## City of

# Development Permit Panel 

Council Chambers, City Hall<br>6911 No. 3 Road<br>Wednesday, July 15, 2020<br>3:30 p.m.

## MINUTES

Motion to adopt the minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on June 24, 2020.

1. GENERAL COMPLIANCE - REQUEST BY HAMILTON HIGH STREET HOLDINGS CORP. FOR A GENERAL COMPLIANCE RULING AT 23100 GARRIPIE AVENUE
(File Ref. No.: DP 15-716274 Xr: DP 19-880533) (REDMS No. 6442201 v. 7)
APPLICANT: Hamilton High Street Holdings Corp.
PROPERTY LOCATION: 23100 Garripie Avenue

## Director's Recommendations

That the attached plans involving changes to the design of the proposed building and landscaping be considered to be in General Compliance with the approved Development Permit (DP 15-716274).
$\square$
2. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 18-820689
(REDMS No. 6469416 v. 4)
APPLICANT: Integrated Construction
PROPERTY LOCATION: 1600 Savage Road

## Director's Recommendations

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of a warehouse building at 1600 Savage Road on a site zoned "Light Industrial (IL)" and partially designated as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA).
$\square$
3. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 18-835533
(REDMS No. 6397573 v. 6)
APPLICANT: Mosaic No. 3 Road and Williams Limited Partnership
PROPERTY LOCATION: 9900 No. 3 Road and 8031 Williams Road

## Director's Recommendations

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. permit the construction of a four-storey mixed use building containing $638 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (6,867 ft ${ }^{2}$ ) of non-residential uses on the ground floor and 33 secured market rental apartment units at 9900 No. 3 Road and 8031 Williams Road on a site zoned "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU44) - Broadmoor"; and
2. vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to reduce the setbacks to No. 3 Road and Williams Road for the southwest corner of the building from 2.0 m to 0.0 m.
3. New Business
4. Date of Next Meeting: July 29, 2020

ADJOURNMENT

# Development Permit Panel <br> Wednesday, June 24, 2020 

Time: 3:30 p.m.
Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall
Present: Joe Erceg, Chair
Cecilia Achiam, General Manager, Community Safety
Milton Chan, Director, Engineering

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 June 10, 2020 be adopted.

## CARRIED

1. GENERAL COMPLIANCE - REQUEST BY CHRISTOPHER BOZYK ARCHITECTS LTD. FOR A GENERAL COMPLIANCE RULING AT 4331 VANGUARD ROAD (FORMERLY 4331 AND 4431 VANGUARD ROAD)
(File Ref. No.: DP 17-782793) (REDMS No. 6463441)
APPLICANT: Christopher Bozyk Architects Ltd.
PROPERTY LOCATION: 4331 Vanguard Road (formerly 4331 and 4431 Vanguard Road)

## INTENT OF PERMIT:

To consider the attached plans to change the location of the proposed green wall feature and add new sustainability features to be in General Compliance with the approved Development Permit (DP 17-782793).

## Development Permit Panel <br> Wednesday, June 24, 2020

## Applicant's Comments

Ernst Loots, Christopher Bozyk Architects, Ltd., with the aid of a visual presentation (copy on file, City Clerk's Office), briefed the Panel on the proposed changes to the approved Development Permit (DP 17-782793), highlighting the following:

- the green wall on the south elevation of the building which frames the building entrance is proposed to be relocated on the west elevation at a reduced size in order to be consistent with the corporate standard of the building occupant;
- the approved Development Permit for the project includes significant sustainability features, including, among others, a green roof, collection and storage of storm water for use in on-site irrigation and car wash facility, and installation of rooftop solar panels;
- to compensate for the reduction of the size of the green wall, the applicant is proposing an apiary on the west side of the site and two publicly accessible Level 2 electric vehicle (EV) charging stations which will be servicing four parking stalls; and
- the relocated green wall would now be more visible from the showroom of the building.


## Staff Comments

Wayne Craig, Director, Development, noted that staff support the addition of the apiary and the two EV charging stations which offset the minor reduction of the size of the green wall.

## Gallery Comments

None.

## Correspondence

None.

## Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded
That the attached plans to change the location of the proposed green wall feature and add new sustainability features be considered to be in General Compliance with the approved Development Permit (DP 17-782793).

CARRIED

## Development Permit Panel

## 2. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 18-797127

(REDMS No. 6472575)

APPLICANT:
PROPERTY LOCATION:

Wensley Architecture Ltd.
8131 Westminster Highway

## INTENT OF PERMIT:

Permit the construction of a high-rise mixed-use development containing approximately $436 \mathrm{~m} 2(4,695 \mathrm{ft} 2)$ of commercial space, $641 \mathrm{~m} 2(6,904 \mathrm{ft} 2)$ of office space, and 134 dwellings (including 13 affordable housing units) at 8131 Westminster Highway on a site zoned "Downtown Commercial (CDT1)".

## Applicant's Comments

Barry Weih, Wensley Architecture, with the aid of visual presentation (copy on file, City Clerk's Office) provided the site context and other background information on the proposed development, highlighting the following:

- there will be lane dedication for the new City lane to be constructed along the west and north frontages of the site;
- the project will achieve LEED "Silver" equivalency;
- the tiered project includes a three-storey podium, a mid-level section and a tower portion;
- the main floor includes the garbage and recycling area, parking area, retail and entrance to residential units fronting Westminster Highway;
- the main residential entrance is shared by the market residential units and 13 affordable housing units;
- the majority of affordable housing units have two and three bedrooms and are distributed throughout the building;
- the outdoor amenity areas located on the fourth and eighth floor levels provide a variety of outdoor activities for residents;
- the proposed architectural design and building materials are of high quality, including the decorative metal screens that provide screening to the parkade; and
- retail store fronts with decorative canopy enhance the pedestrian experience along Westminster Highway.

Michael Patterson, P+A Landscape Architecture, briefed the Panel on the main landscape features of the project, noting that (i) a double row of trees are provided along the Westminster Highway frontage, (ii) trees along the west lane define the residential entrance and bicycle racks are located adjacent to trees, (iii) the outdoor amenity area on the fourth floor is family-oriented and provides exercise and active play opportunities, (iv) the eighth floor level outdoor amenity area provides a passive sundeck area facing south and an active family play area on the north side, (v) outdoor deck areas are proposed on the penthouse level, and (vi) a variety of planting materials are proposed for landscaping in the project and are layered to provide seasonal interest.
In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Patterson confirmed that an irrigation system is provided for trees on the landscaped roof decks as well as for street trees.

## Staff Comments

Mr. Craig noted that (i) 73 percent of units overall and 92 percent of the affordable housing units have two and three bedrooms, significantly exceeding the City's Official Community Plan (OCP) and Affordable Housing Strategy guidelines, (ii) there is a significant Servicing Agreement associated with the project for the construction of the lane adjacent to the development, (iii) the project has been designed to achieve the City's aircraft noise standards and noise mitigation related to noise impacts related to the Canada Line, (iv) the project has been designed to be District Energy Utility (DEU) ready, and (v) all residential parking stalls and 10 percent of shared visitor and commercial parking spaces will be provided with energized electric vehicle (EV) charging outlets.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Craig advised that the developer has chosen to take advantage of the density bonus that the City provides to encourage the provision of affordable housing.

## Gallery Comments

None.

## Correspondence

Derrick Chang, 8081 Westminster Highway, expressed concern regarding potential traffic congestion in the area, shadowing of the project, and construction-related concerns.
In reply to Mr. Chang's concerns, Mr. Craig advised that (i) the project was reviewed by the City's Transportation Department and noted that the lane improvements and existing road improvements can support traffic on the site, (ii) the shadow analysis provided by the applicant indicates that shadowing to the west is limited to early morning hours, and (iii) the applicant will be required to provide a construction parking and management plan should the application move forward to Building Permit stage and adhere to the City's Noise Bylaw during construction hours.

## Development Permit Panel Wednesday, June 24, 2020

In addition, Mr. Craig noted that the subject development is located approximately 41 meters from the adjacent tower to the west, which exceeds the City's tower separation guidelines.

## Panel Discussion

The Panel expressed support for the project and appreciated the provision of affordable housing units and construction of a new City lane.

## Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded
That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of a highrise mixed-use development containing approximately $436 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(4,695 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of commercial space, $641 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ( $6,904 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) of office space, and 134 dwellings (including 13 affordable housing units) at 8131 Westminster Highway on a site zoned "Downtown Commercial (CDT1)".

CARRIED

## 3. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 19-858597

((REDMS No. 6245695)
APPLICANT: 0855855 B.C. Ltd.
PROPERTY LOCATION: 9820 Alberta Road

## INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of six townhouse units at 9820 Alberta Road on a site zoned "Town Housing (ZT60)- North McLennan (City Centre)"; and
2. Vary the provision of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to reduce the minimum east side yard setback from 3.0 m to 2.25 m .

## Applicant's Comments

Eric Law, Eric Law Architects, with the aid of a visual presentation (copy on file, City Clerk's Office), provided background information on the proposed development, highlighting the following:

- a shared driveway on the neighbouring property to the east provides access to the proposed development;
- the siting, orientation and design of the two townhouse buildings make them compatible with neighbouring townhouse developments;
- one convertible unit is proposed with space provided for future installation of an elevator; and
- a five-foot wide sidewalk provides pedestrian access from Alberta Road to the townhouse units.

Denitsa Dimitrova, PMG Landscape Architects, briefed the Panel on the main landscape features of the project, noting that (i) the existing on-site tree at the northwest corner of the site and the off-site tree adjacent to the southwest corner of the site will be retained and protected, (ii) the streetscape will be enhanced by a low transparent fence along the site frontage, (iii) a six-foot fence will be installed along the west and south property lines to provide privacy to neighbours, (iv) the outdoor amenity areas of the subject development and the neighbouring property to the east will be combined for shared use of the two developments, (v) the subject development will provide two types of play equipment, a picnic table, and open lawn area for the shared outdoor amenity area, (vi) each private yard will be separated by a six-foot high privacy fence, and (vii) permeable paving treatment is proposed for the two visitor parking stalls.

In reply to queries from the Panel, Ms. Dimitrova acknowledged that (i) the outdoor amenity area for the neighbouring property to the east to be shared with the subject development is already existing, and (ii) a bench is proposed near the mail kiosk and a bike rack will be provided adjacent to the internal drive aisle of the proposed development.

In reply to queries from the Panel, Mr. Craig noted that the proposed variance to the east side yard setback will result in better separation between the subject site and adjacent development to the west and as well as increase site permeability.

## Staff Comments

Mr. Craig noted that (i) the proposed east side yard setback variance was identified at rezoning stage, and (ii) there will be a Servicing Agreement associated with the project for frontage works and site servicing along Alberta Road.

In reply to query from the Panel, Mr. Craig stated that the proposed setback variance only applies to the northern townhouse building of the subject development located along Alberta Road.

## Gallery Comments

A Richmond resident and owner of Unit 2, 9800 Alberta Road, stated that he lives in the townhouse building immediately adjacent to the west of the subject site. He queried about (i) the potential impact of the proposed east side yard setback variance to the adjacent townhouse building, (ii) the height of the proposed fence along the subject site's west property line which could reduce the visual connection between the two adjacent developments, (iii) the potential for pedestrian connectivity between the subject site and the adjacent development to the west, and (iv) the size and potential impact of trees to be planted along the western edge of the subject site on sun exposure to the adjacent townhouse building.

## Development Permit Panel

Wednesday, June 24, 2020

In reply to the queries, the Chair noted that the proposed setback variance will increase the separation between the north building of the subject development and the townhouse building to the west. In addition, Ms. Dimitrova confirmed that (i) a six-foot high wood fence with a two-feet high transparent upper portion is proposed to be installed along the west property line of the subject site, (ii) there is no provision for pedestrian connectivity between the two adjacent developments, and (iii) small and medium-sized deciduous trees are proposed to be planted along the west property line of the subject site.

## Correspondence

None.

## Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

## That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. permit the construction of six townhouse units at 9820 Alberta Road on a site zoned "Town Housing (ZT60)- North McLennan (City Centre)"; and
2. vary the provision of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to reduce the minimum east side yard setback from 3.0 m to 2.25 m .

CARRIED

## 4. Date of Next Meeting: July 15, 2020

## 5. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting be adjourned at 4:30 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, June 24, 2020.

Joe Erceg
Chair

Rustico Agawin
Committee Clerk

Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on Wednesday, June 24, 2020.

| From: | Derrick Chang [dfc01@aol.com](mailto:dfc01@aol.com) <br> Sent: |
| :--- | :--- |
| June 24, 2020 12:14 PM |  |
| To: | CityClerk |
| Subject: | 8131 Westminster - June 24th hearing |
| Importance: | High |
| Categories: | Rustico (DPP \& ADP) |

To whom this may concern,
I reside in the Richmond Landmark, located at 8081 Westminster Hwy and have the following concern regarding the adjacent proposed development at 8131 Westminster:-

- Traffic congestion and impact; (any traffic impact analysis or report?)
- Shadowing effect from the project; (any shadow study?)
- The project rendering is deceiving as it did not show the close proximity to our building.

Furthermore, there are quite a few elderlies who reside in 8081 Westminster and are concern about the noise \& dust mitigation during the construction as well as road closures.

Sincerely,
Derrick Chang

## City of

Richmond

## Report to Development Permit Panel

To: Development Permit Panel
From: Wayne Craig
Director, Development

Date: June 24, 2020
File: DP 15-716274
(via DP 19-880533)

Re: Application by Hamilton High Street Holdings Corp. for a General Compliance Ruling at 23100 Garripie Avenue

## Staff Recommendation

That the attached plans involving changes to the design of the proposed building and landscaping be considered to be in General Compliance with the approved Development Permit (DP 15716274).


Wayne Craig
Director, Development
(604-247-4625)
WC:rp
Att. 3

## Staff Report

## Origin

Hamilton High Street Holdings Corp. has requested a General Compliance ruling regarding a minor change to the issued Development Permit (DP 15-716274) for a 130-unit senior's housing building at 23100 Garripie Avenue in Hamilton Village. A location map for the subject property is provided Attachment 1.

The rezoning for the project (RZ 14-660662), to the "Low Rise Apartment (ZLR27) -Neighbourhood Village Centre (Hamilton)" zone, was adopted by Council on June 12, 2017. Subsequently, a Development Permit (DP 15-716274) was issued on January 29. 2018. The subject site is currently under construction.

The proposed modifications to the Development Permit include changes to landscaping, site layout and the Garripie Avenue and Westminster Highway frontages. The proposed changes do not necessitate changes to legal agreements. A Servicing Agreement (SA 15-617692) for off-site works was previously approved, and the proposed changes do not necessitate any changes to that agreement.

## Background

Development surrounding the subject site is as follows:

- To the north, a lot zoned "Senior's Care Facility (ZR11) - Hamilton Village (Hamilton)" contains a three-storey residential care facility with 135 residential units. The Development Permit for that site (DP 17-771210) was approved on January 15, 2018.
- To the east, vacant lots zoned "Single Detached (RS1/F)" which are being used for temporary parking and staging related to construction on adjacent lots. This area has been designated by the Hamilton Area Plan for future mixed use development and stacked townhouses.
- To the south, a lot zoned "Residential/Limited Commercial (ZMU29) - Neighbourhood Village Centre (Hamilton)" contains a multi-unit residential building that is currently under construction. The Development Permit for that site (DP 15-716268) was approved on January 29, 2018.
- To the west, across Westminster Highway, a vacant former fire hall site is zoned "School and Institutional (SI)". This area has been designated by the Hamilton Area Plan for townhouse development.


## Staff Comments

The proposed changes to the plans attached to this report are in general compliance with the issued Development Permit for this project (see Attachment 2 for the relevant approved drawings). In addition, the proposed changes (Attachment 3) complies with the intent of the applicable sections of the Official Community Plan (OCP) and is generally in compliance with the "Low Rise Apartment (ZLR27) - Neighbourhood Village Centre (Hamilton)" zone.

## Analysis

## Proposed Changes to the Approved Design:

General Landscaping:

- Changes to various landscaped areas and their flora palettes are proposed based on the re-arrangement of building and hard landscaping features. Changes to the plantings include:
- The removal of two Japanese snowbell trees (which had been located in the south yard under the approved landscape design) from the flora palette, which has been replaced a Japanese maple tree in the south yard and a Ginko Biloba tree in the west yard. Staff note that there is no net loss to the number of trees on the subject site.
- A substantial amount of groundcover plantings (predominantly kinnickinik and wild ginger) are proposed, replacing Barrenwort in the west yard and grassed berms in the lower courtyard area.
- Establishing an upper and lower courtyard area, with sloped walkways between the berms. The lower courtyard area is approximately $30 \mathrm{~cm}(1 \mathrm{ft})$ lower than the upper area. A new landscape berm on the northwest area of the courtyard accommodates a smooth transition from the upper courtyard area and the new lower elevation of the courtyard.
- These changes maintain and improve upon the high quality of landscape design that was previously approved.
- All landscaped areas are proposed to be irrigated.
- The City is currently holding a landscape security for $\$ 735,056$, which was provided through the issued Development Permit.


## General Fenestration and Building Materials

- Various minor changes to the dimensions (including the height of the sill from the ground) of the first-storey large-pane windows on all elevations.
- Change of column material from wood to stone on the south elevation (on the west side) and the north elevation (on the east side).
- Minor changes to doorway location on the north elevation (on the east side), east elevation (change to double-doors) and south elevation (east side).
- The proposed changes to fenestration and building materials retain the quality and spirit of the approved building design.


## Fronting on to Garripie Avenue:

- As Garripie Avenue was constructed, it became evident that changes to the grading of the Garripie Avenue frontage on the subject property and the front of the subject building would be required in order to meet the constructed grade of Garripie Avenue and the adjacent property to the north.
- The changes to grade in the front yard of the subject site has resulted in a stairway needing to be extended toward the pedestrian thoroughfare in order to comply with the BC Building Code. In order to maintain free-flowing pedestrian areas, the stairways and landscaping beds in the area fronting Garripie Avenue had to be redesigned.
- A Handi-Dart pick-up and drop-off area has been introduced to the front driveway loop.
- The garbage/recycling staging area has been relocated from the west side of the front entrance driveway loop (between it and the parkade access ramp) to the east side of the
driveway loop, in order to accommodate the final civil road design. Solid waste from the subject property and 23233 Gilley Road to the south will also be picked up from this location. With respect to the proposed relocated garbage area staff note that:
- Pedestrian access to and from the east side of the site is maintained through the use of crosswalks across Garripie Avenue to facilitate movement around the proposed garbage/recycling staging area. No changes to the existing Statutory Right of Way and Pedestrian Rights of Passage is required.
- Pick up of solid waste (garbage and recycling) is anticipated to occur one day per week, and the carts for holding the garbage or recycling is expected to remain in the staging area for a period of two hours on those days.
- The applicant has confirmed to City staff that the relocation of the staging area is not in conflict with any legal agreements with the City or the owners of 23233 Gilley Road.


## Fronting on to Westminster Highway:

- The west yard was originally proposed to include a paved walkway elevated above the street level for exclusive use by residents. The walkway ran the length of the building, parallel to Westminster Highway, and connected the courtyard area to the corner of Westminster Highway and Garripie Avenue, where a gate for accessing the walkway was located.
- The approved paved walkway, pedestrian gate and terraced landscaping design in the west yard is proposed to be removed in order to address unanticipated changes to finished grade in this area and to better protect the memory care patients from leaving the site. Likewise, the exit stairway is proposed to be reconfigured in order to address the grade changes and to provide a paved walkway connection to the City sidewalk along Westminster Avenue.
- The walkway and the terraced landscape design in the west yard is proposed to be replaced with a 4:1 landscaped slope and the introduction of an additional Ginko Biloba tree. The proposed sloped treatment of the west yard provides a softer edge condition than the terraced approach in the approved landscape design.


## Conclusions

Hamilton High Street Holdings Corp. has requested a General Compliance ruling for proposed changes to landscaping, site layout and the Garripie Avenue and Westminster Highway frontages. The proposed modifications are within the scope of the General Compliance Guidelines as adopted by Council. Staff have no objection to the proposed revisions. Staff recommend support of this General Compliance request for the proposed changes to the approved Development Permit.


Robin Pallett
Planner 2
(604-276-4200)
RP:blg
Attachments:
Attachment 1: Location Map
Attachment 2: Approved Design via DP 15-716274
Attachment 3: Proposed Design

City of
Richmond
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## City of Richmond

## Report to Development Permit Panel

To: Development Permit Panel
Date: June 23, 2020
From: Wayne Craig
File: DP 18-820689
Director, Development
Re: Application by Integrated Construction for a Development Permit at 1600 Savage Road
(Re: Referral from April 27, 2020 Council Meeting)

## Staff Recommendation

That a Development Permit be issued which would permit the construction of a warehouse building at 1600 Savage Road on a site zoned "Light Industrial (IL)" and partially designated as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA).


Wayne Craig
Director, Development
(604-247-4625)
WC:sds
Att. 5

## Staff Report

## Origin

Integrated Construction has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to develop a $2,918 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(31,415 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ warehouse building at 1600 Savage Road on a site zoned "Light Industrial (IL)" and partially designated as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA).

The Development Permit application was endorsed by the Development Permit Panel at the meeting on October 17, 2019 (original Staff Report is provided as Attachment A). On April 27, 2020, the application was considered by Council and referred back to the Development Permit Panel under the following referral motion:

That Development Permit Application (DP 18-820689) by Integrated Construction, located at 1600 Savage Road, be referred back to the Development Permit Panel to:
a) assess construction activity occurring on site;
b) investigate alternative site plans that would allow for the retention of the central Environmentally Sensitive Area; and
c) review the Environmentally Sensitive Area restoration plans as it relates to the scope of work involved with invasive species removal and tree replacement planting species.

This supplementary Report provides a response to the referral and presents the Development Permit for consideration by the Development Permit Panel.

## Development Information

Please refer to the original Staff Report dated September 25, 2019 (Attachment A) for information regarding development information, background, staff comments and analysis, including the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA).

Please refer to this supplementary Report and the Development Permit plans (Plan \#1-5) that accompany this Report for the response to the Council referral motion. Staff worked with the applicant to provide additional information to address the Council referral motion, and after a comprehensive assessment of alternatives, no changes were made to the Development Permit plans previously endorsed by the Development Permit Panel on October 17, 2019.

## Staff Comments

Staff comments are provided in bold italics describing the response to each component of the referral motion.

Council referral item (a): assess construction activity occurring on site.
Response:

- Staff conducted site inspections, identified construction activities were conducted without a Permit, and ensured a stop work order was placed to prohibit any further construction. The applicant had proceeded with form works for the building's footings without receiving Council approval and issuance of the Development Permit or issuance of the associated

Building Permit. Future construction activity on-site will require a Council issued Development Permit and issued Building Permit.

- As a result of staff inspections, the City's Tree Preservation Officer also identified that six trees (tag\# 726, 727, 728, 729, 730 \& 731) were removed prior to Development Permit issuance and without Permits (Attachment B). The property owner and applicant were each fined $\$ 6,000$ for the removal of the trees, for a total of $\$ 12,000$ in fines, which have been paid. Staff note that the trees which were removed without a Permit were located outside of the ESA and had been identified for removal through the Development Permit application process.
- The project Arborist and Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) have confirmed the remaining trees and ESA have not been impacted by the construction activities and all tree and ESA protection fencing has been installed. A memorandum from the Project QEP confirming this information is provided in Attachment $C$.
- Tree Preservation staff have also conducted a site visit and confirmed tree and ESA protection fencing has been installed.

Council referral item (b): investigate alternative site plans that would allow for the retention of the central Environmentally Sensitive Area.

Response:

- As part of the original staff review process for the Development Permit application, alternative site planning was considered to allow for the retention of the central ESA. It was determined that retention of the central ESA was not feasible to accommodate the proposed building envelope, vehicle access and required vehicle parking and circulation.
- In response to the referral, the applicant has investigated alternatives to retain the central ESA. An assessment of these alternatives demonstrated that the retention of the central ESA does not allow the proposal to achieve the desired floor area and lot coverage, required vehicle parking and circulation, and results in conflicts with the existing shared access private easement agreement with the property to the south.
- The applicant has also provided a letter from the property owner (Attachment D), who will be relocating his existing businesses in Richmond into the proposed building. The letter indicates that the alternative options to retain the central ESA would not serve the operational needs of the businesses, including issues regarding dock loading and circulation, floor space and building orientation.
- In addition, the retention of the central ESA would also result in the removal of the currently proposed additional habitat area in the northern ESA. The project QEP has provided confirmation that the proposed addition and remediation of habitat in the northern ESA will have a higher value in terms of habitat function relative to retaining the existing central ESA. A memo from the Project QEP confirming this information is provided in Attachment E. The existing chainlink fence will be removed and new split rail fencing will be installed to delineate the northern ESA, including the proposed additional area.

Council referral item (c): review the Environmentally Sensitive Area restoration plans as it relates to the scope of work involved with invasive species removal and tree replacement planting species.

Response:

- As identified in the memo from the project QEP provided in Attachment C, the QEP has confirmed that the removal of invasive English Ivy (along with removal of other invasive species) from affected areas will be part of the ESA compensation plan, including the ivy climbing the trees.
- All restoration work must be conducted under the supervision of the project QEP and monitoring requirements will ensure the invasive species removal is successful. The applicant has provided a contract with the QEP to monitor and provide annual reporting to the City on the ESA for three years following completion.
- The applicant was also asked to investigate the planting of Lodgepole Pines as part of the ESA compensation plan. The project QEP has recommended not to include Lodgepole Pines as a replacement tree species, due to the following:
- Lodgepole Pines are not listed as one of the trees endemic to the coastal biogeoclimatic zone.
- Although Lodgepole Pines are currently present in the central ESA, it is likely these were planted rather than occurring naturally.
- The canopy cover within the northern ESA would likely shade out the Lodgepole Pines, limiting growth and potentially long term survival.
- Proposed tree species to be planted in the ESA were recommended by the project QEP and are generally consistent with the "Upland Forest (UPFO)" ESA designation and the "Suitable Trees for Replanting in the City of Richmond" list.


## Conclusions

The applicant has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to develop a $2,918 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(31,415 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ warehouse building at 1600 Savage Road on a site zoned "Light Industrial (IL)" and partially designated as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA).

The applicant has provided supplemental information in order to address the issues identified in the referral and direction by Council at the meeting of April 27, 2020. Staff recommend that the Development Permit be endorsed, and issuance by Council be recommended.


Steven De Sousa
Planner 1
(604-204-8529)
SDS:blg
Attachment A: Original Staff Report to Development Permit Panel (dated September 25, 2019)
Attachment B: Trees removed without a Permit
Attachment C: Memo from the Project QEP regarding construction impacts
Attachment D: Letter from the Proposed Tenant
Attachment E: Memo from the Project QEP regarding ESA

## City of Richmond

## Report to Development Permit Panel

To: Development Permit Panel
Date: September 25, 2019
From: Wayne Craig
File: DP 18-820689
Director of Development
Re: Application by Integrated Construction for an Environmentally Sensitive Areas Development Permit at 1600 Savage Road

## Staff Recommendation

That an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) Development Permit be issued at 1600 Savage Road in order to allow construction of a warehouse building on a site partially designated as an ESA.


Att. 6

## Staff Report

## Origin

Integrated Construction has applied to the City of Richmond for an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) Development Permit to construct a $2,918 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(31,415 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ warehouse building at 1600 Savage Road (Attachment 1). As the construction would impact an ESA, a Development Permit is required prior to Building Permit approval.

The site is currently developed as a paved parking lot. No rezoning is needed as the proposed use is consistent with the 'Light Industrial (IL)' zone.

## Development Information

Please refer to the attached Development Application Data Sheet (Attachment 2) 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 across River Road, City-owned land zoned Light Industrial (IL) and designated as Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA);
- to the east, an industrial building on a lot zoned 'Light Industrial (IL)' and partially designated as ESA;
- to the south, an industrial building with outdoor storage on a lot zoned 'Light Industrial (IL)'; and
- to the west across Savage, an industrial building on a lot zoned 'Light Industrial (IL)'.


## Staff Comments

The proposed scheme attached to this report has satisfactorily addressed the significant Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) issues and other staff comments identified as part of the review of the subject Development Permit application (DP Plans 1, 2, 3, 4.a, 4.b and 5). In addition, it complies with the intent of the applicable sections of the Official Community Plan and is generally in compliance with the Light Industrial (IL) zone. No variances are being sought through this ESA Development Permit application.

## Advisory Design Panel

As the scope of this Development Permit does not involve any building design components, the application has not been reviewed by the Advisory Design Panel.

## Analysis

## Site Planning

1600 Savage Road is a $5,257 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ( 1.3 acre) parcel zoned Light Industrial (IL) and designated Industrial in the Official Community Plan. An Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA)
designation is present on portions of the property and requires that a Development Permit be issued prior to construction. There are two distinct ESA on site: the northern ESA (approximately $788 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / 8,482 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ), which is predominantly 'Upland Forest' with a small sliver of 'Shoreline' ESA along the northern property line; and a central, disconnected ESA (approximately $198 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / 2,131 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) that is entirely classified as 'Upland Forest' (Attachment 3).

The applicant proposes to remove the Upland Forest ESA at the centre of the site to enable development of a warehouse with associated office space, loading and surface parking. The proposed two storey warehouse is $2,918 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(31,415 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ and $11.1 \mathrm{~m}(36.5 \mathrm{ft})$ in height. The proposal includes four loading bays: two located on either side of the front elevation in order to serve separate operational requirements of the business. Two vehicle driveways are proposed from Savage Road to facilitate loading from each of the loading areas; one at the southern corner of the site (currently existing) and a second access to the north near River Road.

To compensate for removing the central ESA area, the applicant proposes to establish two new ESA areas on-site (DP Plan 1):

- $305 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,283 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of new ESA contiguous with the existing northern portion of Upland ESA; and
- $109 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,173 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of new, discontinuous ESA along the western property boundary adjacent Savage Road.

Net gain in total ESA over the site would be $216 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,325 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$. Additional compensation measures proposed include the removal of invasive species and replanting of native species within the existing ESA to be retained and within the new ESA to be established.

## ESA Environmental Inventory

The City of Richmond identifies the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) on this site as predominantly 'Upland Forest' with a small sliver of 'Shoreline' ESA along the northern property line. The northern portion of Upland Forest ESA is contiguous with ESA designated on the neighbouring parcel to the east (totalling approximately $1,900 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / 20,451 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ). Both are contiguous with the Shoreline and Intertidal ESAs associated with the Fraser River to the north, which form a 'hub' in the Ecological Network Management Strategy.

An environmental inventory and assessment report was submitted by Aquaterra Environmental Ltd. (July, 2019). The environmental inventory, completed in the winter of 2018 and spring of 2019 , found the site to be primarily disturbed and generally flat with no defining geological or topographical features. No watercourses were found on site, although a dry ditch was observed immediately north of the site within the City road dedication, and a Riparian Management Area (RMA) protected watercourse was observed to the west across Savage Road. The Fraser River is located less than 50 m north of the site.

Within the small portion of on-site Shoreline ESA, vegetation was found to consist of riparian vegetation, including: mature black cottonwood, red alder, red-osier dogwood and paper birch trees.

The areas classified as Upland Forest, both the northern and the central ESA areas, were found to be degraded habitat with established invasive species throughout. The northern ESA, which is proposed to be protected, consists of non-native Norway maple, as well as native Western red cedar, black cottonwood, lodgepole pine, Western red pine and red alder, with an understory impacted by invasive species and dominated by Himalayan blackberry. Invasive species cover was found to be approximately $60 \%$. The trees were found to be generally intact and providing cover and habitat for terrestrial species such as birds and small mammals.

The central ESA, which is proposed to be removed, consists of 15 conifer trees, including lodgepole pine, Western red cedar and Western red pine. The understory consists of large cleared areas with invasive Himalayan blackberry and cherry laurel. Invasive species cover was found to be approximately $50 \%$. The central ESA was found to have little habitat value as a result of its small size and isolation from other habitat areas, marginal understory cover and anthropogenic disturbance from being situated within a parking lot.

Limited bird activity was observed during the field assessments; direct observations were limited to Northwestern crow, with one inactive crow's nest observed within a row of off-site trees to the west. One bald eagle site was observed approximately 300 m east of the site along the Fraser River. According to Aquaterra, site redevelopment is not anticipated to impact bald eagles or their nesting success.

No mammals, amphibians, reptiles or invertebrates were directly observed.

## Tree Inventory

The applicant has submitted a Certified Arborist's report which identifies on-site and off-site tree species, assesses tree structure and condition, and provides recommendations for tree retention and removal relative to the proposed development. The report assesses 54 bylaw-sized trees on the subject property, 4 trees on the neighbouring property, and 5 trees on City property.
(Attachment 4).

## Tree Removal

30 on-site trees are proposed to be removed, including 15 trees from the central ESA area and 15 trees located on-site but outside the ESA. The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has reviewed the arborist report and has the following comments:

- 1 tree (tag\# 704), a 48 cm Norway maple, exhibits a significant crack in the main trunk and is now a high hazard. This tree should be removed as soon as possible.
- 4 trees (tag\# 728, 729, 730 and 731), all Norway maples ranging from $20-25 \mathrm{~cm}$, are in poor condition (sparse canopy) and conflict with the proposed development. Remove and replace.
- 15 trees (tag $\# 711,712,713,714,715,716,717,718,719,720,721,722,723,724$ and 725 ) located in the central ESA are in good condition but conflict with the proposed development. Remove and replace.
- 6 are lodgepole pines ranging from $30-60 \mathrm{~cm}(\# 711,719,720,721,724$ and 725 );
- 8 are Western redcedars, ranging from $40-50 \mathrm{~cm}(\# 712,713,714,715,716,717$, 722 and 723); and
- 1 is a 25 cm Western red pine (\#718).
- 10 trees (tag\# 701, 702, 703, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 726 and 727), all Norway maples in good condition, ranging from $30-48 \mathrm{~cm}$, conflict with the proposed development. Design alternatives were assessed to protect tree tag \#701, 702, 703, 705, 706, 707, 708, and 709, however, insufficient area is available to accommodate trees as well as the required parking and drive aisle. The applicant has committed to replacing trees closer to the western property line. Tree tag \#726 and 727 conflict with the proposed building footprint.
- Replacement trees should be provided at a $2: 1$ ratio as per the OCP.
- If required replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site, a cash-in-lieu contribution in the amount of $\$ 500 /$ tree to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for off-site planting is required.


## Tree Retention

24 on-site trees and 4 off-site trees are proposed to be retained and protected on site. The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has reviewed the arborist report and has the following comments:

- 2 trees (tag \# 710 and 737), are located on-site but outside the ESA. Tree tag \#737 is a significant tree in good condition. These are to be retained and protected.
- 22 trees (tag \# 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745,746, 749, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, $758,759,760,761,762$, and 763) located in the northern ESA are in good condition. These are to be retained and protected.
- 4 trees (tag \#747, 748, 450, and 751) located on the neighbouring site are to be retained and protected.
- Retained trees should be protected as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.


## City Trees

5 trees (tag \# 732, 733, 734, 735, 736) located on City property were assessed by Parks Arboriculture staff.

- 4 trees (tag \#732, 733, 734 and 736) are to be retained.
- 1 tree ( $\operatorname{tag} \# 735$ ) is a 10 cm caliper tree that has been pruned for hydro lines and conflicts with development. Compensation of $\$ 650$ is required to remove the tree for the City to plant two new trees at or near the development site.


## Tree Protection

The applicant is to submit a tree management plan showing the trees to be retained and the measures taken to protect them during development stage (Attachment 4). To ensure that the
trees identified for retention are protected at the development stage, the applicant is required to complete the following items:

- Prior to approval of the Development Permit, the applicant is required to submit a tree security of $\$ 10,000$ for the four City trees to be protected.
- Prior to issuance of the Development Permit, the applicant is to register legal agreements on title to ensure protection and retention of the modified ESA, including protection of trees be retained on-site (tag \# 710, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745,746, 749, $752,753,754,755,756,757,758,759,760,761,762$, and 763 ) and submit landscape security for the restoration works
- Prior to issuance of the Development Permit, the applicant is to submit to the City a contract with a Certified Arborist for the supervision of all works conducted within or in close proximity to tree protection zones. The contract must include the scope of work required, the number of proposed monitoring inspections at specified stages of construction, any special measures required to ensure tree protection, and a provision for the arborist to submit a post-construction impact assessment to the City for review.
- Prior to any works on the subject sitc, the applicant is to ensure installation of tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained. Tree protection fencing must be installed to City standard in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03 prior to any works being conducted on-site, and remain in place until construction and landscaping on-site is completed.


## Tree Replacement

The applicant wishes to remove 30 on-site trees (tag \#701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, $709,711,712,713,714,715,716,717,718,719,720,721,722,723,724,725,726,727,728$, 729,730 and 731). The $2: 1$ replacement ratio would require a total of 60 replacement trees. The applicant has proposed to plant 26 trees in the proposed development. The required replacement trees are to be of the following minimum sizcs, bascd on the size of the trees being removed as per Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057.

Table 1: Tree Replacement Calculation

| No. of Replacement Trees | Minimum Caliper of Deciduous <br> Replacement Tree | Minimum Height of Coniferous <br> Replacement Tree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 8 cm | 4 m |
| 14 | 9 cm | 5 m |
| 8 | 10 cm | 5.5 m |
| 2 | 11 cm | 6 m |

To satisfy the 2:1 replacement ratio established in the OCP, the applicant will contribute a total of $\$ 17,000$ to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the remaining thirty-four trees that cannot
be accommodated on the subject property after redevelopment. An additional $\$ 650$ is required in compensation for one City tree to be removed.

As part of the Development Permit application, the applicant must provide a Landscape Plan prepared by a registered Landscape Architect, which must include the agreed upon replacement trees. The City will collect a Landscape Security prior to issuance of the Development Permit based on the cost estimate for the works, including a $10 \%$ contingency, provided by the Landscape Architect.

## Proposed Environmentally Sensitive Area Compensation

To compensate for removal of $198 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of ESA, the applicant proposes to add $414 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(4,456 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of new ESA, and complete landscape restoration and enhancement as follows (DP Plans 1, 2, 3, 4.a, 4.b and 5):

- removal of Himalayan blackberry and other invasive plant species within the existing northern ESA to be protected (approximately $788 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / 8,482 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of the site) and within the new ESA to be created, Attachment 5;
- expansion of the northern ESA by $305 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(93,283 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ and enhancing both the new and existing ESA at the north of the site (totalling $1,093 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / 11,765 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ). Proposed plant species include:
- 4 large western redcedar trees ( $5.0-5.5 \mathrm{~m}$ in height);
- 10 large Douglas fir trees (5.5-6.0 m in height);
- 345 native shrubs including 54 salal, 67 Oregon grape, 47 baldhip rose, 55 oceanspray, 58 salmonberry, 64 common snowberry plants; and
- 1059 perennial plants, including 120 vanilla leaf, 160 pacific bleeding heart, 214 sword fern, 284 small flowered alumroot, 80 large leaved lupine, and 201 pink fawn lily.

Plant density is proposed to be 1.3 plants $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ in addition to the existing trees to be retained.

- designation, enhancement and protection of $109 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,173 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of non-contiguous ESA with native plant species, including:
- 6 large western redcedar trees ( 5.0 m in height);
- 5 large Douglas fir trees ( 5.0 m in height);
- 87 native shrubs including 42 salal, 35 Oregon grape, 4 baldhip rose, 2 salmonberry, 4 common snowberry plants.

Plant density is proposed to be 0.9 plants $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$.

Table 2: Balance Sheet

| ESA Area | ESA Existing | ESA Loss | ESA Gain | FINAL ESA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northern ESA | $788 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(8482 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | 0 | $305 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,283 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $1,093 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(11,765 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| Central ESA | $198 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,135 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $198 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,135 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | 0 | 0 |
| New ESA along Savage Road | 0 | 0 | $109 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,177 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $109 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,177 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| TOTAL | $986 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(10,613 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $198 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,135 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $414 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(4,456 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | 1,202 m ${ }^{2}\left(12,938 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |

The proposal represents a net gain of $216 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,325 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ in habitat area (ratio of $2: 1$ ), with a net gain in function by augmenting the upland forest with a new densely planted, natural area to be protected as ESA. Enhancement will support utilization by a variety of terrestrial species, including small and medium-sized mammals, birds and invertebrates. Improvements are anticipated to improve foraging potential, cover, nesting, and direct and indirect utilization by wildlife as a home range for resident and migratory species.

To ensure that the proposed enhancements have the best chance of survival and that invasive species are controlled, monitoring and annual reporting by a Qualified Environmental Professional will occur for three years following completion of the landscape restoration plan.

Development Permit Considerations include bonding for the landscape restoration costs and success monitoring, installation of temporary tree and ESA protective fencing, and the registration of legal agreements to ensure protection and retention of the modified ESA (Attachment 6).

An existing covenant (BP 245419), associated with a previously issued Development Permit (DP 99-170971) and registered over the existing, northern ESA for the protection of the native vegetation, is to be discharged as a condition of this Development Permit. The new legal agreement, noted above, will reflect updated conditions, including the proposed modified ESA boundary and enhancements.

## Engineering Comments

A Servicing Agreement will not be required for this development. Utility connections and frontage improvements will be addressed through a Work Order at the time of Building Permit, including completing new water and stormwater connections. At the time of future installation of any private utilities, all above-ground utility boxes (transformers, kiosk, etc) required to service the development will be situated within the development site. Utility alignments and connections must be approved by Engineering.

Registration of a new 13 m Statutory Right of Way for access, construction and maintenance of future road, dike and utility works is a consideration of the Development Permit. The dyke SRW will overlap with the ESA protective covenant. The covenant will prohibit any excavation or construction within the SRW and provide the City with unrestricted vehicular and man access to all areas of the SRW. Any future impacts to ESA as a result of the ultimate dyke cross section will be addressed at that time.

An existing flood plain covenant (BP 245434), associated with a previously issued Development Permit (DP 99-170971), is to be discharged as a condition of this Development Permit. A new flood protection covenant agreement reflecting current City standards is a condition of this Development Permit.

## Financial Impact

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

## Conclusion

The applicant proposes to remove a total of $198 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,325 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ from the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) to allow development of a warehouse and associated parking, loading and office. Compensation is proposed through a combination of additional ESA designation on-site, planting of $414 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of newly established ESA area with native trees, shrubs and plants, and invasive species management and replanting of $788 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(8,482 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of existing ESA. The total net gain in area would be $216 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,325 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ with a total of $1,202 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(12,938 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of enhanced ESA (new and existing).

As the proposed landscape restoration plan would result in a net gain in ESA area and function, staff recommend that the Development Permit be endorsed, and issuance by Council be recommended.

## Jeanette Elmore

Planner 2

JE:cas
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## Development Application Data Sheet

## DP 18-820689

## Attachment 2

Address: 1600 Savage Road
Applicant: Integrated Construction
Owner: 10647462 Canada Ltd.
Planning Area(s): Bridgeport

| Floor Area: | Gross: $2,918 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | Net: $\underline{2,918} \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Proposed |
| Site Area: |  | 5,257 m ${ }^{2}$ |  | 5,257 m ${ }^{2}$ |
| Land Uses: |  | Surface parking lot |  | Warehouse |
| OCP Designation: |  | Industrial |  | No change |
| Zoning: |  | Light Industrial (IL) |  | No change |


|  | Bylaw Requirement | Proposed | Variance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | Max. 1.0 | 0.55 | none permitted |
| Lot Coverage: | Max. $60 \%$ | $42 \%$ | none |
| Setback - Front Yard: | Min. 3.0 m | Min. 3.0 m | none |
| Setback - Exterior Side Yard: | Min. 3.0 m | Min. 3.0 m | none |
| Setback - Interior Side Yard: | No minimum | 0.3 m | none |
| Setback - Rear Yard: | No minimum | 0.32 m | none |
| Height (m): | Max. 12.0 m | Max. 11.12 | none |
| Off-Street Parking Spaces: | Min. 30 | 30 | none |
| Off-Street Parking Spaces <br> (accessible): | Min. 1 | 1 | none |
| Total Off-Street Parking Spaces: | Min. 31 | 31 | none |
| Loading Spaces: | Min: 1 large $/ 1$ Medium | 2 Large 2 medium | none |
| Bicycle Parking Spaces: | Class $1: 8$ spaces <br> Class $2: 8$ spaces | Class 1.8 spaces <br> Class $2: 8$ spaces | none |


AQuAterna
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| *The tree health and structural condition ratings are as follows and are based on factors that could include one or a combination of: <br> Poor Condition - Severe Canopy diedack, significant lean, decayed, missing leader, significant disease or parasitic plant presence <br> Fair Condition - Moderate Canopy dieback and/or lean, limb defects, multiple stems, moderate foliage damage from stress, moderate damage from disease or parasite. <br> Good condition - Healthy vigorous growth, no or minor visible defects or damage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { TREE OR } \\ \text { TAG \# } \end{gathered}$ | BOTANICAL NAME | COMMON NAME | DBH (cm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CANOPY } \\ & \text { RAD. (m) } \end{aligned}$ | STEMS | CONDITION* | COMMENTS | RECOMMENDATION |
| 701 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 39 | 3 | 1 | Good-Fair | Pruned | Remove for Development |
| 702 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 34 | 3 | 1 | Good | Pruned, slight lean | Remove for Development |
| 703 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 48 | 3 | 1 | Good | Pruned, slight lean | Remove for Development |
| 704 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 48 | 3 | 1 | Poor | Crack in trunk, pruned | Remove for Condn/Development |
| 705 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 38 | 3 | 1 | Fair | Pruned, dieback | Remove for Development |
| 706 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 35 | 2 | 1 | Fair | Pruned, dieback | Remove for Development |
| 707 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 49 | 3 | 1 | Fair | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pruned, dieback, has birds } \\ & \text { nest } \end{aligned}$ | Remove for Development |
| 708 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 44 | 3 | 1 | Fair | Pruned, dieback, corrected lean, broken branches | Remove for Development |
| 709 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 37 | 2 | 1 | Fair | Pruned, dieback on one side, uncorrected lean | Remove for Development |
| 710 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | $\begin{gathered} 3 @ 25,1 @ \\ 15 \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 4 | Fair | Pruned, dieback, growing into tree wire and rebar | Retain and Protect |
| 711 | Pinus contorta | Lodgepole Pine | 40 | 2 | 1 | Good-Fair | Shaded dieback one side | Remove for Development |
| 712 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 45 | 4 | 1 | Good |  | Remove for Development |
| 713 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 45 | 4 | 1 | Good |  | Remove for Development |
| 714 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 50 | 4 | 1 | Good | Minor shaded dieback | Remove for Development |
| 715 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 50 | 4 | 1 | Good |  | Remove for Development |
| 716 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 45 | 4 | 1 | Good | Shaded dieback | Remove for Development |
| 717 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 40 | 2 | 1 | Good |  | Remove for Development |
| 718 | Pinus resinosa | Western Red Pine | 25 | 1 | 1 | Poor | Shaded dieback | Remove for Development |
| 719 | Pinus contorta | Lodgepole Pine | 35 | 1 | 1 | Poor | Shaded dieback, corrected lean | Remove for Condn/Development |
| 720 | Pinus contorta | Lodgepole Pine | 45 | 3 | 1 | Fair-Poor | Shaded dieback | Remove for Condn/Development |
| 721 | Pinus contorta | Lodgepole Pine | 30 | 2 | 1 | Poor | Leader missing, dieback, leaning | Remove for Development |
| 722 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 52 | 4 | 1 | Good | Shaded dieback | Remove for Development |
| 723 | Thuja plicata | Western Red Cedar | 40 | 3 | 1 | Poor | Some canopy dieback, fruiting bodies, holes in trunk indicate insect infestation, likely internal decay | Remove for Condn/Development |
| 724 | Pinus contorta | Lodgepole Pine | 60 | 2 | 1 | Fair | Shaded dieback, one stem removed, corrected lean | Remove for Development |
| 725 | Pinus contorta | Lodgepole Pine | 55 | 4 | 1 | Good-Fair | Shade dieback, corrected lean | Remove for Development |
| 726 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 40 | 4 | 1 | Good | Pruned | Remove for Development |
| 727 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 30 | 3 | 1 | Fair | Pruned, Dieback | Remove for Development |
| 728 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 25 | 1 | 1 | Fair | Pruned | Remove for Development |
| 729 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 25 | 2 | 1 | Fair | Dieback Leaning | Remove for Development |
| 730 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 25 | 2 | 1 | Poor | Missing leader, broken limbs, dieback, large trunk cavity | Remove for Condn/Development |
| 731 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 20 | 1 | 1 | Poor | Broken limbs, dieback, heavily pruned | Remove for Condn/Development |
| 732 | Acer freemanii | Freeman's Maple | 10 | 2 | 1 | Good-Fair | Leaders all pruned due to hydro lines | Retain and Protect |
| 733 | Acer freemanii | Freeman's Maple | 10 | 2 | 1 | Good-Fair | Leaders all pruned due to hydro lines | Retain and Protect |
| 734 | Acer freemanii | Freeman's Maple | 10 | 2 | 1 | Good-Fair | Leaders all pruned due to hydro lines | Retain and Protect |
| 735 | Acer freemanií | Freeman's Maple | 10 | 2 | 1 | Good-Fair | Leaders all pruned due to hydro lines | Remove for Development |
| 736 | Acer freemanii | Freeman's Maple | 17 | 3 | 1 | Good-Fair | Leaders all pruned due to hydro lines | Retain and Protect |
| 737 | Acer species | Maple | 40 | 5 | 1 | Good | Pruned on one side | Retain and Protect |
| 738 | Acer platanoides | Norway Man!e | 45 | 6 | 1 | Good |  | Retais and Protect |
| 739 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 50 | 3 | 1 | Good | Shaded dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 740 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 45 | 2 | 1 | Fair-Poor | Significant dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 741 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 30 | 4 | 1 | Fair | Shaded dieback, slight lean | Retain and Protect |
| 742 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 45 | 3 | 1 | Good | Shaded dieback on one side | Retain and Protect |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { TREE OR } \\ \text { TAG \# } \end{gathered}$ | BOTANICAL NAME | COMMON NAME | DBH (cm) | CANOPY RAD. (m) | STEMS | CONDITION* | COMMENTS | REGOMMENDATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 743 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 50 | 3 | 1 | Good-Fair | Shaded dieback on one side | Retain and Protect |
| 744 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 60 | 3 | 1 | Good-Fair | Dieback, one sided growth | Retain and Frotect |
| 745 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 60 | 3 | 1 | Good-Fair | Dieback, one sided growth | Retain and Protect |
| 746 | Populus trichocarpa | Black Cottonwood | 75 | 2 | 1 | Fair | Ivy on trunk | Retain and Protect |
| 747 | Populus trichocarpa | Black Cottonwood | 70 | 1 | 1 | Poor | Ivy on trunk | Retain and Protect |
| 748 | Pseudotsuga menziesii | Douglas fir | 70 | 2 | 1 | Good-Fair | lvy on trunk, some dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 749 | Populus trichocarpa | Black Cottonwood | 75 | 2 | 1 | Fair | Shaded dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 750 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 50 | 3 | 1 | Good-Fair | luy on trunk | Retain and Protect |
| 751 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | $\begin{array}{\|c} 1 \text { Braken, } 1 @ \\ 45,1 @ 40 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 3 | 3 | Good-Fair | Shaded dieback, ivy on trunk | Retain and Protect |
| 752 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | $\begin{gathered} 1 @ 10,1 @ \\ 15,1 @ 20 \\ 1 @ 35 \end{gathered}$ | 3 | 4 | Gooc-Fair | Shaded dieback, ivy on trunk | Retain and Protect |
| 753 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 60 | 6 | 1 | Good |  | Retain and Protect |
| 754 | Acer macrophyllum | Big Leaf Maple | 45 | 4 | 1 | Good | Djeback | Retain and Protect |
| 755 | Acer macrophyllum | Big Leaf Maple | 70 | 5 | 1 | Good-Fair | Dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 756 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 20.5 | 2 | 1. | Good |  | Retain and Protect |
| 757 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 22 | 2 | 1 | Poor | Missing leader | Retain and Protect |
| 758 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 20.5 | 1 | 1 | Good-Fair | Dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 759 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | $\begin{gathered} 1 @ 22,1 @ \\ 15 \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 2 | Good-Fair | Corrected lean | Retain and Protect |
| 760 | Alnus rubra | Red Alder | 41 | 4 | 1 | Good | Shaded dieback | Retain and Protect |
| 761 | Populus trichocarpa | Black Cottonwood | 22 | 2 | 1 | Good |  | Retain and Protect |
| 762 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 55 | 7 | 1 | Good |  | Retain and Protect |
| 763 | Acer platanoides | Norway Maple | 50 | 6 | 1 | Good-Fair | Shaded Dieback, Pruned | Retain and Protect |

ATTACHMENT 5
Figure 9: 1600 Savage Road - May 2019 Invasive Plant Mapping


# Development Permit Considerations 

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

Address: 1600 Savage Road
File No.: DP 18-820689

## Prior to approval of the Development Permit, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. Receipt of a Letter of Credit for landscaping and tree retention security in the amount of $\$ 36,247.20$ based on the cost estimate provided in the Environmental Impact Assessment (Aquaterra Environmental, July 30, 2019) including 10\% contingency.
2. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute $\$ 17,650$ to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of replacement trees within the City.
3. Submission of a Contract entered into between the applicant and a Certified Arborist for supervision of any on-site works conducted within the tree protection zone of the trees to be retained. The Contract should include the scope of work to be undertaken, including: the proposed number of site monitoring inspections, and a provision for the Arborist to submit a post-construction assessment report to the City for review.
4. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of $\$ 10,000$ for the four City trees to be retained.
5. Installation of appropriate tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained as part of the development prior to any construction activities, including building demolition, occurring on-site.
6. Installation of appropriate Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) protection fencing and silt control fencing at the boundary of the ESA as proposed by the Development Permit, per the ESA Changes Plan L2. 2 (August 22, 2019) prior to any construction activities, including building demolition, occurring on-site.
7. Submission of a Contract entered into between the applicant and a Qualified Environmental Professional to monitor and provide annual reporting to the City on the ESA for three years following City approval of substantial completion.
8. The granting of a 13 m wide statutory right-of-way along the northern property line for the purpose of access, construction, and maintenance of future road, dike, and utility works by the City. The SRW shall prohibit any excavation or construction within the SRW and provide the City with unrestricted vehicular and man access to all sections of the SRW.
9. Registration of a flood plain covenant on title identifying a minimum habitable elevation of 3.0 m GSC.
10. Registration of a legal agreement on title to identify the modified ESA and to ensure that landscaping is retained and planted as identified within the Environmental Impact Assessment (Aquaterra Environmental, July 30, 2019) and will not be abandoned or removed.
11. Registration of a legal agreement on title to allow City access to the property in case the works identified within the Environmental Impact Assessment (Aquaterra Environmental, July 30, 2019) are not completed, maintained or monitored as proposed.
12. Discharge of Covanant BP245419.
13. Discharge of Covenant BP245434.

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

1. Submission of a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to the Transportation Department. Management Plan shall include location for parking for services, deliveries, workers, loading, application for any lane closures, and proper construction traffic controls as per Traffic Control Manual for works on Roadways (by Ministry of Transportation) and MMCD Traffic Regulation Section 01570.
2. Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
3. Complete works to be done at the developer's sole cost via City Work Order:

- Water Works:
$\qquad$
a) Using the OCP Model, there is $424 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ of water available at a 20 psi residual at the Savage Road frontage. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of $250 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$.
b) The Developer is required to:
i) Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage building designs.
ii) Provide a right-of-way for the water meter. Minimum right-of-way dimensions to be the size of the meter box (from the City of Richmond supplementary specifications) + any appurtenances (for example, the bypass on W2o-SD) +0.5 m on all sides. Exact right-of-way dimensions to be finalized during the building pernit process.
iii) Install a water meter on the existing water service connection. Water meter to be located onsite in a right-of-way.
- Storm Sewer Works:
a) The Developer is required to:
i) Confirm the capacity and condition (via video inspection) of the existing storm connection near the south property line. If the existing storm connection is adequate to serve the proposed development, at the City's digression, the existing connection may be retained to scrve the proposed developincnt. A new inspection chamber will be required. If the cxisting storm comnection is not adequate to serve the proposed development, the existing connection shall be capped and a new storm comnection complete with inspection chamber shall be installed by the City at the developer's cost.
- Sanitary Sewer Works
a) The Developer is required to:
i) Confirm the capacity and condition (via video inspection) of the existing sanitary connection at the south property line. If the existing connection is adequate to serve the proposed development, at the City's digression, the existing connection may be retained to serve the proposed development. If the existing connection is not adequate to serve the proposed development, the existing connection shall be replaced by the City at the developer's cost.
b) At Developer's cost, the City is to:
i) Replace the sanitary inspection chamber at the south property line with a 1050 mm manhole.


## - Frontage Works

a) The Developer is required to:
i) Coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers:
(1) To pre-duct for future hydro, telephone and cable utilities on all road frontages.
(2) Before relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the property frontages.
(3) To underground overhead service lines.
(4) To locate/relocate all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks required to service the proposed development, and all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks located along the development's frontages, within the developments site (see list below for examples). A functional plan showing conceptual locations for such infrastructure shall be included in the development design review process. Please coordinate with the respective private utility companies and the project's lighting and traffic signal consultants to confirm the requirements (e.g., statutory right-of-way dimensions) and the locations for the aboveground structures. If a private utility company does not require an aboveground structure, that company shall confirm this via a letter to be submitted to the City. The following are examples of statutory right-of-ways that shall be shown on the architectural plans/functional plan:

- BC Hydro PMT - $4.0 \times 5.0 \mathrm{~m}$
- BC Hydro LPT $-3.5 \times 3.5 \mathrm{~m}$
- Street light kiosk $-1.5 \times 1.5 \mathrm{~m}$
- Traffic signal kiosk $-2.0 \times 1.5 \mathrm{~m}$
- Traffic signal UPS $-1.0 \times 1.0 \mathrm{~m}$
- Shaw cable kiosk - $1.0 \times 1.0 \mathrm{~m}$
- Telus FDH cabinet - $1.1 \times 1.0 \mathrm{~m}$

4. If applicable, payment of latecomer agreement charges associated with eligible latecomer works.
5. Obtain a Building Permit (BP) for any construction hoarding. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a public street, the air space above a public street, or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For additional information, contact the Building Approvals Department at 604-276-4285.

## Note:

* This requires a separate application.
- Where the Director of Development deems appropriate, the preceding agreements are to be drawn not only as personal covenants of the property owner but also as covenants pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act.
All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall have priority over all such liens, charges and encumbrances as is considered advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall, unless the Director of Development determines otherwise, be fully registered in the Land Title Office prior to enactment of the appropriate bylaw.
The preceding agreements shall provide security to the City including indemnities, warranties, equitable/rent charges, letters of credit and withholding permits, as deemed necessary or advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements shall be in a form and content satisfactory to the Director of Development.
- Additional legal agreements, as determined via thc subject development's Scrvicing Agreement(s) and/or Dcvelopment Permit(s), and/or Building Permit(s) to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering may be required including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, de-watering, drilling, underpinning, anchoring, shoring, piling, pre-loading, ground densification or other activities that may result in settlement, displacement, subsidence, damage or nuisance to City and private utility infrastructure.
- Applicants for all City Permits arc required to comply at all times with the conditions of the Provincial Wildlife Act and Federal Migratory Birds Convention Act, which contains prohibitions on the removal or disturbance of both birds and their nests. Issuance of Municipal permits does not give an individual authority to contravene these legislations. The City of Richmond recommends that wherc significant trees or vegetation exists on site, the scrvices of a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) be secured to perform a survey and ensure that development activities are in compliance with all relevant legislation.



## 1600 SAVAGE ROAD MONITORING MEMORANDUM <br> то: Adrian Botez <br> \#3-13680 Bridgeport Road Richmond, BC V6V 1V3 AQUAEERRA

fRom: Chris Lee, M.Sc., R.P. Bio., QEP, BC-CESCL
CC: Integrated Construction, City of Richmond, Orion Construction
DATE: 13 May 2020
RE: 1600 SAVAGE ROAD ENVIRONMENTAL INSPECTION \#2 (11 May 2020) - MONITORING MEMORANDUM

## 1 ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING MEMORANDUM OBJECTIVE

On 11 May 2020, Mr. Chris Lee, RPBio, QEP of AquaTerra Environmental Ltd. ('AquaTerra') attended the site, referenced as 1600 Savage Road in the City of Richmond (Figure 1). The monitoring event was conducted in response to concerns raised by the City of Richmond relating to alleged Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) disturbance. Representative monitoring photographs are attached to this memorandum.

Figure 1: Site Location (Outlined in Red).


## 2 ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING EVENT - COMPLIANCE EVALUATION

### 2.1 Erosion \& Sediment Control Compliance

No run-off, surface water quality issues, or erosion \& sediment control (ESC) issues were noted on-site at the time of the site monitoring event. Additional preload had been placed near the southern portion of the site. Catchbasin (CB) inlet protection remained in place and was functioning, as intended.

### 2.2 Environmentally Sensitive Area Protection Compliance

The blue temporary fencing had been relocated from the southern ESA treed area to the western site boundary. Orange snow fencing and wood framing had been installed in place of the relocated blue temporary fencing around the southern ESA boundary. No impacts to the ESAs on-site were observed. AquaTerra personnel noted that three (3) tree stumps had been recently deposited in the southern ESA. This ESA is to be removed as part of site re-development. Three additional tree stumps had been temporarily placed to the northeast of the southern ESA. The City of Richmond may have inadvertently assumed that trees had been cut within the southern ESA as a result of stump placement; however the number of trees (15) within the southern ESA remained intact with no evidence of impact (i.e., no injury or damage to the trees or their root systems). The trees and resulting stumps had been reportedly removed by the contractor from a narrow parking boulevard to the south, which was not part of the ESA. Trees within the Savage Road boulevard remain protected with tree protection fencing with the exception of one tree, and no encroachment or impact to the northern WSA were observed.

AquaTerra personnel thoroughly traversed the northern ESA to address the City of Richmond English Ivy infestation concerns of trees within the area. English Ivy ground cover was prevalent within the eastern portion of the northern ESA and a total of six (6) trees had been affected - 2 moderate infestations and 4 severe infestations, primarily affecting Red Alder and Douglas-fir. AquaTerra discussed English Ivy management with the contractor and owner during the monitoring event and confirmed the intent to grub affected area and to cut the ivy climbing the trees will occur when the contractor is restoring the northern ESA.

## 3 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT SUMMARY AND CLOSURE

In summary, during the 11 May 2020 monitoring event of 1600 Savage Road, AquaTerra verified compliance with ESC measures prescribed in the project drawings and did not identify any construction-related impacts to any of the ESAs on-site.

We trust this provides the information you currently require. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Digitally signed by Chris Lee DN: cn=Chris Lee,
(
Chris Lee, M.Sc., R.P. Bio., QEP, BC-CESCL
AquaTerra Environmental Ltd.

## Attachments:

Photographs

Photographs:
Photo 1: Southern ESA Fencing Protection looking northeast.


Photo 2: Deposited stumps within the ESA.


Photo 3: Stumps stored to the north of the southern ESA.


Photo 4: Northern ESA boundary and fencing.


Photo 5: Southern ESA boundary and minor erosion around footing excavation; no exposed roots
were observed


Photo 6: Minor English Ivy infestation - Red Alders.


Photo 7: English Ivy Infestation within the northern ESA.

\#3-13680 Bridgeport Road, Richmond, BC sales@open-windows.ca 604.971.6736 |www.open-windows.ca

Planning and Development Division<br>Development Applications<br>City of Richmond<br>6911 No 3 Rd<br>Richmond, BC, V6Y 2C1

## Re: ALTERNATIVE SITE PLAN

My name is Adrian Botez and I am the owner of Open Windows Inc. As you are aware, Open Window has submitted applications to the City of Richmond for the construction of a new industrial and office facility located at 1600 Savage Road.

In order to fully understand why the alternative site plan is not feasible solution for my business, let me please explain the business model we run.

I am currently run my operations in (3) buildings in the City of Richmond. The new facility at 1600 Savage Road will be used to consolidate all my operations into one building. There will be (2) separate companies that I own, that will operate out of this building. One company - Open Windows Inc. involves selling preassembled vinyl windows shipped from Europe. A portion of the warehouse will be used for the storage of these vinyl windows prior to shipping to sites. The second company - Nordica Aluminum Inc. involves aluminum windows manufacturing. The balance of the warehouse area will be used to fabricate these aluminum windows, it is a totally separate business and runs under separate permit and under different work safety rules than the vinyl windows company. The workers from Open Windows' storage area cannot and must not have access to the Nordica's production area due to safety hazards, a fence will be placed to separate the two areas. The ancillary office and showroom area of our proposed building will be utilized for both companies.

I will details some of the biggest issues with the Alternative Site Plan:

## Dock loading:

It is imperative that we have (2) separate dock loading points that can accommodate $40^{\prime}$ long containers, placed on opposite ends of the building, in order to separate our deliveries and operations of the wo companies, within the building. We receive weekly containers for both our companies, Open Windows and Nordica Aluminum.

The two separate operations taking place in the warehouse area of our building need to be separated (including separate loading areas for deliveries and shipping) for the operations of each business to work efficiently and safely.

It is impossible in the alternative plan to accommodate unloading $40^{\prime}$ containers, on opposite ends.

## Floor space:

On the alternative site plan, the main floor space is reduced under our minimum requirements.

On the alternative plan we have 19,462 sqf vs 23,909 sqf on the plan initially submitted with the full application package. That translates in almost $23 \%$ reduction of the floor area. Even on the initial plan we were forced to find solutions to accommodate all the production line for our aluminum products and the storage space needed.

With this square footage reduction, we will not able to run any operation for production of our structural glazed aluminum products. Structural glazed windows are the future in the windows business as the offer minimal frame exposure and more visible glass. To achieve this, glass needs to be structural glued on the aluminum frame using structural silicones. Doing so, the window panel needs to be kept horizontally until glue dries, in same position for 24 hours, it cannot be vertically stacked. Even with our designed racks for horizontal storage, we cannot pile more than 5 panels horizontally, therefore the storage space needs are much higher for the finished product.

Adding together all the space we need for Open Windows to store the already made vinyl frames received from Europe and for Nordica Aluminum to run the production operations with all the space needed for raw material storage, production line, finished product to be stored horizontally for 24 hours and finished product vertically stored, it is impossible to fit all these in such a small building.

## Building shape:

With the odd shape of the building due to shared access with neighbours next door, dividing of the building in between the two business, Open Windows and Nordica Aluminum, will make the floor space boundaries in very irregular shape, wasting lots of space that cannot be used efficiently for production line or storage with proper forklift access.

That will further reduce the usable flor space to ridiculous small numbers.

## Windows and daylight flow:

Comparing to submitted application where all the windows are facing West and lots of natural light will be available, the alternate plan has all the windows facing North, and most of them will be covered by the ESA that is in the middle of the lot and the one on the north boundary of the lot that has also high trees. That will translate in low natural lighting in our showroom and offices, making the use of artificial light a necessity, affecting the people working in the building.

Scientific research has proven that people seek out sunlit places and enjoy spending time in natural light. Research has also proven that there are real benefits associated with spending time in spaces that offer abundant natural light. The benefits of natural lighting are numerous and can affect a person's health, the environment and energy usage.

Survey by HR advisory firm Future Workplace called "The Employee Experience" reveals the reality is that employees crave something far more fundamental and essential to human needs. In a research poll of 1,614 North American employees, it was found that access to natural light is the number one attribute of the workplace environment, outranking stalwarts like onsite cafeterias, fitness centers, and premium perks including on-site childcare (only 4-8\% of FORTUNE 100 companies offer on-site child care).

The study also found that the absence of natural light hurts the employee experience. Over a third of employees feel that they don't get enough natural light in their workspace. $47 \%$ of employees admit they feel tired or very tired from the absence of natural light or a window at their office, and $43 \%$ report feeling gloomy because of the lack of light.

I thank you for taking the time to read my letter. We are pleased with the fact that our new project will be a productive component of the City of Richmond and will continue to contribute to the community in which we have been a part of for so long.

We target to be an innovative company, offering our employees that most are Richmond residents, a safe and enjoyable place to work. We grew up so much in such a sort time, but now with all these delays to get into our modern and remarkable new head office and manufacturing shop puts a lot of financial pressure on the companies I run.

Please advise if you require any further information on this subject.

Yours truly,
Adrian Botez


OPEN WINDOWS Inc.
\#3-13680 Bridgeport Road
Richmond, BC V6V 1V3
phone: 604.971.OPEN (6736)
www.open-windows.ca

## 1600 SAVAGE ROAD ESA COMMENTARY

TO: Adrian Botez
\#3-13680 Bridgeport Road Richmond, BC V6V 1V3

FROM: Chris Lee, M.Sc., R.P. Bio., QEP, BC-CESCL
cc: Integrated Construction, City of Richmond, Orion Construction
DATE: 04 June 2020
RE: 1600 SAVAGE ROAD ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREA COMMENTARY FOR CITY OF RICHMOND

As requested by the City of Richmond, this letter briefly re-affirms AquaTerra Environmental Ltd.'s position that the addition and remediation of habitat within the northern Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) will have a higher value in terms of habitat function relative to the existing central ESA at the site (referenced as 1600 Savage Road). The central ESA is a landscaped area with planted trees with an understorey comprised of invasive Himalayan Blackberry. The central ESA is not contiguous, being isolated geographically from other habitat areas. As such, habitat value will be limited to mobile species such as foraging and potentially nesting birds. It does not confer high habitat value for other species, including sensitive species / species-atrisk. Given the small size of the ESA, there is a large boundary effect, with a high potential for disturbance. In contrast, expansion and enhancement of the northern ESA will improve habitat function relative to existing conditions and provide increased foraging, nesting and movement opportunities through contiguous areas off-site and fronting the Fraser River. Additional detail to this effect is clearly referenced in the Environmental Assessment (EA) document issued by AquaTerra and can be reviewed for any supplementary details.

We trust this provides the information you currently require. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Lee, M.Sc., R.P. Bio., QEP, BC-CESCL
AquaTerra Environmental Ltd.

# Development Permit 

No. DP 18-820689

To the Holder:
Property Address:
Address: C/O UNIT 310-12960 84 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ AVENUE SURREY, BC V3W 1K7

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 \#5 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 $\$ 36,247.20$ 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 one year 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 18-820689 

| To the Holder: | INTEGRATED CONSTRUCTION |
| :--- | :--- |
| Property Address: | 1600 SAVAGE ROAD |
| Address: | C/O UNIT $310-1296084^{\text {th }}$ AVENUE |
|  | SURREY, BC V3W 1K7 |

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.
ISSUED BY THE COUNCIL THE
DAY OF

DELIVERED THIS DAY OF

MAYOR

City of



| 1 | DP 18-820689 SCHEDULE "A" | Original Date: 05/22/18 Revision Date: 05/23/18 Note: Dimensions are in METRES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |








## City of

 Richmond Report to Development Permit PanelTo: Development Permit Panel<br>From: Wayne Craig<br>Director, Development<br>Date: June 25, 2020<br>File: DP 18-835533<br>Re: Application by Mosaic No. 3 Road and Williams Limited Partnership for a Development Permit at 9900 No. 3 Road and 8031 Williams Road

## Staff Recommendation

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

1. Permit the construction of a four-storey mixed use building containing $638 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(6,867 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of non-residential uses on the ground floor and 33 secured market rental apartment units at 9900 No. 3 Road and 8031 Williams Road on a site zoned "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU44) Broadmoor"; and
2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to reduce the setbacks to No. 3 Road and Williams Road for the southwest corner of the building from 2.0 m to 0.0 m .


Wayne Craig
Director, Development
(604-247-4625)
WC:cl
Att. 3

## Staff Report

## Origin

Mosaic No. 3 Road and Williams Limited Partnership has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to develop a four-storey mixed use building containing approximately $638 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ( $6,867 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) of non-residential uses and 33 secured market rental apartment units totalling approximately $2,210 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(23,788 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ in area above the ground floor at 9900 No. 3 Road and 8031 Williams Road on a site zoned "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU44) - Broadmoor", with right-in/right-out vehicle access to No. 3 Road and Williams Road (Attachment 1). The site is currently vacant.

Consistent with the policies in the Official Community Plan (OCP) as it relates to sites within a Neighbourhood Centre and as it relates to the provision of a variety of housing types to accommodate the needs of a diverse population as encouraged by the Market Rental Housing Policy, the proposal involves:

- Commercial, office, and a limited range of other non-residential uses and services on the ground floor of the building.
- $100 \%$ market rental dwelling units on the second through fourth floors, secured through a market rental agreement registered on title and through the use of rental tenure zoning (i.e., 33 units).
- $42 \%$ of the units designed with two or more bedroom that are suitable for families, secured through a legal agreement to be registered on title prior to rezoning bylaw adoption.
- $30 \%$ of the units designed with basic universal housing features, and with aging-in-place features in all units, secured through a legal agreement to be registered on title prior to rezoning bylaw adoption.

The site is being rezoned from the "Gas \& Service Stations (CG2)" zone and the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" zone to the "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU44) - Broadmoor" zone for this project under Bylaw 10111 (RZ 18-835532). Also, to accommodate the proposed development on a land assembly with a single land use designation, an amendment to the land use designation in Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000 for the property at 8031 Williams Road is proposed under Bylaw 10110 from "Neighbourhood Residential" to "Neighbourhood Service Centre". Bylaws 10110 and 10111 were given Third Reading at the Public Hearing held on December 16,2019 , and the applicant is working to complete all of the rezoning considerations.

Consistent with the series of incentives identified in the OCP to encourage the development of new market rental housing and a diverse housing stock, this application is exempt from the City's Affordable Housing Strategy and Public Art Program Policy.

Off-site works required as part of the proposed development (after road dedication) include boulevard, road, and transportation infrastructure upgrades as well as water, storm, and sanitary service improvements, which will be undertaken as part of a Servicing Agreement (SA) to be entered into prior to rezoning bylaw adoption (SA 19-880238).

## Development Information

Please refer to the attached Development Application Data Sheet for a comparison of the proposed development data with the relevant Bylaw requirements (Attachment 2).

## Background

The subject site is located at the main intersection of No. 3 Road and Williams Road, in the Broadmoor planning area. The OCP identifies the intersection of No. 3 Road and Williams Road as one of eight future Neighbourhood Centres, which are intended to act as "hearts" in a community that provide a sense of place and welcome residents (Attachment 3).

Existing development immediately surrounding the subject site is as follows:

- To the north, is an existing townhouse complex fronting No. 3 Road on a lot zoned "Medium Density Townhouses (RTM1)" at 9700 No. 3 Road, as well as an existing single-family dwelling on a lot zoned "Single Detached (RS1/E)" at 9871 Pigott Road.
- To the south, across Williams Road, is a one-storey commercial building containing a convenience store and medical offices, as well as three-storey rental apartments on a site zoned "Local Commercial (CL)" and "Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1)" on the southeast corner of the intersection at 10060,10100 No. 3 Road and 8080 Williams Road.
- To the east, is an existing townhouse complex fronting Williams Road on a lot zoned "Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3) at 8091 Williams Road.
- To the west, across No. 3 Road, is an existing townhouse complex on a lot zoned "Low Density Townhouses (RTL1)" at 7711 Williams Road.
The subject site is also opposite an existing mixed use neighbourhood shopping centre containing a gas station, a range of commercial services, and a six-storey apartment building on the southwest corner of the No. 3 Road and Williams Road intersection.


## Rezoning and Public Hearing Results

During the rezoning process, staff identified the following design issues to be resolved at the Development Permit stage:

- Strengthening of the on-site pedestrian circulation through the surface parking area.
- Refining the concepts for the required City infrastructure on-site (e.g., location of water meter and traffic infrastructure cabinets etc.).
- Demonstrating that all of the proposed accessibility features are incorporated into unit design.
- Finalizing the proposed colour palette, exterior building materials, and landscape elements.
- Reviewing the applicant's design response to the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).
- Gaining a better understanding of the proposed sustainability features to be incorporated into the project.

Through the review of this Development Permit application, staff has worked with the applicant to address these issues to staff satisfaction and to ensure that the proposed architectural form and character is consistent with the intent of the design guidelines contained within the OCP. The applicant has made the following modifications to their proposal to address the urban design issues identified:

- Surface parking spaces and the accessory bike storage structure have been reconfigured to enable pathways to be incorporated between the surface parking area and the buildings, thus strengthening on-site pedestrian circulation.
- Placement of City infrastructure on-site has been refined. The water meter has been incorporated into the building's mechanical room, no longer resulting in conflicts with walkways and landscaping in the public realm. While the traffic infrastructure cabinets remain located on-site to the west of the building to meet the City's requirements for proximity to the signals within the intersection, options to minimize their visual impact have been investigated and have resulted in the opportunity to pursue one smaller traffic cabinet and to paint them to match the dark accents in the proposed building design.
- The plans have been revised to demonstrate that all of the proposed basic universal housing features in $30 \%$ of units ( 10 units) and the aging-in-place features in all units have been incorporated into unit design.
- The proposed colour palette, exterior materials for the principal building and accessory bike storage structure, and several landscape elements such as trellis and grading details have been finalized.
- Information on how the proposal responds to the principles of CPTED and the proposed sustainability features to be incorporated into the project are summarized in the "Analysis" section of this report below.

The Public Hearing at which the subject proposal was considered was held on
December 16, 2019. At the Public Hearing, written submissions were received by:

- The Chair of the Richmond Poverty Response Committee in support of the proposal due to the increase to the supply of purpose-built rental housing in the community, and the inclusion of some units designed with basic universal housing features.
- The Strata Council of the townhouse complex to the east at 8091 Williams Road against the proposal due to concerns about the potential for increased noise and commercial-related traffic at the intersection of No. 3 Road and Williams Road, increased neighbourhood population density and changes to household composition, and a perceived lack of need for additional commercial services in the neighbourhood.

In response to the neighbouring Strata Council's concerns, the proposed mixed use development:

- Will be designed and constructed with noise mitigation measures incorporated to avoid noise generated by the internal use of the building and mechanical equipment from penetrating into neighbouring residential areas that exceed noise levels allowed in the City's Noise Bylaw. A legal agreement to secure the noise mitigation measures as per an acoustic and thermal/mechanical report prepared by a registered professional is required to be registered on title prior to rezoning bylaw adoption.
- Is supported by a Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by a registered professional engineer, which confirms that the proposal has been designed to minimize disruption to existing traffic operations on both roads, and the applicant is providing a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategy as part of the proposed development including upgrades to the Williams Road bike lane and a contribution in the amount of $\$ 15,000$ to the City for future streetscape improvements at the No. 3 Road and Williams Road intersection. This is in addition to the road dedication to accommodate the standard boulevard, road, signal and transit improvements that are required with development.
- Is consistent with the policies contained within the OCP regarding neighbourhood centres, employment lands, and new market rental housing, in that: it adds to the existing range of land uses and densities needed to support residential, employment, daily shopping, personal service and enhanced transit service in this neighbourhood centre area; it retains and intensifies the supply of commercial lands required to 2041 in the Central Richmond area; and it enhances the supply of secured market rental housing, which is an important piece of Richmond's housing continuum.

In response to queries from City Council at the Public Hearing regarding the private outdoor spaces proposed with the development, the applicant had indicated that they would further investigate the feasibility of increasing the depth of the Juliet balconies as part of the Development Permit application review process, and more clearly determine what the implications for the project would be. The applicant has further investigated this issue and confirms that:

- pursuing an increased cantilevered depth for the 28 Juliet balconies is cost prohibitive under the economic model of a small-scale wood frame rental housing project, as it would involve additional material costs, construction costs, and increased fire suppression, and that the future residents would be best served by optimizing the size, functionality, and programming of the rooftop common outdoor amenity space, as currently designed;
- The increased balcony depth would not satisfy accessibility requirements for wheelchair users, would increase the perceived mass of the building, and would increase potential concerns of overlook onto neighbouring properties to the north;
- Recessed balconies would critically diminish unit plan functionality and/or reduce the total number of rental dwellings provided, as the building footprint is constrained;

The applicant's proposal is acceptable to staff on the basis that the total amount of common and private outdoor space recommended per unit is achieved when considering all of the proposed on-site outdoor space combined, and that the proposal has been designed to provide future residents with a highly-desirable opportunity for on-site access to common outdoor space on the rooftop, which is ideally situated to benefit from southern exposure, vertical separation from the street and surface parking, and is screened to limit overlook to neighbouring properties.

## Staff Comments

The proposed scheme attached to this report (Plans \# 1 to \# 6.n, and Reference Plans) has satisfactorily addressed the significant urban design issues and other staff comments identified as part of the review of the subject Development Permit application. In addition, it complies with
the intent of the applicable sections of the Official Community Plan (OCP) and is generally in compliance with the "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU44) - Broadmoor" zone, except for the zoning variances noted below.

## Zoning Compliance/Variances (staff comments in bold)

The applicant requests to vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to reduce the setbacks to No. 3 Road and Williams Road for the southwest corner of the building from 2.0 m to 0.0 m .

Staff supports the proposed variance due to the requirement for a 4 m x 4 m corner cut road dedication at No. 3 Road and Williams, and to enable a strong urban street wall at the southwest corner of the building at this prominent intersection. The proposed variance does not impact pedestrian circulation in the public realm.
The small triangular projection of the building into the setback consists of a white brick column element and a slight portion of black-framed glazing, which rises four storeys and is terminated with a black cornice detail at the top of the building. The projection into the setbacks was illustrated on the conceptual development plans considered at the Public Hearing and no concerns were identified.
The corner cut road dedication enables adequate visibility and streetscape infrastructure at the intersection and the applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by a registered professional engineer, which includes a sightline analysis of the building corner projecting into the setback, which has been accepted by the City's Transportation Department.

## Advisory Design Panel Comments

The Advisory Design Panel review of the proposal was held on May 20, 2020, and was supported to move forward to the Development Permit Panel subject to the applicant giving consideration to the comments identified at the meeting. A copy of the relevant excerpt from the Advisory Design Panel Minutes is attached for reference (Attachment 4). The design response from the applicant has been included immediately following the specific Design Panel comments and is identified in 'bold italics'.

## Analysis

## Conditions of Adjacency

- The proposal is designed with consideration of the adjacent townhouse and single-family dwelling context to the north and east.
- A shadow impact analysis undertaken by the applicant as part of the rezoning application review process is included in the Reference Plans to the Development Permit, and supports the proposed location of the building closest to the intersection and away from the existing adjacent housing to the north and east. The analysis indicates that the building will not cast significant shadows on the adjacent properties the majority of the times.
- Situating the principal building furthest away from the common property lines with adjacent sites also provides opportunities for screening and minimizing potential overlook. The principal building is buffered from adjacent sites by the proposed drive-aisle, surface parking, trees, and perimeter fencing. The common outdoor amenity space is situated on the
south side of the rooftop, is set back from the building edges and is screened by taller portions of the building containing the common elevator and stair access lobbies. Where a one-storey accessory bike storage structure is proposed along the north property line, it is proposed to be screened with climbing vines and perimeter fencing.


## Site Planning, Access, and Parking

- The proposed site layout consists of the principal building at southwest corner of the property, at the No. 3 Road and Williams Road intersection, and an L-shaped drive aisle flanked by surface parking to the north and east of the building. A one-storey accessory structure containing secured bike parking for residents of the building is proposed approximately mid-way along the north property line of the site, which is to be screened from the north by fencing and climbing vines.
- Commercial unit entrances on the ground floor are proposed along the Williams Road frontage and along the north side of the building, and are accentuated through the use of awnings, non-fixed landscape planters, and storefront glazing. The entrance to the residential lobby is proposed on the east side of the building, via a walkway leading from the public sidewalk on Williams Road, and is accentuated through a large awning, decorative paving stones, soft landscaping including trees, and an arrival area with seating.
- On-site pedestrian circulation is also provided through defined paths from the surface parking area to the raised walkways along the storefront entries on the north and south sides of the buildings, to the main residential entrance lobby on the east side of the building, and to the accessory bike storage structure and other service areas.
- To secure the opportunity to potentially provide pedestrian connectivity in the future through the subject site to the main intersection of this Neighbourhood Centre, the applicant has agreed to registration of a blanket Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) for Public Right-ofPassage (PROP) on title of the property prior to issuance of the Development Permit.
- Garbage, recycling, and organics storage is incorporated into the northeast corner of the building on the ground floor to facilitate access by building users and during collection service. The storage area is sized to accommodate the appropriate number of carts to service the development.
- Two sign structures for the site address, rental information, and businesses are proposed adjacent to each driveway crossing (at the southeast corner off Williams Road and at the northwest corner off No. 3 Road, respectively). Separate Sign Permit applications are required for the proposed signs.
- Vehicle access to the site was reviewed as part of the rezoning application review process and was supported by the City's Transportation Department. Two new driveway crossings are proposed as far away from the intersection as possible, in approximately the same locations as two of the existing driveway crossings (i.e., at the southeast corner on Williams Road, and at the northwest corner on No. 3 Road). Both new driveway crossings will be constructed with a triangular-shaped raised barrier curb island within the boulevard to physically restrict vehicle movements to the site to right-in/right-out only. The Traffic Impact Assessment Report, which has been reviewed and the findings supported by City staff, confirms that the proposed restricted vehicle access minimizes disruption to existing
traffic operations and reduces conflicting vehicle movements compared to the access configuration of the previous gas station that occupied the site at this intersection.
- Parking and loading is provided consistent with the Zoning Bylaw, and consists of a total of 54 vehicle parking spaces in the surface parking area, 54 short and long-term bike parking spaces in the form of bike racks along the commercial storefronts and in a one-storey accessory structure along the north property line, and the drive-aisle has been design to accommodate the required medium-sized loading space to be shared between the residential and commercial users.
- The applicant is providing a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategy as part of the proposed development, including but not limited to: monthly transit passes (2-zone) for one year for all 33 dwelling units, upgrades to the Williams Road bike lane, and a contribution in the amount of $\$ 15,000$ to the City for future streetscape improvements at the No. 3 Road and Williams Road intersection.
- The proposed shared commercial/visitor parking spaces, common long-term bike storage, shared commercial/residential loading space, and TDM measures are to be secured through registration of a legal agreement on title prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.


## Open Space Design and Landscape Design

## Outdoor Amenity Space

- A large common outdoor amenity space for residential users is proposed on the south side of the rooftop, which is accessible by elevator and stairway, and consists of a passive outdoor deck area for dining, barbequing, and lounging, as well as an area for more active uses such as artificial turf play/lawn bowling, ping pong tables, raised garden beds with potting bench/tool storage, and rubber-surfaced area complete with hopscotch, a children's picnic table and umbrella, Kompan play house, mounted blackboards for drawing, and adult seating. Small trees and planting areas containing shrubs are also proposed. The area is screened through several measures, such as setting the area back from the edges of the building, using a roof parapet, as well as a metal picket guardrail and planters. Rooftop mechanical equipment is screened by solid privacy fencing.


## Private Open Space

- Residential private outdoor space is proposed on the second, third, and fourth floors in the form of decks (approximately $9 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(90 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right) / \mathrm{unit}$ ) or Juliet balconies (approximately $0.86 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ $\left(9 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right) /$ unit). This is acceptable to staff on the basis that the proposed rooftop common outdoor amenity space is substantially greater than the amount identified in the design guidelines in the OCP, and that the total amount of common and private outdoor space required per unit is achieved when considering all of the on-site outdoor space combined.


## Landscaping

- Tree retention and removal was assessed as part of the rezoning application review process, at which time it was determined that there are no bylaw-sized trees on-site, that there are trees on the adjacent properties to the north near common property lines, and that there was a hedge along the front property line at 8031 Williams Road that encroached into the boulevard on City-owned property. The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator and the City's Parks Department staff conducted site inspections and visual tree assessments, and indicated that
the neighbouring trees will not be impacted by the proposed development on the subject site and that the hedge along the Williams Road frontage was authorized for removal as it conflicted with the required frontage improvements (and was also inconsistent with the design guidelines in the OCP, which encourage an animated public realm for mixed use developments). The hedge and some undersized trees and shrubs were removed in January, 2020 prior to issuance of the Demolition Permit for the former single detached dwelling at 8031 Williams Road.
- The proposed Landscape Plan illustrates that 21 trees of a variety of species and sizes are proposed to be planted throughout the site, including the rooftop outdoor amenity space (e.g., Dogwood, Sweetgum, Pine, Columnar Aspen, Serbian Spruce). The Landscape Plan also includes a variety of shrubs, perennials, vines, and grasses to enhance the subject site (e.g., Azalea, Mexican Orange Blossom, Salal, Honeysuckle, Red Currant, Spiraea, Topiary Cedar, Kinickinick, Creeping Fig, Evergold Japanese Sedge, Winter Heather, Blue Fescue, Daylily, Coral Bells, and Porcupine Grass).
- A variety of hardscape material is also proposed to provide visual interest and apparent softening of the extent of hard surfaces, including the use of some materials that increase site surface permeability (e.g., two-toned cast-in-place concrete walkways, porous paving for all surface parking spaces, decorative pavers at north facing storefront entries and at other key pedestrian circulation areas, as well as hydra pressed pavers and wood decking on the rooftop).
- The Landscape Plan requires that all soft landscaped areas be irrigated to industry standards with a high-efficiency automatic irrigation system, and the rooftop patio to be equipped with hose bibs.
- Solid wood privacy fencing is proposed on the north and east property lines along the interface with adjacent properties, stepping down to a lower fencing height as it approaches the streets. Solid wood screening is also proposed around all sides of the required rooftop mechanical equipment. A low metal picket fence and guardrail is proposed around the common outdoor amenity space on the south side of the rooftop, and is set back from the roof overhang and parapet.
- To ensure that the trees and landscape materials are installed in accordance with the Landscape Plan, the applicant is required to submit a Landscaping Security in the amount of $\$ 185,096.60$ prior to issuance of a Development Permit.


## Indoor Amenity Space

- Consistent with the OCP, the applicant proposes to submit a contribution to the City prior to rezoning bylaw adoption in the amount of $\$ 75,200$ in-lieu of providing common indoor amenity space on-site.


## Architectural Form and Character

- The design of the building at the southwest corner provides for a strong urban streetwall and anchors the building at this prominent intersection of two busy streets at the gateway to the future Neighbourhood Centre. The corner of the building is emphasized through four storeys of white brick, punched out at the three corners, with distinct black-framed glazing and
articulated with a black raised cornice detail. The massing, proportions, window and Juliet balcony detailing reflect elements of the Georgian architectural style.
- The white brick wraps around the entire ground floor with large vertical column elements breaking down all four elevations into pedestrian-scaled components, further emphasized with dark awnings over storefront entries and the residential lobby entrance.
- Further away from the intersection, massing articulation is enabled by stepping back the building above the ground floor to ease the transition in scale to the surrounding adjacent development. This stepping back of the building combined with the use of contrasting horizontal material cladding and colour above the ground floor further away from the corner further assists with breaking the building down into an architectural hierarchy of elements.
- Extruded central bays visually break down the north and east elevations, which is defined by a transition to wider horizontal siding, vertically stacked windows and balconies, and accentuated with black trim and balcony fascia.


## Accessible and Diverse Housing

- Consistent with the OCP objective of providing for housing that meets the needs of a diverse population, $30 \%$ of units are proposed to be designed with the basic universal housing features listed in Section 4.16 of the Zoning Bylaw, which are intended to facilitate ready access, use and occupancy by a future resident in a wheelchair (i.e., 10 units in total consisting of three 2-bedroom units, one 1-bedroom unit, and six studios).
- All of the proposed units incorporate aging-in-place features to accommodate mobility constraints associated with aging. These features include:
- Stairwell hand rails.
- Lever-type handles for plumbing fixtures and door handles.
- Solid blocking in washroom walls to facilitate future grab bar installation beside toilets, bathtubs and showers.
- Consistent with the OCP objective of encouraging a mix of multi-family housing types to support diverse needs, $42 \%$ of the units are proposed to be designed with two or more bedrooms that are suitable for families with children (i.e., 14 two-bedroom units).


## Sustainability

- The proposed simple building form with punched windows results in thermal energy efficiency. The narrow floor plates enable natural light to penetrate units to decrease lighting loads and increase the effectiveness of natural ventilation. The building's upper wooden structure makes effective use of a renewable resource in place of more energy intensive concrete or steel.
- As this development application was received after July 16, 2018, it is subject to the Energy Step Code according to the Building Regulation Bylaw requirements in place at the time of Building Permit application submission (currently Step 2 for non-residential uses; and Step 3 for residential uses). Energy modelling conducted by the applicant's Qualified Energy Modeller confirms that the proposed building achieves the required Energy Step Code targets.
- Energy saving measurements incorporated into the building design include: a window to wall ratio of $32 \%$ to reduce heating load in winter and cooling load in summer; a 30\% flow rate reduction for plumbing fixtures compared to Code standards to reduce domestic water use; high efficiency water heater of $96 \%$ to reduce energy consumption from hot water heating; and, heat recovery ventilation for residential units to reduce heating load from ventilation air.
- Consistent with the Zoning Bylaw requirements, all residential parking spaces, excluding visitors, will feature an energized outlet capable of providing level 2 charging or higher to parking spaces to support the future use of plug-in electric vehicles for tenants.


## Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

- The applicant has identified that the proposal responds to the following principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), as encouraged in the design guidelines contained within the OCP:
Natural Access Control
- The proposal features clearly defined separate entrances for residential and non-residential uses.
- Storefronts along Williams Road and the northwest corner of the building at No. 3 Road enable an expanded pedestrian realm.
- The residential use has a single lobby entrance, one dedicated exit stair closure, and interior access to the secured garbage room.


## Natural Surveillance

- The building's siting allows for line of sight to the expanded pedestrian realm from any location on the site, providing opportunities for people to view what is happening around them during the course of everyday activities.
- Extensively glazed storefronts and the residential lobby at grade encourages eyes on the street and the surface parking area.
- Sensitive building-mounted sconce lighting and surface area lighting enables visibility and security of on-site walkways, building entrances, and parking areas.
- The location of the project's bike storage structure allows for surveillance from public spaces and by residents in the building, while also increasing activity and surveillance on the building's north façade.


## Territoriality/Defensible Space

- Resident and visitor approaches to the building are differentiated with changes in paving treatment, low walled planters, and seating and landscaping personalize the space in front of the residential entry.
- The building and site design, as well as the proposed management of operations on-site post-occupancy are intended to project a sense of ownership and control.


## Maintenance

- On-going maintenance of the site by the owner's property management team will ensure the continued use of all spaces on-site for their intended purpose.
- Landscaping will be professionally maintained, sightlines through tall growing vegetation will be maintained via pruning, and lighting will remain in operable condition.


## Site Servicing \& Off-Site Improvements

- The design and construction of site servicing and off-site improvements are required to be undertaken as part of a Servicing Agreement (SA), which is required to be entered into prior to rezoning bylaw adoption (SA 19-880238).
- Required servicing and frontage improvements with the proposed redevelopment include:
- relocation of the existing fire hydrant on Williams Road and replacement of a portion of the watermain on No. 3 Road at the crossing location with the proposed storm sewer; upgrading of the existing storm sewer along Williams Road at No. 3 Road;
- removal of the existing sanitary manhole and main in the northwest corner of the existing property at 8031 Williams Road (which will require subsequent discharge of the existing Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) from the title of the properties and registration of a new SRW on title of the properties to reflect the new location of the infrastructure);
- the provision and installation of improved traffic signal and bus stop infrastructure, and
- improvements on both frontages including installation of a new concrete sidewalk at the new property line after road dedication, a treed/grass boulevard, and road widening to accommodate an on-street bike lane along the north side of Williams Road complete with a raised buffer between the bike lane and vehicle lanes.
- To accommodate the required road improvements, the applicant is required to provide a minimum road dedication of 2.0 m along the entire frontages of No. 3 Road and Williams Road, and a 4 mx 4 m corner cut dedication at the intersection (the exact amount of road dedication is to be finalized through a functional road plan prepared through the SA design review process). Land from the subject site is suitable to be dedicated as roadway to the City as the property at 9900 No. 3 Road received a Certificate of Compliance from the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy in 2001.


## Conclusions

This development proposal is to construct a four-storey mixed use building containing $638 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ( $6,867 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) of non-residential uses on the ground floor and 33 secured market rental apartment units totalling approximately $2,210 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(23,788 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ in area above the ground floor, with right-in/right-out vehicle access to No. 3 Road and Williams Road.

The applicant has addressed the design issues identified through the rezoning process, as well as additional staff comments regarding site planning, urban design, architectural form and character, and landscape design identified as part of the Development Permit application review process. The proposal as designed conforms to the applicable policies and designed guidelines contained within the OCP.

The development proposal complies with the requirements of the "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU44) - Broadmoor" zone, with the exception of the zoning variance discussed.

On this basis, staff recommends that the Development Permit be endorsed, and issuance by Council be recommended.


Cynthia Lussier
Planner 2
(604-276-4108)
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## Attachment 2: Development Application Data Sheet

## Attachment 3: Excerpts from OCP - Future Neighbourhood Centres Map \& Broadmoor Planning Area Map

Attachment 4: Excerpt from the May 20, 2020 Advisory Design Panel Meeting minutes and Applicant's design response

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

1. Final adoption of Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 10110.
2. Final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10111.
3. Receipt of a Letter-of-Credit or other form of security acceptable to the City for landscaping in the amount of $\$ 185,096.60$ ( $100 \%$ of the cost estimate provided by the Registered Landscape Architect, including all materials, installation, and a $10 \%$ contingency cost).
4. Registration of a Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW), and/or other legal agreements or measures, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, on title to enable potential future public pedestrian access through the site, including the installation of wayfinding and other appropriate signage on the subject property, and requiring a covenant that the owner provide written notification of this through documentation to all tenants and provide an acknowledgement of the same in all rental/lease agreements of the potential for these impacts. Maintenance \& liability responsibility by the property owner is to be clearly noted. The design must be prepared in accordance with good engineering practice with the objective to optimize public safety and after completion of the works.

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

- Incorporation of accessibility and sustainability measures in Building Permit plans and construction as determined via the Rezoning and Development Permit applications (e.g., Aging-in-place features in all units; Basic Universal Housing features as per Section 4.16 of the Zoning Bylaw in 10 units; and Energy Step Code requirements in place at the time of Building Permit application submission).
- Incorporation of all of the noise mitigation measures in Building Permit plans and in construction as outlined in the acoustical and thermal report and recommendations prepared by the appropriate registered professional as part of the Development Permit application, which demonstrates that the interior noise levels and noise mitigation standards comply with the City's Official Community Plan and Noise Regulation Bylaw requirements (as per the noise-related covenants registered on title prior to final to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw).
- Submission of a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to the satisfaction of the City's Transportation Department (http://www.richmond.ca/services/ttp/special.htm). The Management Plan shall include location for parking for services, deliveries, workers, loading, application for any lane closures, and proper construction traffic controls as per Traffic Control Manual for Works on Roadways (by Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure) and MMCD Traffic Regulation Section 01570.
- 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.


## Notes:

* This requires a separate application.
- Where the Director of Development deems appropriate, the preceding agreements are to be drawn not only as personal covenants of the property owner, but also as covenants pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act.

All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall have priority over all such liens, charges and encumbrances as is considered advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall, unless the Director of Development determines otherwise, be fully registered in the Land Title Office prior to enactment of the appropriate bylaw.
The preceding agreements shall provide security to the City including indemnities, warranties, equitable/rent charges, letters of credit and withholding permits, as deemed necessary or advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements shall be in a form and content satisfactory to the Director of Development.

- Additional legal agreements, as determined via the subject development's Servicing Agreement(s) and/or Development Permit(s), and/or Building Permit(s) to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering may be required including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, de-watering, drilling, underpinning, anchoring, shoring, piling, pre-loading, ground densification or other activities that may result in settlement, displacement, subsidence, damage or nuisance to City and private utility infrastructure.
- Applicants for all City Permits are required to comply at all times with the conditions of the Provincial Wildlife Act and Federal Migratory Birds Convention Act, which contain prohibitions on the removal or disturbance of both birds and their nests. Issuance of Municipal permits does not give an individual authority to contravene these legislations. The City of Richmond recommends that where significant trees or vegetation exists on site, the services of a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) be secured to perform a survey and ensure that development activities are in compliance with all relevant legislation.
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## City of Richmond

## Development Application Data Sheet

## DP 18-835533

Address: 9900 No. 3 Road and 8031 Williams Road
Applicant: Mosaic No. 3 Road and Williams Limited Partnership
Planning Area(s): Broadmoor

|  | Existing | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owner: | Mosaic ( 9900 - No. 3 Road) Corporation | Mosaic ( 9900 - No. 3 Road) Corporation |
| Site Area: | 9900 No .3 Road - $2,041.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ <br> 8031 Williams Road - $979.2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ <br> Total $3,020.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ <br> $\left(21,974 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $2,800.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(30,145 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ <br> after the required road dedication and land consolidation |
| Land Uses: | Vacant | 4-storey mixed commercial/residential market rental building with rooftop amenity space |
| OCP Designation: | 9900 No. 3 Road -Neighbourhood <br> Service Centre <br> 8031 Williams Road - Neighbourhood <br> Residential | Neighbourhood Service Centre |
| Zoning: | 9900 No. 3 Road - Gas \& Service <br> Stations (CG2) <br> 8031 Williams Road - Single Detached <br> (RS1/E) | Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU44) Broadmoor" |
| Number of Units: | 0 | 33 |


|  | Bylaw Requirement | Proposed | Variance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | Max. 1.08 | 1.06 | None permitted |
| Buildable Floor Area (m²): | $3,024.64 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ <br> $\left(32,557 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $2,978.56 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ <br> $\left(32,061 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | None permitted |
| Lot Coverage (\% of lot area): | $20 \%$ | $33 \%$ | None |
| Minimum Lot Size: | $2,800.00 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $2,800.60 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | None |
| Minimum Setbacks (m): | No. 3 Road: 2.0 m <br> Williams Road: 2.0 m <br> North: 20.0 m <br> East: 20.0 m | No. 3 Road: 2.0 m <br> Williams Road: 2.0 m | To reduce the <br> North: 20.37 m <br> East: 20.58 m <br> Southwest building corner at <br> corner cut property line: 0.0 m <br> Road and Williams <br> Road for a small <br> portion of the <br> southwest corner <br> of the building <br> from <br> 2.0 m to 0.0 m. |
| Maximum Building Height (m): | 20.0 m | 18.91 m | None |
| On-site Vehicle Parking Spaces <br> (Residential): | Min. 33 spaces (1.0/unit) | 33 spaces | None |


| On-site Vehicle Parking Spaces (Residential Visitor): | Min. 7 spaces (0.2/unit) |  | 7 spaces (shared with commercial) | None |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| On-Site Vehicle Parking Spaces Commercial: | $\begin{gathered} 3 / 100 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { of } \\ \text { GLFA } \\ 350 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { up to } \text { and } \\ 4 / 100 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { over } \\ 350 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 23 spaces | 21 spaces | None |
|  | $10 \%$ reduction for TDMs | -2 spaces |  |  |
|  | Total: | 21 spaces |  |  |
| On-Site Vehicle Parking Spaces Total: | Minimum 54 spaces |  | 54 spaces | None |
| Small Parking Spaces: | Maximum 50\% of spaces provided (27 spaces) |  | $\frac{48 \%}{(16 \text { residential spaces; }}$ 10 commercial spaces) | None |
| Accessible Parking Spaces: | $2 \%$ of total required parking spaces (2 spaces) |  | 2 spaces | None |
| On-site Bike Parking Spaces (Residential): | $\begin{gathered} \text { Class } 1 \\ (1.25 / \text { unit }) \end{gathered}$ | 42 | 42 | None |
|  | Class 2 <br> (0.2/unit) | 7 | 7 |  |
| On-site Bike Parking Spaces (Commercial): | $\begin{gathered} \text { Class } 1 \\ \left(0.27 / 100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\right. \\ \text { GLFA) } \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 2 | None |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Class 2 } \\ \left(0.4 / 100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\right. \\ G L F A) \end{gathered}$ | 3 | 3 |  |
| On-site Loading Spaces: | 1 medium undesignated (residential) <br> 1 medium undesignated (commercial) |  | 1 medium undesignated (shared) | None |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Amenity Space - Indoor: | $\begin{gathered} 70 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { or } \\ \text { Cash-in-lieu } \end{gathered}$ |  | Cash-in-lieu | N/A |
| Amenity Space - Outdoor: | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \text { unit } \\ & \left(198 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  | $334.82 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | N/A |

[^3]
## Attachment 3

（Excerpts from OCP－
Future Neighbourhood Centres Map \＆ Broadmoor Planning Area Map）
Future Neighbourhood Shopping Centre Map


Subject Site


Canada Line
City Centre Boundary
Fulure Neighbountood Centre
（subjact to hrither planning arde communily consultation：＇
Steveston Villigge

## 6．Broadmoor



|  | Apartmant Reseidential |  | Aroadmaor Naighbourtood Centie（hulura） |  | Ensiding Major Street Bila Route |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Comumarcial |  | Garden City Meightourhood Cantre（future） |  | Future Major Sopet Bike Reate |
| 辰號 | Commurity Instibutional | （b） | Police South Amm Conwmurity Stetion | － | Evisting Gremmay Trail |
|  | Nsighbourhood Residential |  | South Amm Community Centru | －＂＝ | Fuhure GreanmayTred |
| 枟交 | Neighbourhood Sexvics Centre | ［ | South Amm Poorl |  | Enisting Meightoumhood Link－entranced |
| － | Park |  |  | 100\％ | Futhre Neghtbourtood Link－unenhances |
|  | School |  |  | ＊＊＊ | Furure Netghtourhood Liotk |

# Excerpt from the Minutes from The Design Panel Meeting 

Wednesday, May $20-4: 00$ p.m.<br>Cisco Webex

## 2. DP 18-835533-4-STOREY MIXED USE MARKET RENTAL DEVELOPMENT

ARCHITECT:
LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECT:
PROPERTY
LOCATION:

Proscenium Architecture and Interiors Inc.
Durante Kreuk Ltd.

9900 No 3 Road and 8031 Williams Road

## Applicant's Presentation

Architect Hugh Cochlin, Proscenium Architecture and Interiors Inc., presented the project and together with Landscape Architect Alexa Gonzalez, Durante Kreuk Ltd., and Elise Spearing, MOSAIC Homes, answered queries from the Panel

## Panel Discussion

Comments from Panel members were as follows:

- appreciate the provision of 10 units with Basic Universal Housing (BUH) features and including aging-in-place features in all 33 market rental units;


## Noted

- consider making the garbage bins accessible to tenants in a wheelchair;

The waste collection room is accessible to tenants in wheelchairs. The proposed recycling and garbage bins follow Richmond's Waste Management Design Guidelines, and the waste \& recycling report prepared by Target Zero previously submitted to and accepted by Staff. Front load containers will be provided for both waste and cardboard recycling, which provide a lower front lip to improve reachability. Recycling carts are only available in standard sizes, and must be of minimum capacity to sufficiently meet the needs of the building residents.

- consider providing an additional accessible parking as there are several BUH units in the proposed development;

Due to the highly constrained nature of the parking area and the minimum required parking ratio, it is not feasible to dedicate additional accessible parking stalls. Note that there are 3 other residential stalls in the parking area with extra
clearance on one side, due to their location adjacent to either an access path or a drive aisle. As needed, these could provide more easily accessible stalls for future tenants occupying BUH units.

- consider installing pocket doors for the washrooms and closets in the BUH units;

Pocket doors are not proposed, as they can actually create a greater inconvenience for mobility challenged residents. The void required within the wall to accommodate a pocket door cannot have any penetrations, which forces important features like light switches, outlets, thermostats, and towel bars to be moved to awkward locations out of reach from the natural path of travel through the accessible space. Instead, appropriate clearances are provided to accommodate the swing doors. Bi-fold doors are proposed on closets in order to achieve the minimum required opening width for BUH units.

- consider providing for future conversion of bathtub to roll-in showers in the BUH units;
Considered, but not provided due to upfront cost burden.
- appreciate the simple massing and the use of brick to anchor the podium and the southwest corner of the building; consider emphasizing the corner further, for example through parapet height or brick articulation; review the roof edge as the parapet is lower than the guardrail;
Noted. The following improvements are implemented to better emphasize the role of the southwest corner of the building as the anchoring feature of the proposal:
- Brick parapet raised to exceed height of guardrail around rooftop amenity;
- Black fiber cement cornice detail added, to further emphasize the corner height and prominence above the rest of the building;
- Full height brick columns punched out at the 3 corners of the brick feature, to create more verticality and draw the eye up to the cornice detail; and,
- All vinyl siding changed to charcoal, removing the strong horizontal white band around the building that was competing for attention with the brick.
- the white horizontal vinyl lap siding on the fourth floor away from the southwest corner is competing with the white brick façade at the southwest corner of the building; the project's design team needs to address this concern;
As noted above, the white siding wrapping the fourth floor is replaced with charcoal siding to match the lower floors.
- the detached residential bike storage enclosure appears like a totally different element as it is not adopting a similar architectural character, articulation, or quality of materials as the principal building;
Design improvements to the bike shelter are proposed, including revision to horizontal fibre cement plank siding to complement the more predominant visual language of the horizontal siding on the building, and to ensure long term durability given the shelter's location in the parking area. The trim on the external vertical corners of the shelter are revised to a dark colour to match the
siding, mirroring the language on the corners of the principal building. Further, a black metal overhang is proposed over the access gate to respond to the black overhangs that mark the CRU entries, and planters framing the entry point will match the colour and character of those proposed along the building frontage.
- review alignment of canopies to review whether approach of using them to highlight the commercial rental unit (CRU) entrances on the south elevation is successful;

The proposed canopies on the south elevation not only indicate the location of the CRU entries, but also create a rhythm that complements the brick columns, and relates the building to a pedestrian scale along the street frontages.

CRU \#4 has a second street-fronting door, which accommodates emergency exiting. This door is intended to be secondary and thus is intentionally not aligned with the canopy above. The character of this door has been revised to blend more into the storefront windows, and reflect its secondary nature.

- the south elevation facing the street is less articulated than the north elevation facing the parking area (for example, there is accent lighting to highlight the columns on the north elevation); consider increasing the level of articulation on the south elevation as it is more prominent;

Accent lighting is added to the brick columns all the way around the building. The brick columns positioned along the street-facing frontages, wrapping on the NW and SE corners, and surrounding around the residential entry, are now punched out several inches. This matches the language of the vertical elements added to the southwest corner feature and adds further articulation to these façades.

- review the signage with letters arranged vertically on building columns on the north elevation to ensure clarity and readability of signage to visitors;
The proposed vertical signage on the north elevation is meant to be indicative of the CRU entry locations for pedestrians arriving from the parking area. Legibility issues are not anticipated. Fascia signs are not feasible here due to spatial demands of the required weather protection over the central CRU's, and the necessity of a louvre feature for ventilation. The ultimate look and feel of the signs will be determined via Tenant Improvement applications, by future commercial tenants.
- the design of the canopies should be more appropriate for the city's rainy climate, including drainage;

The canopy form proposed is a traditional, slopestyle awning with a 'kick' added to create visual interest, and cap the storefronts with a memorable design feature.

They create a covered area around the entries, where shoppers can pause to stash or open their umbrellas when entering or leaving the CRU's. They are not intended to create continuous weather protection, as this location will never directly connect to further covered walkways along No. 3 or Williams due to the land use context.

A flat canopy character that slopes back to trap rainwater against the building not only creates construction challenges, maintenance issues, and more visual clutter by introducing the requirement for rain water leaders, but this form on our frontage would also blend into the horizontal line created by the louvres and fail to emphasize the CRU entry locations and break down the frontage into pedestrian scaled modules.

- consider relocating the traffic signal cabinets away from the storefront windows;

As agreed to with Staff, the traffic signal cabinets are to remain in the proposed location within a dedicated ROW onsite to protect the equipment and allow a clear line of sight to the traffic signal.

- the overall project is good; however, the southwest corner that is to be the more prominent piece seems to be very neutral, fading slightly and letting the Williams Road and No. 3 Road elevations away from the corner to be more prominent, with their animation and articulation;

Refer to above summary of design improvements proposed for south west corner.

- the corner element could be slightly higher;

Refer to above summary of design improvements proposed for southwest corner.

- punched windows on the corner element could be interconnected to create more verticality;

Refer to above summary of design improvements proposed for southwest corner. Interconnected windows were explored and resolved to add clutter, without enhancing the prominence of the elevations.

- consider creating a different canopy style at the corner element so it is not similar to the canopies along Williams Road;

Refer to above summary of design improventents proposed for southwest corner. Alternate canopy styles were tested and determined to create an undesirable break in the architectural language of the proposal, weakening the entry to CRU \#1 rather than enhancing its prominence.

- explore the possibility of connecting the residential lobby to Williams Road through CRU No. 4;

Reviewed. The residential lobby is located strategically to relate to the residential adjacencies of the site, provide convenient access from residential and visitor parking stalls, connect efficiently to the residential elevator and stair, and maximize street fronting space for CRUs. The location is not revised.

- look at extending the dark grey vinyl into the white vinyl similar to the east elevation, or even extending the white vinyl into the dark grey vinyl to create some playfulness;

Reviewed. White vinyl is fully replaced with charcoal vinyl to simplify the elevations and improve the prominence of the corner feature in response to other ADP comments. Interconnecting two colours of vinyl around the facades would be counter to these strategies and the architectural style, and is not proposed.

- appreciate the pleasing, clean and aesthetic design of the building which is a welcome addition to the neighbourhood;

Noted

- the building is designed to achieve BC Building Code Step 3 through incorporating energy saving/sustainability measures such as installing energy recovery units, low window to wall ratio, among others;


## Confirmed

- consider using high efficiency filters for the energy recovery units for residential units;


## High efficiency filters will be provided for the ERVS.

- consider increasing the height of the band of louvers above the storefront glazing to create more free area for mechanical units as the framing uses up a portion of the louver area;


## Proposed louvre heights are confirmed to be sufficient by the project's mechanical engineer.

- the size of canopies above the storefront entrances is limited and proposed design will not provide adequate rain protection for customers entering/exiting the CRUs; consider a canopy design that is more suitable to the city's wet weather, including drainage;


## Refer to above commentary regarding canopy locations and profile.

- choice of materials for ground level hard and soft landscaping is logical; helps delineate the different spaces on ground level and emphasize their functions;


## Noted

- appreciate the provision of wide sidewalks and generous setbacks from the street which help compensate for the lack of dedicated pedestrian pathways on the ground level of the subject site;
Noted
- appreciate the landscaping of the site being done strategically;


## Noted

2 understand the constraints of installing a children's play equipment on the rooftop outdoor amenity area; however, consider increasing play opportunities for children through (i) making the children's play spaces more flexible to allow different play opportunities, and (ii) replacing unit pavers with a more suitable surface paving material to create a more welcoming space for children's play;

Design improvements proposed to the rooftop amenity area include:

- Program features shifted as required to create a more convenient and central accessible circulation path, connecting all program areas while minimizing wasted space;
- Artificial turf area enlarged accordingly, increasing space available for lounging, active play, and lawn games;
- Flexible children's play area revised from pavers to rubber tile surfacing;
- Play feature revised from raised sand table to a freestanding "toddler station", which reflects the flexibly programmed nature of the space and provides a rich variety of features to encourage social play and support children's physical, emotional, cognitive, and creative development; and,
- Additional Adirondack chairs added for spectators and supervisors alike.
- the rooftop outdoor amenity area consists of several small spaces for different uses; consider introducing a common landscape material to integrate all the spaces together;

The proposed materials are intentionally differentiated to reflect the anticipated use of each 'zone' on the rooftop, and are encouraged by other ADP comments. Pavers are provided where a smooth and even surface is required. Wood decking is provided to soften the aesthetic of the dining and lounge area. Artificial turf and rubber tiles are provided for more active recreational uses.

- support Panel comments to (i) consider having more flexible uses for the delineated outdoor amenity spaces on the building rooftop, and (ii) consider installing more child-friendly surface paving materials (e.g. grass turf) and also suitable for outdoor activities of young adults as these would provide more opportunities for programming of the rooftop outdoor amenity space;

Refer to above summary of design improvements proposed for the rooftop amenity. While great for kids, the proposed artificial turf and rubber tile areas are equally valuable to young adults, who can use these open areas for lounging, picnics, lawn games, and exercising. The ping pong tables are also anticipated to be highly appealing to this demographic, which are provided with regulation sized play areas.

- appreciate the proposed barbeque equipment and sink on the rooftop dining area; however, built-in elements are preferable, such as a built-in barbeque equipment with counter space, and other additional features for barbequing and entertainment, as the dining area is anticipated to be well-used by residential tenants as a replacement for individual patios;

A prep counter is added to the dining area, adjacent to the barbeque. Built-in elements are not appropriate due to the woodframe nature of the building. The sink shown on the architectural plan previously was in error, and has been removed.

- the project's design team needs to provide details on the fence and allan block retaining wall along the north and east property lines such as grading and how these two elements will work together;
Refer to new drawing sheet A313 for detailed sections along the property line as requested.
- the proposed residential bike storage screening enclosure appears out of place in the proposed development; consider celebrating the lockers, or integrating some of the brick material used on the principal building to integrate the free-standing structure with the principal building;

Refer to above summary of design improvements proposed for the bike shelter. The incorporation of brick was deemed inappropriate due to the high traffic context of the shelter, and likelihood of damage.

- consider either removing the proposed linear band of concrete at the drive aisle entrances to the site or introducing a surface paving treatment with a herringbone pattern and widening it to match the size of adjacent landscape planters in order to better celebrate the entrances to the subject site;

The linear band of concrete at the drive aisle entrances has been removed as suggested. Special landscape features are focused at the actual pedestrian entrances to the subject site, at the northwest and southeast corners of the building.

- appreciate the applicant's clear presentation and package of materials provided to the Panel;


## Noted

- support the Panel's recommendation to slightly increase the height of the southwest corner of the building to clearly show its precedence; the parapet on the brick portion of the building at the corner could be made slightly higher;


## Refer to above summary of design improvements proposed for southwest corner.

- appreciate the design team's efforts to create an urban building along the street and provide a good sidewalk and frontage experience along Williams Road; review the opportunity to provide a formal residential entry on Williams Road; consider providing a residential entry at the southeast corner or in the area of the commercial unit immediately adjacent to the corner;


## Refer to above response regarding possible relocation of the residential entry.

- consider installing a children's play area with a play structure on the ground level utilizing the spaces for two parking stalls on the outdoor parking area;
Reviewed. Incorporation of a children's play feature into a publicly accessible parking lot without proper setbacks to accommodate protection for and screening from the play area was deemed to be inadvisable. Further, we are unable to reduce the number of parking stalls provided at this point.
- appreciate the use of brick as it a good material to anchor the southwest corner of the site; however, consider introducing articulation, which could be through a change in patterning, for example on the brick columns separating the commercial units; suggest that the applicant maintain the proposed colour for the brick material up to construction stage;
Refer to above summary of design improvements proposed for southwest corner.
- consider increasing the depth of the Juliet balconies to accommodate a furniture for seating;
The size of the balconies is based on extensive discussion with Staff, and will not be revised. The rooftop amenity size and programming are proposed to compensate for the lack of private outdoor area.
- investigate opportunities for installing two additional canopies along No. 3 Road near the southwest corner of the building; and
Additional canopies in this location would be counteractive to the design efforts made to better emphasize the southwest corner feature of the building, and are not proposed. Those areas are also generally occupied by the traffic cabinets and a bike rack, and would not create very usable covered area regardless.
- arrangement of alternate cladding and colour above the ground floor further away from the corner creates a strong beltline and horizontal expression; consider redesigning to add more verticality to building facades away from the corner.

Refer to above commentary regarding siding revisions to remove the 'beltline' on the fourth floor. The brick podium is crucial to the architectural expression of the base of the building, and announcing the commercial presence on the ground floor.

## Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded
That DP 18-835533 be supported to move forward to the Development Permit Panel subject to the applicant giving consideration to the comments of the Advisory Design Panel.

No. DP 18-835533

To the Holder:
Property Address:
Address:

MOSAIC NO. 3 ROAD AND WILLIAMS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
9900 No. 3 ROAD AND 8031 WILLIAMS ROAD
C/O UNIT 500-2609 GRANVILLE STREET
VANCOUVER, BC V6H 3H3

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 reduce the setbacks to No. 3 Road and Williams Road for the southwest corner of the building from 2.0 m to 0.0 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 \# $6 . n$ attached hereto.
5. Sanitary sewers, water, drainage, highways, street lighting, underground wiring, and sidewalks, shall be provided as required.
6. As a condition of the issuance of this Permit, the City is holding the security in the amount of $\$ 185,096.60$ 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 one year after inspection of the completed landscaping in order to ensure that plant material has survived.
7. 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 <br> No. DP 18-835533

| To the Holder: | MOSAIC NO. 3 ROAD AND WILLIAMS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP |
| :--- | :--- |
| Property Address: | 9900 NO. 3 ROAD AND 8031 WILLIAMS ROAD |
| Address: | C/O UNIT 500-2609 GRANVILLE STREET |
|  | VANCOUVER, BC V6H 3H3 |

8. 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.
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## PLAN <br> 0202 与 2 Nini <br> REFERENCE <br> $10-35533$ <br> do
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(2) $\frac{\text { GROUND FLOOR ACCESSIBLE PLAN }}{\text { BRTFTV }}$
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|  | A211 |
|  |  |


JUN 252020

(1) $\frac{B A S I C ~ U N I V E R S A L ~ H O U S I N G ~ G U I D E L I N E S ~}{18=F 1 / R^{\prime}}$


[^0]:    

[^1]:    
    

[^2]:    
    CITY
    FIRR TRICKS CAN BE
    BASED ON SU-9 TRUCKS

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Gross leasable floor area

[^4]:    O202 G Z NNT
    $n$

    0
    $\vdots$
    $\vdots$
    DP

[^5]:    Nu7d

    0202 S Z Nins
    (1)
    $\frac{14}{2}$
    $\frac{1}{2}$
    $n$
    $n$
    $n$
    $n$
    $n$
    $n$
    0
    0
    믐

