifications attached to this Permit which shall form a part hereof.

This Permit is not a Building Permit.

AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION NO. DAY OF ,

ISSUED BY THE COUNCIL THE

DELIVERED THIS DAY OF

MAYOR





7 168

g

201

ŝ

-

Ľ

16-7

Q.

2







6-727168

down -



anned and the second \sim -----



5 - \sim 2 \sim -----



Development Permit

		No. DP 16-727168
To the Holder:	PRITAM SAMRA	
Property Address:	7311 NO. 5 ROAD	
Address:	C/O 7311 NO. 5 ROAD RICHMOND, BC V6Y 2V2	

- 1. This Development Permit is issued subject to compliance with all of the Bylaws of the City applicable thereto, except as specifically varied or supplemented by this Permit.
- 2. This Development Permit applies to and only to those lands shown cross-hatched on the attached Schedule "A" and any and all buildings, structures and other development thereon.
- 3. Subject to Section 692 of the Local Government Act, R.S.B.C.: buildings and structures; off-street parking and loading facilities; roads and parking areas; and landscaping and screening shall be constructed generally in accordance with Plans #1 to #2 attached hereto.
- 4. Sanitary sewers, water, drainage, highways, street lighting, underground wiring, and sidewalks, shall be provided as required.
- 5. As a condition of the issuance of this Permit, the City is holding the security in the amount of \$2,080.38 to ensure that development is carried out in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Permit. Should any interest be earned upon the security, it shall accrue to the Holder if the security is returned. The condition of the posting of the security is that should the Holder fail to carry out the development hereby authorized, according to the terms and conditions of this Permit within the time provided, the City may use the security to carry out the work by its servants, agents or contractors, and any surplus shall be paid over to the Holder. Should the Holder carry out the development permitted by this permit within the time set out herein, the security shall be returned to the Holder. The City may retain the security for up to three years after inspection of the completed landscaping in order to ensure that plant material has survived.
- 6. If the Holder does not commence the construction permitted by this Permit within 24 months of the date of this Permit, this Permit shall lapse and the security shall be returned in full.

To the Holder: PRITAM SAMRA

Property Address: 7311 NO. 5 ROAD

Address:

C/O 7311 NO. 5 ROAD RICHMOND, BC V6Y 2V2

7. The land described herein shall be developed generally in accordance with the terms and conditions and provisions of this Permit and any plans and specifications attached to this Permit which shall form a part hereof.

•

This Permit is not a Building Permit.

AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION NO. DAY OF , .

ISSUED BY THE COUNCIL THE

.

DELIVERED THIS DAY OF

MAYOR





	O6 M 200 200 RE-ISSUED FOR DP O5 0.200 SSUED FOR DP O4 11200 FOR REVIEW O3 11200 FOR REVIEW O2 0220 FOR REVIEW O2 0220 FOR REVIEW O1 16 1000 FOR DF FOR DP 01 16	کل کل کل کل کل کل	SUITE 215 - 12150 AV B 0 1 h - A v * o o Surrey, B, C, V3W 0V 7 7 8 - 891 0167 - je sgubri@yaho.ce	
REY DATE DESCRIPTION	BY REV DATE DESCRIPTION	BY	DO NOT SCALE THE DRAWIN	7

LEGAL DESCRIPTION LOT 139, SEC. 13 , BLOCK 4 NORTH RANGE 6 WEST NWD PLAN 32652 PID-006-690-114	PRPOSED AVERAGE GRADE ANALYSIS: FINISHED LOT GRADE CALCULATIONS: NH CORNER OF PROPERTY: EL.2.IIM NE CORNER OF PROPERTY: EL.2.IIM SH CORNER OF PROPERTY: EL.2.IIM
CIVIC ADDRESS 7311 NO. 5 ROAD, RICHMOND, BC SITE RECONCILIATION SITE AREA : 2028 SQ.M ZONING : AGI FAR PROPOSED: 5,470.00 SQ.FT. (504.65 SQ.MT.) EXTERIOR COVERS: 633.00 SQ.FT. GARAGE ACTUAL: 630 SQ.FT. (58.52 SQ.MT.) BUILDING HEIGHT = MAX. 105m OR 2.5 STOREYS PROPOSED 9,65m OR 31'-68% LOT COVERAGE = MAX. 35% PROPOSED 34.10%	SE CORNER OF PROFERTY. EL.2.11M TOTAL : EL.3.44M AVERAGE GRADE EL FOR PROFERTY. EL.2.11M FINSHED KOJEG GRADE CALCULATIONS. INI CORNER OF PROFERTY. EL.2.40M SI CORNER OF PROFERTY. EL.2.40M SI CORNER OF PROFERTY. EL.2.40M TOTAL : EL.11.5M AVERAGE GRADE EL FOR PROFERTY. EL.2.40M AVERAGE GRADE EL FOR PROFERTY. EL.2.40M AVERAGE GRADE EL FOR PROFERTY. EL.2.40M
GENERAL NOTES:	

ALL CONSTRUCTION TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CURRENT EDITION OF THE B.C. BUILDING CODE AND ALL OTHER LOCAL CODES AND BYLAVE OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND
 THE CONTRACTOR AND ALL SUB TRADES ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REVIEW OF ALL DRAWINGS AND SITE CONDITIONS FRIOR TO START OF ANY MORK OR ORDERING OF MATERIALS, AND SHALL REPORT ANY PROPOSED REVISIONS, OR ANY ERRORS OR DISCREPANCIES, TO MSO DESIGN INHEDIATELY,
 ALL CONCRETE TO BE PLACED ON FIRM, UNDISTURBED SOIL, FREE OF ANY LOOSE, ORGANIC OR FROSTY MATERIA

ALL CONCEPTIAL.
 ALL CONCEPTIAL.
 STING OF BUILDINGS MUST BE VERIFIED BY A LEGAL LAND SURVEYOR PRIOR TO FLACING ANY CONCRETE, AND MUST BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL LOCAL. BY-LANS AND REGULATIONS.
 ALL TRUSSES TO BE PRE-ENGINEERED, AND SPANS AND DETAILS VERIFIED BY THE TRUSS SUPPLIER ON SITE PRIOR TO ANY FABRICATION.
 DRAWINGS AKE NOT INTENDED TO BE SCALED, AND LARGE SCALE DRAWINGS TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER ENGINE SCALE DRAWINGS.

DRAVINGS ARE NOT INTENDED TO BE SCALED, AND LARGE SCALE DRAVINGS TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER SMALLER SCALE DRAVINGS.
 MISS DESIGN MUST BE GIVEN FULL ACCESS TO ALL THE WORK IN PROGRESS
 THE CONTRACTOR SHALL SUPPLY TIREEE COPIES OF ALL SHOP DRAVINGS TO THE ARCHITECTURAL CONSULTANT FOR REVIEW.
 ALL ROOF SPACES SHALL BE VENTILATED WITH SOFFIT AND ROOF VENTS. SEE THE ROOF PLAN AND THE 2012 BUILDING CODE SECTION 4141. THE VENTILATION MUST BE DISTRIBUTED WITH A MINIMUM 25 % AT THE TOP O'H THE ROOF, AND 25 % AT THE EAVES
 DOOR FRAMES TO OPENINGS FOR ENTRANCE AND EXTERIOR DOORS TO DIVELLING WITS AND DOORS INTERCOMENT DWITT AND TATACHED GARGES GHALL DE SQUIDY ELLOCKED BETWEEN THE DOOR

BETWEEN DWELLING UNITS AND ATTACHED GARAGES SHALL BE SOLIDLY BLOCKED BETWEEN THE DOOR FRAME AND THE FRAMING AT THE HEIGHT OF THE DEADBOLT AS TO RESIST SPREADING BY THE WAY OF

HATTE AND THE FRAMING AT THE REGISTION THE DEALDOLT AS TO RESIST SPREADING BY THE WAT OF FORCE FORCE II. ALL GLASS IN DOORS, OR SIDELIGHTS TO WELDED WIRE GLASS OR SAFETY GLASS.
II. ALL CLASS IN DOORS, OR SIDELIGHTS TO WELDED WIRE GLASS OR SAFETY GLASS.
II. ALL CHASS IN DOORS, OR SIDELIGHTS TO WELDED WIRE GLASS OR SAFETY GLASS.
II. ALL CHASS IN DOORS, OR SIDELIGHTS TO WELDED WIRE GLASS OR SAFETY GLASS.
II. ALL CHASS IN DOORS, OR SIDELIGHTS TO WELDED WIRE GLASS OR SAFETY GLASS.
II. ALL CHASS IN DOORS, OR SIDELIGHTS TO WELDED WIRE GLASS OR SAFETY GLASS.
II. ALL CHASS IN DOORS, OR SIDELIGHTS TO WELDED WIRE GLASS OR SAFETY GLASS.
II. ALL CHASS IN DOORS, OR SIDELIGHTS TO WELDED WIRE GLASS OR SAFETY GLASS.
II. STERENCE HALL DIMENSIONS IN PLAN ARE TO THE OUTSIDE FACE OF PLYWOOD SHEATHING OR TO THE OUTSIDE FACE OF FOUNDATION WALLS.
I. PROVIDE A MINIMUM OF TWO HOSE DIBS PER INIT, LOCATION TO BE DETERMINED BY THE DEVELOPER.
II. RAINWATER LEADERS ARE NOT SHOWN ON THE ELEVATIONS OR THE PLANS, LOCATION TO BE DETERMINED BY THE DEVELOPER.

THE DEVELOPER. 16. THE DIMENSIONS FOR U.P.O. CALCULATIONS ARE 2" SMALLER IN EACH DIRECTION FROM THE SIZES GIVEN ON

107115-27 A440.
24. ALL AIR BARRIER JOINTS ARE TO BE OVERLAPPED, SEALED & SECURED OVER STRUCTURAL MEMBERS.
25. INIDOMS ARE TO HAVE A MAXIMUM U VALUE OF 1.0.
26. SKYLIGHTS NEED TO MEET THE NEW ENERGY RATING OF U 2.9. SKYLIGHT SHAFTS ARE TO MEET THE NEW EFFECTIVE INSULATION LEVELS FOR THE WALL ASSEMBLIES.
27. THE ATTIC INSULATION LEVEL CAN BE TAPPED FOR A MAX OF 1.2M FROM THE EDGE OF THE OUTSIDE WALLS. HOMEVER THERE MIST BE A MIN. 200 VALUE AT THE JOINT OF THE TOP FLOOR WALL PLATES AND THE TRUSSES. TRUSS HEAL IS TO BE A MIN. 200 VALUE AT THE JOINT OF THE TOP FLOOR WALL PLATES AND THE TRUSSES. TRUSS HEAL IS TO BE A MIN. 200 VALUE AT THE JOINT OF THE INSULATION AND VENTILATION BAFFLES.
28. MATER TIPING MIST BE INSULATED FOR 2.0M ON BITHER SIDE OF THE HOT WATER TANK TO A MIN. OF AT LEAST FIRMS MIST BE INSULATED FOR 2.0M ON BITHER SIDE OF THE HOT WATER TANK TO A MIN. OF AT LEAST FIRMS MIST BE INSULATED FOR 2.0M ON BITHER SIDE OF THE HOT WATER TANK TO A MIN. OF AT LEAST 12MM THICK.

LEAST 12MM THICK. 29. PIPING OUTSIDE THE HEATED ENVELOPE MUST BE INSULATED TO NOT LESS THAN THE EFFECTIVE R-VALUE OF

PIPING OUTSIDE THE HEATED ENVELOPE MOST BE INSULATED TO NOT LESS THAN THE EFFECTIVE R-VALUE OF THE EXTERIOR HALLS.
 HEATED GARAGE REQUIRES NEATHER STRIPPED GARAGE DOOR.
 GASKETED ELECTRICAL BOXES REQUIRE THE INRESS INTO THE BOX BE SEALED.
 METAL CHIMEY'S ARE TO BE SEALED WITH HIGH TEMPERATIRE SEALANT AT THE VAPOR BARRIER LOCATION.
 HEATING AND AIR CONTINUOUS CONTINUOUS TO BE SEALED.
 HEATING AND AIR CONTINUOUS CONTINUOUS CONTINUOUS THE INC.
 HEATING AND CAR CONTINUOUS FANDISE DECOLOR THE STREED IN THE CONDITIONED SPACE UNLESS IT IS DESIGNED TO BE LOCATED OUTSIDE. DOCUMENTATION NILL BE REQUIRED IF IT IS PROPOSED TO BE OUTSIDE.
 HEATING AND CONTINUOUS TAY HUST BE LOCATED TO \$6,0354.
 THE PRINCIPAL VENTLATION FAN IS TO RUN CONTINUOUSLY. IT IS PREFERED THAT HE SHITCH FOR THE LOW SPEED IS LOCATED TO BE VENTLATED CONTINUOUSLY.
 BEDROCH'S ARE REQUIRED TO BE VENTLATED CONTINUOUSLY.
 A BEDROCH'S ARE REQUIRED TO BE VENTLATED CONTINUOUSLY.
 A BEDROCH'S ARE REQUIRED TO BE VENTLATED CONTINUOUSLY.
 A BEDROCH'S ARE REQUIRED TO BE VENTLATED CONTINUOUSLY.

94, BEURGOMS ARE REQUIRED TO BE VENTILATED CONTINUOUSLY 35, A 4* 80 GR A 6* FLEX DUCT IS TO BE TIED INTO THE RETURN A MIN, OF IO'-O' AND A MAX, OF IS'-O' FROM THE FURNACE. 36, THE FURNACE FAN IS TO RUN CONTINUOUSLY. 37, MIN, 60% OF HALL R VALUE IS REQUIRED BEHIND BEAMS IF THEY LAND ON AN OUTSIDE HALL. 36, ALL PUMPING FIXTURES ON EXTERIOR HALL TO HAVE MATER AND DRAIN LINES IN FLOOR, 34, AIR BARRIER SYSTEM ON INTERIOR OF HALL.



00

0

10000

S Ter and

_



-			-				-
			NSIDE				Ă
Fi	COMMON NAME Pacific Ninebark	LATIN NAME Physicalipus capitalus	SHRU COUNT S	POT SÚŽE Z gal	ECOLOGICAL Litter Inputs, shade value	VALUE	N
3		Comura algéoistora	17	2 gal	Fruit braiding, sloper stability		
\$	ted elderberry	Sanducus racemosa	13	ns, 3 pol	Fruit bearing, stade value		
R)	Salmonberry	Rutura aparciatităs	5	no, 3 pol	Fruit bearing, slope stability		
\$5)	Nootka rose	Rose notione	3	no. 3 pot	Litter Inputs, shade value		
20	Thinkleberry	Rubus parritionus	12	50 plugs	Shade value, nesting habits	at	
Ð	Hardback	Spiraea douglasi	17	1 gal	Utier Inputa, shade value		
is	Sala)	Gaultonia shallon	22		Utier Inputs, shade value		
3p)	Paper Binch	Setule papyefern	REE	no. 3 pol	Stade value, neršing habits	at	
D	Paper Birth	Beluia papyrifora	4	no. 2 pel	Shade value, nexting habits	at	
20)	Shore Line Fine	Olinuş cretorta	2	no. 3 pet	Erosion control and attracts	a bleda	
-	Weslem Red Coder	Thuja plicala	2	no. 3 pot	Shade volue, nesting habits	at	
Ip)		TOTAL	110				
							
		Ales 5.RD.			,		
	-	•				SITE PROPOSED BUTCHING OUTLINE WITTING ESA RAFA ESA ROPACTION MIRICE NICH MOR THEE PROVIDE ORF-ATTE THEE TO BE RAVOYED ORF-ATTE THEE TO BE RAVOYED DATE: 3/15/16	
-		Pritam Sar	nra			DATE 3/16/16 SHEET No. 1 of 1 PROJECT No.	-
	P	lanting l	Plan	1		12701-108 REVISION No.	-
						DRAWING No. 16-12701	-01
_			_		14.4		

168 Plan #2

16-72716

9



			Project Name
			SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING 7311- NO. 5 ROAD Richmond, B.C.
			Owner Pritay Sahra
	START DATE	JUNE 2015	
160 AVE.	PROJECT No.	2015-06	ELEVATIONS
V 3 W 0 V 3 1 6 7 - T	DR.	JG	
0,02 - 6	CH.	JG	g PROJECT No.
DRAWING	SCALE	AS SHOWN	a 06 2015-06 A301
DRAWING	SCALE	AS SHUWN	2013-00 A301



SECOND FLOOR AREA (IST FLOOR) 1 3402.20 50.FT. LESS 871.00 50.FT. TOTAL 2531.00 50.FT.

 06
 14 stp
 RE-ISSUED FOR DP

 05
 0 stp
 ISSUED FOR DP

 04
 17 2016
 RE-ISSUED FOR REVIEW

 03
 11 2018
 RE-ISSUED FOR REVIEW

 02
 01 256
 ISSUED FOR REVIEW

 02
 01 256
 ISSUED FOR DP

 01
 18 2016
 ISSUED FOR DP

 02
 01 256
 ISSUED FOR DP

 01
 18 2016
 ISSUED FOR DP

 02
 10 556
 ISSUED FOR DP
 JG JG JG JG SUITE 215 - 12160 80 th A ve Surrey, B.C. V3 778 - 891016 jasgabri@yahoo.0 JG JG REV DATE DESCRIPTION REV DATE DESCRIPTION BY DO NOT SCALE THE DI





rence Refe

6-727168

1 SECOND FLOOR LAYOUT

			Project Name SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING 7311- NO. 5 ROAD Richmond, B.C.	alla manga a
	START DATE	JUNE 2015	Owner Pritam Samra	
0 AVE. nue 3 W GV3	PROJECT No.	2015-06	SECOND-FLOOR	
3 W G V 3 7 - T ca - e	DR. CH.	JG JG	g PROJECT No.	
RAWING	SCALE	AS SHOWN	a 06 2015-06 A202	



MAIN FLOOR AREA (MAIN FLOOR),3, 401,00 50,FT. LESS GARAGE : 462,00 50,FT. TOTAL : 3,439,00 50,FT.

 06
 14 set 2016
 RE-ISSUED FOR DP

 05
 01 set 2016
 RE-ISSUED FOR DP

 04
 17 AUSRE-ISSUED FOR REVIEW

 03
 11 AUSRE-ISSUED FOR REVIEW

 02
 01 set 2016

 04
 17 AUSRE-ISSUED FOR REVIEW

 03
 11 AUSRE-ISSUED FOR DP

 01
 16 AUSR

 02
 01 set 2016

 01
 16 AUSR

 02
 01 set 2016

 03
 USEL

 04
 07 AUSRE

 05
 07 BUSR

 01
 16 AUSR

 01
 16 AUSR

 02
 01 SSUED FOR DP

 01
 16 AUSR

 02
 01 SSUED FOR DP

 03
 11 AUSR

 04 AUSR
 01 BUSR

 05
 01 BUSR

 05
 01 BUSR
 JG JG JG JG SUITE 215 - 121 SUTE 215 - 121 Surrey, B.C. 778 - 891 01 jasgabri@yahoo JG JG REV DATE DESCRIPTION BY BY DO NOT SCALE THE

NOTES : ALL BEAMS AND LINTELS 2-2 X 10 UNO. ALL BERROOT INNDONS AS TER BLELC, 9.410.1 ALL HAND RAILS AS TER BLELC, 9.410.1 ALL GUAR PAILS AS TER BLELC, 9.8.8 ALL STAR LARTS TO BE INTERCONTECTED A/C ATTIC HATCH TO BE ATTIC HATCH TO BE ALL SPARTAL SEPARTICHS AS TER BLELC, 9.0.15





MAIN FLOOR LAYOUT

			Project Name	
			SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING 7311- NO. 5 ROAD Richmond, B.C.	
			Owner PRITAM SAMRA	
	START DATE	JUNE 2015		
160 AVE.	PROJECT No.	2015-06	MAIN-FLOOR	
V 3 W 0 V 3 167 - T	DR.	JG		
00.ca - e	CH.	JG	g PROJECT No,	
E DRAWING	SCALE	AS SHOWN	ີ 06 2015-06	A201






Report to Development Permit Panel

To:	Development Permit Panel
From:	Wavne Craig

Director of Development

Date: November 14, 2016 File: DP 16-741981

Re: Application by Townline Gardens Inc. for a Development Permit at 10780 No. 5 Road

Staff Recommendation

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

- 1. Permit the construction of one (1) 10-storey residential building and three (3) 3-storey residential buildings at 10780 No. 5 Road on a site zoned "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) The Gardens (Shellmont)"; and
- 2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
 - (a) For the most westerly building (Building E1), increase the maximum height over a parkade structure from six (6) storeys and 25.0 m, to ten (10) storeys and 33.6 m; and
 - (b) For the most westerly building (Building E1), increase the allowable projection of unenclosed balconies into a side yard setback abutting the Agricultural Land Reserve, from a maximum of 0.9 m to 1.8 m.

Wayne Craig Director of Development

WC:hc Att.

Staff Report

Origin

Townline Gardens Inc. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to develop one (1) 10-storey residential building (Building E1 – 'The Dahlia') and three (3) 3-storey residential buildings (Building F1/F2/F3 – 'The Jasmine') all above an underground parkade. The development would have 180 housing units in total: Building E1 would have 157 apartment units; and Buildings F1/F2/F3 would have 23 townhouse units.

'The Gardens' is a mixed-use development located at the northeast corner of Steveston Highway and No. 5 Road that has occurred in Phases 1-3 (Attachment 1). Council approved the rezoning (RZ 08-0450659) for the overall development on July 25, 2011. 'The Gardens' site was rezoned from "Service Station District (G2)", "Botanical Garden District 1 (BG1)" and "Botanical Garden District 2 (BG2)" to "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) – The Gardens (Shellmont)" through Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 8532. The vision is a 'Garden City' with compact, transit-oriented development, pedestrian-friendly streetscapes and small shops and restaurants within a landscaped setting of common gardens including urban agriculture areas.

Significant requirements and contributions were secured at the time of rezoning that included:

- 12.2 acre 'Agricultural-Park' dedication and the park design;
- 5 % of total residential floor area as affordable housing units;
- A City-owned 37 space child care facility in an upgraded existing building;
- Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) setback and landscape buffer;
- Enhancement of an existing Riparian Management Area (RMA);
- On-site public art;
- Construction of a north-south and an east-west internal road; and
- Upgrades to the No. 5 Road frontage and existing infrastructure.

The "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) – The Gardens (Shellmont)" Zone permits development of the overall site up to a maximum density of 1.43 FAR, provided that commercial use does not exceed 9,000 m² and that residential use does not exceed 53,511 m².

The Development Permit (DP-10-544504) for Phase 1 was issued in 2011 and Buildings A and B along Steveston Highway are built. The Development Permit (DP-13-641796) for Phase 2 was issued in 2014 and Building D along No. 5 Road is under construction.

In June 2016, Council approved a Development Permit (DP 15-708397) for Phase 3 for two (2) eight-storey residential buildings (Building E1 – 'The Dahlia' and Building E2 – 'The Calla') and one (1) four-storey residential building (Building F – 'The Jasmine). This Development Permit includes two variances: one for building height and the other for projection of balconies into a side yard setback abutting an agricultural landscape buffer. Construction of Building E2 ('The Calla') will occur under DP 15-708397 and the issuance of a Building Permit is pending.

The applicant has applied for a new Development Permit (DP 16-741981) for the remainder of the site development (Building E1 - Dahlia' and Building F - Jasmine') through a revised

scheme that minimizes the number of housing units adjacent to the future Highway 99 road interchange. This would be achieved through replacing one (1) four-storey apartment building (Building F – 'Jasmine') with a cluster of three (3) three-storey townhouse buildings (Buildings F1/F2/F3 – 'Jasmine'). Additionally, the surplus floor area would be redistributed to Building E1 ('Dahlia') through an increase in height from eight storeys and 26.9 m to ten storeys and 33.53 m. A new variance is required to permit the proposed increased height, which exceeds the maximum six-storey (25 m) in the "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) – The Gardens (Shellmont)" Zone. A second variance is required for the projection of balconies into the agricultural landscape buffer, which is identical to the previously approved variance for Building E2 ('Calla') (DP 15-708397).

This proposal for Phase 3 is the fourth Development Permit for the overall development project.

Surrounding Development

North:	A 12.2 acre dedicated 'Agricultural Park' zoned "Agriculture and Botanical Show Garden (ZA3) – Fantasy Gardens (Ironwood)".
South:	Building A and Building B in Phase 1 of 'The Gardens' are immediately south of proposed Building E1, Building E2 and Building F across the traffic end point at the east end of the internal east-west shopping high street.
East:	Beyond the development site is Highway 99, separated from the development site by a tall, evergreen hedge (within the subject site) and a large drainage ditch (within the highway right-of-way). Properties to the east of Highway 99 are agricultural.
West:	Across No. 5 Road is an established, single-family neighbourhood with lots fronting No. 5 Road zoned "Single Detached (RS1/E)" and a townhouse project zoned "Low Density Townhouse (RTL4)" that fronts onto No. 5 Road.

Development Information

The proposal to develop one (1) mid-rise (10-storey) apartment building and three (3) low-rise (three-storey) townhouse buildings, is generally consistent with 'The Gardens' master plan that was presented to Council at the time of the rezoning (RZ 08-0450659). Vehicle access was provided to the site in Phase 1 of the overall development and includes a right-in only access from Steveston Highway, and a two-way access from the signalized intersection at No. 5 Road. Pedestrians enter the site from points along No. 5 Road and Steveston Highway and two (2) public paths which will eventually connect the overall subject site to the 'Agricultural Park'.

The attached Development Application Data Sheet (Attachment 2) provides a comparison of the proposed development data with the relevant Bylaw requirements.

Related Policies and Bylaws

Official Community Plan (OCP)

The subject site is designated as "Limited Mixed Use" in the Official Community Plan (OCP), and the proposal is consistent with the vision for the area as medium-density, mid-rise housing with limited commercial, industrial, office, institutional or community uses. This application also complies with Shellmont Area Plan "Ironwood Sub-Area" policies and design guidelines.

Flood Plain Designation and Protection (Bylaw 8204)

In accordance with the Flood Management Strategy, registration of a Flood Indemnity Covenant has been secured as a condition of the rezoning.

Affordable Housing Strategy

In accordance with the Affordable Housing Strategy, the applicant is required to provide 5% of total residential floor area as affordable housing units which for Phase 3 are 16 units in total. In the previously approved Development Permit application (DP 15-708397) for Phase 3, the applicant's proposal had the distribution of 16 units as follows:

- Buildings E1 and E2 together would have one (1) studio; one (1) accessible onebedroom; five (5) two-bedrooms: and six (6) three-bedrooms;
- Building F would have one (1) two-bedroom and two (2) three-bedrooms.

The current proposal is to redistribute the affordable housing units previously located in Building F as follows:

- Building E1 will have have one (1) accessible one-bedroom; six (6) twobedrooms; and five (5) three-bedrooms;
- Building E2 would have four (4) three-bedrooms (approved in DP 15-708397);
- Building F would have no affordable housing units.

The following is a chart that compares the current Housing Covenant and the proposed changes.

	Previous DP 15-708397	Current DP 16-741981
Studio	1	0
Accessible 1-Bedroom	1	1 (Building E1)
1-Bedroom	0	0
2-Bedroom	6	6 (Building E1 = 6)
3 Bedroom	8	9 (Building $E2 = 4$, Building $E1 = 5$),
Total area of units (ft ²)	14,260 ft ²	14,716 ft ²

The affordable housing units in Building E2 ('Calla') are unaffected by this proposal and the affordable housing units in Building E1 ('Dahlia') are identified in the interior plans for the current proposal (DP 16-741981). The existing Housing Covenant must be amended to redistribute the 16 units and this amendment is included in the Development Permit conditions. As the Housing Agreement would remain the same, it is not necessary to amend the Housing Agreement Bylaw.

OCP Accessibility Policy

The proposal includes 15 out of 16 affordable housing units that would meet basic universal access design requirements to be easily adaptable to accommodate a resident in a wheelchair. These single-storey units are required to incorporate all accessibility provisions in the Basic Universal Housing Features section of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500.

The proposed development includes one (1) barrier-free unit in Building E1 to be designed to be fully accessible at the time of construction for a resident in a wheelchair.

OCP Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

The development proposal will include standard CPTED features as articulated by the applicant in the Development Permit plans. For example, the size of the apartment buildings will ensure there are many sets of 'eyes on the street', and access to the underground parkade is restricted.

Public Art Program (Policy 8703)

Rezoning conditions for The Gardens included the provision of public art for all phases. Artist Joel Berman delivered two pieces for Phases 1 and 2. The remaining amount for Phase 3 was \$143,419, which was secured prior to the issuance of the previous Development Permit (DP 15-708397) through a Letter of Credit with a letter from the applicant that commits to the timeframe for the production and installation of public art.

Childcare Facility

In accordance with the rezoning conditions, registration of a legal agreement for the City-owned childcare facility was required prior to zoning bylaw adoption. The conditions of the earlier Phase 3 Development Permit (DP 15-708397) included the release and replacement of this agreement with a Restrictive Covenant (RC) to secure a construction agreement. The construction agreement has since been registered on title and includes plans, a budget and the completion and occupancy of the childcare facility, which must occur prior to occupancy of any Phase 3 building (DP 15-708397/ DP 16-741981).

Agricultural Landscape Buffer Zone and Maintenance Plan

The applicant is proposes no changes to the agricultural landscape buffer from the earlier Phase 3 application (DP 15-708397). Registration of a legal agreement for an Agricultural Landscape Buffer Zone and Maintenance Plan was also required as a condition of the rezoning. The legal

agreement terms required that the applicant provide a plan with the appropriate details for the buffer zone between the north property line of the subject site and the 'Agricultural Park'. Prior to the issuance of the previous Development Permit (DP 15-708397), the agreement was released and simultaneously replaced with a RC with the landscape plan and maintenance provisions and a Statutory Right-of-Way to allow for the City to maintain the buffer area in the event that the strata corporation does not fulfill legal obligations for maintenance. Costs for the landscaping plan were included in the landscaping estimate for the subject site and were a component of the landscaping security.

Riparian Management Area Landscape and Maintenance Plan

The current proposal does not include any changes to the Riparian Management Area (RMA) along the east edge of the subject site. At the time of rezoning, the conditions included the registration of a legal agreement for a RMA Landscape and Maintenance Plan, prior to the bylaw adoption. This required that the applicant engage a qualified environmental professional (QEP) to prepare a plan to enhance the RMA in the short-term and preserve and maintain the RMA over the long-term. The RMA is partially located along the east edge of the subject site and partially on the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) lands along the Highway 99 corridor. The applicant's QEP prepared the RMA plan, including the MoTI portion, and the applicant agreed to cover all costs for the works through security for the off-site improvements. Prior to the issuance of the previous Development Permit (DP 15-708397), the agreement was released and replaced with a registered RC with the RMA plan and a Statutory Right-of-Way to allow for the City to maintain the RMA should the strata corporation not fulfill the legal obligations for long-term maintenance.

Noise and CHMC Standards

Registration of a legal agreement for noise attenuation was required as a condition of the rezoning. As per its requirements, the applicant has provided an acoustical engineering report which assesses that the proposed apartment and townhouse designs for Phase 3 (DP 15-708397/DP 16-741981) will meet all of the applicable CMHC standards for mitigation of traffic-related noise. It should be noted that this report was based on the most recent available data for future conditions for Highway 99 as part of the George Massey Tunnel Replacement (GMTR) project.

Rezoning and Public Hearing Results

The Public Hearing for the rezoning application was held on October 19, 2009. While no objections to the proposed development were raised, some concerns were expressed about the traffic impact in the immediate vicinity. As a result, improvements were made in Phase 1 of 'The Gardens' to the Steveston Highway and No. 5 Road intersection and a new signalized intersection was introduced along No. 5 Road at the entry to the subject site.

Public Consultation

As The Gardens master plan vision at the time of rezoning was mid-rise buildings between four and six storeys, the applicant held an Open House on September 13, 2016, to gather feedback on the proposal primarily with respect to the height variance for the ten-storey apartment building.

The applicant has provided a report that summarizes the steps taken in the public consultation (Attachment 3) and the feedback results. As stated in this report, a Public Notice was sent to households within an identified mail-out area, and a survey was available at the event. There were 43 public participants at the Open House and six (6) individuals completed the survey: four (4) respondents indicated support and two (2) had concerns related to traffic circulation at the intersections of Highway 99 and Steveston Highway and Steveston Highway and No. 5 Road. Verbal comments included similar concerns about traffic conditions and noise impacts. Other feedback focused on the ten-storey apartment and ranged from support for creation of a dense urban environment to the visual prominence of the building as seen from the neighbourhood to the north and west, and the future park to the north.

Zoning Compliance/Variances

The proposed scheme attached to this report has satisfactorily addressed urban design issues and responded to staff comments in the review process for this Development Permit application. The proposal is generally consistent with applicable sections of the Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw 9000 and Schedule 2.8A – Shellmont Area – Ironwood Sub-Area Plan in the OCP Bylaw 7100 including site-specific design guidelines. Two (1) zoning variances are required as below.

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

(a) For the most westerly building (Building E1), increase the maximum height over a parkade structure from six (6) storeys and 25.0 m, to ten (10) storeys and 33.6 m.

Staff support the variance for building height because the relocation of residential floor area away from the future Highway 99 road interchange would significantly improve liveability for the more residents than the previous proposal. Additionally, the form and massing of Building E1 ('Dahlia') has been designed to minimize the visual impact of the increased height as seen from the internal high-street, the future park to the north, and the neighbourhood to northwest.

(b) For the most westerly building (Building E1), increase the allowable projection of unenclosed balconies into a side yard setback abutting the Agricultural Land Reserve, from a maximum of 0.9 m to 1.8 m.

This regulation is part of the zone to protect farm uses in the ALR. The adjacent lands are located within the ALR but are not farmed as the property is dedicated to the City as a park. Staff support the proposed variance because the projection of unenclosed balconies further into the north (side) setback would help to connect the occupants of the apartment units to the people and activities in the park, and thereby promote animation. The balcony projections into the side setback would have no adjacency or other negative impacts, given the dwelling units would be facing a park and not sensitive land uses (e.g. adjacent residential buildings).

Urban Design Response

Advisory Design Panel Comments

The Advisory Design Panel recommended support for this Development Permit application. A copy of the relevant excerpt from the Advisory Design Panel Minutes from October 19, 2016 is attached (Attachment 3). The design response from the applicant is included immediately following the specific Design Panel comments and is identified in '*bold italics*'.

Analysis

Conditions of Adjacency and Streetscape

The proposed design of Building E1 and Buildings F1/F2/F3 respect adjacent properties and neighbouring land uses to ensure urban design is well-suited to the site in the following ways.

- Buildings E1 would have some shadow impacts on the 'Agricultural-Park' and nearby neighbourhood to the northwest but these are limited to the winter months.
- The proposed development would not have a negative impact on public views from the 'Agricultural Park', looking south:
 - The increased height for Building E1 would not change the appearance of the building at eye level as seen from the future park. Also the larger step backs in building form of the north elevation and the choice of white for exterior finishes would serve to lighten the building's appearance.
 - Though the above-grade exterior of the parking roof deck would be visible along the north edges of the subject site, the 'blank wall' appearance would be softened through plantings in the Agricultural Buffer and trees in the front of Building F1.
- The views of Buildings F1/F2/F3 from Highway 99 would be somewhat screened from view due to the existing tall, evergreen hedge.
- The relationships between Buildings E1, E2 and F2/F3 would form a north streetscape:
 - Building E1 would complete the sense of enclosure with Building D along the internal road and the L-shaped mirroring of Buildings E1 and E2 would create the edges of an enclosed plaza between the two buildings.
 - The creation of three-storey brick veneer 'frame' along the south elevations of Buildings E1 and E2 would be complementary to the height of the commercial storeys along the north elevations of Buildings A and B. Together these four buildings would form the streetscape along an internal east-west retail street.
 - The three-storey height of Buildings F2 would complement the three-storey podium of Building E2 and their respective east/west elevations would add a sense of enclosure around the 'pedestrian mews'.

Site and Functional Planning

• This site is located at an important southern gateway to Richmond from Highway 99 where the vision for multi-storey (above a parkade structure) mixed-use commercial and

residential built forms spread throughout the site was intended to provide the genesis for a new neighbourhood along the north side of Steveston Highway.

- The original development vision included seven buildings all located on an internal eastwest 'high street' on top of the parking roof deck with apartments above ground-level commercial spaces. This pedestrian-scale retail street incorporates a variety of store frontages, a limited amount of surface parking, wide sidewalks, raised crosswalks, decorative paving and other special features intended to create an enjoyable pedestrian experience and to contribute to a vibrant 'urban village'.
- The proposed site plan for Buildings E1, E2 and F1/F2/F3 is generally consistent with the overall vision to create a vibrant, mixed-use, 'urban village'.
 - The public realm between Buildings E1 and E2 and between Building E2 and Building F2 would consist of high-quality gardens, courtyards, plazas, and the 'pedestrian mews' connecting to the 'Agricultural Park' with trees, shrubs, plantings, outdoor seating and viewing areas that are appropriately detailed.
 - The site orientation of Building F2 in relation to Building E2 would create a generous 'mouth' at the south edge of the pedestrian mews and the 'funnel' effect would encourage pedestrians to move toward the plaza at the north end of the mews and to cross over the 'grand staircase' and Agricultural Landscape Buffer and into the 'Agricultural Park'.
 - Interruption of the public realm at the vehicle entry point to the underground parkade, along the west elevation of Building E1, would be softened through extensive plantings along the road and the private patios.
 - Pedestrian connectivity would be further achieved through the completion of the sidewalk along the north side of the road between Buildings E1, E2 and F2/F3.

Parking and Loading

- In Phase 1, the applicant provided a parking study and proposed a suite of transportation demand management (TDM) measures that Transportation staff accepted as sufficient to support a 10% reduction in the on-site parking requirements for the overall development.
- All required commercial spaces for the overall development were provided in Phase 1, and these stalls are shared as unassigned residential visitor parking for Phases 1 and 2.
- Vehicle parking stalls for Phase 3 (DP 15-708397/DP 16-741981) are based on the 10% reduction in ratios for apartment, townhome and affordable housing spaces, small car stalls, accessible and visitor spaces and loading spaces.
 - It should be noted that ten (10) surface parking stalls to the north of Building F3 will be dedicated for the exclusive use of townhouse residents. Registration of a legal agreement on title for this purpose is required prior to Development Permit issuance.
- Class 1 and Class 2 bicycle parking facilities also comply with the Bylaw requirements:
 - All required visitor bicycle racks were provided in Phase 1;
 - Phase 3 bicycle storage units would be located in the bike pavilion/parking structure that will be reserved for the use of residents in Building E2 ('Calla') and Building E1 ('Dahlia'). A legal agreement to secure the proposed cross-access is required, prior to the subdivision of the subject site ('Lot 2') into separate parcels.

• Phase 3 vehicle parking stalls would be provided partly in the underground parkade, and partly in the above-ground bicycle pavilion/parking structure to the east of Building F3.

Architectural Form and Character

- One central principle in the design guidelines for Shellmont Area Ironwood Sub-Area is the 'pedestrian-first orientation' that would be achieved through the design as follows:
 - Buildings E1:
 - This ten-storey building would mirror the L-shaped Building E2, which together would form an enclosed plaza and gardens as described above.
 - Some units would have individual entrances and others would have patios that would connect the private and public realms.
 - The form and massing would be stepped back at the sixth storey on all elevations where the building would terrace back at the 7th-10th storeys. The six-storey base would create a sense of human-scale and progressively stepping back would further help to reduce the pedestrians' experience of the bulk, size and scale through the creation of a 'bottom, middle and top'.
 - Buildings F1/F2/F3:
 - Building F2 is sited at an angle to frame the 'pedestrian mews' and each unit has an angled façade which would connect the residents to the 'street' and complements the angled balconies along the east side of Building E2.
 - Garage entrances are blended with upper storeys through the continuity of materials, texture and colours.
- Although the architectural features and expression of Buildings E1 and E2 are distinct from Buildings F1/F2/F3, they are well-integrated with the overall development. The podium along the south elevation of Buildings E1 and E2 takes cues from the datum line of the commercial storey of Buildings A and B and the finishes and palettes on both sides of the retail street would be complementary.

Landscape Design and Open Space Design

- As part of the rezoning, the applicant was required to dedicate approximately 12.2 acres as an 'Agricultural Park' that will include trails, play areas, ponds, community gardens, horticultural and agricultural interpretive facilities in the various garden areas.
- Phase 1 and 2 provided a high quality of hard and soft landscape design, materials, detailing and furnishings. All soft landscape areas have an automatic irrigation system. Landscaping the internal road between Building D and E1 included 1.5 m wide boulevard planting strips with street trees and grass and 2.0 m wide sidewalks on both sides, which will also provide future pedestrian access to the 'Agricultural-Park'.
- Phase 3 landscaping would include the following:
 - The courtyard between Buildings E1 and E2 would have five zones: a large amenity garden with a simple sheet of lawn and water feature; a summer flower

garden; a children's play area; a covered outdoor dining area and large semiprivate patios for the units facing the common spaces.

• The pedestrian mews would have a linear path with textured concrete pavers in a charcoal colour alongside grasses and other plantings that would visually and physically connect the mews to the semi-private patios of Buildings E2 and F1/F2. Its south end would have a trellis structure with seating oriented to north, and way-finding to the staircase and ramp to provide universal access to the park.

- The bike pavilion has a green roof that would be accessible to townhouse residents as a common garden area.
- The Agricultural Landscape Buffer Area would have cedar hedging and a variety of thorny plantings that would serve as an effective barrier between the ALR buffer and the development site, while providing an attractive landscape strip when seen from the park and Buildings E1, E2 and F1/F2/F3.

It should be noted that the landscape architecture remains the same from the earlier Phase 3 application (DP 15-708397) except for the removal of the dog park in the northeast section of the site plan. This was removed to anticipate the future land expropriation tied to the GMTR project. However, the proposal remains consistent with the site-specific design guidelines to provide a 'garden setting' with extensive outdoor amenity spaces.

Conclusions

The proposed design is responsive to the City of Richmond's urban design objectives within the Ironwood Sub-Area of the Shellmont neighbourhood, and is generally consistent with the master plan that was presented to Council at the time of rezoning. The siting of the proposed buildings and their respective forms, massing and heights would complete the envisioned streetscapes and urban design pattern of the central spine (i.e. retail street) courtyards, gardens, a large plaza (i.e. the south end of the mews) and pedestrian connections to the 'Agricultural Park'. The proposed architectural styles, features and exterior finishes are also complementary to the mixed-use buildings on Steveston Highway, and the apartment building which faces No. 5 Road.

As the proposal would meet the design guidelines, staff recommend that the Development Permit be endorsed and issuance by Council is recommended.

Helen Cain

Helen Cain Planner 2 (604-276-4193)

HC:cas

Attachment 1: Context Plan for Phases of The Gardens Development Attachment 2: Data Sheet Attachment 3: Report for Public Open House on Phase 3 Development Permit with Variances, September 13, 2016, prepared by Townline Gardens Inc.

Attachment 4: Advisory Design Panel Minutes & Applicant Responses (inserted in bold italics)

The following are to be met prior to forwarding this Development Permit application to Council for approval:

1. Amendment of the existing CA5244228 and CA5244229 on Lot 2 in the Land Title Office, to provide the number of affordable housing units, together with their types, sizes (averages in Table 1; minimums in Table 2), and unit mix, to the satisfaction of the City according the following schedule:

Table	1
-------	---

Phase	Unit Type	No. of Units	%	Average Unit Size	Total Amount (ft²)
Phase 3 (Lot 2) Buildings E1	Studio	0	0%	n/a	n/a
	1 Bedroom	0	0%	n/a	n/a
	Accessible 1 Bedroom	1	8%	600	600
	2 Bedroom	6	50%	871	5,226
	3 Bedroom	5	42%	982	4,910
	Sub-Total	12	100%	-	10,736
Phase 3 (Lot 2) Building E2	Studio	0	0%	n/a	n/a
	1 Bedroom	0	0%	n/a	n/a
	Accessible 1 Bedroom	0	0%	n/a	n/a
	2 Bedroom	0	0%	n/a	n/a
	3 Bedroom	4	100%	995	3,980
	Sub-Total	4	100%	-	3,980

• rental rates and occupant income restrictions shall be in accordance with the City's Affordable Housing Strategy and guidelines for Low End Market Rental housing, according to the following schedule:

Table 2

Unit Type	Minimum Unit Sizes	Maximum Monthly Rent	Total Household Annual Income ^{1,2}
Bachelor	37 m2 (400 ft2)	\$850	\$34,000 or less
One bedroom	50 m2 (535 ft2)	\$950	\$38,000 or less
Two bedroom	80 m2 (860 ft2)	\$1,162	\$46,500 or less
Three bedroom	91 m2 (980 ft2)	\$1,437	\$57,500 or less

Notes:

¹ Denotes 2013 amounts adopted by Council on March 11, 2013.

- ² Household income may be increased annually by the Consumer Price Index.
- 2. Registration of a legal agreement on Lot 2 to secure the dedication of ten (10) surface parking stalls to the north of Building F3 for exclusive use of townhouse residents in perpetuity, to the satisfaction of the City.

*Prior to Building Permit Issuance, the developer must complete the following requirement

- 1. Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
- 2. 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.

*Prior to Subdivision, the developer must complete the following requirement

1. Registration of a legal agreement on Lot 2 to secure the access to the 'bike pavilion' for the exclusive use of residents of Building E1 and Building E2 in perpetuity, to the satisfaction of the City.

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 the issuance of the Development Permit.

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.

Signed

Date

ATTACHMENT 1





¢

Distanced police A-102



Development Application Data Sheet

Development Applications Department

DP 15-708397 Attachment 2 10780 and 10788 No 5 Road and 12733 Steveston Highway Address: Applicant: Townline Gardens Inc. Owner: Townline Gardens Inc. Planning Area(s): Shellmont Ironwood Sub-Area Floor Area Floor Area Net: 15,345 m² 18.010 m² Gross. Existing Proposed 17, 088 m² Site Area: 17, 088 m² Land Uses: Vacant Residential apartment **OCP Designation:** Limited Mixed Use No change "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) - The Zoning: No change Gardens (Shellmont)" 180 Number of Units: 180 **Bylaw Requirement** Proposed Variance 1.43 1.41 none permitted Floor Area Ratio: Max. 50% 25.0% Lot Coverage: n/a Setback - Front Yard (west): Min. 6.0 m 8.40 m (Building E1) n/a Setback - Rear Yard (east): Min. 6.0 m 11.60 m (Building E1) n/a Min. 6.0 m 6.10 m (Building E1) Variance Setback - Side Yard (north): Projection of 1.80 m for No projection into required setback abutting ALR unenclosed balconies Min. 3.0 m Setback - Side Yard (south): 7.60 m (Building E1) n/a Max. 25.0 m 33.53 m Variance Height (m): 6 storeys 10storeys required 17, 088 m² Min. 3,000 m² Lot Size: n/a 424 residential 431 residential Off-street Parking Spaces n/a Regular/Commercial: No commercial No commercial Off-street Parking Spaces -8 8 n/a Accessible: 424 431 Total off-street Spaces: n/a **Tandem Parking Spaces** 50% for townhouses 48% for townhouses n/a Min. 70 m² Provided in Phase 1 Amenity Space - Indoor: n/a

ATTACHMENT 3

TOWNLINE

120-13575 Commerce Parkway Richmond, BC, Canada V6V 2L1 Main 604 276 8823

www.townline.ca

November 14, 2016

Dear Helen,

RE: <u>Public Information Consultation Report</u>

Due to the potential impact of the proposed Massey Bridge and Highway 99 improvements, Townline Gardens Inc. submitted a new Development Permit Application (DP-741981) to the City of Richmond, which further improves the overall design in line with the vision of 'The Gardens' Master Planned Community. In order to address any concerns the public may have, Townline held a public information session on September 13th, 2016. The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of this session and the data obtained. Basic information on the session:

- South Arm Community Centre 6:00 to 8:00 pm
- 600 invitations sent out
 - o see appendix A for map of notice area, appendix B for copy of letter
- 2 half page advertisements were put in the Richmond News on Wednesday, September 7 and Friday, September 9 (see appendix C)
- 43 attendees
- 7 feedback forms handed in during the session (see appendix D)
- 1 feedback form emailed to Townline directly after the session (see appendix D)

Public feedback received both verbally during the information session and on the feedback forms was generally positive and supportive. A copy of these feedback forms are provided at the end of this report (see appendix D). Verbal comments were received on:

- Appreciation of design of Phase 3
- Appreciation for removing density away from the highway towards the centre of the Gardens Master Planned Community
- Appreciation for the Townhome Design
- One attendee, currently residing at phase 1 of the Gardens, shared a concern regarding the existing and future traffic congestion on Steveston Hwy and No. 5 Road
- General support for the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses.
- No shadow concerns considering the very minor additional impact of shadowing on the park
- Numerous concerns regarding the George Massey Tunnel Replacement project were voiced
- Councillor Day indicated the very positive public consultation process which was undertaken by Townline for the original rezoning of the Gardens Master Planned Community. Councillor Day expressed concerns regarding the proposed building height of one of the buildings and how it might impact the views from the single family community to the West of the Gardens. Councillor Day expressed severe concerns regarding the George Massey Tunnel Replacement Project and indicated that it was very unfortunate for Townline that the Ministry of Transportation was needing to expropriate a portion of the Phase 3 development

 Several comments were received from attendees who would like more information on purchasing one of the phase 3 homes.

Summary of responses to the questions in the feedback forms:

Question #1 – The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?

 Response summary: No concerns were indicated by 7 respondents. One respondent commented: "The original plans were exciting this is not"

Question #2 – The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of 12 noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?

 Response summary: No concerns were indicated by 7 respondents. Some of the comments were "not a big difference" – "minor additional impact". One respondent indicated a concern

Question #3 – One of the proposed buildings will be higher than currently allowed in the zone for The Gardens. Based on the public views of the building from different locations in nearby areas, as shown in the Open House boards, do you have any concerns about this increase in building height?

 Response summary: No concerns were indicated by 7 respondents. Some of the comments were "No it's minor" – "No problem with increase"- "Increasing building height and density will be trend in Richmond". One respondent indicated a concern.

Question #4 – As shown in the Open House Boards, the proposed townhouses would have tandem (front and back) parking for 21 of 23 units. Do you have any comments about parking arrangements?

Response summary: No concerns were indicated by 6 respondents. Some of the comments
were "Parking space enough should be ok" – "Parking should be fine"- "No I think it's reasonable
I live in one like that myself! Design is nice". Two respondents left the question blank.

Question #5 – Do you support the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses?

Response summary: Support was indicated by 6 respondents. Some of the comments were
 "Townline has done a great job on the project so far I am sure it will finish off nicely" – "One
 respondent does not support the new development considering they live in existing Gardens
 Phase 1" One respondent supports the townhomes but commented the 10 storey building is
 high.

Kind Regards,

Stefan Slot Development Manager - Townline 604-276-8823, ext 205

Appendix A: Map of notice area



Appendix B: Copy of notice letter



120-13575 Commerce Parkway Richmond, BC, Canada V6V 2L1 Main 604 276 8823 Fax 604 270 0854

www.townline.ca

August 29, 2016

Dear Neighbor,

RE: <u>Public Information Session</u> – Final Phase of 'The Gardens' Master Planned Community 10780, 10788 No. 5 Road and 12733 Steveston Highway

Earlier this year, Council approved the Townline Gardens Inc. Development Permit Application (DP-15-708397) for the final phase of 'The Gardens' Master Planned Community – former 'Fantasy Gardens', located on the corner of No. 5 Road and Steveston Highway.

Due to the potential impact of the proposed Massey Bridge and Highway 99 improvements, Townline Gardens Inc. has submitted a new Development Permit Application (DP-741981) to the City of Richmond, which further improves the overall design in line with the vision of 'The Gardens' Master Planned Community.

'The Gardens' Master Planned Community is located on the corner of Steveston Hwy and No. 5 Road.



Townline is cordially inviting you to a public information session to present the proposed design and seeks your feedback.

Where:	South Arm Community Centre
	8880 Williams Rd, Richmond
When:	September 13, 2016
Time:	6:00 – 8:00 pm

Please note that this is not a City of Richmond event however there will be a city planner present at the information session to answer general zoning and city process related questions.

For questions in advance of the public information session, please contact: Stefan Slot Development Manager - Townline 604-276-8823, ext 205

Appendix C: Copy of advertisement

lectrolique, Hao inheritud

his musical terms from both

parents who are also famous

singers. Tickets available at

A20 WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2015

ARTSin the City

Prepared by the Richmond Ads Coalition

Ealeway fixedm (6500 Gibort Road) presents ficeing Boeing Scipt. 8-10 in Castonase with English and Traditional Chrocks surfilles.

Ehina's newest amposing prodigy and winner of the first season of "Sing My Song ' Henry Hus will be at the River Fock Show Theatre (8811 River Read) on Sept. 9. Known for his crystal clear heating voice and vocal

Tickelmaster Sept. 11 The Charm of Postry on Sect. 11 at the River Rock Sept. 10 Many know Amy Wu as a Casino Resort is Vagcouver's familius Filong Kong Filon and stage artist, but she is also first neglouming arts show in which Charse poetry is the main theme. The show a famous opera singer who will be performing Sept. 10 at features many classic and modern pacity related to the River Rich Show Thealto, We seenved the "Women of Mid-Automs and the moon. Through the use of music, Distinction Award " issued dance and other forms of art. by The Using Kong Woman the show shoves to portray Development Association Limitad, Since 1990, her CD the open's theme as well as and audio visual needucts in

Hong Kong has accumulated saids over 10 platinum. For at Ticketmaster. lickets, call 604-617-8753. A Very Frozen Musical is A very reaction during a theorem (calculated b) character cast of the loo Queen, the fee Princers, and their frastie friend. Join them in the relating of this classic story as you sing-a-long with them to all your favoarile songs. Klos will get a chance to interact with the princesses during the show. After the show, every child VIP lickel will much with the principles for a photo opportunity and mont and greet. This show is based on the classic fairy tale The bringing astranding visuals to

the audience. Lickels on sale

Public Information Session Townline is cordially inviting you and seeks your feedback.

Earlier this year, Council approved the Townline Gardens Inc. Development Permit Application (DP-15-708397) for the final phase of 'The Gardens' Master Planned Community - former 'Fantasy Gardens', located on the corner of No. 5 Road and Steveston Highway.

Due to the potential impact of the proposed Massey Bridge and Highway 99 improvements, Townline Gardens Inc. has submitted a new

Development Permit Application (DP-741981) to the City of Richmond, which further Improves the overall design in line with the vision of 'The Gardens' Master Planned Community.

'The Gardens' Master Planned Community is located on the corner of Steveston Hwy and No. 5 Road.

Townline is cordially inviting you to a public information session to present the proposed design and seeks your feedback.

Where: South Arm **Community Centre** 8880 Williams Rd. Richmond When: September 13, 2016

Time: 6:00 - 8:00 pm

Please note that this is not a City of Richmond event however there will be a city planner present at the information session to answer general zoning and city process related questions.

For questions in advance of public information session, please contact: Stefan Slot **Development Manager - Townline** 604-276-8823, ext 205

Final Phase Area The Unidary' Mantas H.



Snow Queen written by Hans Christian Anderson and has no affiliation with Disney.

At the Stars and Foll

Moons and Lentern Making event at the City Centre Community Centre (5900 Minoru Boulevard) create a wi tay wowen star or moot or a unique lantern marle from local groon waste, salvaged and recycled materials to by used in the procession on the night of the Hawest Full Moon Colobration. This free, drop-in event raiss from 5:30 - 8:30 p.m. and is open to all ages.

Sept. 13

With six million dayshads in 2004 for the first single. Alice Love Rice, Ho Yana Chen Gang hirit: 25 ils musi calisaylings to the River Rock Show Theatre on Sept. 13. The song was not only translatest and sung in more than 10 different languages, it has also been covered by popular artists, most outably HK Pop due Twins in 2012. Ticknts available at Ticketmaster.

Sept. 15

If world-famous Indian ghazal singer Jagjit Singh were to share a bookah with No I Young, the result would be into-Folk Music That's what to expect when Ranj Singh porterms Sept. 16 al the Chinese Bunkhouse at Britannia Horitage Shipyard (5190 Westwater Drive) & presentation of the Sleveston Falk Guild, the owent starts at 7:30 p.m. For more, visit anlina stavestonfolk net

RICHMOND-NEWS.COM



Galenty Thashe Is a carina ty journey in A Paste of Cospite, Photo subjected

Sept. 15-17

Bateway Theatre presents A Taste of Empire in Cardonese with English and Simplified Chinese su ticles, Written and directed by Jovanni Sy: Translated and performed the Derek Chap it proces the ounstion "We are what we eat. But where does it com from? How does it and here? i's a wacky and fun culhary exploration of global food demination and the conquest for our annehiles. Everything. we eat tells a story. This show is not suitable for children under 12. Tickets: 255, at takels selewisthoalte.com

Esept. 15 Celebrato the Mid-Moon Festival at Brighouse Library (7700 Minnu Gate) Imm 5 5:30 p.m. in the Kowk-Chu Lee Living Room and 7 - 8:30 Jum, - In the Performance Hall. The event, presented in Mandaria, features pretry. reusic and clance event in celebration of the Mid-Moon Festival



STEVESTON GIRL SURVIVES

Having somehow survived not jast her childhood years in Hetla, Manitoba, but her teen years in Steveston, BC, Elin (nee Sigurgeirson) Rovi is proud to armunce the 65th Arniversary (Sept 7) of her marriage to Raymout Ross, originally of Revelstola, BC. Currently living to Nanáino, BC, they are, as ever, still madiy in love.



CONGRATULATIONS mom and dad: well done! Love, your family: Eric & Mandy & Lauren & Kimmy & Hannah & Trevor and Ian & Anne-Lise.

R: CHMONO-NEWS.COM

VOICES on Vocabulary

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2016 A27

Sutton

COMMETTED TO EXCELLENC

LuluklandHomes.com

Call us today to discuss the market value of your home!

The great nut divide

How the words hazelnut, walnut grew

SABINEEICHE In other words

As I watch politics get lization and flip the work: tapsy-turvy, 1 like to imaging haw maken simpler the present - the new --was for someone living in the first millennium.

A thousand years ago, when not obsessing about dely dangers, as Anglo-Sexon with a bartica tural hert might have thought about Britain as the hazelmit narth.

ite might not have been aware that seens where for to the south wats the land of the fore en nul.

The idea of associating cursolves with what errows amund us is appealing and seents mare respectful of the planet Earth than identifying with a po-

litical party or figurations. Latin and the Germanic langues had words for mat that ultimately ga back to the same Plate-Indo-European roat, "keten." "Nux" was what the

encient Romans called if The Sermanic tribes, tarb as the Angle Sax-pas, know it as "finatu." The pagement is the ford

of the brood from west time Old English word for # was "haselbrudu. When the ancient

Romens snoke of "nux" ("noce" in modern ItaSan) three were reletting to the a, which then great primarily in southern Europe and Asia.

They dismissed the hazelout as the little out, ni "elo:acen") "eloscun" runders Statian).

Almaugh the Romans, who established camps in northern Europa, are likely to have brought walnuts with them, the walnut tree is add receited as growing in Britain before tee 1681 century.

A thousand or so weats

oeb, an Anglo-Saxon What sew a out imported from the south identified it as a 'ealhauta' --- toreign out · by prefocing the Old English 'weath," foreign, to "hnuty"

The walnut stayed the foreign nul in many other notificin Europe languag usa "Walnuss" in Gor-man, "walnoot" in Dutch, 'valuat' in Norwegian. नगरों इन ईवर्षी.

At the time the Germanic Anglo Salions invaided Sinte n in the 5th century, the island was already inhabited by people known as the Cells

Nanetholess, to the consuming Angla-Saxons the Cell was deemed a "Weath," a foreigner, and "weath," is the word at five basis of the place names Wales and Costwall. It's also the origin of

Walloon (the people of southern Belgium and their dielect) and the family vames Wallace and Watsh Eventually, the English

used the adjective Welsh to convey the sense of infestor or substitutes a Welsh pearl was a take means Weish rabbit or tercipit has nothing to do with rabbit - it refers to a dish of toasted bread hallam a Aliw brievon cheese souce; a Welsh crickes was a buse and a Walshmen's hug was an itch.

Also the word nut slid down into the derogatory. In the 19th century and became equated with head, wading to such phrases as to be off your

ti tre By the early 20th contury, mit was used to de-scribe someone who was receiving, a screwhall, In 2016, nut found a noime candidate fac its derisive meaning in a

making headlines just I fervently hope this particular not will fall on afertile gipward and not end up defining half a onlinent. Sabine Eiclin Is a willer

and an instation (Mern bers.Shaw.ca/SEichel

Public Information Session Townline is cordially inviting you and seeks your feedback.

Earlier this year, Council approved the Townline Gardens Inc. Development Permit Application (DP-15-708397) for the final phase of 'The Gardens' Master Planned Community - former 'Fantasy Gardens', located on the corner of No. 5 Road and Steveston Highway.

Due to the potential impact of the proposed Massey Bridge and Highway 99 improvements, Townline Gardens Inc. has submitted a new

Development Permit Application (DP-741981) to the City of Richmond, which further improves the overall design in line with the vision of 'The Gardens' Master Planned Community.

'The Gardens' Master Planned Community is located on the corner of Steveston Hwy and No. 5 Road.

Townline is cordially inviting you to a public information session to present the proposed design and seeks your feedback.

Where:	South Arm
	Community Centre
	8880 Williams Rd, Richmond
	The first of the
When:	September 13, 2016

Time: 6:00 - 8:00 pm





Please note that this is not a City of Richmond event however there will be a city planner present at the information session to answer general zoning and city process related questions.

For guestions in advance of public information session, please contact: Stefan Slot **Development Manager - Townline** 604-275-8823, ext 205





Appendix D: Feedback forms recieved

5159781

The Gardens Phase 3: Public Open House, September 13, 2016

Feedback Form

Townline thanks you for coming. Please review our presentation materials before you complete this form. You are welcome to approach our staff with any questions. All comments are anonymous and will be shared with the City of Richmond.

Question #1 \perp The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?

0

Question #2 - The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of 12 noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?

Pup ain II a

Question #3 ¹/₁ One of the proposed buildings will be higher than currently allowed in the zone for The Gardens. Based on the public views of the building from different locations in nearby areas, as shown in the Open House boards, do you have any concerns about this increase in building height?

SIRAK

space enough.

arken

17

Question #5 – Do you support the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses?

Please provide other comments that you would like to share.

like see more higher 11 Mach

TOWNLINE

NO CONTERNS LOOKS FINE

The Gardens Phase 3: Public Open House, September 13, 2016

Feedback Form

Townline thanks you for coming. Please review our presentation materials before you complete this form. You are welcome to approach our staff with any questions. All comments are anonymous and will be shared with the City of Richmond.

Question #1 – The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?

Question #2 – The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of 12 noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?

NO CONCERNS AS WINTER TIME NOT OUTSIDE MUCH, WILL MORE LIGHTS BE PUT IN?

Question #3 – One of the proposed buildings will be higher than currently allowed in the zone for The Gardens. Based on the public views of the building from different locations in nearby areas, as shown in the Open House boards, do you have any concerns about this increase in building height?

NO CONCERNS



NO PARKING SHOULD BE FINS

Question #5 – Do you support the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses? YES Please provide other comments that you would like to share. MONE

TOWNLINE

The Gardens Phase 3: Public Open House, September 13, 2016

Feedback Form

Townline thanks you for coming. Please review our presentation materials before you complete this form. You are welcome to approach our staff with any questions. All comments are anonymous and will be shared with the City of Richmond.

Question #1 – The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?

ND. J THNE IT LODES GOD, AND WON'T RE VERM NOTICEARVE FOR MOUT PEDPLE. Question #2 - The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of 12 noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park? I THAK IT IS A MADE ADDI'L IMPACT NO.

Question #3 – One of the proposed buildings will be higher than currently allowed in the zone for The Gardens. Based on the public views of the building from different locations in nearby areas, as shown in the Open House boards, do you have any concerns about this increase in building height?

NO. IT IS MNDE

5159781

ND. J TIHME 17 15 FEADONABLE, J LIVE WORE LIKE THAT MUSELF! DELIGN 15 NICE Question #5 - Do you support the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses? YES. JOLNLINE 17AS A ELDA VONE Jos_ ON PROJECT SO FAL I AM SJE IT WILL FNISH THE OFF NICELU THE Y Please provide other comments that you would like to share. troop had comminy MEETING! Unes WITH IT. ' في FFT M

ΤΟ W N L I N E

THE

Deopl

MONT

10.015

do

05

The Gardens Phase 3: Public Open House, September 13, 2016

Feedback Form

Townline thanks you for coming. Please review our presentation materials before you complete this form. You are welcome to approach our staff with any questions. All comments are anonymous and will be shared with the City of Richmond.

Question #1 – The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?

would

Nor

No

unuch

erence.

sturner

Question #2 – The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of 12 noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?

SP

Question #3 – One of the proposed buildings will be higher than currently allowed in the zone for The Gardens. Based on the public views of the building from different locations in nearby areas, as shown in the Open House boards, do you have any concerns about this increase in building height?

of Azaleci i Maynolia

na

4 N

PNC

p.

Question #5 – Do you support the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses?

Coverec NUSP oure NO CIC

Please provide other comments that you would like to share.

nga

CXX NP 10 SPI 0 noper 2 IN CIM

📶 TOWNLINE

Makos

n

It

Mill

The Gardens Phase 3: Public Open House, September 13, 2016

Feedback Form

Townline thanks you for coming. Please review our presentation materials before you complete this form. You are welcome to approach our staff with any questions. All comments are anonymous and will be shared with the City of Richmond.

Question #1 – The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?

VIEW

HO

additte

0

Plance As Et

TADAT

Question #2 – The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of 12 noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?

Question #3 – One of the proposed buildings will be higher than currently allowed in the zone for The Gardens. Based on the public views of the building from different locations in nearby areas, as shown in the Open House boards, do you have any concerns about this increase in building height?

ic quite ammin.

.

Question #5 – Do you support the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses?

Please provide other comments that you would like to share.

Time

on

len

1000 2010/0most 220 IM inn 1111 TP C 1017

ΤΟΨΝΙΙΝΕ

The Gardens Phase 3: Public Open House, September 13, 2016

Feedback Form

Townline thanks you for coming. Please review our presentation materials before you complete this form. You are welcome to approach our staff with any questions. All comments are anonymous and will be shared with the City of Richmond.

Question #1 – The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?

Question #2 – The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of 12 noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?

Question #3 – One of the proposed buildings will be higher than currently allowed in the zone for The Gardens. Based on the public views of the building from different locations in nearby areas, as shown in the Open House boards, do you have any concerns about this increase in building height?

increase by 23 unite.

Question #5 – Do you support the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses?

.

Please provide other comments that you would like to share.

10

les

TOWNLINE

The Gardens Phase 3: Public Open House, September 13, 2016

Feedback Form

Townline thanks you for coming. Please review our presentation materials before you complete this form. You are welcome to approach our staff with any questions. All comments are anonymous and will be shared with the City of Richmond.

Question #1 – The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?

NHAD

Question #2 – The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of 12 noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?

1.30 nonum

Question #3 – One of the proposed buildings will be higher than currently allowed in the zone for The Gardens. Based on the public views of the building from different locations in nearby areas, as shown in the Open House boards, do you have any concerns about this increase in building height?

merally

5159781

Question #5 – Do you support the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses?

oun houses 10 server1 hul 1 homeowners on

Please provide other comments that you would like to share.

.
📶 TOWNLINE

The Gardens Phase 3: Public Open House, September 13, 2016

n, shering the Alexandria

and the second second

Feedback Form

Townline thanks you for coming. Please review our presentation materials before you complete this form. You are welcome to approach our staff with any questions. All comments are anonymous and will be shared with the City of Richmond.

Question #1 – The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?

NO.

Question #2 – The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of 12 noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?

NO, IT'S IMMATERIAL.

Question #3 – One of the proposed buildings will be higher than currently allowed in the zone for The Gardens. Based on the public views of the building from different locations in nearby areas, as shown in the Open House boards, do you have any concerns about this increase in building height?

INCREASING BUILDING HEIGHT AND DEADSITY WILL BE TREND IN RICHMOND

Question #4 -- As shown in the Open House Boards, the proposed townhouses would have tandem (front and back) parking for 21 of 23 units. Do you have any comments about parking arrangements?

Question #5 – Do you support the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses?

and in the second

Please provide other comments that you would like to share.

الم المائية المراجعة (1996) من المراجعة (1996) من المراجع (1996) من المراجع (1996) من المراجع (1996) من المراجع

A set of the set of

化磷酸盐医磷酸盐 化氯化合物 化氯化合物 医鼻腔 化合物 化磷酸化合物 化合物 网络小麦花 化合物

5159781

No

Yes.

Excerpt from the Minutes from The Design Panel Meeting

Wednesday, October 19, 2016 – 4:00 p.m. Rm. M.1.003 Richmond City Hall

3. DP 16-741981 – SECOND APPLICATION FOR THIRD PHASE MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT COMPRISED OF 10-STOREY AND 3-STOREY RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS (168 MARKET UNITS & 12 LOW END MARKET RENTAL UNITS)

APPLICANT: Townline Gardens Inc.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 10780 and 10788 No. 5 Road and 12733 Steveston Highway

Applicant's Presentation

Stephen Slot, Development Manager, Townline, Architect Joseph Lau, ZGF Cotter Architects, and Landscape Architect Jennifer Stamp, Durante Kreuk Ltd., presented the project and answered queries from the Panel on behalf of the applicant.

Panel Discussion

Comments from the Panel were as follows:

 the north façade of the project is not as successful at reading like a miniature cityscape as viewed from the park; buildings look disjointed and some building elements appear pasted on;

As noted at panel, the model was damaged during transportation. Due to the "frame" not being on the model when it was presented, we believe that this de-emphasized the miniature cityscape concept of our design. The panel did note that the concept was clear on the renderings and other presentation material. Also in response to panel comments, we have lifted the northwest frame up one level to create a clearer read on the north volume and eliminated the 'tacked-on' feel of the expression.

lower portions of the proposed ten-storey building appear tall; many floors look the same; the building massing appears more prominent when viewed from the park;

We have taken steps to break up the façade on the courtyard side on Building E1. We have set up a more gradual/progressive shift in form and texture on this façade that we believe has broken up the mass and improved the

proportions of the building. By adding the 'zig-zag' balconies from level 8 to levels 6 and 7, there is a cleaner read in the shift of the massing as it runs up the building. Both the "base" of the building and the transition to the upper, recessed tier is also more clearly read.

consider a more continuous design for the lower portions of the ten-storey building; carefully designed townhouse buildings work but the design of the ten-storey building is not as successful;

As noted, we have made changes to the façade to improve on the continuity and clarity of our design.

consider a larger setback at the 4th or 5th level of the ten-storey building; the low datum line and multiple storeys above it makes the ten-storey building appear heavy;

As noted, the introduction of the level 8 expression onto level 6 and 7 has made the read of the lower base levels read more clearly. The brick frame of the will be lifted on the north and west corners to visually bring up the datum.

- appreciate the overall scheme for the proposed development; "neighbourly" moves, e.g. creating interesting corners, introducing setbacks to the buildings behind the guardrails, and introducing bandings reduce the massing of the tenstorey building;
- the cluster of three 3-storey townhouse buildings are an improvement over the original proposal for a 4-storey apartment building;
- concerned about thermal bridging; thermal breaks for projections are difficult and expensive; concrete projections and fins act like "radiators";
- increasing the height of the building from eight to ten-storeys is not a concern; however, diminishing the height and massing of the additional upper floors is challenging; the applicant's approach to lighten the two uppermost floors appears more successful in the renderings than in the model; consider alternate ways to lighten the two uppermost floors, e.g. changing the proposed window specifications and wall systems; also consider design development and change materials for the wood soffit to visually reduce the apparent height of the tenstorey building;

The wood soffit of the roof overhang has been deleted to eliminate the cornice/cap effect as noted by panel. The transition up to the uppermost tier is more gradual as noted above.

 appreciate the proposed roof terraces in townhouse building "F2"; consider introducing skylights or glazing at the stairs to introduce natural lighting inside the townhouse units;

Glazing into the stair well has been added to the stair pop up to introduce natural light into the stairwell.

nice project; provides beautiful views of the park to the north;

۲

- the project is on the right track from a sustainability perspective;
- proposed window design of buildings create an opportunity for good views to the park; however, it is also a thermal comfort concern; applicant needs to address this issue;
- extensive use of spandrel glass is also a concern from a thermal performance sustainability perspective;

All spandrel panel is backed by an insulated drywall, back-up wall. While the exterior of the building reads as large field of window wall, from the interior, the wall reads more like punched openings. An energy model was already performed for Building E2. Due to the insulated, drywall backup wall being implemented on the window wall system, we are actually surpassing the required performance values. The same exercise will be performed for Building E1.

 the project's target of four energy points with residential heat pumps may not be achievable;

This is a target only. The LEED certification is not being pursued.

 use of LED lighting and low-flow fixtures will enable the project to gain more energy points;

All common area lights will be LED and all fixtures will be low-flow.

appreciate the applicant doing enhanced commissioning for energy credits; applicant needs to engage the commissioning agent as soon as possible; also appreciate the applicant doing measurement and verification to gain energy credits; not normally done in projects due to the additional costs involved;

The panelist was reading from an older DP submission. We are not pursuing points for either enhanced commissioning or verified measurements for this application as we currently have enough to satisfy the requirements.

- proposed use of compact fluorescent lighting is outdated and not currently considered a sustainable energy strategy; consider instead using LED lighting which is a more recent approach;
 All common area lighting will be LED
- appreciate the affordable units will include universal design features; applicant needs to include detailed unit lay-outs in future presentations of the project;
 Boards with larger scale unit layouts were available at panel but were not viewed.
- consider replacing swing doors in bathrooms of apartment and townhouse units with sliding doors (i.e., barn door type or pocket doors) to enhance accessibility and provide more floor space;

Where possible, sliding doors will be implemented.

agree with the comment that the proposed townhouse buildings are an improvement over the previous proposal;

- consider design development to the two uppermost floors of the ten-storey building as they currently appear "placed on"; *As noted above.*
- appreciate the height of buildings stepping down towards the highway;
- reconsider the reveal at the corner of building "E2" and consider a continuous treatment to read more as a façade that wraps instead of having a notch at the corner;

The break in the roof is to follow the inside corner condition below. The cut corner of the roof will be maintained to mimic the massing below it. This also helps to break up the massiveness of the roof plane as viewed from the street level.

 townhouse residents should have access to the green roof to get views to the park;

The space above the bike pavilion has been made accessible to the Building F3 townhome units, providing residents with additional outdoor space. The green roof material has been replaced with artificial turf to enhance its usability for residents and raised planters provide a space for gardening for the residents.

- the proposed development is an improvement over the previous proposal;
- proposed increase in the height of building "E1" is not a concern; views of buildings from the park works well and gives the park a feeling of enclosure;
- appreciate the proposed cluster of townhouse buildings; hope that the future development of the park will achieve its fullest potential and commensurate with the quality of development facing the park;
- appreciate the wider walkway in the pedestrian mews;
- consider design development to the north end of the pedestrian mews to enhance the sense of openness from and to the park; look at the proposed structures and planting at the north end of the mews;
 The feature trellis at the north end of the mews will be designed as a tall, open cantilevered structure as demonstrated in Section G on sheet L-2.1. This structure will mark the plaza as the focal point of the mews and establish a strong visual connection with the public park to the north and the urban village to the south. The cantilevered design minimizes the number of posts at the ground plane allowing for various site furnishing opportunities, while the angled roof structure opens to the north and south further enhancing visual connectivity and openness through the structure.
 - consider introducing interesting paving materials for the internal roads in the cluster of townhouse buildings; look at precedence in the Olympic Village;

Concrete banding has been introduced in the internal roads in the cluster of townhome buildings to break up the asphalt.

planting plan symbols in the plans provided by the applicant are hard to read;

Planting Plans on sheets L1.1 - 1.3 are at 1/8" scale. Tree fills have been turned off to improve the readability of the plant symbols.

- support the project and look forward to the City developing the park to match the quality of the proposed development;
- in relation to a previous comment, consider shifting up the brick frame on the south corner in building "E1" so the setback will be above it; will raise up the outlines of the ten-storey buildings when viewed from the park; and
- agree with the comment that residents of the proposed cluster of townhouse buildings should have access to the extensive green roof over the bicycle pavilion to access views to the park.

Townhouse F3 will have access to the roof above the bike pavilion in lieu of having access to the park views to the north. The extensive green roof will be replaced with artificial turf to enhance usability. Raised planters will be placed to allow for gardening opportunities for residents.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That DP 16-741981 be supported to move forward to the Development Permit Panel subject to the applicant giving consideration to the comments of the Advisory Design Panel.

CARRIED



Development Permit

No. DP 16-741981

To the Holder:	TOWNLINE GARDENS INC.
Property Address:	10780 NO. 5 ROAD, 10788 NO. 5 ROAD AND 12733 STEVESTON HIGHWAY
Address:	C/O JOSEPH LAU, ZGF COTTER ARCHITECTS 901 – 838 WEST HASTINGS STREET VANCOUVER, BC V6C 0A6

- 1. This Development Permit is issued subject to compliance with all of the Bylaws of the City applicable thereto, except as specifically varied or supplemented by this Permit.
- 2. This Development Permit applies to and only to those lands shown cross-hatched on the attached Schedule "A" and any and all buildings, structures and other development thereon.
- 3. The "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500" is hereby varied to:
 - (a) For the most westerly building (Building E1), increase the maximum height over a parkade structure from six (6) storeys and 25.0 m, to ten (10) storeys and 33.6 m; and
 - (b) For the most westerly building (Building E1), increase the allowable projection of unenclosed balconies into a side yard setback abutting the Agricultural Land Reserve, from a maximum of 0.9 m to 1.8 m.
- 4. Subject to Section 692 of the Local Government Act, R.S.B.C.: buildings and structures; off-street parking and loading facilities; roads and parking areas; and landscaping and screening shall be constructed generally in accordance with Plans 1 to 28 attached hereto.
- 5. Sanitary sewers, water, drainage, highways, street lighting, underground wiring, and sidewalks, shall be provided as required.
- 6. If the Holder does not commence the construction permitted by this Permit within 24 months of the date of this Permit, this Permit shall lapse and the security shall be returned in full.
- 7. The land described herein shall be developed generally in accordance with the terms and conditions and provisions of this Permit and any plans and specifications attached to this Permit which shall form a part hereof.

This Permit is not a Building Permit.

Development Permit No. DP 16-741981

To the Holder:

TOWNLINE GARDENS INC.

Property Address: 10780 NO. 5 ROAD, 10788 NO. 5 ROAD AND 12733 STEVESTON HIGHWAY

Address:

C/O JOSEPH LAU, ZGF COTTER ARCHITECTS 901 – 838 WEST HASTINGS STREET VANCOUVER, BC V6C 0A6

AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION NO. DAY OF

ISSUED BY THE COUNCIL THE

DELIVERED THIS DAY OF

MAYOR





DP 16-741981 PLAN #1

	NOTFOR					
0	OONSTRUCTION.					
0	19/11/14	ISCUED FORGE IS OF MOIT FROMT FAVIL				
1	1012328	ADPIRE REMINISH BE AND F PICKERON				
	191918	DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION VARIANCES				
8 0 0 0	798915	ISSUED FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PHUSE				
ç	181823	ADPREASY				
e	298914	DADED TO F REPORTS				
	57014	DE-BLOHMENT PERMIT NAMUOLITICAL				
	THMEO	CESCRPTION				
ISSU	E.					
PROJ	(ett)					
		1				
	110	K				
	THE 7					
•	O A D D F M O					
- 12	ΛL	THENK				
- 11	NADUENO					
~						
TH	THE GARDENS PHASE THREE					

THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLIA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE

TOWNLINE

D-7,4MDB	-	STAL:
CHEDRED:		
SCALE:		1
J08 Na.;	¥230+5	1
ante:		
SHEET T	1.E	
CI ID		

SURVEY PLAN









	AREA	OF	PERMI	1
--	------	----	-------	---



NOT FOR

CRAIM	12	SEAL
OCHER	4	
24.6	$\xi q \mu = 1 4 \beta^{*}$	
208 Mos	122315	
DALE:	2010/11/04	

CONTEXT PLAN

DEPONING WOL	REV.
A-102	

























 BUILDING F1 JASMINE (PHASE 3) LEVEL 1 / FLOOR 1 - PLAN

 M# = 154'







4 A219 HP = 14"



NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



 \oplus









TOWNLINE

CONTROLS ARE STOLED. THE PLAN INDUCTION AND AT ALL REPORT EXPANSION THE INCLUSES FROM FOR OF SO EXPERIMENTATION AND CONNECTED TO PERSONNEL OF MEMOUTINE AND ATTECTS WIRTTEN CONSIGN.

 WHITEL CONDUCT
 J

 DKAYN
 DC
 J

 CHAYN
 DC
 J

 CHAYN
 DC
 J

 SCALE
 1/8" = 1"-0"
 J

 COULD
 J
 COULD
 J

 SCALE
 1/8" = 1"-0"
 J
 COULD

 COULD
 J
 COULD
 J
 COULD

 SCALE
 1/8" = 1"-0"
 COULD
 J
 COULD
 J

 COULD
 J
 COULD
 J
 COULD
 J
 J

 SCALE
 1/8" = 1"-0"
 COULD
 J
 COULD
 J
 J
 BUILDING F2 JASMINE

BUILDING F2 JASMINE (PHASE 3) FLOOR PLANS





(F3-1)

F3-2

14' - 10 1/4"

F3-3

14'-8'

14' - 8'

F34

F3-5

14'-8"

F3-6

F3-7

F3-8









DP 16 741981

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



 \oplus







BUILDING E1 DAHLIA

(PHASE 3) WEST AND EAST ELEVATIONS

A-311

- F

ann a staite a in stants na	en styptschedelikeringenaarjes järjanteeringen Noon y anno s	NORTH ELEVATION	1E1 (1E2)	1E3 1E4 1E5	160	158 (159	(E12)	(E1) (E1)	 acceleration of the second seco
		p. 4	6'-6 1/2" 19 [2.0 m] [- 8 5/8" 5' - 7 5/8" 5' - 2 1/2" 5.0 m] [2.0 m] [1.5 m]	8 - 7 5(8' 17' - 8 5/6' [2.6 m] [5.4 m] 2' - 9 1/8' [0.8 m]	13'-2 1/2' 3-5 7/8' 3'-9 3/6' [4.0 m] 11.1 m]	21'-9 3/4' 13' [6,6 m] [0	-8 3/8* 5-0" 4.2 mj [1.5 m]	
	- C. FLUID CHILLER 120.17 / 36.53 m			G B G G G		GG	6 66 66	<u>a</u> <u>n</u> <u>a</u>	T.O. FLUID CHILLER 120,177 / 36.63 m
	T.O. MECH PENT. PARAPET 118.17 / 36.02 m LO PARAPET	5'-4 11/16 [1.6 m]	67 - 6 1/2" [2.0 m]	┼╍╼┥╍┼╌╫╴┥╍┽╶┾╸╪				14' - 6 1/2"	T.O. MECH. PENT. PARAPET 0 18.17 / 360.29 118.17 / 360.29 110.67 / 340.04 111.67 / 340.04 111.67 / 340.04
	• T.O. PARAPET 111.67 / 34.04 m	9-9-10 157	[[2.0 m]					[4.4 m]	
	• <u>T.O. ROOF DECK</u> 109.17 / 33.27 m	- NG						3' - 6 1/2" 5' - 0" [1.1 m] [1.5 m]	3 <u>T.O. ROOF DECI</u> 109.17 / 30.27 r
		13-01 [13 [1]						[[.1m] [1.5m]	1445 E Fto
	• LEVEL 10/ FLOOR 11 98.50 / 30.02 m								EVEL 10/ FLOOR 1 98.50 / 30.02
	MAX: BUILDING HEIGHT	111-1							
	LEVEL 9 / FLOOR 10 87,42 / 26.65 m	-							LEVEL 9/FL008 87,42/ 28,65
		5- 9-							
	• LEVEL 8/ FLCOR 9								LEVEL 8/ FLOOP 77.67 / 23.67
	0,6/1 210/m 4	101.0 FLU 8-6 [2.9 m]							
	€ LEVEL 7/ FLOOR 8 68,17/20.78 m	, THE		n mata man premi					LEVEL 7 / FLOOP 58,17 / 20.76
	66,17 / 20,78 m	PARKAU STRUCT							
	- LEVEL 6/12 0007	10.19							1 2 2 37.87 / 17.56 57.87 / 17.56
	€ LEVEL 6/ FLOOR 7	In I							57.87 / 17.58
		9-6- 2-9 m							5 5 9 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
	• LEVEL 5/ PLOOR 6	antroind							48.17/ 14.66
	- 1 B/EL 4/10 000 5	9-9-6 12-9-40							1 LEVEL 4/ FLOOD 30.677 / 11.75
	● LEVEL 4/FLCOR5								38.57 / 11.75
	- LEVEL 3 / EL 000 3	g. e.							LEVEL 3 (FLOO) 29.17 / 8.8
	• EFVEL 3/FLOOR 3 20.17 / 0.59 m	6 E .							29,177 8,66
ana ana amin'ny fisiana		9-95 							LEVEL 2/ FLOO 19.67 / 60
	● LEVEL 2/FLOOR 2 18.57 / 6.00 m								19.67 / 6.0
		9-6 [29#]					⊥K L L → → Ň		LEVEL 1 / FLOO

						BUILDING E1 DAHLIA MATERIAL LEGEND
	● <u>TO FUID CHILER</u> 120.17/ 36.83 m	8 - 5* 13 - 8 34* [1.5 m] [42.8] (2) (34 (55 m)] (2) (34 (55 m)] (3) (33 (52 (54 (55 m)))	(1.2 m) [0.8 m]	1127 (F-7.567) 197-8505 (F-6.102) mi (R.20m) (R.20m) (R.20m) G4 (G4 (G5) (G1 (G3 (G1/M3)	ID. RUD CHILER 120.17/ 86.8m	B1 - BRICK TEXTURED FINISH (DARK GRAY)
 exceptions to a description of the second sec	<u>T.O. MECH. PENT, PARAPET</u> <u>T.O. PARAPET</u>	141-6 1/2" [4.4 m] 1		<u>6' - 6 1/2"</u> [2.D m]		G1 - CLEAR GLAZING G2 - SPANDREL PANEL (WHITE) G3 - GLASS GUARDRAIL
	€ 109.177 / 33.27 m	5'-0" 3'-6 1/2" [1.5 m] 11.1 m]			10. ROXF (JECX) 108,177/33.27 m	G4 - SPANOREL PANEL (ORANGE) G5 - SPANOREL PANEL (VELLOW) G6 - SPANOREL PANEL (GREY)
	€ LEVE, 10/FLOOR 11 9859/7 30.02m					M1 - METAL PANEL (LIGHT GRAY) M2 - METAL PANEL (DARK GRAY) M2 - METAL PANEL (DARK GRAY)
a, meddin riferbrester serffisser en en bebregebrester i	2117 2110 2117 2110 2117 2110					UP 16-/419
	€ 1576 975008 10 77.427 26.85 m					PLAN #
t of the maximum of	● LEVEL &/FLOOR9 3 0 77.87 7 20.87 m 2 5 6 0 5 6 6 0 5 7 0 5					المحاجي المحاجي المحاج المحا
t e	€ LEVEL 7/FLCOR8				ENE 1/F.00R8	nganga manan ana anan anan anan anan ana
	● 10 0 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					
	LEVEL5/ROOR6				EVE big g 48.17/1468m ↔	a and a second
thermal constructions and adviction	C LLVFL 4/FL00R5					angenegation) yan ini angenegatapangkan ang ata'a da kabanaka padasan danan ini ang dagan daran danan danan da
	LEVEL 3/F[00R3 224/7/ 899m				LEVEL 3/ FLOOR 3. 2017 / 880m -	
	थ - स [2.3 m]					
n a an 2 a an 100 mg/d o jatoo dity anao	19.67 / 8.00 m				EVEL 2/10/282 0- 19287/ 5/00m 0-	
-	• LEVE_1//FLOOR1					

(E1) (E13)

(E12)

(E1) (E1)

(1E9) (1E8) (1E7)

(1E2 (1E1)

(1E6) (1E5) (1E4) (1E3)



NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION





THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLIA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE

TOWNLINE

STATISTICS IN CONTRACTOR
 2010
 62

 00000
 40

 10040
 101

 10040
 101

 10040
 101

 10040
 101

 10040
 101

 10040
 101

 10040
 101

 10040
 101

 10040
 101

 10040
 101

 10040
 101

 10040
 101

 10040
 101

(PHASE 3) NORTH AND SOUTH ELEVATIONS

A-312

28,4113,0





NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION







THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLIA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE

TOWNLINE

мітнь саналт. ожим <u>DC</u> со онірэбо J. <u>зоць 116° = 11-27°</u> ловаь, <u>V22315</u> анть: <u>2016/1100</u> внідті тації

- A-315

BUILDING F1 JASMINE (PHASE 3) ELEVATIONS





(LINEN

EN FLICE DOARD (WE TE) EN FLIRE DOARD (LIG IT GRED EN FLIRE BOARD (DA IK GREY)

81 41 9 PLAN 19

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION





THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLIA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE

TOWNLINE

 WHITER CONSULT.

 DMMR
 DC

 0x00x8
 AL

 0x0x8
 1/8" = 11-0"

 .cd ss.
 V23315

 0x1x = -2205/11/004
 wedt TRE
 BUILDING F2 JASMINE (PHASE 3) ELEVATIONS



NOTES: KEY PLAN BUILDING F: JASMINE MATERIAL LEGEND B1 - BRICK TEXTURED FINISH (REDONDO REY) G1 - VINYL WINDOWS (WHITE TRIM) G2 - GLASS GUARDRAIL M1 - METAL SCREENING/DETAILING M2 - GARAGE DOOR H1 - CEMENT FIBRE BOARD SHIPLAP SIDING (LINE H2 - CEME IT FI RI BO RD (WHITE H3 - CEME IT FI RI BOARD (LIGHT BREY) H4 - CEME IT FI RI BOARD (DARNA REY) 81 stides PLAN #20

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



224 (CURE addreft) CT 94. 91-63 (Cure Tankard, Brill, St. 94. 10. 44-53 (Cure Tankard, Brill, St. 94. 10. 44-54 (Cure Tankard, St. 94. 10. 44-54 (Cure Tankard, St. 94.)



THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLIA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE

TOWNLINE

Real Production Control of Contro

distant	00	80.
96343	JL.	
SCALE.	1/8" e 1'-0"]
.0816.	V23815	1
DATE	2016/11/04	1
SHEET UTLE	DINO	

BUILDING F3 JASMINE (PHASE 3) ELEVATIONS

A-317

....









1 SITE ELEVATION A-A A-401 398"= 1-0"



DRAMING HOL	
A-401	



1 SITE ELEVATION B-B 3704" = 1-0"



2 SITE SECTION B-B













Landscape Rationale:

Buildings E and F are residentifial and provide a transition from the mixed use development to the south (The Urban Villogeto the future public park to the north. The street oriented units of Building E are more urban in character as a response to the development across the street. Raised planters, metal patio gates, and address plens embelish the only sequence to these street oriented units.

Building E Amenity Garden Two "L'shape buildings (Building E1 and E2) enclose a large semi-private courtyard. This amenity garden confains a water feature, a simple sheel of kawn, a summer flower garden, a kid's piay area, and a dining area that affords residents the opportunity to be custide and meet their neighbours. Large semi-private potios adjacent the building perimeter also encourage outdoor Ming.

Pedestrian Mews Located between Buildings E2 and F a 10/3m wide public pothway connects the Urban Village and surrounding neighbourhood to the future public park to the north. A trellis structure with seating and way finding at the south end of the Mews guides pedestrians north to a park overlook with a trellis and seating. From here a series of stata and ramps connects the Mews to the future park to the north. Generous patios on the east side of Building E2 and the west side of Building F provide good oversight of the Pedestrian Mews.

Northern Property Line There are several differing conditions along the north property line of buildings E and F as a means to provide some valation to the property edge. In front of building E1 the landscape steps at the edge of the passing garage, and then stopes down to the future public park. In front of building E2 the landscape again steps at the edge of the particip.

A 3m Agricultural Land Reserve has been protected and enchanced along the entire North edge of the site. Public access is discouraged using a variety of thomy, attractive and hardy trespass inhibiting plonts. A retaining wall along the property line also discourage's access, while a row of cohonexister planting will exceed over the wall, softening the sdge. Where possibile an park property the landscope can also stope up to meet the property line and reduce (the height of the wall, A.3 if the metal fence set behind the ALR boundary will further discourage pedestion encoachment into this space.

Along the property line north of building F there is a 4/1.2m wide access path (to the townhause entries) with planting either side.

Eastern Properly Line Riparian Zone Along the eastern property line there is a riparlan setback. This area will be planted as per the recommendation of the environmentia consultant. The existing hedge will be protected and retained, and an existing gap in the hedge will be planted with a similar species. Large native confidences trees are also proposed to be planted in the Aparton zone as a means to buffer the highway.

Sustainability The kandscape will utilize a high efficiency drip inigation system and plants that are drought tolerant in order to reduce the use of potable water. Shade trees and planting have been maximized to reduce the amount of constructive surfaces that heat up and contribute to the heat bland effect. Solt depths of 12 - 30° over the suspended slob will slow slorm water runotf.

Plant Material Plant material will vary throughout the project. Along the street perimeter evergreen shrubs and hedging, as well as small trees will buffer the sidewalk from the ground floor units. Similarly evergreen hedging and medium sked shade trees are proposed to buffer ground floor units from the pedestion mews.

Plantings in the liparian zone will be predominantly native plants, where as plantings in the amenity courtyard and along the pedestrian mews will have colour and seasonal vortation (perennials and ommerhal grasses).

Andra and a struct of a struct and a struct of the struct	
APP 16	5 - 741981
Action That we are a set interested to	-741981 PLAN #23
24 DOD	
Rater to ALR Butter Devulogs	
Area of Land to be Expropriated by M.O.T.	
S And	
OP 1	
Bood and a set	
10	
4.0%	
to the a state	
- the	
	E
No.	North
di .	08 Hoyo C4,16 Based BK ADDP 07 Crit 71,26 Based BK ADDP 08 Apr 13,14 Based BK ADDP 08 Apr 13,14 Based BK ADDP 08 Apr 13,14 Based BK ADDP 09 Apr 13,14 Based BK ADDP 09 Apr 13,15 Based BK ADDP 00 Apr 13,16 Based BK ADDP 01 Net 72,15 Based BK ADDP 02 Net 72,15 Based BK ADDP
	02 Nov 12,15 Issued for DP no: (dolte: j filters Revisions:
	Downie Krewić LLS. 112 - 147 Weid, Shi Anmue 112 - 147 Weid, Shi Anmue 113 - 147 Weid, Shi Anmue 114 - 147 Weid, Shi Anmue 1
	www.dbbca
	need: The Gardens
	Drown by: DVH Checked by: JS Dole: Nov 04, 2015
	Scolar N.I.S. Desiding Wet:
	Overall Landscape Plan
	Project No.:
	15051 Sheel No:
	L1.0
	the second s










Paving Legend 16" x 18" Paving Slabs at Private Patio Colour. Natural 18" x.18" Paving Slabs at Private Patio Colour: Charcoal 12" x 12" Paving Slabs in Commo Walkway Colour: Charcoal 8" x 4" Holland Paver Colour: Charcoal tone Paving C.I.P. Concrete Paving Colour; Natural Resillent Wood Fiber Play Surface

Landsca	pe Lighting Legend	
X	Wall Light	
-	Light Bollard	
+	Trellis Down Ughting	
4	Up Lighting	
0	Pool Light	
		-

Precedent Images



Common Space with Water Feature



Common Space Paths and Planting



Summer Flower Garden



Pavilion Trellis at Park Overlook



Common Space with Water Feature



Street Level Unit Entries



Public Zig-zag Acessible Romp to Park



Cantilevered Trellis



Contemporary Trellis



Common Lawn with Adjacent Paths and Planting



Natural Kids Play - Wood Logs



Linear Wood Bench



Outdoor Dining

16-741981 Size /Spacing / CommenDP PLAN 120





Private Patios Adjacent to Public Pathway





	005	
no.:	date:	inerr:
01	Nov 06_15	Issued for DP
02	Nov 12_15	Issued for ADP
03	Nov 23_15	Issued for ADP
04	Feb 19_16	Issued for DP
05	Apr 13_15	bsued for DPP
06	Aug 16_16	Re-bauad for DPP
07	Oct 17_16	tssued for ADP
08	Nov 04_16 Oct 17_16	Issued for DPP Issued for ADP



Project:

The Gardens

Drown by:	DVH	
Checked by:	12	
Dote:	Nov 04, 2015	
Scole:	N/A	

Planting / Materials Schedule & Precedent Images

Project No.: 15051 Sheet No.:

L-3.0



JUNE 21 @ 9AM



MARCH/SEPTEMBER 21 @ 9AM



DECEMBER 21 @ 9AM



JUNE 21 @ NOON





DECEMBER 21 @ NOON



JUNE 21 @ 3PM



MARCH/SEPTEMBER 21 @ 3PM



DECEMBER 21 @ 3PM



ADDED SHADOWS CAST BY THE PROPOSED 10-STOREY E1: DAHLIA

SHADOWS CAST BY THE ORIGINAL 8-STOREY E1: DAHLIA

C		STRUCTION
~		
Ð	10/11/34	ISSUED FOR DE BLOPMENT PERMIT PANEL
F	10/09/20	ADP RE TEX WORLES AND F PERMIN
E	10/09/18	DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION WILL WARKING
0	100415	ISSUED FOR DEVELOPMENT POINT IN THE
с	191925	ADP PEKEN
5	150914	BLELDIG TOPT ALC: CHENT
	150314	DE ELOPHENT REPORT APPLICATION
NYNK.	TINATOO	DESCRIPTION)





THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLIA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE

TOWNLINE

COPTIGNT RECEIPTER. THIS FILM AND DESIGN ARE AND AT THESE REVIEWS THE EVOLUSIVE PROPERTY OF 2017 CONTEN AND THESE WE AND CANNOT BE USED ON REPROVING WITHOUT THE AND MEDICAS COPENIES COPENIES ENUMBED: JL

SCALE:	N.T.B.	
J08 Ht-	V23065	1
BATC:	20101164	1
SHEET T		STUDIES







DIATING HD. A-104







A-105

CRAWING 10











PROPOSAL

981 田向 REFERENCE PUAR 44

NOTES

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION 4 100% SUBPRIZE Carrow TWEFTMAL 4 000% SUBPRIZE Carrow TWEFTMAL 4 000% SUBPRIZE Carrow TWEFTMAL 6 000% SUBPRIZE Carrow TWEFTMAL 6 000% SUBPRIZE Carrow TWEFTMAL 6 100% SUBPRIZE Carrow TWEFTMAL 6 100% SUBPRIZE Carrow TWEFTMAL
LARULENS THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F; JASMINE
Contract TOWNLINE Contract Number Inter You And States Are and an Address To the State Are and Are and Are and Address To the State Instances
A Constraint of the constraint
инов на. А-301







HEIGHT INCREASE





ZGFF extra laterative Set 458 Werk Nating Sees, Proceeding of the Code Set 1458 Werk Nating Sees, Proceeding of the Code Set 1458 Werk National Sees, Proceeding of the Code
THE T GARDENS
THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING F1: DAHLIA, BUILDING F2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE
TOWNLINE CONTROL THE FAR AND REAL ARE AND AT ALL CONTROL THE CONTROL THE ADDRESS AND ADD
04084 A 5646 K13 465 Nu 1993 19427 MLD BUILDING E PERDECTIVE PENDERNGS

DRAMING NO A-302













	N	IOT FOR
C	ON	STRUCTION
_		
5	191100	ISSUED FOR DE BLOPMONT PERMIT PANES.
E	10/02/0	ADP RETAIN WITH \$1 AND F REMOVAL
D	1000015	DE-ELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION WIT " MEAN CO
¢	100415	INSUED FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL
5	151323	NOP PENEN
	155/014	DE-ELOPMENT REPAIR APPLICS TAXI
A .		





THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLIA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE

TOWNLINE

A-303

DRAMING NO.





HEIGHT INCREASE









ZGF EXECUTER MENTIONER MEN
THE GARDENS
THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLIA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE
Control of Statute of Statute of All Statute of All March of All Statute of All

A-304













NOT FOR
CONSTRUCTION
E 191591 KSLID FOR CETLUPISH FURST PART.
A BRINCH 4DP RE (DWINGTH EI ALD FINDHEDD) HINK TINHED DESCREPTION
ISOUE
ZGE
COTTER
COTTER
903.838 West Hustings Street, Yancouver, DC VBC 046 101.684.872-087 188: 604-272-087. Hereite Hier gestwike Jam
Molion
THE T
GARDENS
THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLIA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE
cupm.
TOWNLINE
CONTINUET RESERVED. THIS PLAN AND DISSON ARC AND AT ALL TAILS REMAIN THE EXCLUSIVE PROMOTY OF 200 DOTEM ACCITEDS INC. AND DANADT SC USED ON REPORTCHED WHOLD THE ANALINES'S TRANSPORT DOTEMU.
DRAWING DD SEAL:
CHEDRED: A.
204.0 N.T.S.
GATE: 201011004
BUILDING E
PERSPECTIVE
RENDERINGS

A-305



KEY PLAN











0	ÔN	STRUCTIO
~	0.14	GILLOGILOI
-	-	
_		
_	-	
2	191104	INVALO FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL
	10/9928	ADP NO ION 73TH ST MIDF PERSON
DAG.	1199600	CERCHPRICH
1551	E	





THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLIA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE

TOWNLINE

COPYREMT RETERVED. THIS PLAN AND SEEKIN ARE, AND AT ALL THESE REMAIN THE VICULARIE PROPERTY OF LOST CONTON AREATED TO ALL AND ALMOST ALL USED OF REPAYEMENTED WITHOUT THE ARCHITECT'S ARETEX CONSIDER. DEaler (V)

CHERRIN &	4,	
SCALID	H(7)#,	
JC8 Ha.:	V73hS	
DATE:	2010/11/64	
SHEET T	TLD:	-

BUILDING E PERSPECTIVE RENDERINGS







	ħ	OT FOR
C	ON	STRUCTION
-		
_	-	
_		
-	-	
a	7911204	ISSUED FOR DEVELOPMENT PED IT PANEL
۸	197227	40P RE 1EW WITH EI NID F REMOON
NMM.	1124400	DESCRIPTION
1850	E	
-	-	





THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLIA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE

TOWNLINE

COPRESS RESERVED. THIS PLAN AND RESERVENT, AND AT ALL TAKES RESART THE EXCLUSIVE PROPERTY OF 257 COTTER ARCHITECTS VIC. AND CANNOT DE LAND ON REPRODUCED WITCHLT DE ARCHITETS WITCHL CONSIDER.

eventing use and over it was a within the analysis and within a second seco

DRAWING HO. A-307



DP REFERENCE PLAN #11

C		OT FOR
_		
_		
8	101104	ISSUED FOR DECELOPHICATIVESIANT PARKED.
	19/19/27	OPRESENT NETHEL AND FREMEWOR
LONGS.	1104400	DESCREPTION
1550	£	
-		TOF





THE GARDENS PHASE THREE BUILDING E1: DAHLIA, BUILDING E2: CALLA, & BUILDING F: JASMINE

TOWNLINE

DOMINGH RESERVED. THES FLAN AND DESCH ARE, AND AT ALL THESE REMAIN THE SPELICENE PROPERTY OF LEF CONTROL MEMORY THE ARCHITECT'S WHETHIN CONSULT MEMORY THE ARCHITECT'S WHETHIN CONSULT

CHECKED	*	
SONE:	н,7,5,	
208 No.;	Y232:5	
DASE:	20171108	
SHEET T	RLC:	
BUI	LDING	E
PEF	SPEC	TIVE
REN	IDEDI	NGS

A-308

DRAWING SID.;





PROPOSAL



		IOT FOR	
2	ΟN	STRUCTION	
-	_		
_			
_			
	_		
	1911/94	ISSUED FOR CONTR. OPMENT PERMIT PINEL	
	1993823	40P RE-JETCHITH EL ALLO F REMISION	
NAM.	Y INVATO DESCRIPTION		
1550	6		





A-309