## Planning Committee

Anderson Room, City Hall 6911 No. 3 Road

Tuesday, January 17, 2017
4:00 p.m.

Pg. \# ITEM

## MINUTES

PLN-6 Motion to adopt the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on December 20, 2016.
$\square$

## NEXT COMMITIEE MEETING DATE

February 7, 2017, (tentative date) at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room

## COMMUNITY SERVCES DIVSION

1. RICHMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RCSAC) 2016 ANNUAL REPORT AND 2017 WORK PROGRAM
(File Ref. No. 07-3000-01) (REDMS No. 5248121)

Designated Speaker: Lesley Sherlock

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
That the staff report titled, "Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee (RCSAC) 2016 Annual Report and 2017 Work Program", dated December 20, 2016, from the General Manager, Community Services, be approved.
$\square$

## ENGINEERINGANDPUBLICWORKS DIVSION

## 2. ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE IN PRIVATE DEVELOPMENTS <br> (File Ref. No. 10-6125-07-02) (REDMS No. 5258357 v. 4)

PLN-57

## See Page PLN-48 for full report

Designated Speakers: Brendan McEwen and Peter Russell

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the stakeholder consultation program to consult on the development and implementation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure in new private developments, as described in the staff report titled "Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure in Private Developments" from the Director, Engineering, dated December 12, 2016, be endorsed.

## PLANNINGAND DEVELOPMENT DIVSION

## 3. APPLICATION BY GRAFTON ENTERPRISES LTD. FOR A STRATA

 TITLE CONVERSION AT 2551 NO. 6 ROAD(File Ref. No. SC 16-734026) (REDMS No. 5071719 v. 3)
See Page PLN-57 for full report

Designated Speaker: Wayne Craig
STAFF RECOMMENDATION
(1) That the application for a Strata Title Conversion by Grafton Enterprises Ltd. for the buildings located on the property at 2551 No. 6 Road, as generally shown in Attachment 1, be approved on fulfilment of the following conditions:
(a) payment of all City utility charges and property taxes up to and including the year 2017;
(b) registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title identifying a minimum habitable elevation of 2.9 m GSC;
(c) registration of an aircraft noise sensitive use covenant on title;
(d) submission of appropriate plans and documents for execution by the Approving Officer within 180 days of the date of this resolution; and
(e) submission of a Landscape Plan, prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, and deposit of a Landscaping Security based on 100\% of the cost estimate provided by the Landscape Architect, including installation costs and a 10\% contingency; and
(2) That the City, as the Approving Authority, delegate to the Approving Officer the authority to execute the strata conversion plan on behalf of the City, as the Approving Authority, on the basis that the conditions set out in Recommendation 1 have been satisfied.
4. APPLICATION BY 1004732 BC LTD. FOR REZONING AT 6840 \& 6860 NO. 3 ROAD AND 8051 ANDERSON ROAD FROM "DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL (CDT1)" TO "CITY CENTRE HIGH DENSITY MIXED USE WITH OFFICE (ZMU31) - BRIGHOUSE VILLAGE"
(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009510; RZ 14-678448) (REDMS No. 5247325 v. 2)

## See Page PLN-77 for full report

Designated Speaker: Wayne Craig

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9510 to create the "City Centre High Density Mixed Use with Office (ZMU31) - Brighouse Village" zone, and to rezone 6840 \& 6860 No. 3 Road and 8051 Anderson Road from "Downtown Commercial (CDT1)" to "City Centre High Density Mixed Use with Office (ZMU31) - Brighouse Village", be introduced and given first reading.
5. APPLICATION BY XIUFENG ZHANG AND SHUFANG ZHANG FOR REZONING AT 8140/8160 LUNDY ROAD FROM TWO-UNIT DWELLINGS (RD1) TO SINGLE DETACHED (RS2/C)
(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009664; RZ 16-734667) (REDMS No. 5244412)
7. APPLICATION BY TRELLIS SENIORS SERVICES LTD. FOR REZONING AT 23100, 23120 AND 23140 WESTMINSTER HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/F) TO SENIOR'S CARE FACILITY (ZR11) - HAMILTON VILLAGE (HAMILTON)
(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009669; RZ 16-738480) (REDMS No. 5265610 v. 2)

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9669 to create the "Senior's Care Facility (ZR11) - Hamilton Village (Hamilton)" zone, and to rezone 23100, 23120 and 23140 Westminster Highway from "Single Detached (RS1/F)" to "Senior's Care Facility (ZR11) - Hamilton Village (Hamilton)", be introduced and given first reading.
8. REFERRAL RESPONSE: REGULATING THE SIZE OF LARGE HOUSES IN THE AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE
(File Ref. No. 08-4057-10; 12-8060-20-009665/9666/9678/9679) (REDMS No. 5251835 v. 3)

## See Page PLN-256 for full report

Designated Speaker: Terry Crowe

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

(1) That the staff report titled, "Referral Response: Regulating the Size of Large Houses in the Agricultural Land Reserve", dated January 10, 2017, from the Director of Development and the Manager of Policy Planning, be received for information; and
(2) That staff be directed to conduct public consultations regarding the bylaw options presented in this report ("Referral Response: Regulating the Size of Large Houses in the Agricultural Land Reserve") regarding house size, farm home plate and setbacks, including residential accessory buildings.

9. MANAGER'S REPORT

## Planning Committee

| Date: | Tuesday, December 20, 2016 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Place: | Anderson Room <br> Richmond City Hall |
| Present: | Councillor Linda McPhail, Chair <br> Councillor Bill McNulty <br> Mayor Malcolm Brodie |
| Absent: | Councillor Chak Au <br> Councillor Alexa Loo <br> Councillor Harold Steves |
| Also Present: | Councillor Carol Day |
| Call to Order: | The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. |

## MINUTES

It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on December 6, 2016, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

## NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

The Chair advised that the January 4, 2017 Planning Committee meeting will be cancelled and that the next meeting will be scheduled for January 17, 2017, (tentative date) at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

## COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION

1. HOUSING AGREEMENT BYLAW NO. 9657 TO PERMIT THE CITY TO SECURE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS LOCATED AT 3031, 3211, 3231, 3291, 3311, 3331, 3351 NO. 3 ROAD, 8151 CAPSTAN WAY, AND 8051 AND 8100 RIVER ROAD (YUANHENG SEASIDE DEVELOPMENTS LTD.)
(File Ref. No. 08-4057-01) (REDMS No. 5243331 v. 9)
Joyce Rautenberg, Affordable Housing Coordinator, reviewed the proposed housing agreement, noting that the (i) second phase will commence in 2017, (ii) the 41 first phase affordable housing units will be clustered on two floors over five buildings, and (iii) staff will be re-examining rents and income thresholds in the Affordable Housing Strategy Update.
It was moved and seconded
That Housing Agreement (Yuanheng Seaside Developments Ltd.) Bylaw No. 9657 be introduced and given first, second and third readings to permit the City to enter into a Housing Agreement substantially in the form hereto, in accordance with the requirements of section 483 of the Local Government Act, to secure the Affordable Housing Units required by Rezoning Application 12-603040.

CARRIED

## PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

2. APPLICATION BY XU YANG FOR REZONING AT 7431 WILLIAMS ROAD FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E) TO COACH HOUSES (RCH1)
(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009613; RZ 15-718064) (REDMS No. 5108940)
Jordan Rockerbie, Planning Technician, reviewed the application, noting that second floor balconies facing the lane are proposed for the coach houses.

In reply to queries from Committee, Wayne Craig, Director, Development, noted that there no current plans to extend the adjacent lane to the west and that should the application proceed, direct mail notification will be sent to adjacent properties prior to Public Hearing.
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It was moved and seconded
That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9613, for the rezoning of 7431 Williams Road from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Coach Houses (RCH1)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

## 3. APPLICATION BY SIMON WONG FOR REZONING AT 4560 GARRY STREET FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E) TO SINGLE DETACHED (RS2/A) <br> (File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009645; RZ 16-736824) (REDMS No. 5228139) <br> It was moved and seconded <br> That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9645, for the rezoning of 4560 Garry Street from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Single Detached (RS2/A)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

## 4. APPLICATION BY 1015553 BC LTD. FOR REZONING AT 4271 FRANCIS ROAD FROM "SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E)" TO "SINGLE DETACHED (RS2/C)" <br> (File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009660; RZ 14-659770) (REDMS No. 5235499)

Mr. Rockerbie reviewed the application, noting that the corner lot will be accessible from the side street and the interior lot will be accessible from Francis Road. He added that the driveway access from Francis Road was configured to retain two large trees on-site.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Craig noted that the application meets the City's parking, lot coverage and landscaping requirements.

It was moved and seconded
That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9660, for the rezoning of 4271 Francis Road from the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" zone to the "Single Detached (RS2/C)" zone, be introduced and given first reading.

## CARRIED

5. AMENDMENTS TO RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500 FOR 2016 AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTION RATES
(File Ref. No. 08-4430-01) (REDMS No. 5209613 v. 2)
Barry Konkin, Program Coordinator, Development, reviewed the proposed amendments, noting that approximately 60 in-stream applications are under the old affordable housing contribution rates, and that all applications received after September 2016 have secured the new rates.

It was moved and seconded
That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9641, to update affordable housing contribution rates for residential zones, be introduced and given first reading.

## CARRIED

## 6. RICHMOND RESPONSE: METRO VANCOUVER PROPOSED REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY (RGS) AMENDMENT BYLAW 1236, 2016, TO MAKE MINOR CHANGES TO THE RGS SEWERAGE EXTENSION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

(File Ref. No.) (REDMS No. 5258159)
It was moved and seconded
That Metro Vancouver Board be advised that the City of Richmond has no concerns with Metro Vancouver's proposed Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) Amendment Bylaw 1236, 2016, which proposes minor changes to the RGS sewerage extension policies and procedures, by clarifying the circumstances when regional sewerage service may be extended.

CARRIED

## 7. MANAGER'S REPORT

## (i) Mylora Non-Farm Use Application

Mr. Craig briefed Committee on the Mylora Non-Farm Use Application, noting that (i) staff have received approval notice from the Agricultural Land Commission's (ALC) South Coast Regional Panel, however a subsequent letter from the ALC Chair has advised that the application has been referred to the Executive Committee of the ALC for consideration, (ii) the City has been given until January 5, 2017 to provide supporting documents for the application, (iii) staff will be sending a letter to the ALC advising of the City's commitment to bring the site into agricultural production after remediation, and (iv) the applicant has been given until January 12, 2016 to provide supporting documents.
Discussion ensued with regard to the viability of the site for farming.
In reply to queries from Committee, Joe Erceg, General Manager, Planning and Development, noted that (i) the City will take ownership of the agricultural portion of the site after the site's remediation, (ii) Parks staff can provide Council with a memorandum regarding management of the site, and (iii) it is anticipated that the developers will be spending approximately one million dollars to remediate the site.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Craig noted that the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure has expressed interest in acquiring portions of the subject site for the George Massey Tunnel Replacement Project.

## Planning Committee Tuesday, December 20, 2016

## (ii) Single-Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation - Second Phase Consultations

Mr. Craig advised that public consultation meetings for the proposed amendment options to Single-Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulations will be scheduled in January and February 2017 at various community centres and in City Hall. Mr. Konkin added that consultation materials on the proposed amendments will be provided to Council in advance of the public consultation meetings.

## (iii) Onni Bayview Site

Mr. Craig updated Committee on the on-going discussion with Onni regarding their application, noting that staff are evaluating their revised amenity package proposal.

## (iv) Canada Line Capstan Station Funding

Mr. Craig noted that approximately $\$ 14$ million in developer contributions have been secured towards funding the construction of the Canada Line Capstan Station. Mr. Craig added that a further $\$ 13$ million is required and that developers from Yuanheng Seaside Developments Ltd. have expressed interest in contributing the balance of funds required to initiate construction of the proposed station. Mr. Craig further noted that staff will bring forward a report on the matter to Council early in 2017.

## (v) Demolition Materials Bylaw

Mr. Erceg and Gavin Woo, Senior Manager, Building Approvals, updated Committee on the Demolition Materials Bylaw, noting that compliance rates are high and non-compliant builders lose their security deposit and are fined up to $\$ 10,000$.

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (4:28 p.m.).
CARRIED

## Planning Committee

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Tuesday, December 20, 2016.

Councillor Linda McPhail Chair

Evangel Biason<br>Legislative Services Coordinator

## City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

| To: | Planning Committee | Date: | December 20, 2016 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | Cathryn Volkering Carlile | File: | $07-3000-01 / 2016-$ Vol |
|  | General Manager, Community Services | 01 |  |
| Re: | Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee (RCSAC) 2016 Annual <br> Report and 2017 Work Program |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Staff Recommendation

That the staff report titled, "Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee (RCSAC) 2016 Annual Report and 2017 Work Program", dated December 20, 2016, from the General Manager, Community Services, be approved.

Cathryn Volkering Carlile
General Manager, Community Services
(604-276-4068)
Att. 3


## Staff Report

## Origin

The mandate of the Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee (RCSAC) is to encourage and promote social policies and community services that contribute to the well-being and quality of life of Richmond residents, and to develop the capacity of the community service sector.

While an advisory body, the RCSAC is only partially a City-appointed committee (i.e. only two citizen representatives are Council-appointed). The City supports the RCSAC by providing an annual operating budget, a Council Liaison and a Staff Liaison.

This report presents the RCSAC 2016 Annual Report (Attachment 1) and proposed 2017 Work Program (Attachment 2). This report supports Council's 2014-2018 Term Goal \#2 A Vibrant, Active and Connected City:

Continue the development and implementation of an excellent and accessible system of programs, services, and public spaces that reflect Richmond's demographics, rich heritage, diverse needs, and unique opportunities, and that facilitate active, caring, and connected communities.
2.2. Effective social service networks.

2,3. Outstanding places, programs and services that support active living, wellness and a sense of belonging.

## Analysis

## RCSAC Charter

As indicated in the RCSAC Charter (Attachment 3), the mission of this advisory committee is "to encourage and promote those social policies and community services which contribute to the general health, welfare and quality of life of the residents of Richmond, and to increase interagency relations and cooperation in order to enhance community capacity". Their mandate is described in the attached Charter as

## Section A

The RCSAC shall advise Richmond City Council and may, in consultation with City Council, make representations to other policy-making bodies on the following:

1. Policies that encourage cooperative planning and delivery of community services to ensure optimum efficiency and effectiveness;
2. Social issues/concerns that have an impact on community services, special needs groups and the quality of life in the community;
3. Community impact of governmental changes to policies and/or programs affecting Richmond's community services; and
4. Any other matters that may be referred by Richmond City Council, RCSAC member groups and the community at large.

## Section B

1. Coordination of activities and information sharing between the voluntary and public sector.

The RCSAC also has separate "Operating Policies and Procedures" describing membership, structure and procedures.

## 2016 Annual Report

Highlights of the 2016 RCSAC Work Program, based on Council Term Goals (2010-2014) (Attachment 1) include:

- Completion of the annual Social Services and Space Needs Survey exploring funding changes and space needs, with results presented to Planning Committee in December 2016;
- The Non-profit Space Needs Action Team secured a Richmond Community Foundation grant for preliminary work in determining agency-specific space needs;
- Communication Tools were sent to Council regarding changes in VCH Management in Richmond and potential community impact as well as the 2014/2015 RCSAC Social Services and Space Needs Survey; and
- An updated inventory of community tables and committees operating in Richmond.


## 2017 Work Program

Council Term Goals (2014-2018) have been used to form the basis of RCSAC 2017 activities. In addition to responding to Council requests as they arise, highlights of the RCSAC's 2017 plans (Attachment 2) include:

- Hosting an information sharing meeting with Richmond MLAs;
- Continuing to implement the Community Social Services and Space Needs Survey and informing Council of the results;
- Non-profit Space Needs Action Team report to Council;
- Continuing to update an inventory of community-based tables and committees relevant to social services;
- Working collaboratively with other Richmond organizations to provide information regarding affordable housing needs;
- Providing information to Council regarding the impact of Federal and Provincial policy and funding decisions on Richmond services; and
- Continuing to apprise Council of matters affecting community agencies and Richmond residents.


## 2017 Budget

The 2017 RCSAC budget no longer allows for funding special projects and surveys as these initiatives were funded from a surplus that has been depleted. For example, the RCSAC's annual Social Services and Space Needs Survey results were previously compiled, analyzed and reported on with the help of a research assistant. In August 2016, the RCSAC submitted a letter to Council requesting an increase of $\$ 2,000$ per annum to their operating budget to bring the total amount from $\$ 11,000$ to $\$ 13,000$. The increase was not recommended as part of the 2017 operating budget process as proposed increases were limited to non-discretionary increases only.

## Financial Impact

None.

## Conclusion

The RCSAC 2017 Work Program is designed to reflect a number of Council Term Goals (2014-2018) and address emerging issues impacting the community. The RCSAC will continue to support the community service sector by fostering collaborative working relationships, networking opportunities and information exchange. The RCSAC thereby plays a vital role in sustaining and enhancing the social well-being of Richmond residents.


Lesley Sherlock
Social Planner
(604-276-4220)

Att. 1: RCSAC 2016 Final Report<br>2: RCSAC 2017 Work Program and Budget<br>3: RCSAC Charter

Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee

## 2016 Final Report

# 2016 RCSAC Executive Committee Report 

## 2016 Executive Committee Membership:

Daylene Marshal, Richmond Youth Services Agency
Alex Nixon, Richmond Food Bank
Rick Dubras, Richmond Addictions Services Society
Kathie Chiu, Salvation Army
Ihsan Malik, Citizen Appointee
De Whalen, Richmond Poverty Response Committee Lisa Whittaker, Family Services of Greater Vancouver Councillor Derek Dang
Lesley Sherlock

Co-Chair
Co-Chair
Treasurer
Member-at-Large
Member-at-Large
Member-at-Large
Member-at-Large
City Council Liaison
City Staff Liaison

## Results of Executive Elections at the November 10, 2016 Annual General Meeting

As documented in the RCSAC Operating Policies and Procedures, members on the Executive, with the exception of the Co-Chair positions, hold their positions for a period of one year. Elections are held at the November Annual General Meeting (AGM) to elect/re-elect committee members to their respective executive roles. The results of the elections were:

Co-Chair<br>Alex Nixon, Richmond Food Bank ( $3^{\text {rd }}$ year)<br>Co-Chair<br>Kathie Chiu, Salvation Army ( $1^{\text {st }}$ Year)<br>Treasurer<br>Members-at-Large<br>Rick Dubras, Richmond Addiction Services Society<br>Jenn Fancy de Mena, BC Responsible and Problem Gambling; Ihsan Malik, Citizen Appointee; Haydon Marshall-Fox, Turning Point Recovery Society.

## Executive Committee Summary of 2016 Activities:

Membership

- Membership increased in 2016 as the Richmond Animal Protection Society joined RCSAC. The Jewish Addiction Community Services and the United Way of the Lower Mainland also showed interest in joining RCSAC.
- There were two Citizen Appointee positions: Hamid Ghanbari and Ihsan Malik.


## RCSAC Action Groups

The RCSAC does not have standing sub-committees, but rather has ad hoc, time-limited action groups to address specific concerns or accomplish specific tasks. The following action groups were active in 2016:

- Addictions and Mental Health
- NPO Space Needs
- Service Gaps for New Citizens
- Social Services and Space Needs Survey
- Website
- Youth

Additionally, the RCSAC receives monthly reports from the Richmond Homelessness Coalition to keep the RCSAC informed on housing and homelessness issues.

## Action Group Reports

## Addictions and Mental Health

Membership: Brenda Plant, Belinda Boyd, Kathie Chiu, Rick Dubras, Jenn Fancy de Mena Heather Hall, Dave MacDonald, Judy Valsonis.

Mandate: To work in an advisory capacity to the City of Richmond on issues related to Addictions and Mental Health (AMH); to enhance the continuum of AMH services in Richmond; and to develop partnerships and identify funding sources for the implementation of AMH working group initiatives.

Activities: With funding from the Province of BC's Ministry of Health, the RCSAC AMH Working Group in partnership with Turning Point Recovery Society established the Outreach and Resource Support (OARS) program to provide a continuum of supports to individuals with addiction and mental health issues that are homeless and/or at risk of homelessness. OARS provides outreach counselling, referrals to housing and health services, community education and training, supports and client advocacy. A Communication Tool was submitted to Council on the development of the OARS program; a community resource guide was updated and circulated in Richmond; the Working Group identified that the most concerning gap in Richmond is the lack of communication and collaboration between some agencies and that this was impacting client care and client navigation. Meetings were held with the City of Richmond, Vancouver Coastal Health and RCSAC AMH Working Group members to address these issues.

## NPO Space Needs

Membership: Janice Barr, Janice Lambert, Sandy McIntosh, Daylene Marshall, Alex Nixon.
Mandate: To explore the space needs of Richmond's NPOs and find collaborative solutions to report back to the RCSAC on those needs.

Activities: The member organizations of this committee worked together to secure a grant from Richmond Community Foundation to commission a report on the NPO space needs in Richmond. The preliminary work preparing the report is expected to be completed by December 2016.

## Social Services and Space Needs Survey

Membership: Rick Dubras, Daylene Marshall, Alex Nixon.
Mandate: To analyze the results of the Social Services and Space Needs Survey and prepare a final report for City Council.

Activities: The committee compiled and analyzed the results of the 2014-2015 Social Services and Space Needs Survey and prepared a final report for City Council to be presented to Planning

Committee in December 2016. The committee also sent the 2015-2016 Social Services and Space Needs Survey out to RCSAC members

## Website

Membership: Rick Dubras, Daylene Marshall, Alex Nixon.
Mandate: This group explored options to update the RCSAC website.
Activities: The RCSAC website needed significant upgrades in order to ensure its continued operation. The RCSAC contracted IT Gurl to update the website to a format that should allow it to continue to operate without major upgrades for 3-4 years.

## Youth

Membership: Danny Taylor, Lauren Burrows Backhouse.
Mandate: To maintain the What's Up Richmond website and advise RCSAC and City Council on issues facing youth.

Activities: What's Up Richmond (WURd) was maintained and managed successfully through 2016. We faced difficulty confirming a youth volunteer content manager, but have finally established some current stability in the role. Updates continue on a monthly basis, and the goal is to promote a formal youth-specific "launch", whereby the website is promoted to youth in Richmond.

## Communications with the City of Richmond

The RCSAC sent the following Communication Tools to City Council to advise them on issues impacting Richmond's citizens and Community Services:

- Changes in VCH Management in Richmond and the potential impact for the community
- Social Services and Space Needs Survey Report


## Community Tables/Committee Inventory

As per our 2016 Work Plan, the RCSAC keeps the Richmond Community Table/Committee Inventory. Currently, we are aware of the following committees operating in Richmond.

- Advisory Design Panel
- Affiliation of Multicultural Societies and Services Agencies in BC (AMSSA) Collaborative Opportunity for Resources (CORe)
- Community Living Leadership Network Meeting
- Community Living BC (CLBC) Community Council
- Fetal Alcohol Syndrome FASD round table
- The Gambling Steering Committee in Richmond
- Gilwest Clinic Community Advisory Group
- Metro Vancouver Living Wage Committee municipality sub-committee
- Mental Health and Addictions Coordinating Committee
- Richmond Advisory Council on Perinatal Issues
- Richmond Arthritis Support Group
- Richmond Autism Interagency Committee (RAIC)
- Richmond Caring Place Tenants Council
- Richmond Child Care Development Advisory Committee (RCCDAC)
- Richmond Child Care Alliance
- Richmond Child Care Training Committee (RCCTC)
- Richmond Children First
- Richmond Community Action Team
- Richmond Community Collaboration Table (CCT)
- Richmond Community Meals Round Table
- Richmond Community Peace Labyrinth
- Richmond Falls Prevention Network
- Richmond Family Violence Prevention Network
- Richmond Health Advisory Committee
- Richmond Homelessness Coalition
- Richmond Infant Development Program Local Advisory Committee
- Richmond Literacy Now Committee
- Richmond Poverty Response Committee
- Richmond Public Agency Partners Group
- Richmond Seniors Advisory Committee
- Richmond Supported Child Development Program Local Advisory Committee
- Richmond VIAL of Life Committee
- Safer Relationships, Safer Children
- Settlement Workers In School Advisory Committee.
- Supporting Families With Parental Mental Health and/or Addictions Committee
- Welcoming Community Project Advisory Committee
- Youth Concurrent Disorders Network
- Youth Network


## Presentations

Community organizations presented to RCSAC at almost every RCSAC meeting on issues and topics vital to Richmond's community services. The organizations and topics include:

- January: City Centre Area Plan
- February: SFU Kiwanis Place-Making Project
- March: CHIMO Crisis Line Service BC Responsible and Problem Gambling
- April: Richmond Cares, Richmond Gives
- May: Atira Women's Resource Society
- June: MLA Information Session
- September: RCMP Domestic Violence Coordinator
- October: Salvation Army Emergency Response Teams
- November: RCSAC AGM


## Financial

A 2016 financial report and proposed 2017 budget was drafted by the Treasurer and approved by the membership at the RCSAC's November AGM.

The RCSAC has continued to operate without an increase in the City Grant for five years, despite the added financial pressures due to increasing membership (from 33 members in 2011 to 40 members in 2016). For 2016, the RCSAC reduced meeting and staff expenses. The RCSAC will need to have increased funding if it is to continue to effectively advise City Council. At the September 10, 2015 General Meeting, the RCSAC membership approved a motion to request an additional $\$ 2,000$ for the 2017 budget year.

The 2017 Work Plan was approved at the November 10, 2016 RCSAC AGM as a working document that will be revisited throughout the year and revised as necessary.

RCSAC 2016 Membership

|  | Organization |
| :--- | :--- |
| Voting Membesentative(s) |  |
| Avia Employment Centres | Nicole Smith |
| BC Responsible and Problem Gambling | Jenn Fancy de Mena |
| Boys and Girls Club of South Coast BC | Jason Lee |
| Chimo Community Services | Diane Sugars |
| City Appointee | Hamid Ghanbari |
| City Appointee | Ihsan Malik |
| Community Living BC | George Sartori |
| Developmental Disabilities Association | Donna Cain |
| Family Services of Greater Vancouver | Lisa Whittaker |
| Heart of Richmond AIDS Society | Brian Wardley |
| Individual Member | Jennifer Larsen |
| Pacific Community Resource Services | Leslie Martin |
| Pathways Clubhouse Richmond | Una Mulhall |
| RCMP Richmond | Constable Heather Hall |
| Richmond Addictions Services Society | Rick Dubras |
| Richmond Animal Protection Society | Eyal Lichtmann |
| Richmond Cares, Richmond Gives | Jocelyn Wong |
| Richmond Caring Place Society | Sandy McIntosh |
| Richmond Children First | Helen Davidson |
| Richmond Centre for Disability | Ella Huang |
| Richmond Division of Family Practice | Denise Ralph |
| Richmond Family and Youth Court Committee | Neelu Kang Dhaliwal |
| Richmond Family Place Society | Janice Lambert |
| Richmond Food Bank Society | Alex Nixon |
| Richmond Food Security Society | Anita Georgy |
| Richmond Mental Health Consumer \& Friends Society | Barb Bawlf |
| Richmond Multicultural Community Services | Parm Grewal |
| Richmond Poverty Response Committee | De Whalen |
| Richmond School District \#38 | Monica Pamer/Sherry Elwood |
| Richmond Seniors Advisory Committee | Corisande Percival-Smith |
| Richmond Society for Community Living | Janice Barr |
| Richmond Therapeutic Equestrian Society | TBD |
| Richmond Women's Resource Centre | Florence Yau |
| Richmond Youth Service Agency | Daylene Marshall |
| Salvation Army (Richmond) | Kathie Chiu |
| S.U.C.C.E.S.S. | Francis Li |
| Touchstone Family Services | Judy Valsonis |
| Turning Point Recovery Society | Ted Paxton |
| Vancouver Coastal Health | Belinda Boyd |
| Vancouver Transit Police | Inspector Wendy Hawthorne |
| Non-Voting Members |  |
| Council Liaison | Staff Liaison |

## 2016 RCSAC Work Plan Results

For the 2016 year, the RCSAC continued to link its annual work plan initiatives to the Richmond City Council Term Goals. The 2016 Work Plan was designed to provide Council with advice to support Council's Goal Statement for Community Social Services:

To develop and implement an updated social services strategy that clearly articulates and communicates the City's roles, priorities and limitations with respect to social services issues and needs.

Within this goal statement, the RCSAC focused on providing advice on Council's following priorities.
The RCSAC also highlighted several other areas to work towards in 2016 to ensure committee stability and to improve Community Agency engagement.

RCSAC further advised Richmond City Council by providing feedback on their Term Goals through two sessions at General member meetings.

## Council Term Goal 1.4

## Effective interagency relationships and partnerships

## Objectives

- To respond to Council requests for advice regarding community safety matters
- To provide a forum for Social Service Providers, Council Liaisons and City Staff, Citizen Appointees and Individual Members to collaborate, share, network and learn from one another, as well as from guest presenters from the City and community
- To identify, advise and provide recommendations to City Council and staff of trends, gaps and needs of our community


## Proposed Actions

- Participate in City consultations regarding community safety
- Continuing to implement the RCSAC Community Social Services and Space Needs Survey.
- Advise Council if changes in social service programs and corresponding funding structures will impact the City of Richmond
- Invite guest presenters to educate the RCSAC on topics relevant to Social Service providers and their clients
- Determine the need for further service gaps analysis in service areas in addition to Addictions and Mental Health
- Build on the success of the Mental Health and Addiction services wallet card. Determine potential need for other similar service cards in the community
- Complete a multi-year analysis of Community Social Services Survey results (2014-2016)
- Support initiatives that reduce barriers to accessing services in the community


## Anticipated Outcomes/Indicators of success

- Advice provided to Council regarding community safety matters
- Community Social Services and Space Needs Survey and Report Completed
- Communication Tools to Council as appropriate
- Final report on successful actions completed


## 2016 Activities

- Encouraged member organizations to participate in the City of Richmond's Municipal Policing Survey
- Provided a robust report for the 2014-2015 Social Services and Space Needs Survey that included multi-year analysis
- Developed and submitted the Changes to VCH Management communication tool to Council to inform them of potential additional gaps in mental health and addictions services
- Heard eight presentations from various groups on topics relevant to RCSAC member organizations and Richmond social services


## Council Term Goal 2.2

Effective social service networks

## Objectives

- To increase connections within the RCSAC membership
- To increase access to information and opportunities to plan and promote community and social service events and activities
- To review and broaden the membership of the RCSAC and encourage organizations providing community and social services in the Richmond community to join.
- To increase administrative efficiency for RCSAC


## Proposed Actions

- Maintain the Community Table/Committee Inventory and provide an update to Council in the RCSAC 2016 Annual Report
- Continue to develop members only log-in section on the RCSAC website so members can access minutes, agendas, reports etc.
- Support on-going updates to the RCSAC website
- Form an action team to review membership and determine organizations to receive invitation to learn more about the RCSAC


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- RCSAC website members-only log-in page continues to be enhanced and utilized by members
- RCSAC website utilization continues to increase. Increased number of webpage hits.
- Increased number of events and program information posted to the RCSAC website
- Potential new memberships joining the RCSAC
- Report on successful outcomes completed and included in the RCSAC 2016 Annual Report


## Anticipated Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- RCSAC website members-only log-in page continues to be enhanced and utilized by members
- RCSAC website utilization continues to increase. Increased number of webpage hits.
- Increased number of events and program information posted to the RCSAC website
- Potential new memberships joining the RCSAC
- Report on successful outcomes completed and included in the RCSAC 2016 Annual Report


## 2016 Activities

- Maintained the Community Table/Committee Inventory and included an update in the RCSAC 2016 Annual Report
- Actively recruited potential member organizations
- Began the process of upgrading the RCSAC website to ensure that it can continue to be used
- Completed the RCSAC 2016 Annual Report


## Council Term Goal 3.4

## Diversity of housing stock

## Objectives

- Continue to support the implementation of the Affordable Housing Strategy
- Provide input regarding the Affordable Housing Strategy Update


## Proposed Actions

- Participate in the Affordable Housing Strategy Update consultations
- Work collaboratively with the Richmond Homeless Coalition -Homes for All, Richmond housing organizations, advocates and the City to identify and highlight affordable and supportive housing needs and projects in Richmond.
- Work collaboratively with Richmond housing organizations and advocates to draft regular communication, which highlights housing needs and projects, to City Council and staff


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Affordable Housing Action Team formed as required
- Communication Tool to Council as appropriate regarding the Affordable Housing Strategy Update
- Regular updates presented to RCSAC General Committee meeting
- Successful outcomes completed and reported in the RCSAC 2016 Annual Report


## 2016 Activities

- Received monthly updates from the Richmond Homeless Coalition
- Received a report from CHIMO and the Richmond Poverty Response Committee on the current homeless situation in Richmond


## Council Term Goal 4.2

Innovative projects and initiatives to advance sustainability
Objectives

- Support the City as it advocates for a coordinated regional approach to enhance local food security
- Support the development of a food security action plan for the City of Richmond


## Proposed 2016 Actions

- Action teams formed as necessary to meet objectives
- Potential gap analysis undertaken
- Communication Tool developed for Council


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Presentation from Richmond Food Security Society on final draft of Food Charter
- Action team formed
- Communication Tools to Council completed as appropriate
- Successful actions completed and included in the RCSAC 2016 Annual Report


## 2016 Activities

- Received a report from the Richmond Food Security Society on the Richmond Food Charter and encouraged member agencies to consider sponsoring it


## Council Term Goal 5.1

Advancement of City priorities through strong intergovernmental relationships

## Objectives

- To provide Council with information about the impact of provincial and federal funding decisions on social services agencies and Richmond residents


## Proposed 2016 Actions

- Completion of annual Community Social Services Survey and Report - provide information to Council on provincial and federal funding decisions that may affect the delivery of social services in Richmond
- Contribute to and update as needed multi-year analysis of Community Social Services Survey
- Membership will submit Communication Tools to Council regarding changes in member agency funding relationships with federal and provincial governments
- Invite MLAs to information exchange with RCSAC members


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Communication Tools submitted as appropriate
- Community Social Services survey completed and report submitted to Council
- Successful actions completed and included in the RCSAC 2016 Annual Report
- Meeting held with Richmond MLAs to exchange information regarding social services in Richmond


## 2016 Activities

- Completed the annual Social Services and Space Needs Survey and submitted the report to Council
- Developed and submitted the "Changes to VCH Management" Communication Tool to Council on changes to VCH staff funding in Richmond
- Held the MLA Information Session and exchanged information on social services and gaps in service in Richmond


## Council Term Goal 6.2

Infrastructure is reflective of and keeping pace with community need.

## Objectives

- Identify space needs for non-profit societies within Richmond
- Identify housing and community space needs of RCSAC clients and member agencies


## Proposed 2016 Actions

- Inclusion of space needs in Community Social Services Survey
- Action team reports to RCSAC as needed


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Space results compiled from community needs assessment survey
- Communication Tool to Council as appropriate
- Successful actions completed and included in the RCSAC 2016 Annual Report


## 2016 Activities

- Included space needs in the Social Services Survey
- Completed the 2016 RCSAC Social Services and Space Needs Survey and submitted the report to Council
- Formed the NPO Space Needs Subcommittee to closely examine NPO space needs in Richmond
- Had presentations from City Staff on the City Centre Area Plan and from the SFU Kiwanis Place-Making Project


## Council Term Goal 9.2

Effective engagement strategies and tools.

## Objectives

- To share and promote information and engagement opportunities to clients of member agencies
- To stay apprised of results of engagement tools and how they are impacting our clients


## Proposed 2016 Actions

- Provide an opportunity for presentations to the RCSAC from City staff and Community Partners on engagement strategies and tools
- Share and promote information and engagement opportunities within agencies and to clients


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Communication Tools to Council as appropriate
- Final report on outcomes
- Presentations included in RCSAC meetings
- Information sharing included in meetings
- Encouraged information sharing at every RCSAC General Meeting
- Sent out weekly updates to RCSAC member organizations that included community and agency updates
- Welcomed eight presentations from various groups on important topics relevant to member organizations


## Additional RCSAC Work Plan Activities

## Objectives

- To increase connections within RCSAC members
- To review and broaden the membership of RCSAC and encourage organizations providing community and social services in the Richmond community to join
- To increase administrative efficiency for RCSAC


## Proposed Actions

- Maintain Community Table/Committee Inventory and provide update to Council in 2015 final report
- Continue to develop members only log-in section on RCSAC website so members can access minutes, agendas, reports etc.
- Support on-going updates to the RCSAC website
- Form an action team to review RCSAC membership and determine which organizations will receive an invitation to learn more about the RCSAC


## Anticipated Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Members only log-in page continues to be enhanced and utilized by members
- Website utilization continues to increase; increased number of webpage hits
- Increased number of events and program information posted to website
- Potential new members joining the RCSAC
- Report on successful outcomes completed


## 2016 Activities

- Maintained the Community Committees and Tables Inventory
- Increased RCSAC membership
- Encouraged and facilitated sub-committees and task forces to collaborate on projects outside the scope of the RCSAC
- Promoted information sharing amongst member organizations
- Encouraged and facilitated advocacy amongst member organizations
- Reduced meeting and administrative costs of the RCSAC
- Began the process of upgrading the RCSAC website


## RCSAC 2016 Financial Statement

|  | 2016-January 1 to December 31 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Balance Projected to be brought Forward | \$300.00 |
| Revenue |  |
| City of Richmond | \$11,000.00 |
| Membership Dues | \$1,400.00 |
| Bank Interest | \$1.50 |
| Sponsorship |  |
| Total Revenue | \$12,701.50 |
| Expenses |  |
| Admin Assistant | \$10,000.00 |
| Admin Expenses | \$80.00 |
| Forums/Meetings | \$1,400.00 |
| Website + IT | \$700.00 |
| Website Training/Calendar | \$100.00 |
| Post Box Renewal | \$158.00 |
| Volunteer Appreciation | \$200.00 |
| SubCommittee/printing/events |  |
| Total Expenses | \$12,638.00 |
| Total Balance | \$63.50 |

## 2017 Work Plan and Budget

## 2017 RCSAC Work Plan

The RCSAC continues to link its annual work plan initiatives to Richmond City Council's Term Goals. The 2017 Work Plan is designed to provide Council with advice on social and other community services to support Council's Goal Statement for a Vibrant, Active and Connected City.

The RCSAC will prioritize responding to Council requests as they arise throughout the year, and provide advice on the following Council Term Goals in the following RCSAC initiatives scheduled for implementation in 2017.

## Council Term Goal 1.4

## Effective interagency relationships and partnerships

## Objectives

- To respond to Council requests for input regarding community safety matters
- To provide a forum for Social Service Providers, Council Liaisons and City Staff, Citizen Appointees and Individual Members to collaborate, share, network and learn from one another, as well as from guest presenters from the City and community
- To identify, advise and provide recommendations to City Council and staff of trends, gaps and needs of our community


## Proposed 2017 Actions

- Continue to implement the RCSAC Community Social Services and Space Needs Survey.
- Advise Council if changes in social service programs and corresponding funding structures will impact the City of Richmond
- Continue to build on past results of the RCSAC Community Social Services and Space Needs Survey to provide context on the changing nature of social services in Richmond
- Invite guest presenters to educate the RCSAC on topics relevant to Social Service providers and their clients
- Determine the need for further service gaps analysis in service areas in addition to Addictions and Mental Health
- Support initiatives that reduce barriers to accessing services in the community


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Advice provided to Council regarding community safety matters
- Community Social Services and Space Needs Survey and Report Completed
- Communication Tools to Council as appropriate
- Final report on successful actions completed


## Council Term Goal 2.2

## Effective social service networks

## Objectives

- To increase connections within the RCSAC membership
- To increase access to information and opportunities to plan and promote community and social service events and activities
- To review and broaden the membership of the RCSAC and encourage organizations providing community and social services in the Richmond community to join.
- To increase administrative efficiency for RCSAC


## Proposed 2017 Actions

- Maintain the Community Table/Committee Inventory and provide an update to Council in the RCSAC Annual Report
- Continue to develop members only log-in section on the RCSAC website so members can access minutes, agendas, reports etc.
- Support on-going updates to the RCSAC website
- Form an action team to review RCSAC membership and determine organizations to receive invitation to learn more about the RCSAC


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Increased use of RCSAC website members-only log-in page
- Increased RCSAC website utilization and webpage hits.
- Increased number of events and program information posted to the RCSAC website
- Increase the number of social and community service organizations joining the RCSAC
- Report on successful outcomes completed and included in the RCSAC 2017 Annual Report


## Council Term Goal 3.4

## Diversity of housing stock

## Objective

- Continue to support the implementation of the Affordable Housing Strategy
- Provide input to Council regarding the Affordable Housing Strategy Update


## Proposed 2017 Actions

- Participate in the Affordable Housing Strategy Update consultations
- Work collaboratively with the Richmond Homeless Coalition, advocates, and the City to identify and highlight affordable and supportive housing needs and projects in Richmond.
- Work collaboratively with Richmond social services and advocates to draft regular communication, highlighting housing needs and projects, to City Council and staff


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Receive monthly reports from the Richmond Homelessness Coalition and report to Council as required
- Regular updates presented to RCSAC General Committee meeting by member organizations on the state of housing and homelessness in Richmond
- Successful outcomes completed and reported in the RCSAC 2017 Annual Report


## Council Term Goal 4.2

## Innovative projects and initiatives to advance sustainability

## Objectives

- Support the City as it advocates for a coordinated regional approach to enhance local food security
- Support the development of a food security action plan for the City of Richmond


## Proposed 2017 Actions

- Action teams formed as necessary to meet objectives
- Support social service organizations as they address food security in Richmond


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Communication Tools to Council completed as appropriate
- Successful actions completed and included in the RCSAC 2017 Annual Report


## Council Term Goal 5.1

## Advancement of City priorities through strong intergovernmental relationships

## Objectives

- To provide Council with information about the impact of provincial and federal funding decisions on social services agencies and Richmond residents


## Proposed 2017 Actions

- Completion of annual RCSAC Social Services and Space Needs Survey and Report - provide information to Council on provincial and federal funding decisions that may affect the delivery of social services in Richmond
- Contribute to and update as needed multi-year analysis of RCSAC Social Services and Space Needs Survey
- Invite MLAs to an information session with RCSAC members


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Communication Tools submitted as appropriate, including Community Social Services Survey and Space Needs Survey
- Successful actions completed and included in the RCSAC 2017 Annual Report
- Meeting held with Richmond MLAs to exchange information regarding social services in Richmond


## Council Term Goal 6.2

## Infrastructure is reflective of and keeping pace with community need.

## Objectives

- Identify space needs for non-profit societies within Richmond
- Identify housing and community space needs of RCSAC clients and member agencies


## Proposed 2017 Actions

- Submit the RCSAC Social Services and Space Needs Survey Communication Tool to Council
- NPO Space Needs Action team reports to RCSAC; RCSAC Communication Tool to Council as needed


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Space results compiled from community needs assessment survey
- Communication Tool to Council as appropriate
- Successful actions completed and included in the RCSAC 2017 Annual Report


## Council Term Goal 9.2

### 9.2 Effective engagement strategies and tools.

## Objectives

- To share and promote information and engagement opportunities to clients of member agencies
- To stay apprised of results of engagement tools and how they are impacting our clients


## Proposed 2017 Actions

- Presentations to the RCSAC from City staff and Community Partners on engagement strategies and tools
- Share and promote information about engagement opportunities within agencies and to clients


## Outcomes/Indicators of Success

- Communication Tools to Council as appropriate
- Final report on outcomes
- Presentations included in RCSAC meetings
- Information sharing included in meetings


## RCSAC 2017 Budget

|  | 2017 - January 1 to December 31 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Balance Projected to be brought Forward | \$300.00 |
| Revenue |  |
| City of Richmond | \$11,000.00 |
| Membership Dues | \$1,400.00 |
| Bank Interest | \$1.50 |
| Sponsorship |  |
| Total Revenue | \$12,701.50 |
| Expenses |  |
| Admin Assistant | \$10,000.00 |
| Admin Expenses | \$80.00 |
| Forums/Meetings | \$1000.00 |
| Website + IT | \$700.00 |
| Website Training/Calendar | \$100.00 |
| Post Box Renewal | \$158.00 |
| Volunteer Appreciation | \$200.00 |
| Sub-Committee | \$400.00 |
| Total Expenses | \$12,638.00 |
| Total Balance | \$63.50 |
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## I. MISSION STATEMENT OF THE RICHMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

To encourage and promote those social policies and community services which contribute to the general health, welfare and quality of life of the residents of Richmond, and to increase inter-agency relations and cooperation in order to enhance community capacity.

## II. HISTORY

The Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee, hereinafter referred to as "RCSAC", received formal recognition as an advisory body to Richmond City Council and its appropriate Committees on May 25, $1987^{1}$.

It builds on the information gathering and sharing strengths of the Richmond Community Services Council, which served the community in a similar but less formal capacity from April, 1978 to its evolution as the RCSAC in September, 1987.

During several years of Community services as a voluntary collaborative of non-profit, government and private agencies and organizations in the field of social and related community services, the Richmond Community Services Council and its member organizations were instrumental in the development and establishment of:

- The municipally funded RCMP Youth Intervention Program;
- A municipal social planner position;
- Richmond Child Protection Network;
- Richmond Family Place;
- An open referral in-the-home parenting program (lost with others during the 1983 restraint measures imposed by major government funding sources);
- Collaboration in preparation of the report Preparing for a Livable Future: Recommendations by the City Center Steering Committee;
- Improved Municipal Grant application and appeal processes;
- The Child Care Advisory Committee;
- The Inventory of Social Services in Richmond
- The Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee

An RCSAC Poverty Response Committee was established, and reports were submitted to Council. This has now become an independent committee.
Representatives from the RCSAC

- participated in the Community Parks, Recreational \& Cultural Working Group to assist in providing City Council with a Master Plan;
- currently participate in the Substance Abuse Task Force; and
- the Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee.

[^0]
## III. RICHMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RCSAC) IN BRIEF

1. Advises Richmond City Council, and/or the appropriate Council Committee.
2. Makes representations to other policy-making bodies on social policy and community services matters.
3. Provides informed comment and advice to Richmond City Council on implications for policies and services being changed and introduced.
4. Undertakes its work at the request of Richmond City Council, the RCSAC membership, and the community at large.
5. Provides a strong and active role in overall social policy and community services decisions for community representatives and nonprofit society boards.

## IV. RCSAC ROLES

1. The Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee (RCSAC) is a forum for community service* agencies to meet on a regular basis in order to share information and ideas about issues of common interest, and to identify emerging needs.
*Community Services: defined as those covering the general areas of health, social services, education, and other related service where the overall intent is to improve the quality of life for Richmond residents.
2. The RCSAC will foster the development of services, through an asset building ${ }^{2}$ approach, to meet those needs.
3. The RCSAC will establish and monitor Task Forces to undertake activities deemed by the RCSAC to be necessary and consistent with the objectives of the RCSAC. All Task Forces will be time limited with both start and end dates, and will produce a written report.
4. The RCSAC may employ and hire such staff as deemed necessary to assist in the operation of the RCSAC, including all Task Forces. All employees will report directly to the CoChairs of the Executive Committee.
5. The RCSAC will provide a leadership and educational role in social issues affecting community services.
6. The RCSAC strives to work cooperatively and in a complementary manner with other City advisory committees.
[^1]
## V. CITY LIAISON

Liaison with the City of Richmond will be provided by:

- One (1) non-voting Richmond City Council Liaison, and
- One (1) non-voting City Staff Liaison, provided by the Policy Planning Department.


## VI. MANDATE

## Section A

The RCSAC shall advise Richmond City Council and may, in consultation with City Council, make representations to other policy-making bodies on the following:

1. Policies that encourage cooperative planning and delivery of community services to ensure optimum efficiency and effectiveness;
2. Social issues/concerns that have an impact community services, special needs groups and the quality of life in the community;
3. Community impact of governmental changes to policies and/or programs affecting Richmond's community services; and
4. Any other matters that may be referred by Richmond City Council, RCSAC member groups and the community at large.

## Section B

1. Coordination of activities and information sharing between the voluntary and public sector.

## APPENDIX I

## An Oral History of RCSC, later to become RCSAC

## (Delivered by Olive Bassett at the RCSAC General meeting of December 8, 2003)

It is ten years since I have been associated with this advisory council, some of which I speak on today could be familiar to many of you but perhaps some of you are not familiar with the early history I hope it will be of interest to you. I was a member of RCSC for many years before becoming a school trustee then I was elected as their Rep. on the PAC (Policy Advisory Council) in 1990. Back in 1978, there was very little planning for social services, something had to be done, and the United Way was invited to set up some social planning for the community. There was no Social Planner at the municipal level at that time. The Child Services Committee, a committee of the United Way, was not representative enough; its mandate was services to children 12 \& under. A newly formed Child Abuse Committee was attempting to educate the public on what was happening to children; the community health nurses and social workers were the only ones going into the homes of many abused children. But the climate of the times prevented anyone from speaking out especially about sexual abuse, this was a taboo topic, no one wanted to talk about it. And there were many turf problems, every one was working in isolation on their own particular issues and problems, this is mine that is yours, don't mix the two! Finally the United Way placed an arms length community person in as Chair of the Child Services Committee hoping to become more effective. Something was still needed; the committee was not representative of agencies working with families, children \& youth. Palmer School had just gone up in smoke, at the hands of a teen-age girl who badly needed treatment. There were no services of the kind youth like her needed, but it was risking a teachers or a community health nurse's job to speak out on lack of services. It was so difficult to address so many social problems in the community but at that time, the thought of washing your linen in public was not to be tolerated. The School Board refused to put a family life program into the schools. The community was polarized. Many were demanding the program, just as many were in denial it was needed, and these felt the only place to teach this subject was in the home. Which was fine but those children needing the program did not come from homes where this kind of education was taught. It was a little later I believe the Richmond Youth Services Agency came into being to focus on the issues and problems facing the over 12's. And so, it was in this type of atmosphere that a major meeting was held with many of those delivering social services to families. Through this meeting, they got the endorsement needed to be something much broader than the Richmond Children's Committee. A Steering Committee was set up that met twice a month for a solid year and what came out of that was the framework for the Richmond Community Services Council. That was in 1978, and nine years later in '87, with the assistance of a municipal councilor, a social planner had finally been hired, RCSC was restructured and given the formal title of the Richmond Community Services Advisory Council, RCSAC, as it is known today. They would make recommendations for social service issues and report those issues \& concems directly to the Municipal Council through the Policy Advisory Council, who were elected from the Boards of the individual agencies to serve on PAC. They were the political arm of the RCSAC. And Council listened. In their eyes, it was no longer just staff driven. These were elected people making the recommendations. With the new structure, there was also the IAC, Inter Agency committee, made up the staff and the 'Hands On' people who worked in the field, and the Coordinating Committee overseeing both IAC \& PAC. This is all in your charter, I found it very interesting to re-read, and it would be well worth your re-reading pages 20 to 24 . In

1989, the RCSAC held a "Strategy Planning and Priority Setting Meeting". This was an extremely important meeting for RCSAC. Johnny Carline, Deputy Administrator, Strategic Planning for Richmond spoke on what Richmond could look like in the future, two questions he asked of the group: 1. "What are the priorities for service provision for all of the agencies in the next three years?" 2. "What suggestions do you have for the municipality to incorporate social issues into the growth management strategy?" A planning committee took all the suggestions, solutions, comments and concerns and brought in a final report in January 1990. Seven (7) recommendations came out of it and were presented to council, they may help you in your deliberations on the restructure process, I will leave it with Michael Then in 1994, RCSAC sent out an excellent questionnaire to member organizations, to see if the advisory council was meeting the needs of its membership by addressing gaps, identifying issues and resources to address them and then develop an action plan. The survey was divided into six major sections: Role \& Function, Participation, Community issues, Strengths \& Weaknesses, Suggestions for raising the profile of RCSAC and lastly the potential for sending out a newsletter. I will also leave a copy of this with Michael, as it may prove useful. I see you are now contemplating another re-structure, perhaps some questions that you may ask yourselves are: "What do you want to accomplish that you are not doing now?" "When was the last time your charter was brought up to date?" "How many agencies out there are not aware of what you do?" "How many agencies or groups out there doing a service for the community, are you not aware of?" In my opinion the reason RCSAC has survived while many others have not, is because community volunteers and staff have worked together for a common goal, this way everyone wins. The effectiveness of RCSAC has always been present to a greater or lesser degree. It is a tremendously important organization and the accomplishments you have gained have not come easy. It is an organization you can be proud to belong to. However, it must be supported by each and every social service organization in order to have the greatest impact for good.

Thank you.
M. Olive Bassett

## APPENDIX II

## 40 DEVELOPMENTAL ASSETS

Search Institute has identified the following building blocks of healthy development that help young people grow up healthy, caring, and responsible.

## External Assets

Category Asset Name and Definition

## Support

1. Family Support-Family life provides high levels of love and support.
2. Positive Family Communication-Young person and her or his parent(s) communicate positively, and young person is willing to seek advice and counsel from parents.
3. Other Adult Relationships-Young person receives support from three or more non-parent adults.
4. Caring Neighborhood-Young person experiences caring neighbors.
5. Caring School Climate-School provides a caring, encouraging environment.
6. Parent Involvement in Schooling-Parent(s) are actively involved in helping young person succeed in school.

## Empowerment

7. Community Values Youth-Young person perceives that adults in the community value youth.
8. Youth as Resources-Young people are given useful roles in the community.
9. Service to Others-Young person serves in the community one hour or more per week.
10. Safety-Young person feels safe at home, school, and in the neighborhood.

## Boundaries and Expectations

11. Family Boundaries-Family has clear rules and consequences and monitors the young person's whereabouts.
12. School Boundaries-School provides clear rules and consequences.
13. Neighborhood Boundaries-Neighbors take responsibility for monitoring young people's behavior,
14. Adult Role Models-Parent(s) and other adults model positive, responsible behavior.
15. Positive Peer Influence-Young person's best friends model responsible behavior.
16. High Expectations-Both parent(s) and teachers encourage the young person to do well.

## Constructive use of time

17. Creative Activities-Young person spends three or more hours per week in lessons or practice in music, theatre, or other arts.
18. Youth Programs-Young person spends three or more hours per week in sports, clubs, or organizations at school and/or in the community.
19. Religious Community-Young person spends one or more hours per week in activities in a religious institution.
20. Time at Home-Young person is out with friends "with nothing special to do" two or fewer nights per week

## INTERNAL ASSETS

## Category Asset Name and Definition

## Commitment to Learning

21. Achievement Motivation-Young person is motivated to do well in school.
22. School Engagement-Young person is actively engaged in learning.
23. Homework-Young person reports doing at least one hour of homework every school day.
24. Bonding to School-Young person cares about her or his school.
25. Reading for Pleasure-Young person reads for pleasure three or more hours per week.

## Positive Values

26. Caring-Young person places high value on helping other people.
27. Equality and Social Justice-Young person places high value on promoting equality and reducing hunger and poverty.
28. Integrity-Young person acts on convictions and stands up for her or his beliefs.
29. Honesty-Young person "tells the truth even when it is not easy."
30. Responsibility-Young person accepts and takes personal responsibility.
31. Restraint-Young person believes it is important not to be sexually active or to use alcohol or other drugs.

## Social Competencies

32. Planning and Decision Making-Young person knows how to plan ahead and make choices.
33. Interpersonal Competence-Young person has empathy, sensitivity, and friendship skills.
34. Cultural Competence-Young person has knowledge of and comfort with people of different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds.
35. Resistance Skills-Young person can resist negative peer pressure and dangerous situations.
36. Peaceful Conflict Resolution-Young person seeks to resolve conflict nonviolently.

## Positive Identity

37. Personal Power-Young person feels he or she has control over "things that happen to me."
38. Self-Esteem-Young person reports having a high self-esteem.
39. Sense of Purpose-Young person reports that "my life has a purpose."
40. Positive View of Personal Future-Young person is optimistic about her or his personal future.
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## Report to Committee

To: Planning Committee
From: John Irving, P.Eng. MPA Director, Engineering

Date: December 12, 2016
File: 10-6125-07-02/2016Vol 01

Re:
Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure in Private Developments

## Staff Recommendation

That the stakeholder consultation program to consult on the development and implementation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure in new private developments, as described in the staff report titled "Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure in Private Developments" from the Director, Engineering, dated December 12, 2016, be endorsed.


John Irving, P.Eng. MPA
Director, Engineering
(604-276-4140)

|  | REPORT CONCURRENCE |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ROUTED TO: | CONCURRENCE |  |
| Building Approvals |  |  |
| Development Applications |  |  |
| Policy Planning |  |  |
| Transportation | CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER |  |
| REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT $I$ |  |  |
| AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE |  |  |

## Staff Report

## Origin

In January 2014, Council adopted the Community Energy and Emissions Plan, which includes Action 18: Set minimum requirements for electric vehicle infrastructure in new developments.

This report supports Council's 2014-2018 Term Goal \#4 Leadership in Sustainability:
Continue advancement of the City's sustainability framework and initiatives to improve the short and long term livability of our City, and that maintain Richmond's position as a leader in sustainable programs, practices and innovations.
4.1. Continued implementation of the sustainability framework.
4.2. Innovative projects and initiatives to advance sustainability.

## Background

In 2010, Council adopted targets in Richmond's Official Community Plan to reduce community greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions 33\% below 2007 levels by 2020, and $80 \%$ below 2007 levels by 2050. The 2041 Official Community Plan also includes a target to reduce energy use by $10 \%$ below 2007 levels by 2020 . These targets are in line with what climate science suggests developed nations will need to achieve to have a good chance of avoiding an increase of 2 degrees Celsius in global average temperatures above pre-industrial levels, which is considered a threshold for dangerous climate change.

Richmond's 2014 Community Energy and Emissions Plan (CEEP) outlines strategies and actions for the City to take to reduce community energy use and GHG emissions, including:

- Strategy 7: Promote Low Carbon Personal Vehicles
- Action 18: Set minimum requirements for electric vehicle infrastructure in new developments.

Modeling undertaken as part of the CEEP indicates Richmond's 2050 emissions reduction targets can only be achieved with the near-universal adoption of zero emissions personal vehicles by the 2040s. The CEEP states that the City will pursue the widespread adoption of low carbon vehicles, in coordination with senior levels of government and industry.

## Electric Vehicles (EVs)

Plug-in Electric Vehicles (EVs) include:

- Battery electric vehicles (BEVs) - A vehicle that runs on electricity stored in batteries and has an electric motor rather than an internal combustion engine.
- Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles (PHEVs) - A vehicle equipped with a plug that can use either electricity or gasoline fuels. PHEVs typically have smaller batteries than BEVs and use a gasoline engine to provide additional range.

EVs realize near-zero GHG and air contaminant emissions when using power from BC's electric grid. BC is considered one of the most attractive markets for EVs in North America, given its relatively low cost of power and "green" consumption trends.

## City Action on Electric Vehicles

The City has demonstrated leadership by being one of the first municipalities in the region to establish policy providing for home access to EV charging. Section 8.5 .2 d of the 2041 Official Community Plan currently includes policy for new private multifamily developments to include EV charging infrastructure. This policy specifies that "a minimum of $20 \%$ of parking stalls be provided with a 120 volt receptacle to accommodate electric vehicle charging equipment [and] $\ldots$ an additional $25 \%$ of parking stalls be constructed to accommodate the future installation of electric vehicle charging equipment (e.g. pre-ducted for future wiring)".

The City has also led in deployment of public EV charging. In 2012, Council approved a cost sharing project with the Province that allowed the installation of public EV charging stations at Steveston, Thompson and Cambie Community Centres, and City Hall. Currently, there is no cost charged for this public charging service. Use of these stations increased eight-fold between 2013 and 2015, which may suggest that providing this public charging is playing a role in growing demand for EVs. In November 2016, Council directed staff to evaluate the development of a "fast charging" station network, and report back to Council with recommendations for implementation; staff are currently undertaking this investigation and will recommend a course of action to Council later in 2017.

EV procurement is an important part of the City's Green Fleet Action Plan. To date, the City has purchased four EVs, and additional procurement is planned in the future.

## Analysis

## Market Penetration of EVs

The price of EVs are falling, availability of vehicles is increasing, and demand for EVs is projected to grow. In 2012, BC Hydro forecasted that 20-50\% of new light-duty vehicles sold in BC in 2030 will be EVs. Similarly, Bloomberg New Energy Finance estimates that, even in the absence of additional government climate policy, EVs will constitute $25-50 \%$ of new vehicle sales worldwide by 2040. A recent survey conducted by the City of Vancouver suggested that
$85 \%$ of respondents would consider an electric vehicle the next time they purchased a vehicle. Many organizations, such as the International Energy Agency, have noted that government policy speeding the uptake of EVs will be necessary to avoid run away climate change.

A number of jurisdictions illustrate how policies can speed up the adoption of electric vehicles. For example, EVs comprised over 30 per cent of vehicles sold in Norway in the first half of 2016; Norway provides significant consumer incentives, as well as access to HOV lanes, free ferries, and preferred parking. Ten American states have enacted a Zero Emissions Vehicle mandate, requiring 15 per cent of new vehicles be zero emissions by 2025, and the province of Quebec has indicated it will match that requirement. The German parliament has passed a resolution calling for the European Union to pass directives to allow only Zero Emissions Vehicles by 2030. Additionally, the European Union has drafted regulations requiring 100 percent of new and refurbished homes to feature electric access for EV charging. British Columbia has introduced incentives for EV purchases, and in 2016 announced that EVs would be allowed in HOV lanes. The market share of EVs in coming years will ultimately be dictated by EV prices, government policy, oil prices, consumer preferences, and availability of charging infrastructure.

## EV Charging Infrastructure

Access to appropriate charging infrastructure is considered a key enabler of the adoption of EVs. The City can play an important role in growing demand for EVs by adopting improved standards for access to charging infrastructure.

Different "levels" of charging stations are recognized, as outlined in the Table 1.
Table 1: Common EV service equipment charging levels.

| Charging <br> Level | Voltage | Amperage | Apprx km of <br> range per hour <br> of charging | Time to fully <br> Recharge <br> (dependent on <br> battery size) | Applications |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| "AC Level 1" | 120 <br> VAC | $12-16 \mathrm{~A}$ | $\sim 7 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 5 to 30 hours | At home, at work. |
| "AC Level 2" | $208 /$ <br> 240 <br> VAC | $<=80 \mathrm{~A}(30 \mathrm{~A}$ <br> most <br> common) | $15-45 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 2 to 8 hours | At home, at work, public <br> charging |
| "DC Fast <br> Charge" | $200-$ <br> 400 <br> VAC | $80-400 \mathrm{~A}$ | $200+\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $<10$ min to 1 hour | Major public rapid-recharge <br> locations |

Market research suggests that approximately 80 per cent of EV charging occurs at home, with the remaining 20 per cent occurring at work and "on the go". Thus, appropriate infrastructure in residential parking areas is necessary to support EV's adoption. "Level 2" charging access is generally viewed as providing a higher level of service given its faster charging times; however, many EV owners report that "Level 1" (e.g. a standard 120 volt outlet) is adequate for most overnight charging.

Unfortunately, many residences do not currently have appropriate electrical connections for charging. This problem can be particularly acute in multifamily buildings. The Condominium Homeowners Association has estimated that it would cost $\$ 8,000-\$ 13,000$ to retrofit an electric vehicle charger in a multifamily parking area. At this cost, it can become financially unviable to acquire an EV. However, buildings can be "future-proofed" to significantly reduce these costs, as discussed below.

## EV Charging Infrastructure Configurations

Buildings can provide EV charging stations, and/or be future-proofed to accommodate lowercost installation of charging stations in the future. The following are options for infrastructure configurations in new developments:

- EV charging stations. EV charging stations (also called EV Service Equipment) are devices used to connect vehicles to an electric receptacle to recharge an EV's battery. Charging stations typically cost $\$ 500-3000$, making it costly to equip all parking spaces in new developments. Due to these costs, it is not recommended to require new developments to equip all parking spaces with charging stations. However, in order to develop the "On the Go" charging network, it may be appropriate to equip a small percentage of new publicly accessible commercial parking with charging stations and appropriate signage. Likewise, it may be appropriate to provide a few shared EV charging stations in multifamily developments to provide for guests and/or residents.
- "Energized" parking stalls. This infrastructure configuration provides parking stalls with an electrically wired receptacle dedicated for EV charging. A future EV driver need only install the charging station at their cost in order to charge their vehicle.
- "Partial EV infrastructure" parking stalls. This infrastructure configuration provides some features in a new buildings' construction that will make it easier to energize stalls and install EV charging stations in the future. While installing a charging station may not be as simple as under an "energized" infrastructure configuration, providing this "partial EV infrastructure" can reduce the costs of retrofitting the building to accommodate EVs in the future.

These options are illustrated in Figure 1.

## Innovative Technologies are Reducing the Cost of Implementing EV Charging

Charging technologies that can reduce the costs of EV charging infrastructure are emerging. Notably, "power sharing" technologies can allow multiple chargers to communicate so as not to exceed the capacity of a circuit, and also to time charging to occur when power costs less. Designing for such technologies can reduce the first cost of providing EV charging infrastructure, by reducing the size of building electrical systems that must be installed. These technologies can also ultimately reduce energy costs for users by coordinating vehicle charging to minimize consumer electrical costs, while still ensuring users receive sufficient charge.


Figure 1: Different potential configurations of EV charging infrastructure in new developments.

## City Policy Regarding EV Charging Infrastructure in New Developments

The City has been a leader in supporting EVs adoption, being one of the first communities in the region to specify that new developments feature electrical services for EV charging - Section 8.5.2 d of the 2041 Official Community Plan currently includes policy for new multifamily developments, requiring 20 per cent of residential parking stalls be "energized" with Level 1 ( 120 V ) service, with an additional 25 per cent featuring rough-in raceway to the parking stall. This policy applies to new developments undergoing rezoning. The City has successfully applied this policy, with new developments typically complying with or exceeding these provisions.

The City now has the opportunity to build on its leadership in enabling EVs, in light of the expanding EV market and the recognition that buildings currently being constructed are expected to be used well past 2050, when widespread adoption of EVs will be necessary to achieve climate targets. It is proposed that revised EV charging provisions be developed for Council's consideration. A revised policy provides the opportunity to:

- Allow for Level 2 charging. The current policy specifies Level 1 charging. Level 1 charging is viewed by some industry actors to be insufficient for the electric vehicles of the future, which may necessitate Level 2 home charging to provide sufficient overnight charge when battery is low. Staff will investigate whether both Level 1 and Level 2 should be allowed for home charging, or whether a particular infrastructure configuration should be specified.
- Consider providing a greater proportion of households access to EV charging. The current policy provides some form of home EV charging infrastructure access for 45 per cent of residential parking spaces. This is higher than what prevails in many jurisdictions in BC, and constituted significant leadership by the City. Nevertheless, under the current policy, 55 per cent of parking space owners will face a significant cost to implement any form of home charging. Staff will explore options to provide a higher percentage of households with access to EV charging.
- Consider provisions for detached housing, townhouses, "at work" or "on the go" charging. A future policy could cover a larger range of residential development, and also provide requirements for commercial developments to support charging at work and publicly accessible charging. It is important to note, however, that detached housing and townhouses typically do not have the same challenges implementing electric vehicle charging equipment as higher-density residential, mixed-use, commercial and institutional buildings. Moreover, detached housing and townhouses will typically have access to at least a "Level 1 " outlet in their parking area.


## Stakeholder Consultation Program

In 2016, two meetings with the Urban Development Institute were hosted by staff to solicit initial feedback on EV charging in new multifamily developments and develop principles for an updated approach. The next phase of consultation is intended to develop more detailed options for multifamily EV charging infrastructure. It is recommended that Council endorse the stakeholder engagement program outlined below, guided by the following principles:

- Ensure reasonable costs for EV infrastructure for both developers and end users EV charging requirements should balance costs for both developers and end-users.
- Better accommodate universal access to EV charging. Explore options to support as broad access to EV charging as possible, so as to provide greater options for consumers as EVs reduce in price and allow for the high uptake of EVs that will be necessary for the City to meet its emission reduction goals. This includes realizing higher rates of coverage of EV charging infrastructure in shared parkades, and providing charging infrastructure for building typologies with private garages or carports, including townhomes, duplexes and single family residences.
- Accommodate potential future technologies - The requirements should be flexible to accommodate future technologies, including "load management" and power sharing solutions.
- Accommodate at home Level 2 charging - Level 2 home charging access is considered by many stakeholders to be important to enable the adoption of EVs. Richmond's policy should change to accommodate Level 2 charging, and not only reference Level 1.
- Support the "at work" and "on the go" EV charging networks - The requirements should support the build out of the "at work" and "on the go" charging networks.
- Evaluate development costs and incentives - As part of developing policy, staff will evaluate the cost to future-proof new developments with different configurations of EV charging infrastructure; the extent of demand for EV charging infrastructure provisions amongst Richmond residents and homebuyers; and potential incentives or mechanisms that can help balance any incremental costs of EV charging infrastructure borne by new developments.
- Develop workable operating models for future strata corporations - As part of stakeholder consultation, staff will investigate how best to ensure that stratas can properly manage EV charging infrastructure and electricity costs.

Options for Council's consideration will be further developed as part of stakeholder consultation. The following consultation program will be carried out with Council's endorsement:

- Condominium owners focus group(s)
- Developer workshop
- Small builders workshop
- Local EV user groups (formal and informal groups)
- EV charging service providers
- Meetings with staff from the province, Metro Vancouver and other municipalities


## Financial Impact

None.

## Conclusion

This report reviews EV charging infrastructure considerations and options, and recommends that staff engage in stakeholder consultation and report back to Council with recommended options for EV charging infrastructure policy.


Brendan McEwen
Sustainability Manager
(604-247-4676)


## Report to Committee

To: Planning Committee
From: Wayne Craig
Director of Development

Date: December 13, 2016
File: SC 16-734026

Re: Application by Grafton Enterprises Ltd. for a Strata Title Conversion at 2551 No. 6 Road

## Staff Recommendations

1. That the application for a Strata Title Conversion by Grafton Enterprises Ltd. for the buildings located on the property at 2551 No. 6 Road, as generally shown in Attachment 1, be approved on fulfilment of the following conditions:
(a) Payment of all City utility charges and property taxes up to and including the year 2017;
(b) Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title identifying a minimum habitable elevation of 2.9 m GSC;
(c) Registration of an aircraft noise sensitive use covenant on title;
(d) Submission of appropriate plans and documents for execution by the Approving Officer within 180 days of the date of this resolution;
(e) Submission of a Landscape Plan, prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, and deposit of a Landscaping Security based on $100 \%$ of the cost estimate provided by the Landscape Architect, including installation costs and a $10 \%$ contingency.
2. That the City, as the Approving Authority, delegate to the Approving Officer the authority to execute the strata conversion plan on behalf of the City, as the Approving Authority, on the basis that the conditions set out in Recommendation 1 have been satisfied.

Wayne Craig
Director of Development
WC:jr
Att. 5


## Staff Report

## Origin

Grafton Enterprises Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to convert three (3) existing industrial buildings at 2551 No. 6 Road from multi-tenant rental buildings into thirteen (13) strata title lots.

## Findings of Fact

The subject property is located in an established business park and industrial area in the Bridgeport planning area (Attachment 1). Development immediately surrounding the subject property is as follows:

- To the north, a lot zoned "Light Industrial (IL)," with vehicle access from No. 6 Road.
- To the south, a lot zoned "Light Industrial Limited Office (ZI8) - Bridgeport Road Area," with vehicle access from No. 6 Road and Bridgeport Road.
- To the east, across No. 6 Road, lots zoned "Agriculture (AG1)."
- To the west, across a rail right-of-way, lots zoned "Light Industrial (IL)," with vehicle access from Viking Place and Viking Way.

There are three (3) existing buildings on the subject site, referred to as Buildings 1000, 2000, and 3000 in the proposed strata plan (Attachment 2). Building 1000 is located near the east lot line and is accessed directly from No. 6 Road. The building was renovated in 2015 as a multi-tenant building to accommodate eleven (11) industrial units; which are all currently occupied by tenants. This proposal would convert the building into eleven (11) strata lots. Required parking for the building is provided in the front and rear yards.

Buildings 2000 and 3000 are newly constructed and are currently occupied by tenants. The buildings are located at the west lot line, with Building 2000 in the northwest corner and Building 3000 in the southwest corner of the subject site. The buildings are accessed via an internal drive aisle circling the property. The proposal would convert each of these buildings into a strata lot, for a total of two (2) strata lots. Required parking for the buildings is provided in the rear yard.

There is no on-site landscaping between the parking area and the No. 6 Road frontage. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 requires a minimum 3.0 m wide landscaped area along the property line abutting a public road. To address the lack of landscaping within the existing parking area, the applicant has agreed to install a 4.5 m wide landscaped area in the City owned boulevard, between the concrete sidewalk and the property line. The applicant has submitted a Landscape Plan, showing the proposed works (Attachment 3). The applicant will remove and replace any existing street trees in poor condition, install three (3) new trees where none previously existed, and install shrubs and groundcover. The City Parks Department has reviewed the Landscape Plan and supports the proposed planting.

Prior to approval of the Strata Title Conversion, the applicant must provide a revised Landscape Plan, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, showing additional landscaping within 3.0 m of the property frontage and improved pedestrian access to No. 6 Road; and submit to the

City a Landscape Security for $100 \%$ of the total cost of installation, including a 10\% contingency, to ensure the landscaping is installed.

## Analysis

City of Richmond Policy 5031 (Strata Title Conversion Applications - Commercial and Industrial) outlines Council's policy in determining how staff process strata title conversion applications for three (3) or more proposed strata lots (Attachment 4). The applicant has submitted all of the necessary information required by City staff, including a Building Condition Assessment, and a Building Code Compliance report.

- Interior and exterior alterations to Building 1000 in 2014 required a Building Permit. The renovated building received Final Inspection on November 5, 2015.
- The two (2) new buildings have received Final Inspection from the City's Building Approvals Division. Building 2000 received Final Inspection on March 9, 2016; and Building 3000 received Final Inspection on December 1, 2015.
- A Strata Title Conversion report provided by Grafton Enterprises Ltd. and reviewed by Weiler Engineering Ltd. dated May 16, 2016 indicates that the life expectancy of Building 1000 is at least 50 years, and the life expectancy of Buildings 2000 and 3000 is at least 75 years.
- The author of the Building Condition Assessment expects no increase in maintenance, repair, or replacement costs within the next 10 to 20 years.
- The author of the Building Code Compliance report confirms that the existing buildings are substantially in compliance with the BC Building Code. Building 1000 was upgraded to be substantially compliant with the BC Building Code 1998; Buildings 2000 and 3000 are substantially compliant with the BC Building Code 2012.
- Building Approvals confirmed that the proposed strata title conversion of the existing building has no building code implications.
- All three (3) buildings are currently occupied by tenants. The applicant has submitted signed letters from each of the existing tenants, stating that they are aware of and take no issue with this application (Attachment 5).
- The owner's intention is to retain sole ownership of the Lands and to lease the units after the strata title conversion is completed. The existing tenants will continue to occupy the premises with no changes to the terms of the existing leases, other than modifications to reflect the strata title conversion.
- No physical or structural upgrading of the buildings will take place, and no changes affecting open space, landscaping, common facilities, off-street parking, or loading spaces are being proposed.
- All on-site parking and loading areas will be designated as limited common property for the exclusive use of the designated thirteen (13) strata lots. As part of a business license, each business will need to verify that they have access to the Bylaw-required parking.
- The subject property is located within Aircraft Noise Area 4. All aircraft noise sensitive land uses are considered in this area. A restrictive covenant must be registered on title, the purpose of which is to address public awareness and ensure aircraft noise mitigation is incorporated into the design and construction of buildings and additions as required.

In light of this, staff support the proposed strata title conversion subject to:

1. Payment of all City utility charges and property taxes up to and including the year 2017.
2. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title identifying a minimum habitable elevation of 2.9 m GSC.
3. Registration of an aircraft noise sensitive use covenant on title.
4. Submission of appropriate plans and documents (i.e., Strata Plan Surveyor's Certificate, Application to Deposit, Form V and Form W, etc.) for execution by the Approving Officer within 180 days of the date of this resolution.
5. Submission of a Landscape Plan, prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, and deposit of a Landscaping Security based on $100 \%$ of the cost estimate provided by the Landscape Architect, including installation costs and a $10 \%$ contingency.

## Financial Impact

None.

## Conclusion

Grafton Enterprises Ltd. has applied to convert three (3) existing industrial buildings at 2551 No. 6 Road into thirteen (13) strata title lots. The proposal is straightforward. Staff have no objection to this application and recommend approval of the strata title conversion application.

Jordan Rockerbie
Planning Technician
(604-276-4092)
JR:rg
Attachment 1: Location Map and Aerial Photo
Attachment 2: Draft Strata Plan
Attachment 3: Proposed Landscape Plan
Attachment 4: Policy 5031: Strata Title Conversion Applications - Commercial and Industrial Attachment 5: Letters from existing tenants (7)
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| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Page 1 of 1 | Adopted by Council: Feb. 13/95 <br> Amended by Council: Mar. 27, 1995; July 27, 2015 | POLICY 5031 |
| File Ref: 4105-00 | STRATA TITLE CONVERSION APPLICATIONS - COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL |  |

POLICY 5031:
It is Council policy that:
The following matters shall be considered before deciding on any commercial or industrial strata title conversion applications involving three or more strata lots:

1. The life expectancy of the building and any projected major increases in maintenance costs due to the condition of the building. This information shall be supplied by the applicant in the form of a written report in an acceptable form prepared by a registered architect, engineer or similarly qualified professional. The report shall review the building's age, quality, general condition and measure of compliance with current building codes and City bylaws.
2. The impact of the proposal on the existing tenants in terms of their existing leases and their ability to offer to purchase the units they occupy or to relocate in comparable and suitable rental premises if unable to purchase their existing units.
3. The views of the affected tenants as established by a formal canvass by the City Staff or agents of the City. A standard form available from the City's Planning and Development Division may be used for this purpose.
4. Any proposals involving upgrading of the buildings or changes affecting open space, landscaping, common facilities, off-street parking and loading spaces. The ownership and management of the off-street parking and loading facilities should be specifically addressed.
5. Any other conditions peculiar to the circumstances of the conversion proposal and requiring special measures to be taken as a condition of approval.
6. All commercial or industrial strata conversion applications must be compatible with the City's bylaws regulating the use and development of the land and the servicing standards appropriate to the site.
(Planning and Development Division)

## GRAFTON EnTERPRISES TD.

July $15^{\text {th, }}, 2016$

Morton Clarke \& Co. Ltd.<br>Attention: Paul Clarke<br>1105, 1110, 1115, 1120 - 2551 No. 6 RD<br>Richmond, BC V6V 1P3

Re: $\quad$ Strata Plan EPS3021 at 2551 No. 6 Rd

We are in the final stages of completing the project at the above-noted address. We would like to inform you that the title of your units will be Strata (S.L. 1, S.L. 2, S.L. 3, \& S.L. 4). The reason for this is to allow separate metering for gas, electric, water, sewer, and property taxes. This will ensure that tenants will pay for their own expenses and no one else's.

For those of you who do not know, this will have no ramifications with regards to your tenancy and only changes how the landlord, Grafton Enterprises Ltd., owns the property.

Please sign in the space below to indicate you do not take issue with this change. Retain one copy for your records.

Sincerely,

GRAFTON ENTERPRISES LTD.
Wayne Grafton

Agreed to the above terms by Morton Clarke \& Co. Ltd.

Signature:


Date:


NAME:
Paw cooks
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## GRAFTON EnTERPRISES ITD.

July $15^{\text {th, }}, 2016$

Ultimate Skateboard Distributors Inc.<br>Attention: Brad Richmond<br>1125-2551 No. 6RD<br>Richmond, BC V6V 1P3

Re: $\quad$ Strata Plan EPS3021 at 2551 No. 6 Rd

We are in the final stages of completing the project at the above-noted address. We would like to inform you that the title of your unit will be Strata (S.L. 5). The reason for this is to allow separate metering for gas, electric, water, sewer, and property taxes. This will ensure that tenants will pay for their own expenses and no one else's.

For those of you who do not know, this will have no ramifications with regards to your tenancy and only changes how the landlord, Grafton Enterprises Ltd., owns the property.

Please sign in the space below to indicate you do not take issue with this change. Retain one copy for your records.

Sincerely,


GRAFTON ENTERPRISES LTD.
Wayne Grafton

## Agreed to the above terms by

Ultimate Skateboard Distributors Inc.


## GRAFTON EnTERPRISES TD.

1922103 Ontario Inc. DBA SuPEr 3 Produce
Attention: Ben Chen
1130 \& 1135-2551 No. 6 RD
Richmond, BC V6V 1P3

## Re: Strata Plan EPS3021 at 2551 No. 6 Rd

We are in the final stages of completing the project at the above-noted address. We would like to inform you that the title of your units will be Strata (S.L. 6 \& S.L. 7). The reason for this is to allow separate metering for gas, electric, water, sewer, and property taxes. This will ensure that tenants will pay for their own expenses and no one else's.

For those of you who do not know, this will have no ramifications with regards to your tenancy and only changes how the landlord, Grafton Enterprises Ltd., owns the property.

Please sign in the space below to indicate you do not take issue with this change. Retain one copy for your records.

Sincerely,


GRAFTON ENTERPRISES LTD.
Wayne Grafton

Agreed to the above terms by
1922103 Ontario Inc. DBA Super 3 Produce

SIGNATURE:


DATE:


NAME:
BENCHES

## GRAFTON EnTERPRISES LTD.

Bescorp Holdings Inc. (dea Tapio Tea Company)<br>Attention: Ken Hs<br>1140 \& 1145-2551 No. 6 RD<br>Richmond, BC V6V 1P3

## Re: $\quad$ Strata Plan EPS3021 at 2551 No. 6 Rd

We are in the final stages of completing the project at the above-noted address. We would like to inform you that the title of your units will be Strata (S.L. 8 \& S.L. 9). The reason for this is to allow separate metering for gas, electric, water, sewer, and property taxes. This will ensure that tenants will pay for their own expenses and no one else's.

For those of you who do not know, this will have no ramifications with regards to your tenancy and only changes how the landlord, Grafton Enterprises Ltd., owns the property.

Please sign in the space below to indicate you do not take issue with this change. Retain one copy for your records.

Sincerely,


GRAFTON ENTERPRISES LTD.
Wayne Grafton


AGREED TO THE ABOVE TERMS BY
Bescorp Holdings Inc. (dea Tapio Tea Company)

Signature:


Name: Paid Churn$-73$

DATE:


## GRAFTON EnTERPRISES LTD.

July 15 th, 2016

The Chefs' Warehouse Pastry Division Canada ULC<br>Attention: Ed Davis<br>1150 \& 1155-2551 No. 6 RD<br>Richmond, BC V6V 1P3

## Re: Strata Plan EPS3021 at 2551 No. 6 Rd

We are in the final stages of completing the project at the above-noted address. We would like to inform you that the title of your units will be Strata (S.L. 10 \& S.L. 11). The reason for this is to allow separate metering for gas, electric, water, sewer, and property taxes. This will ensure that tenants will pay for their own expenses and no one else's.

For those of you who do not know, this will have no ramifications with regards to your tenancy and only changes how the landlord, Grafton Enterprises Ltd., owns the property.

Please sign in the space below to indicate you do not take issue with this change.
Retain one copy for your records.

Sincerely,


## GRAFTON ENTERPRISES LTD.

Wayne Grafton

Agreed to the above terms by
The Chefs' Warehouse Pastry Division Canada ULC

Signature:


DATE:


NAME:

## GRAFTON EnTERPRISES LTD.

Barroco Fine Furnitureltid.<br>Attention: Roger Chang<br>Bldg 2000-2551 No. 6 RD<br>Richmond, BC V6V 1P3

## RE: STRATA Plan EPS3021 AT 2551 No. 6 RD

We are in the final stages of completing the project at the above-noted address. We would like to inform you that the title of your unit will be Strata (S.L. 12). The reason for this is to allow separate metering for gas, electric, water, sewer, and property taxes. This will ensure that tenants will pay for their own expenses and no one else's.

For those of you who do not know, this will have no ramifications with regards to your tenancy and only changes how the landlord, Grafton Enterprises Ltd, owns the property.

Please sign in the space below to indicate you do not take issue with this change.
Retain one copy for your records.

Sincerely,

## GRAFTON ENTERPRISES LTD.

Wayne Grafton

AGREED TO THE ABOVE TERMS BY
Barroco Fine Furniture ltd.

Signature:


Date: July $>6 \rightarrow 016$
NAME:

## GRAFTON EnTERPRISES TD.

July $15^{\text {th, }} 2016$

## TEC Floor Coverings Ltd. Attention: LARS SOLLENIUS Bldg 3000-2551 No. 6 RD Richmond, BC V6V 1P3

## Re: Strata Plan EPS3021 at 2551 No. 6 Rd

We are in the final stages of completing the project at the above-noted address. We would like to inform you that the title of your unit will be Strata (S.L. 13). The reason for this is to allow separate metering for gas, electric, water, sewer, and property taxes. This will ensure that tenants will pay for their own expenses and no one else's.

For those of you who do not know, this will have no ramifications with regards to your tenancy and only changes how the landlord, Grafton Enterprises Ltd., owns the property.

Please sign in the space below to indicate you do not take issue with this change.
Retain one copy for your records.

Sincerely,


## GRAFTON ENTERPRISES LTD.

Wayne Grafton

## AGREED To THE AbOVE TERMS BY

 TEC Floor Coverings Ltd.Signature:


Date: July $2 / / 6$.
name: Alyson SolleniusplN-76

## Report to Committee

| To: | Planning Committee | Date: January 10, 2017 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | Wayne Craig <br> Director, Development | File: RZ 14-678448 |
| Re: | Application by 1004732 BC Ltd. for Rezoning at 6840 \& 6860 No. 3 Road and <br> 8051 Anderson Road from "Downtown Commercial (CDT1)" to "City Centre High <br> Density Mixed Use with Office (ZMU31) - Brighouse Village" |  |

## Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9510 to create the "City Centre High Density Mixed Use with Office (ZMU31) - Brighouse Village" zone, and to rezone 6840 \& 6860 No. 3 Road and 8051 Anderson Road from "Downtown Commercial (CDT1)" to "City Centre High Density Mixed Use with Office (ZMU31) - Brighouse Village", be introduced and given first reading.


WC:jd $\qquad$
Att.


## Staff Report

## Origin

1004732 BC Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone the properties at 6840 \& 6860 No. 3 Road and 8051 Anderson Road (Attachments 1\&2) from "Downtown Commercial (CDT1)" to a new site-specific zone, "City Centre High Density Mixed Use with Office (ZMU31) - Brighouse Village", in order to permit the development of a high-density, mixed commercial and residential use building in City Centre's Brighouse Village (Attachment 3). Key components of the proposal include:

- a podium and tower form of development;
- a total floor area of $18,701 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(201,292 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ comprised of approximately:
- $1,149 \mathrm{~m}^{2}(12,371 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.) of retail space on the ground level,
- $9,794 \mathrm{~m}^{2}(105,420 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.) of office space in a twelve-storey tower component facing No. 3 Road, and,
- $7,757 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ( $83,501 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.) of multi-family residential space in a ten-storey mid-rise component facing Anderson Road;
- a total of seventy-five (75) studio through three-bedroom dwelling units including:
- sixty-seven (67) one-storey apartment units, and - eight (8) two-storey apartment units;
- $5 \%$ of the residential floor area allocated to five (5) affordable housing units;
- a variety of utility, transportation and parks improvements and cash contributions along with development of an enhanced public realm along No 3 Road;
- cash-in-lieu contributions of $\$ 515,105.15$ for child care, $\$ 1,417,398.31$ for community facilities, $\$ 50,304.72$ for community planning and $\$ 114,861.64$ for public art; and
- a LEED Silver-equivalent building designed and constructed to connect to the future district energy utility (DEU) system.

Conceptual plans of the rezoning proposal are provided (Attachment 5). A list of Rezoning Considerations (Attachment 6) is provided (signed copy on file).

## Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data (Attachment 4) is provided for comparison of the proposed development with the proposed site specific zone requirements.

## Site and Surrounding Development

The subject site is located on the northeast corner of No. 3 Road and Anderson Road. The site is relatively flat and is currently preloaded in preparation for construction. The previous low scale development has been removed.
Properties in the surrounding area have been or are likely to be redeveloped with higher density commercial, residential and mixed used developments. Please refer to the Brighouse Village Specific Land Use Map for additional information (Attachment 3). Current and future potential surrounding development includes:

To the North: Three lots fronting No. 3 Road developed with low scale commercial buildings
and surface parking to the rear. Also, to the north, two lots facing Park Road. All lots to the north could be redeveloped under the current Downtown Commercial (CDT1) zoning or could be rezoned under the CCAP, resulting in a commercial or mixed use podium and tower development with an FAR ranging between 3.0 and 4.0 and a maximum height of 47.0 m GSC.

To the South: Across Anderson Road, four lots fronting No. 3 Road developed with low scale commercial buildings and surface parking to the rear, and, at 8080 Anderson Road, an affordable housing development (currently under construction) that was approved with an FAR of 3.48 and a height of 43.5 m GSC (DP 12-605094). The properties fronting No. 3 Road could be redeveloped under the current Downtown Commercial (CDT1) zoning or could be rezoned under the CCAP, resulting in a commercial or mixed use podium and tower development with an FAR of between 3.0 and 4.0 and a maximum height of 47 m GSC.

To the East: An existing commercial and residential podium and tower development, with internal parking (DP 91-000172). Further to the east, a recently approved mixed use podium and tower development will be constructed (DP 13-645286).

To the West: Across No. 3 Road, the Richmond City Hall precinct with an eight-storey civic building, landscaped grounds and a combination of underground and surface parking. Additionally, across No. 3 Road, the Richmond Centre site which is currently developed with a two-storey mall surrounded by surface parking and is also under application to amend the OCP to adjust land use designation boundaries (CP 16-752923).

## Related Policies

## A. Official Community Plan/City Centre Area Plan

Official Community Plan: The Official Community Plan (OCP) designates the site as "Downtown Mixed Use". The proposed rezoning is consistent with this designation.
City Centre Area Plan: The City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) designates the site as "Urban Core T6 $(45 \mathrm{~m})$ ". The proposed rezoning is consistent with this designation.

## B. Other Policies, Strategies and Bylaws

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

Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development Policy: The proposed development is located in Area 4 on the Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development Map. The proposed redevelopment must address the requirements of the Aircraft Noise Policy including provision of an acoustic consultant report regarding sound attenuation measures to be incorporated into the development. Registration of aircraft noise covenant is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

Mixed Use Noise and Ambient Noise: The proposed development must address additional OCP Noise Management Policies, specifically Mixed Use Noise and Ambient Noise. Requirements include provision of an acoustic consultant report regarding sound attenuation measures and registration of associated noise covenants before final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

Affordable Housing Strategy: The proposed development provides for affordable housing. Registration of an Affordable Housing Agreement is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. The specific details of the affordable housing proposal are provided in Analysis, Section B. 2 - Affordable Housing.

Richmond Public Art Policy: The proposed development addresses the Richmond Public Art Policy and provides for a financial contribution toward public art in the Brighouse No. 3 Road Art Walk. The specific details of the affordable housing proposal are provided in Analysis, Section B. 3 - Community Amenities.

District Energy Utilities: The proposed development will be designed to utilize energy from a District Energy Utility when a neighbourhood DEU is implemented. Connection to the future DEU system will be secured with a legal agreement.

## Public Consultation

A rezoning notification sign was installed on the subject property. In response, staff received comments from existing tenants, residents of an adjacent property and owners of nearby commercial properties.
Existing Tenants: Existing tenants were concerned about being displaced by the proposed development. The developer and tenants resolved their issues, the tenants have since relocated their businesses and the previous development removed from the site.
Neighbouring Residential Properties: The occupants of one of the mid-level residential units in the building immediately to the east of the subject site (8111 Anderson Road) expressed concern that the new development would eliminate existing western views and reduce privacy. The site is being developed in accordance with the City Centre Area Plan. The applicant has responded to neighbours' privacy concerns with multiple changes to the eastern end of the development. Changes include:

- increasing the side yard setback by approximately 1.5 m at the relevant building level;
- orienting the main windows of the proposed development to the north and south;
- making most of the east façade solid with a few, carefully placed, small windows;
- eliminating access to two deck areas parallel to the east property line;
- adding hedge and tree screening on a second, larger deck area also parallel to the east property line; and
- changing the programming of the second deck to focus on urban agriculture rather than ongoing socializing.
Neighbouring Commercial Properties: Owners of nearby commercial developments have expressed concerns about the impacts of site preloading on the structure and finishing of their buildings. Staff have referred the property owners to the applicant as this is considered to be a civil matter.


## Advisory Design Panel

The design of the proposed development (DP 15-708092) was forwarded to the ADP for comment on November 18, 2015. Feedback from the Panel (Attachment 7) led to elimination of an east-west pedestrian connection between No. 3 Road and the evolving east-west lane system to the east. Otherwise, the proposal was well received by Panel members, who recommended a variety of small changes.

## Analysis

Staff have reviewed the proposed rezoning and find that it is generally consistent with City policy objectives described in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) including but not limited to: public and private infrastructure; community benefits and amenities; and, basic development conditions such as land use, density and height. Further, the proposed development contributes to an enhanced public realm and addresses potential impacts on surrounding developments.

The applicant has agreed to undertake the considerations of rezoning related to the foregoing as well as those related to subdivision, indemnification and other legal agreements to be registered on title (Attachment 6).

## A. Proposed Zoning

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the Brighouse Village Specific Land Use Map transect land use designation, Urban Core T6 ( 45 m ), which provides for up to 3.0 FAR of mixed use density and eligibility for an additional 1.0 FAR of Village Centre Bonus (VCB) commercial density.

A new site specific zone, "City Centre High Density Mixed Use with Office (ZMU31) Brighouse Village", is proposed that incorporates specific requirements regarding the relative amounts of commercial and residential uses, the provision of affordable housing on-site and various form of development parameters.

## B. CCAP Implementation Policies

## 1. Utility, Transportation and Parks Infrastructure

The proposed infrastructure improvements are summarized below and will be realized through a Servicing Agreement (SA). The infrastructure improvements are not eligible for Development Cost Charge (DCC) credits and will be funded by the developer.

City Utilities: The developer is required to undertake a variety of water, storm water drainage and sanitary sewer frontage works. Included are:

- a water main upgrade on Anderson Road;
- a storm sewer upgrade on Anderson Road;
- a lane drainage upgrade to the north of the subject site as well as the site to the east; and
- a combination of temporary sanitary sewer work and permanent upgrades on Anderson Road that will connect with a new sanitary sewer to be constructed on Buswell Street under the City's Capital Plan.

The frontage and other infrastructure improvements are detailed in the Servicing Agreement section of the Rezoning Considerations (Attachment 6).

## Private Utilities: Undergrounding of Hydro service lines is required.

Transportation Network: The CCAP encourages completion and enhancement of the City street and lane network. Based on the City's road network objectives and the submitted Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) frontage and off-site street, lane and intersection improvements are as follows.

- No. 3 Road: The No. 3 Road vehicle lane widths will remain the same. The back-of-curb cross-section will be widened to accommodate a boulevard, bikeway, greenway and sidewalk, all of which are intended to support an enhanced public realm. A property dedication is required.
- Anderson Road: The Anderson Road vehicle and back-of-curb cross-section widths will remain the same. No dedications are required. The finishing of the back of curb areas will be upgraded, including the frontage of 8111 Anderson Road, to establish a consistent frontage design between No. 3 Road and Buswell Street.
- North-South Lane: Development of a formalized north-south lane system to the east of No. 3 Road will begin with the creation of a new north-south connection through the subject site. Because of the configuration of the site and building, this connection will occur at ground level only and will be secured as a volumetric statutory right of way (SRW). The connection is designed to be used by cars, trucks and pedestrians.
- East-West Lane: There is an evolving east-west lane system running from Buswell Street to the site. The proposed development will contribute to this system with a 3.0 m land dedication from the north east edge of the site along with associated frontage improvements. (Note: Additional contributions to the interim functioning of the evolving east-west lane system are discussed in Analysis, Section C. 2 - Site Access-Off-site).
- Transportation Impact Analysis Measures (TIA): Based on the findings of the TIA study, various off-site improvements are required as follow.
- pedestrian upgrades at the No. 3 Road and Anderson Road intersection including:
- upgrade the crosswalks at the intersection with decorative stamped asphalt treatment and yellow tactile warning pavers at the curb ramps to improve visibility and accessibility of crosswalks;
- pedestrian upgrades at the Anderson Road and Buswell Road intersection including:
- installation of two special crosswalk signals (side-mounted) with APS for the north and south legs of the intersection and service panel; pedestrian detection and communications conduit, cable and junction boxes;
- add new curb ramps on east side per City Engineering Design Specification standards with tactile warning strips; and
- street sign upgrades at the Granville Avenue and Buswell Street intersection including:
- upgrade intersection with illuminated street name signs.

Parks and Open Space Network: The CCAP identifies No 3 Road as part of the City's greenway system. The No. 3 Road back-of-curb cross-section accommodates greenway functions.
Public Realm Design - No. 3 Road: Detailed design development of the required frontage improvements will be undertaken through the Development Permit and Servicing Agreement processes. The preliminary public realm plan for the subject development (Attachment 8 ) shows
the proposed locations and designs for various paths, spaces, hard and soft landscape, street furnishings and finishing. However, as the CCAP envisions an "art walk" along No. 3 Road from the Canada Line Station to Granville Ave., staff are hoping to work with current developers and/or a consultant to develop a comprehensive public realm vision that unifies and celebrates the Brighouse Village Centre and the Brighouse section of the No. 3 Road corridor.
Public Realm Design - North-South Lane SRW: The proposed north-south lane runs through the middle of the ground level of the proposed development. To encourage pedestrian use, increase safety and reduce the visual impact of a large opening in the streetwall, the applicant proposes an enhanced design treatment on the ground, walls and ceiling using coloured concrete banding interspersed with embedded lighting. The enhanced design will be implemented through the Development Permit and Servicing Agreement processes.

## 2. Affordable Housing

The CCAP Implementation Strategy, in conjunction with the Affordable Housing Strategy, provides for density bonusing to achieve low end market rental units in residential and mixed use development of 80 or more units. Where there are fewer than 80 units, cash-in-lieu may be provided.

Low End Market Rental Housing (LEMR): Although the proposed development is less than 80 units, the developer has chosen to provide the affordable housing on-site. The proposal includes a total of five (5) LEMR units, with a combined floor area of $395.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ( $4,259.28 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.) which is $5 \%$ of the residential floor area. The proposed LEMR unit allocation includes:

| Unit Type | Affordable Housing Strategy Requirements |  |  | Project Targets (2) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Minimum Unit Area | Maximum Monthly Unit Rent (1) | Total Maximum Household Income (1) | Unit Mix | \# of Units |
| Bachelor | $37 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(400 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | \$850 | \$34,000 or less | 0\% | 0 |
| 1-Bedroom | $50 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(535 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | \$950 | \$38,000 or less | 40\% | 2 |
| 2-Bedroom | $80 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(860 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | \$1,162 | \$46,500 or less | 60\% | 3 |
| 3-Bedroom | $91 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(980 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | \$1,437 | \$57,500 or less | 0\% | 0 |
| TOTAL |  | N/A | N/A | 100\% | 5 |

(1) May be adjusted periodically, as provided for under adopted City policy.
(2) $100 \%$ of affordable housing units shall meet Richmond Basic Universal Housing (BUH) standards or better.

The units will be secured with a housing agreement which will include terms regarding the integration of the affordable units with the market units; tenant access to the indoor and outdoor common amenity areas; and, provision of affordable parking spaces at no additional charge.

## 3. Community Amenities

The CCAP Implementation Strategy includes density bonusing and other measures to support community enhancements that are desirable in the context of City Centre densification. The proposed rezoning includes offers to contribute to the following community amenities in accordance with the OCP.

Child Care: The proposed rezoning is located in the Brighouse Village Specific Land Use Map "T6" area and is subject to a density bonus provision requiring that one percent ( $1 \%$ ) of the residential floor area (excluding affordable housing floor area) be provided to the City in the
form of child care space or a cash-in-lieu contribution to the Childcare Development Reserve Fund and Childcare Operating Contributions accounts ( $90 \%$ and $10 \%$ respectively). Community Services staff have reviewed the location of the development and the potential for child care in the available floor area and recommend that the City accept a total cash-in-lieu contribution based on the finished value of the space (a minimum of $\$ 515,105.15$ calculated using the proposed floor area [0.01 $\left.\times 7,361.8 m^{2} \times \$ 6,997 / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right]$ ).
Community Facilities: The proposed rezoning is located in the Brighouse Village Specific Land Use Map "Village Centre Bonus (VCB)" area and incorporates a VCB density increase of 0.83 FAR. Five percent (5\%) of this area is expected to be provided back to the City in the form of community amenity space or a cash-in-lieu contribution to the City Centre Facility Development Fund ( $100 \%$ ). Community Services staff have reviewed the location of the development and the potential for community amenities in the limited floor area ( $202.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ) and recommend that the City accept a cash-in-lieu contribution based on the finished value of the space (a minimum of $\$ 1,417,398.31$ calculated using the proposed floor area [ $\left.0.05 \times .83 \times 4,881.26 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \times \$ 6,997 / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right]$ ).

Community Planning: The proposed rezoning is subject to a community planning implementation contribution to the CC-Community Planning and Engineering account contribution for future community planning (a minimum of $\$ 50,304.72$ calculated using the proposed floor area $\left[18,700.64 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \times \$ 2.69 / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right]$ ).

Public Art: The CCAP looks to public art to enrich and animate the public realm. The subject site is located on No. 3 Road between Granville Avenue and the Brighouse Canada Line Station, an area specifically identified for development of an "art walk" in the public and adjacent private realm. Community Services staff have considered public art contribution options for this area and recommend that the City accept a cash-in-lieu contribution to the Public Art Provision account (15\%) and the Public Art Reserve account (85\%) so that a co-ordinated approach for the full length of the art walk (Granville Avenue to the Canada Line Station) can be pursued. The public art contribution is calculated on both the commercial and residential space (a minimum of $\$ 114,861.64$ calculated using the proposed floor areas $\left[10,943.14 m^{2} \times \$ 4.63 / m^{2}+7361.8 m^{2} x\right.$ $\left.\$ 8.72 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{~J}\right)$.

## C. Other CCAP Development Policies

## 1. Households and Housing

Seniors and Special Needs: The CCAP encourages inclusion of seniors and special needs housing close to shops, services, transit and community amenities. The proposed development is consistent with the policy and includes a variety of independent living unit types to support aging in place and different ability needs.

| Type | Affordable | Market | Intent | Standard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aging in Place | 0 | 66 | - support mobility and usability | Per OCP |
| Adaptable + <br> Basic Universal Housing | 4 | 4 | - reno potential for wheelchair plus <br> added floor area for manoeuvring | Per BCBC <br> and RZB |
| Barrier Free | 1 | 0 | - move in with wheelchair <br> - includes basic universal housing | Per BCDH |

## 2. Transportation

Site Access: Pedestrian and vehicular access is provided as follows.

- Site Access - On-site: Pedestrian access is provided to individual shop fronts on the two street frontages, to an office lobby on No. 3 Road and to a residential lobby on Anderson Road. Vehicular access is provided via the new north-south lane SRW, which can be entered from Anderson Road on the south and from the evolving east-west lane system on the north.
- Site Access - Off-site: The applicant is proposing to utilize the evolving east-west lane system on the north side of the site to support truck movement. To establish a functional lane width, the current dedicated portions of the lane must be supplemented with statutory rights of way (SRWs) on various properties to the north of the subject site. Provision of the SRWs as well as interim upgrades such as curbing and paving are a consideration of rezoning.
Parking and Loading: The proposal addresses the City's parking and loading policy objectives as follows.
- Parking: The proposed parking rates are consistent with the parking provisions of the Richmond Zoning Bylaw including the opportunity to reduce parking in conjunction with transportation demand management (TDM) measures. A $10 \%$ TDM reduction is proposed for the commercial (retail) parking and the following TDM measures are offered.
- On-Site Measures: Proposed on-site measures, to be implemented through the DP, include:
- end of trip facilities for the commercial uses; and
- provision of two EV quick-charge car share spaces within the development with cars provided and managed for a minimum of three years by a car share company.
- Off-Site Measures: Proposed off-site measures, to be implemented through the SA, include:
- back of curb frontage improvements across the width of 8111 Anderson Road to match those of subject site;
- lane improvements including installation of a 1.5 m sidewalk along the north side of 8111 Anderson Road; and
- a contribution of $\$ 50,000$ to future upgrading of the traffic signal at Park Road and Buswell Street.
- Loading: The proposed development is consistent with the Richmond Zoning Bylaw loading provisions for medium and large size trucks. An agreement regarding shared commercial/residential use of the medium size truck spaces is required.
Electric Vehicles: The OCP supports integration of new vehicle technologies that reduce use of non-renewable energy. The proposed rezoning will incorporate EV charging into $20 \%$ of the residential parking stalls, prepare a further $25 \%$ of the residential parking stalls for future installation of EV charging and provide EV charging for 1 per 10 Class 1 bicycle spaces.


## 3. Ecology and Adaptability

Living Landscape: The CCAP looks to development to support and enhance ecological functioning in City Centre through the creation of a continuous and interconnected landscape
system. The proposed development will contribute to the ecological network through a number of measures including:

- retention of existing street trees along No. 3 Road;
- addition of street trees along Anderson Road;
- provision of soft landscape areas in the back-of-curb public realm areas of No. 3 and Anderson Roads that will be designed as multi-layered habitats complete with trees;
- provision of extensive soft landscape, including trees, in the development's common outdoor amenity areas, which are located on multiple floor levels and the residential roof level; and
- provision of intensive/extensive green roofs on other roof levels.

Further review of the landscape proposal will occur with the Development permit process.
Greening of the Built Environment: The proposed development will be designed to achieve a sustainability level equivalent to the Canada Green Building Council LEED Silver certification.

## 4. Development Concept Review

The CCAP includes a variety of policies intended to shape development to be livable, functional and complementary to the surrounding public and private realm. Those policies most critical to the development concept at the rezoning stage are reviewed below.
Massing Strategy: The massing of the proposed development is arranged to reflect the allocation of uses on the site and is consistent with the general objectives of the CCAP. Double height retail spaces line both street frontages at the ground level. The office uses are primarily located in a 46.9 m (GSC) high "tower" building that overlooks both No. 3 Road and the interior podium level courtyard. The residential uses are primarily located in a 33.6 m (GSC) high "midrise" building that overlooks Anderson Road and the interior podium-level courtyard. The tower and midrise are set in a lower scale podium base, which is sized, in the case of No. 3 Road, to establish a strong and continuous streetwall on the block face, and, in the case of Anderson Road, to have a more residential scale that will step back in sync with the existing mixed use development to the east. Loading and five levels of parking are located within the podium, along with the north-south lane SRW.

Adjacencies: The relationship of new development to adjacent public and private properties is assessed with the intent that negative impacts are reduced and positive ones enhanced.

- Public Adjacencies: The overall massing arrangement, which pushes the bulk of the building floor area toward the street edges, helps establish comfortable street cross-section proportions on No. 3 Road and Anderson Road, both of which are "wider-than-typical" streets. Street animating uses, with large window areas and opportunities for sunny outdoor patios, are located along both streets and weather protection is provided.
- Private Adjacencies: The proposed development is massed to locate the densest and highest forms away from adjacent sites. For future development to the north, this reduces shadowing and overlook impacts and increases tower location options. For existing development to the east (8111 Anderson Road), this optimizes light access and outlook for most of the residential units in the development.
- Common Property Line Interfaces: Because the design of the proposed development anticipates a similar podium and tower style development on the site to the north, there is a long wall on the shared property line. The applicant proposes to embellish this wall with a combination of architectural concrete, painted concrete and metal mesh panels to provide "interim" visual interest. The property line interface with the property to the east is not visible as the podium of the subject development steps along with the podium of the adjacent development.
DP Guidelines: Additional review of the following building features will occur through the Development Permit Application process.
- Parking and Loading: A draft functional plan showing internal truck manoeuvring has been provided and will be finalized through the DP process.
- Waste Management: A draft waste management plan has been submitted and will be finalized through the DP process.
- Rooftop Equipment: Rooftop mechanical equipment and building mounted telecom equipment can be unsightly when viewed from the ground and from surrounding buildings. To prevent diminishment of both the architectural character and the skyline, a more detailed design strategy for rooftop equipment/enclosures is required.
- Common Amenity Spaces: The proposed indoor and outdoor common amenity space areas slightly exceed the OCP and CCAP DP Guidelines expectations, as tabulated in the Development Application Data and Floor Area Summary (Attachment 4). A legal agreement stipulating that all amenity spaces be available to all tenants is a requirement of rezoning. Review of the proposed amenity space programming and landscaping will occur with the DP process.
- Private Amenity Spaces: The City has adopted guidelines for the provision of private outdoor space for residential uses. Assessment of the proposed private amenity areas will be undertaken within the DP process.
- Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED): The City has adopted policies intended to minimize opportunities for crime and promote a sense of security. A CPTED checklist and plans demonstrating natural access, natural surveillance, defensible space and maintenance measures will be reviewed within the development permit process.
- Accessibility: In addition to providing a variety of accessible units (per Analysis, Section C. 1 - Households and Housing), the proposed development will be required to provide good site and building accessibility and visitabilty. Provision of a checklist along with design implementation will occur within the development permit process.
Form and Character: Within the Development Permit Application process, the form and character of the proposed development is assessed against the expectations of the development Permit Guidelines. As a DP Application was submitted shortly after the Rezoning Application, form and character comments have been provided to the applicant by both staff and the Advisory Design Panel. Additional modifications resulting from Council recommendations or further Advisory Design Panel comments will be addressed within the Development Permit approval process.


## D. City-wide Policies

## 1. Tree Retention, Protection and Replacement

Off-site Trees: Three existing street trees located on No. 3 Road are proposed to be retained and a fourth to be removed to accommodate intersection visibility and bike lane integration. The other two trees are located on adjacent frontages and will be protected. A contribution of $\$ 1,300$ to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the removed tree is a consideration of rezoning.
Tree Management Plan: The applicant has submitted a tree management plan which identifies the six off-site trees and related tree protection measures. Further, the applicant has submitted a Certified Arborist Memo concerning the No. 3 Road street trees that includes recommendations for management of upheaval due to the root system.

Tree Protection: Due to concerns about sidewalk buckling, the No. 3 Road sidewalk was recently repaved on the instructions of Engineering staff. This work, which included pruning of the tree roots, may ultimately compromise the viability of the trees. Should the trees require replacement, appropriate contributions will be managed through the Servicing Agreement process. In the meantime, staff recommend proceeding as though the trees will remain viable.

## E. Land and Legal Interests

The proposed rezoning will alter the current property boundaries and legal encumbrances as well as create new ones, as summarized below.

Existing Encumbrances: The applicant has provided a Charge Summary and Opinion prepared by a lawyer. The lawyer advises that encumbrances related to various existing Statutory Rights of Way may be removed and that the proposed rezoning does not create other adverse circumstances. There are six SRWs that may be discharged or, where relevant, modified to accommodate new "public right of passage" SRWs to be provided on properties to the north of the subject site (per east-west lane). The SRWs are described in the Rezoning Considerations (Attachment 6).
Subdivision and New Encumbrances: Sketch survey plans showing the preliminary consolidated site dimensions and site area after required dedications, as well as the location, preliminary dimensions and areas of on-site statutory rights of way, easements and encroachments have been provided (Attachment 9).

## F. Financial Impact

The rezoning 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 application by 1004732 BC Ltd to rezone the properties at $6840 \& 6860$ No. 3 Road and 8051 Anderson Road in order to develop a high-density, mixed commercial and residential use high rise building is consistent with City objectives as set out in the OCP, CCAP and other City policies, strategies and bylaws. The public realm and built form designs will set a high standard for redevelopment of the Brighouse Village No. 3 Road "art walk" corridor and the engineering, transportation and parks improvements, along with the in-kind and in-lieu density bonusing contributions provided by the developer, will help to address a variety of community needs. On this basis, it is recommended that Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9510 be introduced and given first reading.


Janet Digby, Architect AIBC
Planner 3
JD:rg
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| RZ 14-678448 | 6840 and 6860 No 3 Road and 8051 Anderson Road |
| :--- | :--- |
| Address: | 1004732 BC Ltd / 1004732 BC Ltd |
| Owner/Applicant: | City Centre Area Plan - Brighouse Village - T6 (45m) - VCB Overlay - Sub-Area B.4 |
| Planning Area(s): | Aircraft Noise Sensitive Use Area 4 - Flood Construction Level Area A |
| Other Area(s): |  |


| RZ 14-678448 | Existing | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| OCP Designation: | Downtown Mixed Use | Downtown Mixed Use |
| Land Uses: | Commercial | Commercial \& Residential |
| Zoning: | CDT1 | ZMU31 |
| Site Area (before and after dedications): | $5,219.39 \mathrm{m2}$ | $4,778.50 \mathrm{m2}$ |
| Net Development Site Area (for floor area calculation): | N/A | $4,881.26 \mathrm{m2}$ |
| Number of Residential Units: | 0 | 75 |


| RZ 14-678448 | Proposed Site Specific Zone | Proposed Development | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base FAR (max): | 3.00 | 3.00 |  |
| Village Centre Bonus (VCB) (max): | 0.85 | 0.83 |  |
| Commercial FAR (max): | 2.25 | 2.24 |  |
| Residential FAR (max.): | 1.60 | 1.59 |  |
| Total FAR (max): | 3.85 | 3.83 |  |
| Indoor Amenity Space FAR Increase (max): | 0.1 | 0.03 |  |
| Floor Area Gross (not including parking): | n/a | 19,037.00 m2 |  |
| Floor Area FAR (max): | 19,525.04 m2 | 18,700.64 m2 |  |
| Lot Coverage (max.): | 90\% | 64\% |  |
| Setback - Front Yard (min): | 3.8 m/0.8 m | $3.89 \mathrm{~m} / 0.84 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |
| Setback - Exterior Side Yard (min): | 3.8 m/1.5 m | $4.01 \mathrm{~m} / 1.52 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |
| Setback - Interior Side Yard (min): | 0.0 m | 0.0 m |  |
| Setback - Rear Yard (min): | 0.0 m | 0.0 m |  |
| Height Dimensional (geodetic) (max): | 47 m | 46.94 m |  |
| Height Accessory (max): | n/a | n/a |  |
| Subdivision/Lot Size (minimum): | 4780 m 2 | 4,778.5 m2 |  |
| Off-street Parking - Commercial (incl. Accessible, EV, CS) (min): | 141 | 155 |  |
| Off-street Parking - Residential (incl. Accessible, EV,CS) (min): | 75 | 82 |  |
| Off-Street Parking - Visitor Parking (shared) (min); | 15 | 15 |  |
| Off-Street Parking - Disabled (Commerc'I + Resident'l) (min): | 4 | 5 |  |
| Off-street Parking - Total (incl. Accessible, EV, CS) (min): | 216 | 237 |  |
| TDM Reduction (max): | 10\% | 10\% (commercial only) |  |
| Tandem Parking Spaces (max): | n/a | n/a |  |
| Class 1 Bicycle Parking - Commercial (min): | 24 | 24 |  |
| Class 2 Bicycle Parking - Commercial (min): | 35 | 35 |  |
| Class 1 Bicycle Parking - Residential (min)* | 94 | 94. |  |
| Class 2 Bicycle Parking - Residential (min): | 15 | 15 |  |
| Loading - Medium (min): | 3 | 3 |  |
| Loading - Large (min): | 2 | 2 |  |
| Amenity Space - Common Outdoor (min): | 938 m 2 | 1115 m 2 |  |
| Amenity Space - Common Child Play (min): | 225 m2 | 225 m2 |  |
| Amenity Space - Common Indoor (min): | 100 m 2 | 135 m 2 |  |




|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $N$ |
| :--- |
| 0 |
| 1 |
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ATTACHMENT 5

# City of Richmond 

Rezoning Considerations<br>Development Applications Department 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

## Address: 6840 and 6860 No. 3 Road and 8051 Anderson Road

File No.: RZ 14-678448

Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9510, the owner is required to complete the following.

## (Subdivision, Dedications, SRWs and Encroachments)

1. Discharge* of the following Statutory Rights of Way:
a) with respect to 6840 No. 3 Road,

- SRW - Township of Richmond - 287391C;
b) with respect to 6860 No. 3 Road,
- SRW - Township of Richmond - 285751C;
- SRW - Township of Richmond - 285759C;
c) with respect to 8051 Anderson Road,
- SRW - Township of Richmond - 284721C;
- SRW - Township of Richmond - 285746C; and
- SRW - Township of Richmond - 285752C.
* Existing SRWs may be amended where relevant to implementing new SRW requirements, with the agreement of the City Solicitor.

2. Submission of interim and ultimate road functional drawings, showing all dedicated land and statutory rights of way areas pertaining to the subject property and adjacent properties, to the satisfaction of the City.
3. Consolidation of all parcels and registration of a subdivision plan for the subject site that satisfies the following conditions, generally as shown in the sketch survey plan(s) (RTC Attachment 9):
a) dedication of approximately 5.8 m along the No. 3 Road frontage for street widening, subject to final dimensions established by the surveyor on the basis of functional plans completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation; and
b) dedication of an area approximately $33.7 \mathrm{~m} \times 3.0 \mathrm{~m}$ in the northeast corner of the site for lane purposes, subject to final dimensions established by the surveyor on the basis of functional plans completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation.
(Note: Refer to Servicing Agreement section for information regarding frontage improvements on fronting City and dedicated lands.)
4. Granting of a volumetric public right of passage and utilities statutory right-of-way for an internal lane composed of a minimum of:

- an approximately 10.3 m wide $\times 31.7 \mathrm{~m}$ long $\times 5.0 \mathrm{~m}$ high south portion (to accommodate vehicular traffic);
- an approximately 9.0 m wide $\times 22.1 \mathrm{~m}$ long $\times 7.5 \mathrm{~m}$ high north portion (to accommodate vehicular traffic and overflow waste loading);
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- a $3.0 \mathrm{~m} \times 3.0 \mathrm{~m}$ corner cut on either side of the intersection of the SRW with the Anderson Road property line; and
- a $3.0 \times 3.0 \mathrm{~m}$ corner cut on the east side of the intersection of the SRW with the east-west lane,
generally as shown in the related sketch survey plan (RTC Attachment 9) and subject to final dimensions established by the surveyor on the basis of functional plans completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation, providing for:
a) universal accessibility;
b) design and construction requirements, including decorative finishing and lighting for the ground, wall and ceiling surfaces in the south portion, as determined through the Development Permit and Servicing Agreement processes;
c) design and construction at owner's cost; and
d) maintenance and repair at owner's cost.

5. Granting of an approximately $90 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ public right of passage and utilities statutory right of way to accommodate car share stalls and drive aisle access, generally as shown in the related sketch survey plan (RTC Attachment 9 ) and subject to final dimensions established by the surveyor on the basis of functional plans completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation, providing for:
a) universal accessibility;
b) design and construction, including decorative finishing and lighting for the ground, wall and ceiling surfaces to match the decorative finishing in the volumetric SRW (south portion), as determined through the Development Permit and Servicing Agreement processes;
c) design and construction, at owner's cost; and
d) maintenance and repair, at owner's cost.
6. Granting of a volumetric public right of passage and utilities statutory right of way at the corner of No. 3 Road and Anderson Road to satisfy the $4.0 \mathrm{~m} \times 4.0 \mathrm{~m}$ transportation corner cut requirement, generally as shown in the related sketch survey plan (RTC Attachment 9). The statutory right-of-way shall provide for:
a) a clear height of 5.0 m ;
b) universal accessibility;
c) decorative finishing consistent with the finishing on surrounding city and private land, as determined through the Development Permit and Servicing Agreement processes;
d) design and construction at owner's cost; and
e) maintenance and repair at owner's cost.
7. Granting of a public right of passage and utilities statutory rights of way in favour of the City on the properties at 6820 No. 3 Road, 8080 Park Road, and 8108 Park Road for the purposes of supplementing the existing secured portions of the east-west lane that runs to Buswell Street and composed of:

- for 6820 No. 3 Road, approximately $5.348 \mathrm{~m} \times 5.00 \mathrm{~m}$ in the south east corner of the site;
- for 8080 Park Road, approximately $5.348 \mathrm{~m} \times 24.387 \mathrm{~m}$ along the south PL; and
- for 8108 Park Road, approximately $5.348 \mathrm{~m} \times 24.387 \mathrm{~m}$ along the south PL,
generally as shown in the sketch survey plan(s) (RTC Attachment 9), subject to final dimensions established by the surveyor on the basis of functional plans completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation and to provide for:
a) each SRW to be free and clear of obstructions except that, in the case of 8080 and 8108 Park Road, loading may occur in the north 3.0 m of the statutory right of way subject to the provisions of the Traffic Regulation By law;
b) universal accessibility;
c) interim improvements at the developer's cost, as determined by the Servicing Agreement process; and
d) maintenance and repair at owner's cost.

Note: Refer also to the District Energy Utility conditions regarding statutory rights of way related to district energy facilities.

Note: Refer also to Servicing Agreement conditions regarding statutory rights of way related to private utility connections.

## (Covenants and Agreements)

8. (Flood Construction Level) Registration of a flood covenant on title identifying the basic minimum flood construction level of 2.9 m GSC for Area A.
9. (Aircraft Noise) Registration of an aircraft noise restrictive covenant on title suitable for residential uses and a SRW in favour of the Airport Authority.
10. (Mixed Use Noise) Registration of a mixed use noise restrictive covenant on title that identifies the development as being of mixed use (residential and commercial).
11. (Ambient Noise) Registration of an ambient noise restrictive covenant on title noting that the development is located in a densifying urban area and may be subject to impacts that affect the use and enjoyment of the property including, but not limited to, ambient noise, ambient light, shading, light access, privacy, outlook, vibration, dust and odours from development or redevelopment of public and private land in the surrounding area.
12. (Affordable Housing) Registration of a Housing Agreement securing the owner's commitment to:
a) provide $5 \%$ of the residential floor area to affordable housing dwelling units, in perpetuity;
b) provide for affordable housing units, of numbers, types, sizes and associated rent and income levels in accordance with the table below:

| Unit Type | Affordable Housing Strategy Requirements |  | Project Targets (2) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Minimum <br> Unit Area | Maximum Monthly <br> Unit Rent (1) | Total Maximum <br> Household Income (1) | Unit Mix | \# of Units |
| Bachelor | $37 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(400 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $\$ 850$ | $\$ 34,000$ or less | $0 \%$ | 0 |
| 1-Bedroom | $50 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(535 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $\$ 950$ | $\$ 38,000$ or less | $40 \%$ | 2 |
| 2-Bedroom | $80 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(860 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $\$ 1,162$ | $\$ 46,500$ or less | $60 \%$ | 3 |
| 3-Bedroom | $91 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(980 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $\$ 1,437$ | $\$ 57,500$ or less | $0 \%$ | 0 |
| TOTAL |  | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $100 \%$ | 5 |

(1) May be adjusted periodically, as provided for under adopted City policy.
(2) $100 \%$ of affordable housing units shall meet Richmond Basic Universal Housing (BUH) standards or better.
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c) provide for private outdoor amenity area for each unit consistent with the minimum requirements of the CCAP and OCP Development Permit Guidelines;
d) provide for full and unlimited access to, and use of, all on-site indoor and outdoor amenity spaces, at no additional charge;
e) provide 5 parking stalls for exclusive use of the occupiers of the Affordable Housing Units at no cost in perpetuity;
f) provide for full and unlimited access to, and use of, other building facilities including, but not limited to, casual, shared or assigned bicycle storage, visitor parking, electric vehicle charging and related facilities, at no additional charge;
g) provide for all affordable housing units and related uses (e.g. parking) and amenities (e.g. common outdoor amenity space) to be completed to a turnkey level of finish at the sole cost of the developer and to the satisfaction of Director of Development and Manager, Community Services;
a) incorporate and identify the affordable housing dwelling units and associated facilities in the Development Permit plans, subject to the advice (e.g. changes to unit circumstances and/or confirmation of unit locations) of the Housing Co-ordinator; and
b) incorporate and identify the affordable housing dwelling units and associated facilities in the Building Permit plans, subject to the advice (e.g. changes to unit circumstances and/or confirmation of unit locations) of the Housing Co-ordinator.
13. (Shared Commercial and Residential Visitor Parking) Registration of a restrictive covenant on title securing the owner's commitment to:
a) provide a pool of forty-one (41) shared commercial/residential visitor parking stalls;
b) locate the shared stalls on the ground level of the parkade, on either side of the north-south lane, using all of the available commercial stalls, and locate any remainder on the next parkade level, subject to the approval of the Director of Transportation;
c) ensure the shared stalls will remain unassigned;
d) ensure the shared stalls will be fully accessible (e.g. entry gate open) during standard business operating hours;
e) ensure the visitor use of the shared stalls will be accessible (e.g. buzz entry) during non-standard business hours;
f) identify the shared commercial/visitor parking stalls in the Development Permit plans;
g) identify the shared commercial/visitor parking stalls in the Building Permit plans; and
h) prior to Building Permit issuance granting occupancy, provide wayfinding and stall identification signage for the shared commercial/residential visitor stalls, to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation.
14. (Shared Commercial and Residential Truck Loading) Registration of a restrictive covenant on title securing the owner's commitment to:
a) provide a pool of three (3) shared commercial/residential medium size truck loading spaces;
b) ensure the shared spaces will remain unassigned;
c) identify the shared commercial/visitor medium size truck loading spaces in the Development Permit plans;
d) identify the shared commercial/visitor medium size truck loading spaces in the Building Permit plans; and
e) prior to Building Permit issuance granting occupancy, provide wayfinding and space identification signage for the shared commercial/residential large size truck loading space, to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation.
Note: Two adjoining medium size truck spaces are also intended to be used for provision of one of the required large size truck loading spaces.
15. (Electric Vehicle Provisions) Registration of a restrictive covenant on title securing the owner's commitment to:
a) provide a minimum of $20 \%$ of residential parking stalls with a 120 volt receptacle to accommodate electric vehicle charging equipment;
b) provide a n additional minimum of $25 \%$ of residential parking stalls with pre- ducting to support future installation of electric vehicle charging equipment;
c) provide a minimum of one 120 volt receptacle is provided to accommodate electric charging equipment for every 10 Class 1 bike parking stalls;
d) identify the electric vehicle stalls in the Development Permit plans;
e) identify the electric vehicle stalls in the Building Permit plans; and
f) prior to Building Permit issuance granting occupancy, provide wayfinding and stall identification signage for the electric vehicle stalls, to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation.
16. (End of Trip Facilities) Registration of a restrictive covenant on title securing the owner's commitment to:
a) provide cycling end of trip facilities for the shared use of all commercial uses (e.g. retail and office) generally as follows:
i. one male facility and one female facility, each with a minimum of two showers; and
ii. located such that the facilities are easily accessible from bicycle parking areas and all intended users.
b) identify the cycling end of trip facilities in the Development Permit plans;
c) identify the cycling end of trip facilities in the Building Permit plans; and
d) prior to Building Permit issuance granting occupancy, provide wayfinding signage for the end of trip facilities, to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation.
(Note: Facilities shall be a handicapped-accessible suite of rooms containing a change room, toilet, wash basin, shower, lockers, and grooming station (i.e. mirror, counter, and electrical outlets) designed to accommodate use by two or more people at one time.)
17. (Car Share Provisions) Registration of a restrictive covenant on title or alternative legal agreement(s), subject to the final approval of the Director of Transportation, securing the owner's commitment to:
a) provide two car-share stalls with drive aisle access, secured with a SRW in favour of the City, on the ground level of the parkade adjacent to the north-south lane SRW;
b) provide the forgoing stalls with 24 hour a day public access;
c) provide each car-share stall with an EV quick-charge (240 volt) charging station for its convenient and exclusive use;
d) identify the location, size, access, EV and CPTED characteristics of the car share stalls on the Development Permit plans;
e) identify the location, size, access, EV and CPTED characteristics of the car share stalls on the Building Permit plans;
f) prior to Building Permit issuance granting occupancy, provide wayfinding signage for the car share stalls, to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation;
g) provide the car share stalls and associated access at no cost to the car share operator;
h) provide the car share stalls and associated access at no cost to individual users of the car share service, except as otherwise determined by the City;
i) provide two car share cars, of which at least one is an electric vehicle, at no cost to the car share operator;
j) submit a draft contract of the agreement between the Developer and the car share provider for City's review;
k) submit a Letter of Credit prior to Development Permit for the sum of $\$ 45,000$ to secure the developer's commitment to provide the car share cars;
I) should the car share cars not be provided at the time of Building Permit issuance granting occupancy, voluntarily contribute the $\$ 45,000$ secured by LOC towards alternate transportation demand management modes of transportation;
m) prior to Building Permit issuance granting occupancy, enter into a contract with a car share operator for a minimum of three years from the first date of building occupancy, a copy of which shall be provided to the City; and
n) in the event that the car-share facilities are not operated for car-share purposes as intended via the subject rezoning application (e.g., operator's contract is terminated or expires), control of the carshare facilities shall be transferred to the City, at no cost to the City, and the City at its sole discretion, without penalty or cost, shall determine how the facilities shall be used going forward.
18. (Common Amenity Space) Registration of a restrictive covenant on title or alternative legal agreement(s), to the satisfaction of the City, securing the owner's commitment to:
a) provide for full and unlimited access to and use of all common residential indoor and outdoor recreational and/or social amenity spaces/facilities for all residents including, but not limited to, the podium level deck, the Level 7 urban agriculture deck and the roof level deck, except in the case that individual facilities are reserved for private use by residents on a managed, time-limited and specified purpose basis.
19. (District Energy Utility) Registration of a restrictive covenant and/or alternative legal agreement(s), to the satisfaction of the City, securing the owner's commitment to connect to District Energy Utility (DEU), which covenant and/or legal agreement(s) will include, at minimum, the following terms and conditions:
a) no Building Permit will be issued for a building on the subject site unless the building is designed with the capability to connect to and be serviced by a DEU and the owner has provided an energy modelling report satisfactory to the Director of Engineering;
b) if a DEU is available for connection, no final building inspection permitting occupancy of a building will be granted until: the Owner has executed and delivered to the City a Section 219 Covenant for the installation, operation and maintenance of all necessary facilities for supplying the services to the Lands; the Owner has entered into a Service Provider Agreement as required by the City; and the Owner has granted or acquired the Statutory Right-of-Way(s) and/or easements necessary for supplying the DEU services to the Lands; and
c) if a DEU is not available for connection, then the following is required prior to the earlier of subdivision (stratification) or final building inspection permitting occupancy of a building:
i. the City receives a professional engineer's certificate stating that the building has the capability to connect to and be serviced by a DEU;
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ii. the owner enters into a covenant and/or other legal agreement to require that the building connect to a DEU when a DEU is in operation;
iii. the owner grants or acquires the Statutory Right-of-Way(s) and/or easements necessary for supplying DEU services to the building; and
iv. if required by the Director of Engineering, the owner provides to the City with security for costs associated with acquiring any further Statutory Right of Way(s) and/or easement(s) and preparing and registering legal agreements and other documents required to facilitate the building connecting to a DEU when it is in operation.

## (Contributions)

20. (Child Care) City acceptance of an offer to voluntarily contribute at least $\$ 515,105.15$ (one percent of the residential floor area, excluding affordable housing floor area, calculated using the proposed floor area e.g. $0.01 \times 7,361.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \times 86,997 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) towards the development and operation of child care ( $90 \%$ to Childcare Development Reserve Fund - Account \# 7600-80-000-90157-0000 and $10 \%$ to Childcare Operating Contributions Account \# 7600-80-000-90159-0000).
21. (Community Facilities) City acceptance of an offer to voluntarily contribute at least $\$ 1,417,398.31$ (five percent of the Village Centre Bonus floor area calculated using the proposed floor area e.g. $0.05 \times .83 \times 4,881.26 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \times \$ 6,997 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) towards the development of community facilities (City Centre Facility Development Fund - Account \# 7600-80-000-90170-0000).
22. (Community Planning) City acceptance of an offer to voluntarily contribute at least $\$ 50,304.72$ ( $100 \%$ of the total floor area calculated using the proposed floor area $e . g .18,700.64 m^{2} \times \$ 2.69$ $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) towards City Centre community planning (CC-Community Planning and Engineering Account \# 3132-10-520-00000-0000).
23. (Public Art) City acceptance of an offer to voluntarily contribute at least $\$ 114,861.64$ ( $100 \%$ commercial floor area @ $\$ 4.63$ per square meter and $100 \%$ residential floor area, excluding affordable housing floor area, @ $\$ 8.72$ per square meter calculated using the proposed floor area e.g. $10,943.14 m^{2} \times \$ 4.63 / m^{2}+7,361.8 m^{2} \times \$ 8.72 m^{2}$ ) towards public art ( $15 \%$ to Public Art Provision Account \# 7500-10-000-90337-0000 and 85\% to ma \# 7600-80-000-90173-0000).
24. (Transportation Demand Management) City acceptance of an offer to voluntarily contribute $\$ 50,000$ to upgrading the traffic signal at Park Road/Buswell Street (General Account (Transportation) Account \# 5132-10-550-55005-0000) for pedestrian environment enhancement in support of a reduction in parking.
25. (Trees - City Property) City acceptance of an offer to voluntarily contribute $\$ 1300$ (calculated as $\$ 1300$ per tree) to the City's Tree Compensation Fund (Account \# 2336-10-000-00000-0000) for the planting of replacement trees within the City.

Per Current Floor Area Estimates:

| Total Floor Area $\mathbf{m}^{2}$ | Commercial Floor Area <br> $\mathbf{m}^{2}$ | Residential Floor Area <br> $\mathbf{m}^{2}$ | Calculable Residential <br> Floor Area $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ | Affordable Housing <br> Floor Area $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $18,700.64$ | $10,943.14$ | $7,757.50$ | 7361.8 | 395.7 |

## (Miscellaneous Considerations)

26. (LEED) Design and construction of the development to LEED Silver Equivalent based on advice provided by a LEED AP BD+C.
27. (Accessibility) Design and construction of the development to include accessible housing units consistent with the following table:
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Type } & \text { Affordable } & \text { Market } & \text { Intent } & \text { Standard } \\
\hline \text { Aging in Place } & 0 & 66 & \text { - support mobility and usability } & \text { Per OCP } \\
\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Adaptable }+ \\
\text { Basic Universal Housing }\end{array} & 4 & 4 & \text {-reno potential for wheelchair plus added floor } \\
\text { area for manoeuvring }\end{array}
$$ \begin{array}{c}Per BCBC <br>

and RZB\end{array}\right]\)| Barrier Free | 1 | 0 | - move in with wheelchair |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

28. (Common Amenity Area) Design and construction of the development to include common indoor and outdoor amenity area consistent with the common amenity area provisions of the OCP/CCAP.

## (Servicing Agreement)

29. Submission and processing of a Servicing Agreement* application, completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Engineering, for the design and construction of works associated with the proposed rezoning, subject to the following conditions:

## (Water Works)

a) Using the OCP Model, there is $683.6 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ of water available at a 20 psi residual at the No 3 Rd frontage and $145.3 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ at the Anderson Rd frontage. Based on your proposed Development your site requires a minimum fire flow of $220 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$.
b) The Developer is required to:
i. Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm the development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage and Building designs.
ii. Upgrade the existing 150 mm AC water main along Anderson Road frontage to a 200 mm watermain and install additional hydrants as required to achieve minimum 75 m spacing along Anderson Road frontage.
iii. Install a new water service connection. Water meter to be located on-site (e.g. in a mechanical room).
iv. Confirm the actual settlement of the water main located along the No 3 Road frontage via the settlement test points indicated in the Preload Induced Utility Settlement report prepared by Geopacific dated November 5th, 2015, and report the final results to the City. If unacceptable settlement has occurred, the replacement of the water main along the effected length shall be added into the Servicing Agreement scope of works at the Developer's cost.
c) At Developers cost, the City is to:
i. Cut and cap the existing water service connection at the watermain along the No 3 Road frontage.
ii. Complete all tie-ins to existing water mains.

## (Storm Sewer Works)

d) The Developer is required to:
i. Install a new storm sewer within the center of Anderson Road from the existing 600 mm storm sewer to No 3 Road complete with manholes as required. Sizing shall be via the servicing agreement design review.
ii. Remove the adjacent existing storm sewers along both sides of the Anderson Road frontage, and tie-in the upstream portions and all existing service connections and catch basins to the proposed storm sewer along the centreline of Anderson Road. Removal of the existing storm sewer on the south side of Anderson Road will require curb, gutter, and sidewalk restoration.
iii. Note that the existing lane drainage to the south of Anderson Road will require extension to tie in to the proposed storm sewer via a new manhole.
iv. Tie-in existing storm mains, service connections and catch basin leads to the new storm sewer as required.
v. Install a new storm service connection complete with an inspection chamber located on-site within a proposed 1.5 m -deep, 3.0 m -wide SRW along the Anderson Rd frontage. Exact dimensions to be determined during the servicing agreement design review.
vi. Cut and cap the existing service connections and remove existing inspection chambers along the No 3 Road and Anderson Road frontages.
vii. Upgrade and install lane drainage along the east-west lane from 8051 Anderson Road to the east property line of 8111 Anderson Road to City specifications, complete with catch basins and manholes. The pipes shall be sized via a capacity analysis, minimum 200 mm diameter. The design of the lane drainage must be coordinated with the City-funded sanitary sewer to be placed within the east-west lane. Note: no service connections are permitted to connect to lane drainage.
viii. Remove the existing diagonally-aligned drainage line within the east-west lane along the frontage of 8111 Anderson Road.
ix. Confirm the actual settlement of the storm sewer located along the No 3 Road frontage via a CCTV inspection and submit to the City. If unacceptable settlement has occurred, the replacement of the storm sewer along the effected length shall be added into the Servicing Agreement scope of works at the Developer's cost.
e) At Developers cost, the City is to:
i. Complete all tie-ins of the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

## (Sanitary Sewer Works)

f) The Developer is required to:
i. As the site pre-load and other ground improvements, which will impact the existing sanitary main within the development site, has commenced prior to the City's construction of the sanitary main along Buswell Street, the developer was required to construct a temporary sanitary pump station and forcemain diversion. Following this, the Developer, at his sole costs, is required to:
ii. Design and construct a 200 mm diameter sanitary main along Anderson Road by the completion date set out within the related servicing SA 16-731504 and connect to the future City-funded Buswell Street sanitary sewer when it becomes available. Tie-in to the west shall be to the existing sanitary sewer within the north-south aligned lane south of Anderson Road.
iii. Prior to start of on-site excavation and foundation works, construct the 200 mm diameter sanitary sewer along Anderson Road, decommission and remove the on-site forcemain and temporary pump station, and connect to the City-funded Buswell Street sanitary sewer.
iv. Coordinate the construction of the sanitary main along Anderson Road with the construction schedule of the City-funded sanitary main along Buswell Street. The Developer is required to connect to the new sanitary sewer within Buswell Street, as soon as it becomes available.
v. Maintain, monitor and repair, to the satisfaction of the City, the temporary sanitary pump station and the piping system, until such time that the new 200 mm diameter sanitary main to be built by the developer along Anderson Road and the City funded sanitary main along Buswell Street are constructed and operational.
vi. Remove the temporary sanitary pump station and the piping system and restore to original condition or better the affected areas after the connection to the new sanitary sewer within Buswell Street.
vii. Perform all other tasks required by the related servicing agreement SA 16-731504.
g) At Developers cost, the City is to:
i. Complete all tie-ins of the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

## (Frontage Improvements - Engineering)

h) The Developer is required to:
i. Review street lighting levels and street light type along No. 3 Rd and Anderson Rd frontages and upgrade lighting as required to meet City standards.
ii. Provide street lighting along the proposed east-west lane along the north property line of 8051 Anderson Road.
iii. Design the ultimate road cross-section of Anderson Road to accommodate for future District Energy Utility corridor within the roadway.
iv. Coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers

- To underground proposed Hydro service lines.
- When relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the property frontages.
- To determine if above ground structures are required and coordinate their locations (e.g. Vista, PMT, LPT, Shaw cabinets, Telus Kiosks, etc.). All such structures are to be located within the subject site's property line.
v. Complete other frontage improvements as per Transportation's requirements.


## (General Items - Engineering)

i) The Developer is required to:
i. Grant utilities statutory rights of way for required connections between City utilities and the development as determined within the Servicing Agreement process.
ii. Locate/relocate all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks required to service the proposed development within the developments site (see list below for examples). A functional plan showing conceptual locations for such infrastructure shall be included in the development process design review. 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 in the functional plan and registered prior to SA design approval:

- BC Hydro PMT - 4mW X 5m (deep)
- BC Hydro LPT - 3.5mW X 3.5 m (deep)
- Street light kiosk -1.5 mW X 1.5 m (deep)
- Traffic signal kiosk - 1 mW X 1 m (deep)
- Traffic signal UPS - 2 mW X 1.5 m (deep)
- Shaw cable kiosk - 1 mW X 1 m (deep) - show possible location in functional plan
- Telus FDH cabinet-1.1 m W X 1 m (deep - show possible location in functional plan


## (Frontage Improvements - Transportation)

(General Note: Servicing Agreement for design and construction to City Centre standards. All requirements subject to final functional design including, but not limited to, the items outlined in this section and any associated required technical changes.)
j) The Developer is required to:
i. For No. 3 Rd.:
a. Maintain existing curb.
b. From existing curb line provide:

- 0.15 m curb;
- 2.50 m boulevard;
-2.00 m bike lane;
-1.50 m lighting/street furniture buffer strip; and
- 3.00 m sidewalk.
ii. For Anderson Rd.:
a. Maintain existing curb.
b. From the existing north curb line provide:
- 0.15 curb;
- 1.5 m hardscaped treed boulevard; and
- 2.0 m scored concrete sidewalk.
iii. For the internal north-south lane SRW PROP:
a. From east side:
- 1.50 m sidewalk free and clear of all obstructions;
-7.50 m min. pavement width; and
- 0.60 m buffer.

Note: Rollover curbs both sides consistent with CC lane design standard.
iv. For the east-west lane upgrade - subject site portions:
(Note: Works are required to make the E-W lane operational to the greatest extent possible for two way traffic to and from Buswell Rd, to the satisfaction of the City.)
a. From the new subject site north PL (after lane dedication):

- per forgoing note;
- 1.50 m concrete sidewalk including rollover curb; and
- 1.50 m pavement width; and
- grading, drainage, gutter, lighting and traffic marking, as determined through the

Servicing Agreement process.
v. For the east-west lane upgrade - off-site portions:
(Note: Works are required to make the E-W lane operational to the greatest extent possible for two way traffic to and from Buswell Rd, to the satisfaction of the City.)
a. For 6820 No. 3 Road:

- per forgoing note; and
- grading, drainage, curb and gutter, paving, lighting and traffic marking, as determined through the Servicing Agreement process.
b. For 8080 and 8108 Park Road:
- per forgoing note; and
- grading, drainage, curb and gutter, paving, lighting and traffic marking, as determined through the Servicing Agreement process.
c. For 8120 Park Road:
- per forgoing note; and
- grading, drainage, curb and gutter, paving, lighting and traffic marking, as determined through the Servicing Agreement process.
d. For 8111 Anderson Road:
- per forgoing note;
-1.50 m concrete sidewalk including lighting and rollover curb along north PL; and
- grading, drainage, curb and gutter, paving, lighting and traffic marking, as
determined through the Servicing Agreement process.


## (TIA Improvements - Transportation)

k) The Developer is required to:
i. For the No. 3 Rd./Anderson Rd. intersection:
a. upgrade the crosswalks at the intersection with decorative stamped asphalt treatment and tactile warning pavers at the curb ramps to improve visibility of crosswalks.
ii. For the Anderson Rd./Buswell Rd intersection:
a. to install two special crosswalk signals (side-mounted) with APS and service panel; pedestrian detection and communications conduit, cable and junction boxes; and
b. add new curb ramps on east side per City Engineering Design Specification standards with tactile warning strips.
iii. For the Granville Ave./Buswell St. intersection:
a. upgrade intersection with illuminated street name signs.

## (Parks - City Trees)

1) The developer is required to provide for the retention of three existing trees on City property along No. 3 Road, unless otherwise determined by the SA process, in which case replacement terms shall be determined within the SA process. Retention shall be supported with:
i. installation of appropriate tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained on the No. 3 Road frontage, as well as trees located in adjacent frontages that may be affected by the construction of the proposed development and associated frontage improvements; and
ii. submission of a contract entered into by the applicant and a Certified Arborist for the supervision of all works conducted in close proximity to the aforesaid tree protection zones. The contract must include the scope of work to be undertaken, including the proposed number of monitoring inspections at specified stages of construction, any special measures required to ensure tree protection, and a provision for the arborist to submit a postconstruction impact assessment to the City for review.

## (Servicing Agreement - Letter of Credit)

m) Provision of a Letter of Credit to secure the completion of the works in an amount determined by the Director of Development.

## (Servicing Agreement - LTO Registration)

n) Registration of the Servicing Agreement on title.

## (Development Permit)

30. Submission and processing of a Development Permit* application, completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development, demonstrating:
a) design development of the rezoning concept to address:
i. Council directions arising out of Public Hearing;
ii. form and character objectives noted in the associated Report to Planning Committee;
iii. form and character objectives described in the OCP and CCAP Development Permit Guidelines;
iv. technical resolution, as necessary, of building services, private utilities, public utilities, parking and loading and waste management including provision of final utility, loading, waste management and signage and wayfinding plans; and
v. technical resolution, as necessary, of the landscape plans related to:
a. the protection, installation and/or maintenance (including automatic irrigation) of retained and/or new ecological network landscape;
b. the protection, installation and/or maintenance (including automatic irrigation) of retained and/or new trees; and
c. the installation and/or maintenance (including automatic irrigation) of additional landscape; and
b) the owner's commitment to design and construct the development in accordance with rezoning policy, the rezoning considerations and the draft site-specific zoning bylaw, by incorporating information into the Development Permit plans (inclusive of architectural, landscape and other plans, sections, elevations, details, specifications, checklists and supporting consultant work) including, but not limited to:
i. statutory rights of way, easements, encroachments, no build areas, agreements and other legal restrictions;
ii. flood construction level(s);
iii. use, density, height, siting, building form, landscaping, parking and loading and other zoning provisions;
iv. site access and vehicular crossings;
v. the required shared commercial/visitor parking stalls;
vi. the required EV-charging and EV-ready vehicle parking stalls;
vii. the required EV-charging and EV-ready bicycle parking stalls;
viii. the required car-share parking stalls;
ix. the required end of trip facilities, including their location, number, size, type and use;
x. the location of areas reserved for DEU connection facilities and a notation regarding the need for DEU pre-ducting;
xi. the required affordable housing units, including their size and location;
xii. the required aging in place, basic universal, accessible, adaptable and/or convertible dwelling units, including their associated design features;
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xiii. a site and building Accessibility checklist and identification of specific recommended measures on the plans, where relevant;
xiv. a CPTED checklist and identification of specific recommended measures on the plans, where relevant;
xv. a LEED Checklist with measures recommended by a LEED AP BD + C to achieve LEED Silver equivalent and identification of specific measures to be incorporated into the Building Permit plans;
xvi. an acoustic and mechanical report with recommendations prepared by an appropriate registered professional regarding measures to be incorporated into the Building Permit drawings to achieve the exterior and interior noise levels and other noise mitigation standards articulated in the aircraft and mixed use noise covenants;
xvii. the required common indoor, common outdoor and private outdoor amenity areas including their location, size, use and finishing;
xviii. the location and specifications for ecological network landscaping; and
xix. the dimensions of any tree protection fencing illustrated on the Tree Retention/Management Plan provided with the application.

## (Letter of Credit - Trees, Ecological Network and Landscape)

c) Submission of a letter of credit for landscaping based on $100 \%$ of the cost estimate provided by the Landscape Architect, including installation costs, plus a $10 \%$ contingency cost.

## (Building Permit)

Note: Prior to Building Permit issuance the approved Development Permit and associated conditions, as well as any additional items referenced in "Schedule B: Assurance of Professional Design and Commitment for Field Review", shall be incorporated into the Building Permit plans (drawings and documents) prior to Building Permit issuance.

Note: Prior to Building Permit issuance the developer must submit a "Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan" to the Transportation Department. 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 MMCD Traffic Regulation Section 01570.

Note: Prior to Building Permit issuance the developer must obtain a Building Permit 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.

## General Notes:

1. Some of the foregoing items (*) may require a separate application.
2. Where the Director of Development deems it appropriate, legal 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
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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 legal 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.
3. Enter into, if required, additional legal agreements, as determined via the subject development's Servicing Agreement(s) and/or Development Permit(s), and/or Building Permit(s) to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering, including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, 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.
4. 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

## Signed

Date

## 3. RZ 14-678448/DP 15-708092 - PROPOSED REZONING OF 6840-6860 NO. 3 ROAD AND 8051 ANDERSON ROAD TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MIXED COMMERCIAL AND MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL USE DEVELOPMENT WITH A TOTAL FAR OF 3.84 AND A HEIGHT OF 47 M GSC.

APPLICANT:
PROPERTY LOCATION:

Ifortune Homes
8051 Anderson Road

## Applicant's Presentation

Daniel Eisenberg and Amela Brudar, GBL Architects, and Landscape Architect Grant Brumpton, PWL Partnerships, presented the project on behalf of the applicant and answered queries from the Panel.

## Panel Discussion

Comments from the Panel were as follows:

- the design of the proposed building is unique in Richmond but suitable for its location;
- the building design is new and interesting; however, the south-facing balconies of the residential midrise need further articulation to achieve its architectural objective;
- consider introducing architectural elements and/or lighting in the proposed north-south lane to make it more friendly;
- would like to see the application back to the Panel if substantial changes will be made to the proposed development;
- the west façade of the building almost opposite Richmond City Hall is interesting; appreciate the inversion of the "podium streetwall with tower" and the pedestrian use of the space under the cantilevered rectangular volumes;
- applicant should ensure that the proposed commercial balconies are kept tidy and free from unsightly objects (e.g. barbeque grills, potted plants, etc.) as they are an important piece on the south façade;
- consider continuing the concrete paving treatment on the covered southern portion of the north-south lane up to the exposed northern portion to improve the experience of pedestrians and motorists coming from the north of the subject site;
- consider eliminating the sidewalk on the proposed north-south lane to enable pedestrians and motorists to share the use of the lane;
- lanes should be well lit to ensure pedestrian safety;
- commend the applicant for a clear and thorough presentation on the architecture and landscaping of the proposed development;
- the planting palette is well considered; appreciate the animation and landscaping on the various levels of the building; appreciate the round garden plots and the tables in between;
- appreciate the applicant's intent to contrast the landscaping of the different building levels with the rectilinear architecture of the building; overall geometry works in the plan drawings but may not be experienced by the residents at the different floor levels; up close, curves may look fuzzy and accidental; some curves, lines and diagonal trellises create too much geometry; consider design development and refinement of geometry on the landscaped areas in the building;
- curved planting beds fronting Anderson Road is not consistent with the overall architecture of the building and landscaping on the ground level; consider a rectilinear form for the planting beds;
- would like to see the proposal back to the Panel if there will be changes to the proposed landscaping;
- appreciate the proposed building form and massing which is unique in Richmond; appreciate the landscaped rooftop of the office tower;
- overall landscaping is cohesive and works well in aerial view; however, the landscaped areas work independently at each level and will not be experienced as a whole by the residents;
- the common outdoor space at the end of the hallway on level 9 is excessive and may not be used by residents; consider utilizing a portion of the space to create an extended private balcony for the two adjacent residential units;
- consider a more extended overhang to provide 4-5 meters of covered space on the ground level of the office tower along No. 3 Road; will provide better weather protection to future occupants of the office tower; also consider more seating opportunities (e.g. partially covered and partially exposed bench areas) along No. 3 Road and Anderson Road and at the corners to provide meeting places for people; application of Canada Line setback guidelines in this location is not necessary as there is no intention to extend the Canada Line southward;
- attention given to the north-south lane is excessive; should be used only as a vehicle service lane and not for pedestrian circulation; pedestrians should utilize the public realm fronting the streets; an east-west lane is not supported, unless the lane is designed to incorporate commercial and active use at ground level (ex. Fan Tan Alley in Victoria), it will not be well-used by pedestrians; provided service access can be accommodated by the north-south lane, removal of the east-west lane is supported; consider covering the entire lane to screen the exposed parkade and introduce a green roof to provide more visual interest from above;
- applicant can look at appropriate precedents if it wants to animate the lane, e.g. Fan Tan Alley in Victoria, Maiden Lane in San Francisco, and other pedestrian lanes in Europe;
- will support the project if the applicant will incorporate the suggested design changes to the proposed north-south and east-west lanes;
- support the previous comment regarding the needed design changes for the proposed east-west lane especially with regard to eliminating the pedestrian sidewalk;
- the applicant needs to provide adequate setback along No. 3 Road for the possible extension of Canada Line in the future;
- appreciate the provision of affordable units and the incorporation of universal access features in residential units; also appreciate the provision of pocket doors in some residential units;
- project may not return to the Panel unless substantial changes are made to the Canada Line setback and the building overhang;
- the applicant is encouraged to identify public art opportunities for the proposed development;
- appreciate the elevation along No. 3 Road and the overhanging tower; agree with comments that it could be further extended;
- the proposed development is sited in a prominent location; design development is needed to emphasize the importance of the project;
- the proposed north-south lane is highlighted by the applicant; however, it lacks appropriate treatments and amenities which would enhance the pedestrian and motorist experience;
- review the relationship of the subject development with the adjacent development along Anderson Road; the stepping down of the residential midrise is a weak move; consider a stronger transition;
- consider a stronger interaction of the north side of the proposed development, e.g. more "eyes on the street", with the east-west pedestrian mews; and
- would like to see the application again in the Panel.


## Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded
That DP 15-708092 return to the Panel with the applicant giving consideration to the comments of the Panel.

CARRIED
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Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9510 (RZ 14-678448) 6840 \& 6860 No. 3 Road and 8051 Anderson Road

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

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 is amended by inserting the following into Section 20 (Site Specific Mixed Use Zones), in numerical order:

### 20.31 City Centre High Density Mixed Use with Office (ZMU31) - Brighouse Village


#### Abstract

20.31.1 Purpose

The zone provides for a broad range of commercial, service, business, entertainment and residential uses typical of the City Centre. Additional density is provided to achieve City objectives related to the development of affordable housing units, child care, community amenity space and commercial uses, including a significant component of office.


20.31.2 Permitted Uses

- animal grooming
- broadcasting studio
- child care
- education
- education, commercial
- education, university
- entertainment, spectator
- government service
- health service, minor
- housing, apartment
- housing, town
- library and exhibit
- liquor primary establishment
- manufacturing, custom indoor
- microbrewery, winery and distillery
- neighbourhood public house
- office
- parking, non-accessory
- private club
- recreation, indoor
- religious assembly
- restaurant
- retail, convenience
- retail, general
- retail, second hand
- service, business support
- service, financial
- service, household repair
- service, personal
- studio
- vehicle rental, convenience
- veterinary service


### 20.31.3 Secondary Uses

- amenity space, community
- boarding and lodging
- community care facility minor
- home-based business


### 20.31.4 Permitted Density

1. For the purposes of this zone, the calculation of floor area ratio is based on a site area of $4,882 \mathrm{sq}$. m .
2. The maximum floor area ratio is:
a) for residential uses, 1.00; and
b) for non-residential uses, 1.40.
together with an additional 0.1 floor area ratio provided that the additional floor area is used entirely to accommodate indoor amenity space.
3. Notwithstanding Section 20.31.4.2(a), the reference to " 1.00 " is increased to a higher floor area ratio of " 1.60 " if, at the time Council adopts a zoning amendment bylaw to create the ZMU31 zone and include the lot in the zone, the owner:
a) has agreed to provide affordable housing units on site and the combined habitable space of the affordable housing units is not less than $5 \%$ of the total residential floor area;
b) has entered into a housing agreement with respect to the affordable housing units and registers the housing agreement against title to the lot and files a notice in the Land Title Office; and
c) pays a sum into the child care reserve fund based on $1 \%$ of the value of the total residential floor area ratio less the value of the affordable housing unit floor area ratio, calculated using the "equivalent to construction value" rate determined by Council during the rezoning process.
4. Notwithstanding Section 20.31.4.2(b), the reference to " 1.40 " is increased to a higher floor area ratio of " 2.25 " provided that:
a) the owner uses the additional 0.85 floor area ratio for office uses only; and
b) if, at the time Council adopts a zoning amendment bylaw to create the ZMU31 zone and include the lot in the zone, the owner pays a sum into the City Centre Facility Development Fund based on $5 \%$ of the 0.85 floor area ratio "Village Centre Bonus", calculated using the "equivalent to construction value" rate determined by Council during the rezoning process.

### 20.31.5 Permitted Lot Coverage

1. The maximum lot coverage is $90 \%$ for buildings.

### 20.31.6 Yards \& Setbacks

1. The minimum front yard is:
a) $\quad 3.80 \mathrm{~m}$ but the minimum front yard may be reduced to 0.80 m for a maximum of $80 \%$ of the width of the front yard in the case of portions of the building located 5.0 m or more above grade; and,
b) weather protection associated with ground level uses may project into the front yard a maximum of 1.8 m .
2. The minimum exterior side yard is:
a) $\quad 3.80 \mathrm{~m}$ but the minimum exterior side yard may be reduced to 1.50 m for a maximum of $25 \%$ of the width of the exterior side yard in the case of portions of the building located 5.0 m or more above grade; and,
b) weather protection associated with ground level uses may project into the exterior side yard a maximum of 1.8 m .
3. The minimum interior side yard is 0.0 m .
4. The minimum rear yard is 0.0 m .
5. In addition to any front, exterior side, interior side and rear yard requirements, a minimum building setback of 1.5 m is required in any area where a building door provides direct access to or from City land or a secured, publicly-accessible exterior space.

### 20.31.7 Permitted Heights

1. The maximum building height for principal buildings is 47.0 m geodetic.
2. The maximum building height for accessory buildings is 12.0 m .
20.31.8 Subdivision Provisions/Minimum Lot Size
3. The minimum lot area is 4780 sq. m .
4. The minimum lot width is 45.0 m .
5. The minimum lot depth is 40.0 m .

### 20.31.9 Landscaping \& Screening

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

### 20.31.10 On-Site Parking and Loading

1. On-site vehicle and bicycle parking and loading shall be provided according to the standards set out in Section 7.0.

### 20.31.11 Other Regulations

1. Telecommunication antenna must be located a minimum 20.0 m above the ground (i.e., on a roof of a building).
2. In addition to the regulations listed above, the General Development Regulations in Section 4.0 and the Specific Use Regulations in Section 5.0 apply.
3. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following parcels and by designating them CITY CENTRE HIGH DENSITY MIXED USE WITH OFFICE (ZMU31) - BRIGHOUSE VILLAGE:

P.I.D. 011-325-666<br>LOT 3 EXCEPT: PARCEL "A" (EXPLANATORY PLAN 12388); SECTION 9 BLOCK 4 NORTH RANGE 6 WEST NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT PLAN 8552<br>P.I.D. 003-609-944<br>LOT "B" (RD58458E) SECTION 9 BLOCK 4 NORTH RANGE 6 WEST<br>NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT PLAN 8552<br>P.I.D. 002-850-702<br>LOT 169 SECTION 9 BLOCK 4 NORTH RANGE 6 WEST NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT PLAN 39107

3. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9510".FIRST READING
PUBLIC HEARING
SECOND READING
THIRD READING
OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED
ADOPTED

## Report to Committee

To: Planning Committee
From: Wayne Craig Director, Development

Date: December 19, 2016
File: RZ 16-734667

Re: Application by Xiufeng Chang and Shufang Chang for Rezoning at 8140/8160 Lundy Road from Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1) to Single Detached (RS2/C)

## Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9664, for the rezoning of 8140/8160 Lundy Road from "Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1)" to "Single Detached (RS2/C)", be introduced and given first reading.


Wayne Craig
Director, Development
SOS 6 bl
Att. 6

|  | REPORT CONCURRENCE |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Routed TO: | Concurrence | Concurrence of GENERAL MANAGER |
| Affordable Housing | - |  |

## Staff Report

## Origin

Xiufeng Zhang and Shufang Zhang have applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone the property at 8140/8160 Lundy Road from the "Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1)" zone to "Single Detached (RS2/C)" zone, to permit the property to be subdivided to create two (2) single-family lots, with vehicle access from Lundy Road (Attachment 1). The site is currently occupied by a stratified duplex, which will be demolished. A site survey showing the proposed subdivision plan is included in Attachment 2.

## Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details about the development proposal is attached (Attachment 3).

## Surrounding Development

Development immediately surrounding the site is as follows:
To the North: Single-family dwelling on a lot zoned "Single Detached (RS1/E)" fronting Lundy Road.
To the South: Single-family dwellings on lots zoned "Single Detached (RS2/C)" fronting Lundy Road.
To the East: $\quad$ Single-family dwellings on lots zoned "Single Detached (RS1/E)" fronting Lucerne Place.

To the West: Single-family dwellings on lots zoned "Single Detached (RS2/B)" and "Single Detached (RS1/E)" fronting Lundy Road.

## Related Policies \& Studies

## Official Community Plan

The Official Community Plan (OCP) land use designation for the subject property is "Neighbourhood Residential" (NRES). The proposed rezoning and subdivision would comply with this designation.

## Single-Family Lot Size Policy 5423/Zoning Bylaw 8500

The subject property is located within the area governed by Single-Family Lot Size Policy 5423 (adopted by Council on November 20, 1989 and last amended in 2004) (Attachment 4). The Policy permits properties with duplexes to be rezoned and subdivided into two (2) equal sized lots, provided that each lot created meets the requirements of the "Single Detached (RS2/B)" or "Single Detached (RS2/C)" zones. Proposed lots will be approximately 14.6 m ( 48 ft .) wide and $588.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(6,337 \mathrm{ft}^{2}{ }^{2}\right)$ in area. The proposed rezoning and subdivision would comply with the requirements of the "Single Detached (RS2/C)" zone and Single-Family Lot Size Policy 5423.

## Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

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

## Public Consultation

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

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

## Analysis

## Existing Legal Encumbrances

There is an existing 3.0 m wide statutory right-of-way (SRW) registered on Title for utilities (sanitary sewer) along the rear of the subject property. This SRW will not be impacted by the proposed development. The applicant is aware that encroachment into the SRW is not permitted.

There is also an existing restrictive covenant registered on the Title of each strata lot, restricting the use of the subject property to a duplex (Document No. AE6888). The covenant must be discharged from Title as a condition of rezoning.

Prior to subdivision, the applicant must cancel the existing Strata Plan (NWS3444) from the Title of the subject property.

## Transportation and Site Access

Vehicle access to the proposed lots is to be from Lundy Road via separate driveway crossings.

## Tree Retention and Replacement

A Certified Arborist's Report was submitted by the applicant, which identifies tree species, assesses tree structure and condition, and provides recommendations on tree retention and removal relative to the proposed development. The report assesses two (2) trees located on the subject site, two (2) trees located on neighbouring properties and one (1) City-owned tree.

The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has reviewed the Arborist's Report, conducted an onsite visual tree assessment, and concurs with the Arborist's recommendations to:

- Retain and protect one (1) Dogwood tree (tag\# 34) located on the subject site due to good condition ( 15 cm dbh ).
- Retain and protect two (2) trees (tag\# Neigh. 1 \& Neigh.2) located on the neighbouring property to the south.
- Remove and replace one (1) Birch tree (tag\# 35) located on the subject site in poor condition due to Bronze Birch Borer infestation ( 56 cm dbh).
- Remove and replace one (1) City-owned Birch tree (tag\# 33) located in front of the subject property ( 138 cm dbh ). The City's Parks Arborist has assessed the tree for removal and indicated that the required servicing works (including ditch infill) will have a negative impact on the tree's health. The applicant has received approval from the Parks Department and must contact the department four (4) days prior to removal. Compensation of $\$ 1,300$ is required for removal of the tree, in order for the Parks Department to plant two (2) trees at or near the subject property.


## Tree Protection

The proposed Tree Management Diagram is shown in Attachment 5, which outlines the protection of the one (1) tree on-site and two (2) trees on the neighbouring property.

To ensure the protection of the three (3) trees (tag\# 34, Neigh. $1 \&$ Neigh.2), the applicant is required to complete the following:

- Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, submission to the City of a contract with a Certified Arborist for 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.
- Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of $\$ 5,000$ for the one (1) on-site tree to be retained.
- Prior to the demolition of the existing dwelling on the subject site, the applicant is required to install 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 works are completed.


## Tree Replacement

For the removal of the one (1) tree on-site, the OCP tree replacement ratio goal of $2: 1$ requires two (2) replacement trees to be planted and maintained on the proposed lots. Council Policy \#5032 for Tree Planting (Universal) (adopted by Council on July 10, 1995 and amended in 2015) encourages a minimum of two (2) trees to be planted and maintained on every lot. The applicant has proposed to plant and maintain a minimum of two (2) trees on each lot (one (1) in the front yard and one (1) in the rear yard); for a total of four (4) replacement trees.

As per Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057, based on the sizes of the on-site trees being removed ( 56 cm dbh), replacement trees shall be the following minimum sizes:

| No. of Replacement Trees | Minimum Caliper of Deciduous <br> Replacement Tree |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 6 cm |
| 2 | 10 cm |


| Minimum Height of Coniferous <br> Replacement Tree |
| :---: |
| 3.5 m |
| 5.5 m |

To ensure that four (4) replacement trees are planted on-site at development stage, the applicant is required to submit a Landscaping Security in the amount of $\$ 2,000(\$ 500 /$ tree) prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. Securities will not be released until a landscaping inspection has been passed by City staff after construction and landscaping has been completed. The City may retain a portion of the security for a one year maintenance period from the date of the landscape inspection.

## Affordable Housing Strategy

The City's Affordable Housing Strategy for single-family rezoning applications requires a secondary suite on $100 \%$ of new lots, or a secondary suite on $50 \%$ of new lots, plus a cash-in-lieu contribution of $\$ 2.00 / \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of total buildable area towards the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund for the remaining $50 \%$ of new lots, or a $100 \%$ cash-in-lieu contribution if no secondary suites are provided.

The applicant proposes to provide a legal secondary suite on both of the two (2) lots proposed at the subject site. To ensure that the secondary suites are built to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the City's Affordable Housing Strategy, the applicant is required to enter into a legal agreement registered on Title, stating that no final Building Permit inspection will be granted until the secondary suite is constructed to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the BC Building Code and Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500. Registration of this legal agreement is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

## Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

At Subdivision stage, the applicant is required to complete the following:

- Payment of current year's taxes and the costs associated with the completion of the required servicing works as described in Attachment 6.
- Payment to the City, in accordance with the Subdivision and Development Bylaw No. 8751, a $\$ 36,319.60$ cash-in-lieu contribution for the design and construction of frontage upgrades, including new concrete curb and gutter, concrete sidewalk, pavement widening, roadway lighting and boulevard landscape/trees.


## Financial Impact or Economic Impact

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

## Conclusion

The purpose of this rezoning application is to rezone the property at 8140/8160 Lundy Road from the "Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1)" zone to "Single Detached (RS2/C)" zone, to permit the property to be subdivided to create two single-family (2) lots.

This rezoning application complies with the land use designations and applicable policies contained within the OCP for the subject site.

The list of rezoning considerations is included in Attachment 6, which has been agreed to by the applicant (signed concurrence on file).

On this basis, it is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9664 be introduced and given first reading.


Steven De Sousa
Planning Technician - Design
(604-276-8529)
SDS:blg
Attachment 1: Location Map/Aerial Photo
Attachment 2: Proposed Subdivision Plan
Attachment 3: Development Application Data Sheet
Attachment 4: Single-Family Lot Size Policy 5423
Attachment 5: Tree Management Plan
Attachment 6: Rezoning Considerations
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## City of Richmond

Address: 8140/8160 Lundy Road
Applicant: Xiufeng Zhang and Shufang Zhang
Planning Area(s): Broadmoor

|  | Existing | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owner: | X. \& S. Zhang | To be determined |
| Site Size: | $1,177.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(12,674 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | Lot 1: $588.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(6,337 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ <br> Lot 2: $588.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(6,337 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| Land Uses: | Single-family residential | No change |
| OCP Designation: | Neighbourhood Residential | Complies |
| Lot Size Policy Designation: | Single Detached (RS2/B) or Single Detached (RS2/C) | Complies |
| Zoning: | Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1) | Single Detached (RS2/C) |


| On Future Subdivided Lots | Bylaw Requirement | Proposed | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | Max. 0.55 for $464.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of Lot Area +0.3 for remainder | Max. 0.55 for $464.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of Lot Area +0.3 for remainder | None Permitted |
| Buildable Floor Area:* | Max. $292.7 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,150 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | Max. $292.7 \mathrm{~m}^{\mathbf{2}}$ (3,150 $\left.\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | None Permitted |
| Lot Coverage: | Building: Max. 45\% Non-porous: Max. 70\% Landscaping: Max. 25\% | Building: Max. 45\% Non-porous: Max. 70\% Landscaping: Max. 25\% | None |
| Lot Size: | $360 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $588 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | None |
| Lot Dimensions: | Width: 13.5 m Depth: 24.0 m | Width: 14.6 m Depth: 40.2 m | None |
| Setbacks: | Front: Min. 6 m Rear: Min. 6 m Interior Side: Min. 1.2 m | Front: Min. 6 m <br> Rear: Min. 6 m <br> Interior Side: Min. 1.2 m | None |
| Height: | Max. $21 / 2$ storeys | Max. $21 / 2$ storeys | None |

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

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


## City of Richmond

| Page 1 of 2 | Adopted by Council: November 20, 1989 <br> Amended by Council: November $17^{\text {th }}, 2003$ <br> Amended by Council: March $15{ }^{\text {th }}, 2004$ | POLICY 5423 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| File Ref: 4045-00 | SINGLE-FAMILY LOT SIZE POLICY IN QUARTER-SECTION 21-4-6 |  |

## POLICY 5423:

The following policy establishes lot sizes within the area generally bounded by Blundell Road, No. 3 Road, Francis Road and Garden City Road (in a portion of Section 21-4-6):

That properties within the area generally bounded by Blundell Road, No. 3 Road, Francis Road and Garden City Road, in a portion of Section 21-4-6, be permitted to subdivide in accordance with the provisions of Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E) in Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300, with the exception that:
a) properties with duplexes be permitted to subdivide into two equal halves, provided that each lot created meets the requirements of the Single-Family Housing District (R1/B) or (R1/C).
b) five properties highlighted on the map be permitted to subdivide in accordance with the provisions of Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area H (R1/H) in Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300.

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


## Site Plan (Mark up)



## Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9664, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. Submission of a Landscape Security in the amount of $\$ 2,000$ ( $\$ 500 /$ tree) to ensure that a total of four (4) replacement trees (one (1) in the front yard and one (1) in the rear yard of each lot) are planted and maintained on the proposed lots with the following minimum sizes:

| No. of Replacement <br> Trees | Minimum Caliper of Deciduous <br> Replacement Tree |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 6 cm |
| 2 | 10 cm |

or

| Minimum Height of Coniferous <br> Replacement Tree |
| :---: |
| 3.5 m |
| 5.5 m |

The security will not be released until a landscaping inspection is passed by City staff. The City may retain a portion of the security for a one-year maintenance period.
2. 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.
3. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of $\$ 5,000$ for the one (1) on-site tree to be retained.
4. City's acceptance of the applicant's voluntary contribution of $\$ 1,300$ for the removal of the one (1) City-owned tree; in order for the City to plant two (2) trees at or near the developments site.
5. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on Title.
6. Registration of a legal agreement on Title to ensure that no final Building Permit inspection is granted until a secondary suite is constructed on two (2) of the two (2) future lots, to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the BC Building Code and the City's Zoning Bylaw.
7. Discharge of the existing covenant registered on Title of the subject property (i.e. AE6888); which restricts the use of the subject property to a duplex.

## At Demolition Permit* stage, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. 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 must remain in place until construction and landscaping on-site is completed.

## At Subdivision* and Building Permit* stage, the developer must complete the following requirements:

1. Cancellation of existing Strata Plan (NWS3444).
2. The Developer is required to pay, in keeping with the Subdivision and Development Bylaw No. 8751, a $\$ 36,319.60$ cash-in-lieu contribution for the design and construction of frontage upgrades as set out below:
Concrete Curb and Gutter (EP.0641)
\$5,858.00
Concrete Sidewalk (EP.0642)
\$8,494.10
Pavement Widening (EP.0643)
\$10,251.50
Roadway Lighting (EP.0644)
Boulevard Landscape/Trees (EP.0647)
3. Payment of current year's taxes and the costs associated with the completion of the required servicing works and frontage improvements.
$\qquad$
4. The following servicing works and off-site improvements may be completed through either: a) a Servicing Agreement* entered into by the applicant to design and construct the works to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering; or b) a cash contribution based on a City cost estimate for the City to manage the design and construction of the works:
Water Works:

- Using the OCP Model, there is $335 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ of water available at a 20 psi residual at the Lundy Road frontage. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of $95 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$.
- The Developer is required to:
- Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm the development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage Building designs.
- Retain the 2 existing 25 mm water service connections for the development site.

Storm Sewer Works:

- The Developer is required to:
- Infill the existing ditch and install a new 600 mm storm sewer along the entire lot's frontage.
- Install two (2) new storm service connections and inspection chambers at the northwest and southwest corners of the lots.
- At Developer's cost, the City is to:
- Perform all tie-ins of proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

Sanitary Sewer Works:

- The Developer is required to:
- Not start on-site building construction prior to rear yard sanitary works.
- At Developer's cost, the City is to:
- Install a new sanitary service connection at the adjoining property line of the two (2) newly subdivided lots, complete with inspection chamber and dual service leads.
- Cut and cap the existing sanitary lead at the northeast corner of the subject site.


## Frontage Improvements:

- The Developer is required to:
- Coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers.
- When relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the property frontages.
- To determine if above ground structures are required and coordinate their locations (e.g. Vista, PMT, LPT, Shaw cabinets, Telus Kiosks, etc.). These should be located on-site.
- Complete other frontage improvements as per Transportation's requirements.

General Items:
a. The Developer is required to:

- Enter into, if required, additional legal agreements, as determined via the subject development's Servicing Agreement(s) and/or Development Permit(s), and/or Building Permit(s) to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering, including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, 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.

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

## Note:

* This requires a separate application.
- Where the Director of Development deems appropriate, the preceding agreements are to be drawn not only as personal covenants of the property owner but also as covenants pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act.
All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall have priority over all such liens, charges and encumbrances as is considered advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall, unless the Director of Development determines otherwise, be fully registered in the Land Title Office prior to enactment of the appropriate bylaw.

The preceding agreements shall provide security to the City including indemnities, warranties, equitable/rent charges, letters of credit and withholding permits, as deemed necessary or advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements shall be in a form and content satisfactory to the Director of Development.

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


## Signed

Date

## Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9664 (RZ 16-734667) 8140/8160 Lundy Road

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

1. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following area and by designating it "SINGLE DETACHED (RS2/C)".
P.I.D. 017-097-479

Strata Lot 1 Section 21 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Strata Plan NWS3444 together with an interest in the Common Property in proportion to the unit entitlement of the Strata Lot as shown on Form 1
P.I.D. 017-097-487

Strata Lot 2 Section 21 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Strata Plan NWS3444 together with an interest in the Common Property in proportion to the unit entitlement of the Strata Lot as shown on Form 1
2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9664".


OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED
ADOPTED

## Report to Committee

| To: | Planning Committee | Date: | January 9, 2017 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | Wayne Craig | File: | RZ 15-700431 |
|  | Director, Development |  |  |
| Re: | Application by Urban Era Builders \& Developers Ltd. for Rezoning 9700, 9720, <br>  <br>  | 9800 Williams Road from Single Detached (RS1/C) and Single Detached <br> (RS1/E) to Town Housing (ZT81) - Williams Road |  |

## Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9667 to create the "Town Housing (ZT81) - Williams Road" Zone, and to rezone 9700, 9720 and 9800 Williams Road from "Single Detached (RS1/C)" and "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Town Housing (ZT81) - Williams Road", be introduced and given first reading.


Att: 5

| REPORT CONCURRENCE |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Routed To: | ConCurrence |  |
| Affordable Housing |  |  |

## Staff Report

## Origin

Urban Era Builders \& Developers Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 9700, 9720, 9800 Williams Road (Attachment 1) from "Single Detached (RS1/C)" and "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to a site-specific zone in order to develop a 18-unit townhouse project with access from Williams Road. The development would include three (3) affordable housing units that combined have not less than $15 \%$ of the total floor area. The subject site consists of three (3) lots each of which currently contains one (1) single-family dwelling that will be demolished.

## Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details about the development proposal is attached (Attachment 2).

## Surrounding Development

Existing development immediately surrounding the subject site includes the following:

- To the North are single-family dwellings on lots zoned "Single Detached (RS1/K)", "Single Detached (RS1/E)" and "Compact Single Detached (RC1)" along Williams Road.
- To the South are single-family dwellings on lots zoned "Single Detached (RS1/E)" along Swansea Drive with north-south access along a walkway that connects to Williams Road.
- To the East are single-family dwellings on lots zoned "Single Detached (RS1/E)", which front Williams Road.
- To the West are single-family dwellings on lots zoned "Single Detached (RS1/E)", which front Williams Road. The properties at 9620, 9640, 9660 and 9680 Williams Road are subject to an active rezoning application (RZ 15-715406) for townhouses. A staff report will be presented to Planning Committee for this project upon completion of staff review.


## Related Policies \& Studies

## Official Community Plan (OCP)

The OCP Bylaw 9000 land use designation for the subject site is "Neighbourhood Residential" where single-family, two-family, and multiple family housing are the principal uses. This development proposal is consistent with the land use designation.

## Arterial Road Policy

On December 19, 2016, Council adopted the amended OCP Arterial Road Policy. Under the amended policy the subject site is designated for townhouse use in the new Arterial Road Development Map.

The proposal is further consistent with the Arterial Road Policy for the siting of townhouse developments as follows:

- The townhouse development would have a frontage of greater than 50 m along a minor arterial road (i.e. Williams Road);
- Shared vehicle access to the east of the subject site for future townhouse developments will be secured through a legal agreement registered on title prior to rezoning approval;
- Vehicle access points to the townhouse development would be located at a distance of more than 50 m from the intersection of a minor arterial road (Williams Road) with a major arterial road (No. 4 Road).

The amended Arterial Road Policy allows additional density along arterial roads to be considered subject to provision of Low End Market Rental (LEMR) housing units, as per the below conditions:

- Bonus density is used to provide built LEMR units secured through a Housing Agreement;
- Built LEMR units comply with the City's Affordable Housing Strategy with respect to the housing unit sizes, tenant eligibility criteria and maximum monthly rental rates; and
- The overall design of the development complies with the Development Permit Area design guidelines for arterial road townhouse developments.

The proposed development under this application is generally consistent with this new policy.

## Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

The proposed development must meet the requirements of the Richmond Flood Plain Designation and Protection Bylaw 8204. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title is required prior to adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9667.

## Public Consultation

A rezoning sign is installed on the subject property. No comments have been received to date as a result of the sign on the property.

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant $1^{\text {st }}$ reading to Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9667, it will be forwarded to a Public Hearing, where area residents and other interested parties will have the opportunity to comment. Public notification for the Public Hearing will occur as per Local Government Act requirements.

## Analysis

## Density, Form, and Affordable Housing

The Arterial Road Policy specifies a typical density of 0.60 FAR (Floor Area Ratio) for townhouse developments along arterial roads, subject to the applicant providing a cash-in-lieu contributions to the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund in the amount of $\$ 4.00$ per buildable square foot, prior to Council approval of any rezoning application.

This policy further provides for the consideration of additional density for townhouse development if the proposal includes built affordable housing units, secured by the City's standard Housing Agreement. The applicant is proposing medium density townhouses with 0.73 FAR including three (3) affordable housing units with a combined floor area of not less than $15 \%$ of the total floor area. These units would be secured through a restrictive covenant and Housing Agreement registered on property title prior to Council approval of the rezoning.

Conceptual development plans are contained in Attachment 3. The three (3) affordable housing units are proposed to be located in the easterly building fronting Williams Road in close proximity to the outdoor amenity space. Each unit would also have a private front yard.

Consistent with the OCP policies for a variety of housing, the proposed affordable housing units would be ground-oriented in design, and family-oriented in type and size as detailed below:

| Number of Units | Unit Type | Minimum Unit Area <br> as per Affordable <br> Housing Strategy | Proposed <br> Unit Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 3 Bdrm | $91 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(980 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $120.87 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1301 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| Total: 3 |  |  | Total: $362.60 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,903 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ <br> (approx. $15 \%$ of total <br> floor area proposed $)$ |

Staff recommend that Council support this proposal as the community benefit is significant and the proposed form and massing of the triplex buildings is generally consistent with the Arterial Road Policy, as detailed below. Accordingly, a new site-specific zone "Town Housing (RT81) Williams Road" is proposed to accommodate this townhouse development with a maximum base density of 0.60 FAR , and bonus density of 0.13 FAR , up to a total maximum of 0.73 FAR . The bonus density is conditional upon the provision of three (3) affordable housing units with a combined floor area of not less than $15 \%$ of total floor area. These units would be secured through a restrictive covenant and a Housing Agreement to be registered on title, prior to rezoning approval.

The ZT81 zone also reflects the applicant's proposal to allow:

- A maximum lot coverage for buildings of $44 \%$;
- A maximum projection of 0.52 m into the front yard setback for columns only; and
- A minimum 4.5 m front yard setback in favour of a minimum 6.0 m rear yard setback for a building above first storey to transition to existing single detached housing to the south.


## Site Planning, Access, and Parking

The subject site of consolidated lots is $3,154 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(33,949 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ in total area, located on the south side of Williams Road, between Severn Drive and No. 4 Road, in the Broadmoor neighbourhood.

The proposed site plan has a total of 18 units. Seven (7) units in one (1) building fronting Williams Road and six (6) units in two (2) triplex buildings fronting the walkway to the west. Two (2) units in one (1) duplex front the internal north/south drive aisle, but are sited near to the outdoor amenity space, and three (3) units in one (1) triplex front the internal east/west drive aisle but each have private rear yard patios.

The buildings at the rear have a setback of 4.52 m at ground level, and 6.0 m above the first storey. As this application was in-stream prior to Council adoption of the new Arterial Road Policy for townhouses, this does not conform with the new guideline for not more than $50 \%$ of the first storey to have a rear yard setback of less than 6 m . However, it is consistent with the intent of the guidelines and the policy in place at the date of application to ensure a visual transition to single detached housing to the south, as envisioned in the Arterial Road design guidelines for townhouse development.

Outdoor amenity space is well-sited for direct access for pedestrians from the walkway to the west. The proposal also includes a Statutory Right-of-Way for public passage along the west property line of the subject site to accommodate expanded sidewalk and grass boulevard improvements to the north/south walkway from Williams Road to Swansea Drive.

The point of vehicle access is a new driveway entrance from Williams Road and each townhouse garage door entry is sited along the internal east-west or north/south drive aisles. A Statutory Right-of-Way for public passage is required to be registered on title, prior to Council approval of the proposed rezoning, for access to future development adjacent to the east.

As per Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, the proposal requires a total of 37 spaces including 33 spaces for resident parking ( 30 for strata townhouses, 3 for affordable housing units) and four (4) spaces for visitor parking. The proposal exceeds this amount with a total of 36 spaces for residents of which 18 spaces are tandem in arrangement. Another 18 resident spaces are side-byside stalls and include nine (9) standard spaces and nine (9) small sized spaces. Four (4) visitor spaces are proposed in total, including one (1) for disabled parking. Registration of a legal agreement that prohibits conversion of tandem parking spaces into habitable area is included in the rezoning conditions (Attachment 4).

The plan also includes a total of 27 resident bicycle parking spaces (Class 1) in individual garages and a visitor bicycle rack (Class 2 ) with four (4) spaces located within the outdoor amenity space.

## Amenity Space

Consistent with the OCP and Council Policy 5041, the applicant would provide a contribution in the amount of $\$ 18,000$ ( $\$ 1,000 /$ unit), prior to Council approval of Richmond Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw 9667, in-lieu of the provision of an on-site indoor amenity space.

Outdoor amenity space is proposed, and would be located on the west side of the subject site between the two (2) triplex buildings. In the preliminary plan, the proposed outdoor amenity space is $109.9 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ exceeding the OCP requirement of $6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ per unit ( $108 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ). Staff will continue to work with the applicant at the Development Permit application review stage to ensure that the design of this outdoor amenity space does comply with applicable design guidelines in the OCP.

## Tree Retention and Replacement

The applicant has submitted a Certified Arborist Report (Attachment 5), which identifies on-site and off-site tree species, assesses their condition and provides recommendations on tree retention and removal in relation to the proposed development. The Report assesses nine (9) trees on the subject site, six (6) trees on adjacent properties (9931 and 9951 Swansea Drive), two (2) trees on a shared property line ( 9800 Williams Road and 9951 Swansea Drive), and one (1) hedgerow on an adjacent property ( 9931 Swansea Drive).

The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator and Parks Department Arborist have reviewed the Arborist Report, conducted visual tree assessments and provide the following comments:

- Six (6) trees (tags \#A, \#B, \#C, \#D, \#E, \#F) located on adjacent properties (9931 and 9951 Swansea Drive) and one (1) hedgerow located on an adjacent property (9931 Swansea Drive) must be retained and protected.
- Two (2) trees (tags \#12, \#133) located on a shared property line between the subject site ( 9800 Williams Road) and an adjacent property ( 9951 Swansea Drive) should be removed due to existing poor condition, subject to written consent of the adjacent property owner, prior to issuance of the Development Permit. Should consent not achieved, the trees must be retained.
- Nine (9) trees (tags \#135, \#136, \#137, \#138, \#139, \#140, \#141, \#142, \#143) on the subject site should be removed due to existing poor condition.


## Tree Retention

Six (6) trees (tags \#A, \#B, \#C, \#D, \#E, \#F) on the subject șite must be retained and protected as per the Tree Retention and Removal Plan in the Certified Arborist Report.

To ensure the protection of these trees, the applicant must complete the following items prior to the final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9667:

- Submit a contract with a Certified Arborist for supervision of all works conducted within close proximity to the tree protection zone. The contract must include the scope of work, including the number of monitoring inspections at specified stages of construction, and specific measures to ensure tree protection, and a provision for the Arborist to submit a post-construction impact assessment to the City for Review.

Additionally, two trees (tags \#12, \#133) on shared property lines must be retained and protected unless the adjacent property owner provides written consent to remove them prior to the issuance of the Development Permit.

Prior to the demolition of the existing buildings on the subject site, the applicant must install tree protection fencing to City standards in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Information Bulletin TREE-03 prior to any works being conducted on site. Protection fencing must remain in place until such time as the construction and on-site landscaping works are completed.

## Tree Replacement

The Arborist report recommends the removal of nine (9) trees from the subject site and two (2) trees located on a shared property line between the subject site ( 9800 Williams Road) and an adjacent property ( 9951 Swansea Drive). City staff have reviewed the proposal this report and concur with the recommendations. The OCP tree replacement ratio of $2: 1$ requires that 22 replacement trees be planted and retained on the site. As per the preliminary Landscape Plan, the applicant is committed to plant a total of 22 replacement trees including one (1) in the front yard of each townhouse unit fronting Williams Road and fronting the walkway to the west and two (2) trees in the outdoor amenity area.

As part of the future Development Permit application, the applicant is required to submit a final proposed Landscape Plan. A Registered Landscape Architect must prepare the Landscape Plan, and the Cost Estimate for the works provided, and $10 \%$ contingency, for fencing, hard surfaces, trees, soft landscaping and installation, and the applicant must provide a Landscape Security for $100 \%$ of the Cost Estimate. The Landscape Plan, Cost Estimate and Landscape Security must be submitted prior to issuance of the Development Permit.

## Public Art

In response to the City's Public Art Program (Policy 8703), the applicant proposes a voluntary contribution to the City's Public Art Reserve Fund at a rate of $\$ 0.79$ per buildable square foot (not including the affordable housing units) and a total contribution in the amount of $\$ 16,491$.

## Townhouse Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

Consistent with the OCP energy policy for townhouse rezoning applications, the applicant has committed to design and build each townhouse unit so that it scores 82 or higher on the EnerGuide scale, and so that all units will meet the BC Solar Hot Water Ready Regulations.

Prior to adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9667, the applicant is required to meet the complete the following as rezoning conditions:

- Submit a Building Energy Report prepared by a Certified Energy Advisor that confirms the proposed design and construction will achieve EnerGuide 82, or higher, based on the energy performance of at least one unit built to building code minimum requirements including the unit with the poorest energy performance of all the proposed units; and
- Registration on title of a restrictive covenant to secure the design and construction of all townhouse units in compliance with the Building Energy Report and to comply with BC Solar Hot Water Ready Regulations.


## Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

Prior to rezoning, the applicant must enter into a Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of servicing connections, upgrades, and frontage improvements as outlined in the Rezoning Conditions (Attachment 4). These works include, but are not limited to: review of street lighting levels along frontages of the development site for any additional street lighting requirements or upgrades: widening and upgrading of the existing north-south walkway along the entire west property line; removal of the existing driveways from Williams Road; and installation of new sidewalk, curb and gutter on Williams Road.

## Development Permit Application Considerations

A Development Permit application is required for the proposal to ensure consistence with the applicable OCP policies and design guidelines for townhouses.

Further refinements to architectural, landscape and urban design will be made as part of the Development Permit application review process including, but not limited to, the following:

- A detailed design of the outdoor amenity space.
- Perimeter fencing along Williams Road and the pedestrian path to the west.
- A detailed landscape design including trees, shrubs and plantings and hard surface treatments.
- Architectural expression and proposed colour palette and exterior building materials.
- Features that incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED).

Interior plans must demonstrate that all of the relevant accessibility features are incorporated into the proposed Convertible Unit design and that aging-in-place (i.e. adaptable unit) features can be incorporated into all units.

Further items may be identified as part of the Development Permit application review process, which must proceed to an acceptable stage prior to Council adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9667.

## Financial Impact

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

## Conclusion

This application is to rezone 9700, 9720 and 9800 Williams Road from "Single Detached (RS1/C)" Zone and "Single Detached (RS1/E)" Zone to a new site-specific zone, "Town Housing (ZT81) - Williams Road", to permit the development of 18 townhouses including three (3) affordable housing units.


#### Abstract

The townhouse proposal is consistent with the OCP land use designation and is generally consistent with the OCP Arterial Road Policy for townhouses. The conceptual development plans attached are generally consistent with all applicable OCP design guidelines, and would be further refined in the Development Permit application review process.

The application includes the significant benefit of three (3) three-bedroom affordable housing units, which will be secured through a restrictive covenant and a Housing Agreement at the Development Permit stage.


It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9667 be introduced and given first reading.

## Helen Cain

## Helen Cain

Planner 2, Heritage, Policy Planning
HC:cas
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Attachment 4: Rezoning Considerations
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## City of Richmond

## RZ 15-700431

Attachment 2
Address: 9700,9720 and 9800 Williams Road
Applicant: Urban Era Builders \& Developers Inc.
Planning Area(s): Broadmoor

|  | Existing | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Owner: |  <br> Development, Inc. | No change |
| Site Size $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right):$ | $3,154 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(33,949 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $3,154 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(33,949 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| Land Uses: | Single-detached dwelling | 18 townhouse units |
| OCP Designation: | Neighbourhood Residential | No change |
| Zoning: | Single Detached (RS1/E, RS1/C) | Town Housing (ZT81) - Williams <br> Road |
| Number of Units: | 3 | 18 |
| Other Designations: | The Arterial Road Policy for <br> location of new townhouses | Consistent with the Arterial Road <br> Policy. |


| On Future Subdivided Lots | Bylaw Requirement |  | Proposed |  | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | Max. 0.73 |  | 0.73 |  | none permitted |
| Lot Coverage - Buildings: | Max. 44\% |  | 44\% |  | none |
| Lot Coverage - Buildings, Structures, and Non-Porous Surfaces: | Max. 65\% |  | 58.6\% |  | none |
| Lot Coverage - Live Plant Material: | Min. 25\% |  | 27.8 \% |  | none |
| Lot Size (min. dimensions): | N/A |  | N/A |  | none |
| Lot Width (min. dimension): | 40 m |  | 65 m |  | none |
| Setback - Front Yard (m): | Min. 4.5 m |  | 4.52 m |  | none |
| Setback - Rear Yard (m): | Min. 3.0 m |  | 4.50 m for $1^{\text {st }}$ storey 6.00 m above $1^{\text {st }}$ storey |  | none |
| Setback - Side Yard (m): | Min. 3.0 m |  | West - 4.01 m |  | none |
| Height (m): | 12 m |  | 11.98 m |  | none |
| On-Site Vehicle Parking Spaces Regular (R): | Market housing | 2 (R)/unit | Market housing | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \text { spaces } \\ & (2 R \times 15) \end{aligned}$ | none |


| On Future <br> Subdivided Lots | Bylaw Requirement |  | Proposed |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Variance



REZONING FOR PROPOSED TOWNHOUSE AT
CURRENT: RS1/F, (PROFOSED: SITE SPECIFIC)
PROPOSED

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { D.73 } \\
& 2302 \text { SM ( } 24.778 \text { SF) FLDDR AREA } \\
& 18 \text { UNiTS }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { [INCLUDING } 3 \text { RENTAL UNITS (TPPE A1 } 1301 \text { SQQ. FT.) } \\
& \text { TTTAL AFFORDAELE RENTAL AREA: } \\
& 3903 \text { SQ. FT (15\%)] SEE DWG A5] }
\end{aligned}
$$


 BULDING HEIGHT $-11.98 M\left(39^{\prime} 4^{\circ}\right)$
FRONTTARD FACING WWAMM $-4.52 \mathrm{M}\left(14^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}\right)$
 WEST SIDEYARD - $4.01 \mathrm{M}\left(13^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime \prime}\right)$
EAST SIDEYARD $-3.14 \mathrm{M}\left(10^{\prime \prime} 3^{\prime \prime}\right)$
 1.25 PER DWELLING UNIT $\times 18=23$


$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2302 \text { SM (24, //B SF) FLODR AREA } \\
& \text { [INCUUDING } 3 \text { RENTAL UNITS (TTPE A1 } 1301 \text { SQ. FT.) }
\end{aligned}
$$

REAR YARD - 1/F; $4.52 \mathrm{M}\left(14^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}\right)$ 2/F: 6.00 M ( (9 $^{\prime} 7^{\prime \prime}$ )
 RESIEENTAL $\quad 27$ (NSIDE GARAGE)
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## Rezoning Considerations

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

## Address: $9700,9720,9800$ Williams Road

File No.: RZ 15-700431

## Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9667, the applicant is required to complete the following:

1. 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 (at specified stages of construction), and a provision for the Arborist to submit a post-construction impact assessment report to the City for review.
2. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute $\$ 0.79$ per buildable square foot (e.g. $\$ 16,491$ ) to the City's Public Art Reserve Fund.
3. City acceptance of the applicant's voluntary contribution in the amount of $\$ 18,000$ ( $\$ 1,000 /$ unit) in-lieu of providing on-site indoor amenity space.
4. The granting of a 1 m wide x 55 m long Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) for public right-of-passage along the west property line to accommodate widened sidewalk and grass boulevard on the east side of the existing City walkway.
5. The granting of a Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) for public-right-of-passage over the entire north-south and east-west internal drive aisle to provide legal means of public/vehicular access to future developments located east of the subject site. The drive aisle is to be constructed by the developer and to be maintained by the strata.
6. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
7. Registration of a legal agreement on title prohibiting the conversion of the tandem parking area into habitable space.
8. Registration of a legal agreement on title identifying that the proposed townhouse development must be designed and constructed to meet or exceed EnerGuide 82 criteria for energy efficiency and that all units will meet the BC Solar Hot Water Ready Regulations.
9. Registration of the City's standard Housing Agreement to secure three (3) affordable housing units, the combined habitable floor area of which shall comprise not less than $15 \%$ of the subject development's total residential building area. Occupants of the affordable housing units subject to the Housing Agreement shall enjoy full and unlimited access to and use of the outdoor amenity space. The terms of the Housing Agreements shall indicate that they apply in perpetuity and provide for the following:

| Unit Type | Number of Units | Minimum Unit Area | Maximum Monthly <br> Unit Rent** | Total Maximum <br> Household <br> Income** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 Bdrm | 3 | $90 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(980 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $\$ 1,437$ | $\$ 57,500$ or less |

** May be adjusted periodically as provided for under adopted City policy.
11. The submission and processing of a Development Permit* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.
12. Enter into a Servicing Agreement* for the design and construction of servicing connections/upgrades and frontage improvements. Works include, but may not be limited to the following:

## Water Works

- Using the OCP Model, there is $675.0 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ of water available at a 20 psi residual at the Williams Road frontage. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of $220.0 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$. At Building Permit stage, the developer is required to submit fire flow calculations signed and sealed by a Professional

Engineer as per the Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) to confirm that there is adequate available flow for onsite fire protection.

- At the developer's cost, the City is to:
- Cut and cap the existing water service connection on Williams Road.
- Install a new water connection complete with meter and meter box to be placed on-site.


## Storm Sewer Works

- Install drainage along upgraded walkway of approximately 55 m in length.
- At the developer's cost, the City is to;
- Cut and cap the existing storm service connections and remove the existing inspection chamber along the 9800 Williams Road frontage.
- Upgrade the existing storm service connection and inspection chamber located along 9700 Williams Road frontage. Utilize the existing core into the existing box culvert.


## Sanitary Sewer Works

- At the developer's cost, the City is to:
- Cut and cap the existing sanitary service connections and remove the existing inspection chamber along the south property line.
- Install one (1) new sanitary service connection complete with new inspection chamber within the existing SRW at the southwest corner of the development site, tie-in new service to existing manhole (SMH2161). All sanitary works to be completed prior to any onsite building construction.


## Frontage Improvements

- Review street lighting levels along the north and west frontages of the development site for any additional street lighting requirements or upgrades to LED fixtures.
- Widening and upgrading of the existing north-south walkway along the entire west property line through the provision of a $1 \mathrm{~m} \times 1 \mathrm{~m}$ corner cut at the access from Williams Road and a 2.0 m wide sidewalk and 1.0 wide grassed boulevard on the east side of the walkway. The exact width of the new grass strip at all points along the walkway is to be determined in consultation with the Parks Department through the review processes for the Development Permit application and Servicing Agreement.
- Removal of the existing driveways providing access to the subject site from Williams Road and replacement with barrier/curb gutter, 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk and 2.0 m wide grassed boulevard between the new sidewalk and the new road curb. The sidewalk must connect to the existing sidewalk east and west of the subject site along the Williams Road frontage.
- The developer is to coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers:
- To underground the service lines for the proposed development.
- When relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the property frontages.
- To determine if above ground structures are required and coordinate their locations (e.g. Vista, PMT, LPT, Shaw cabinets, Telus Kiosks, etc). All above ground structures to be located on the development site. Architects to coordinate with private utility companies to determine location prior to Development Permit application. Proposed locations to be included on the Development Permit plans.


## General Items

- 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.


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

- Written consent of the adjacent property owners to remove two (2) trees on shared property lines. If written consent is not provided, the trees must be retained and protected through inclusion in the contract between the developer and a Certified Arborist that is outlined in rezoning condition \#1 as per above.
- Complete a proposed townhouse energy efficiency report and recommendations prepared by a Certified Energy Advisor which demonstrates how the proposed construction will meet or exceed the required townhouse energy efficiency standards (EnerGuide 82 or higher), in compliance with the City's Official Community Plan.


## Prior to Building Permit* issuance, the following must be completed:

- Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
- Incorporation of three (3) affordable housing units, the combined habitable floor area of which shall comprise approximately $15 \%$ of the subject development's total residential building area, and which are to comply with all of the terms of the Housing Agreement that is required to be registered on title prior to Development Permit issuance.
- Submission of a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to the Transportation Department. 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 MMCD Traffic Regulation Section 01570.
- Obtain a Building Permit (BP) for any construction hoarding. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a public street, the air space above a public street, or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For additional information, contact the Building Approvals Department at 604-276-4285.


## Note:

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

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

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


## (signed concurrence on file)

Date

## ATTACHMENT 5



## City of Richmond

## Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9667 (RZ 15-700431) 9700, 9720 and 9800 Williams Road

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

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by:
a. Inserting the following into the end of the table contained in Section 5.15.1 regarding affordable housing density bonusing provisions:

| Zone | Sum Per Buildable Square Foot of Permitted <br> Principal Building |
| :--- | :--- |
| "ZT81 | $\$ 4.00 "$ |

b. Inserting as Section 17.81 thereof the following:

### 17.81 Town Housing (ZT81) - Williams Road

17.81.1 Purpose

The zone provides for town housing and other compatible uses.
17.81.2 Permitted Uses

- child care
- housing, town

Secondary Uses

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


### 17.81.3 Permitted Density

1. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) is 0.40 , together with an additional 0.1 floor area ratio provided that it is entirely used to accommodate amenity space.
2. Notwithstanding Section 17.81.3.1, the reference to " 0.4 " is increased to a higher density of " 0.60 " if the owner, at the time Council adopts a zoning amendment bylaw to include the owner's lot in the ZT81 zone, pays into the affordable housing reserve the sum specified in Section 5.15 of this bylaw.
3. Notwithstanding Section 17.81.3.1, the reference to " 0.4 " is increased to a higher density of " 0.73 ", if the owner, at the time Council adopts a zoning amendment bylaw to include the owner's lot in the ZT81 zone, and provided that prior to the first occupancy of the building the owner:
a) provides in the building not less than 3 affordable housing units and the combined habitable space of the total number of affordable housing units comprises not less than $15 \%$ of total floor area that is habitable space; and
b) enters into a housing agreement with respect to the affordable housing units and registers the housing agreement against the title to the lot.

### 17.81.4 Permitted Lot Coverage

1. The maximum lot coverage is $44 \%$ for buildings.
2. No more than $65 \%$ of the lot may be occupied by buildings, structures and non-porous surfaces.
3. $25 \%$ of the lot area is restricted to landscaping with live plant material.

### 17.81.5 Yards \& Setbacks

1. The minimum front yard is 4.5 m , except for the projection of building columns for a maximum of 0.52 m .
2. The minimum interior side yard is 3.0 m .
3. The minimum rear yard is 6.0 m , except for the projection of the first storey for a maximum of 1.5 m .

### 17.81.6 Permitted Heights

1. The maximum height for buildings is 12.0 m (3 storeys).
2. The maximum height for accessory buildings is 5.0 m .
3. The maximum height for accessory structures is 9.0 m .
17.81.7 Subdivision Provisions/Minimum Lot Size
4. The minimum lot width on minor arterial roads is 40.0 m .
5. The minimum lot depth is 35.0 m .
6. There is no minimum lot area.
17.81.8 Landscaping \& Screening
7. Landscaping and screening shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of Section 6.0.

### 17.81.9 On-Site Parking and Loading

1. On-site vehicle and bicycle parking and loading shall be provided according to the standards set out in Section 7.0.

### 17.81.10 Other Regulations

1. In addition to the regulations listed above, the General Development Regulations of Section 4.0 and the Specific Use Regulations of Section 5.0 apply. "
2. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following areas and by designating them "TOWN HOUSING (ZT81) - WILLIAMS ROAD".
P.I.D. 003-606-333

Lot 8 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 44427, Section 34 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 11454
P.I.D. 004-870-620

Lot 9 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 45409, Section 34 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 11454
P.I.D. 003-798-798

Lot 170 Section 34 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 36305
3. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9667".

FIRST READING
A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON
SECOND READING
THIRD READING


OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

## ADOPTED

## Report to Committee

 Planning and Development Division```
To: Planning Committee
From: Wayne Craig
```

Date: January 10, 2017
File: RZ 16-738480

```
Director, Development
Re: Application by Trellis Seniors Services Ltd. for Rezoning at 23100, 23120 and 23140 Westminster Highway from Single Detached (RS1/F) to Senior's Care Facility (ZR11) - Hamilton Village (Hamilton)
```


## Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9669 to create the "Senior's Care Facility (ZR11) - Hamilton Village (Hamilton)" zone, and to rezone 23100, 23120 and 23140 Westminster Highway from "Single Detached (RS1/F)" to "Senior's Care Facility (ZR11) Hamilton Village (Hamilton)", be introduced and given first reading.


Wayne Craig
Director, Development
WC:mp

|  | REPORT CONCURRENCE |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ROUTED TO: | CONCURRENCE | CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER |
| Parks Services |  |  |
| Engineering |  |  |
| Transportation |  |  |

## Staff Report

## Origin

Trellis Seniors Services Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to create a new site-specific zone and rezone a 0.59 ha . ( 1.46 acre) site at 23100,23120 and 23140 Westminster Highway from "Single Detached (RS1/F)" to "Senior's Care Facility (ZR11) - Hamilton Village (Hamilton)". This application is to facilitate development of a three (3) storey, 135-bed health care facility (Attachment 1). All residents will be provided with meals, supervision and full-time health care services. The facility is to be licenced by Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH) and is receiving funding from VCH to subsidize all units for the accommodation and care for seniors referred to it by VCH and other Provincial programs.

The proposed development site is referred to in this report as Parcel 4, and is located immediately to the north of two (2) in-stream rezoning applications that have been submitted by Oris Developments Ltd. for their Parcel 2 and 3 developments (RZ14-660662 and RZ14-660663) which received Third Reading on September 8, 2015 (see Context Map in Attachment 2). These applications include the Oris mixed-use building on Parcel 2 located on Gilley Road and the adjacent apartment / seniors congregate housing building on Parcel 3 proposed by New Coast Lifestyles (NCL) Management Ltd. The subject Parcel 4 development gains access from the shared "New Road" being built for the Parcel 2 and 3 developments (see Conceptual Development Plans in Attachment 3). The. "New Road" provides public access secured through a statutory right of way (SRW) and will be named at a later date through the City's road naming process with Council approval.

## Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details about the development proposal is attached (Attachment 4).

## Surrounding Development

Development surrounding the subject site is as follows:

- To the North: Single-Family dwellings zoned "Single Detached (RS1/F)".
- To the South: Single-Family lots currently zoned "Single Detached (RS1/F)" which are under application to be rezoned to permit the 130 unit seniors housing building on Parcel 3 (RZ14-660662).
- To the East: Single-Family dwellings zoned "Single Detached (RS1/F)".
- To the West: Former fire hall site (vacant) fronting onto Westminster Highway zoned "School and Institutional (SI)".


## Related Policies \& Studies

## Official Community Plan / Hamilton Area Plan

The Official Community Plan (OCP) designates the subject site as "Residential" and the Hamilton Area Plan designates the site as "Neighbourhood Village Centre (Residential 4 Storey 1.50 FAR)" which provides for apartments and a range of assisted living uses (see Attachment 5). The proposal is consistent with the OCP and Hamilton Area Plan.

## Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA)

The development site includes approximately $1,100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ( 0.27 acre) of ESA which is part of a larger contiguous $5,500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ( 1.35 acre) ESA that extends eastward (see maps in Attachment 6). The applicant's Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) has examined how the site should be managed in the context of the larger ESA. On this basis, the QEP report includes the following conclusions and recommendations in their Stage 1 report as follows:

- The report examines the on-site ESA within the context of the larger contiguous $5,500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ( 1.35 acre) ESA that includes the subject site and adjacent lots to the north and east. The report also reviews the site in the broader context of connections to other natural areas within the City's broader Ecological Network within Hamilton. The proposed ESA enhancement and compensation areas will provide vegetation and habitat corridors to the ESA on future development properties to the north and east. Furthermore, the area along the north boundary of the site will form part of a habitat corridor link running from the Queen Canal greenway in the west to the ESA on the lots to the east.
- In accordance with the OCP ESA Development Permit Guidelines, a QEP report providing a detailed inventory and conservation evaluation that includes maintenance of part of the physical area of the ESA area and compensation for lost ESA area, was prepared.
- The QEP and arborist have found that a majority of the $1,100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ( 0.27 acre) on-site ESA area includes mature forest with most trees being in poor or fair condition along with areas of invasive understory plants such as buttercup and canary grass.
- The report also includes recommendations on retention of three (3) coniferous trees and maintenance of approximately one-quarter of the existing ESA area along the north property boundary supplemented with replanting, the addition forest floor soils and removal of invasive species to create a robust native species forest area.
- The habitat compensation for the area impacted by the development is to be provided at a $1: 1$ physical area basis on the existing $1,100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}(0.27$ acre $)$ area of ESA on the site. The compensation planting is included within the conceptual development landscape plans (Attachments 3 and 6) for the rezoning. The QEP also concludes that the relative ecological value of the replanted and enhanced areas will be greater than the existing ESA.

Should the rezoning application proceed, the applicant and their QEP will prepare a more detailed native planting plan, invasive species removal specifications, and a monitoring and maintenance plan for the ESA.

## Affordable Housing Strategy

The City's Affordable Housing Strategy is not applicable to this application as it allows only for senior's health care facility and not independent senior's residential units. As it is not a residential apartment use, it is exempted from providing affordable housing under the Strategy.

## Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

The proposed redevelopment must meet the requirements of the Richmond Flood Plain Designation and Protection Bylaw 8204 which provides for a 3.5 m flood construction level (FCL). Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on Title is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

## Public Consultation

A rezoning sign has been installed on the subject property. Staff have received several telephone inquiries from the public about the general purpose of the rezoning application in response to the placement of the rezoning sign on the property, but no concerns were expressed.

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

Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the Local Government Act.

## Analysis

## Built Form and Architectural Character

## Site Planning

- The proposed building is located on the centre of the site with three (3) wings radiating northward from the common areas and lobby located on the south side of the building adjacent to the "New Road".
- The building's two (2) north courtyards separate the three (3) wings of the building and will open out onto the proposed natural landscaped Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) compensation area.
- As required in the Hamilton Area Plan, the North-South Greenway is provided on the east side of the site on the building podium. The greenway will connect Gilley Road (to the south) to Willet Avenue (to the north), and is an extension of the greenway sections being secured as part of the Parcel 2 and 3 developments. A 4.0 m ( 13.1 ft .) wide SRW will be registered to secure public pedestrian access, provide for developer construction and future owner maintenance of the landscaping and $2.5 \mathrm{~m}(8.0 \mathrm{ft}$.$) pathway.$
- The main floor elevation of the building will be approximately $2.5 \mathrm{~m}(8.0 \mathrm{ft}$.$) above$ Westminster Highway. There is a 6.0 m ( 20.0 ft .) wide sloping, landscaped area rising up from Westminster Highway to provide an attractive grade transition to the building and fully screen the parkade.
- The proposed interim grade transition to the existing single-family dwellings on the north and east sides of building (designated for stacked townhouse development in the Hamilton

Area Plan) are addressed with temporary landscape walls averaging $2.3 \mathrm{~m}(7.5 \mathrm{ft}$.) and landscaping adjacent to the property lines.

- The "New Road" will rise from Westminster Highway up to the 3.95 m elevation of the building's main floor. The building's large port cochere/driveway canopy will face "New Road", and provide cover for the main pedestrian entrance while providing for easy vehicle drop-off/pick-up of residents.


## Architectural Form and Character

- The three (3) wings of the building fan outwards to the north from its centre block on the building's south side.
- The first two (2) storeys of the building are clad in brown brick to provide a stronger, substantial base.
- The third floor has a lighter appearance with beige cementitious siding with sections of large roof overhangs separating this floor from the lower two (2) floors.
- Adjacent to the intersection of the "New Road" with Westminster Highway, the southwest corner of the building includes a large brick-clad vertical buttress/fin element that rises from grade to above the main roof level. This vertical element, together with a similar vertical element on the adjacent Parcel 3 seniors building provide an attractive shared gateway to both developments.
- The building has a flat roof with sections of a sloping roof rising up to $3.0 \mathrm{~m}(10.0 \mathrm{ft}$.) above the main flat roof; these sloping roof sections are clad in charcoal colour standing metal seam roofing material. These sections of roof provide for further visual interest on the prominent west and will help screen rooftop mechanical equipment.


## Existing Legal Encumbrances

Two (2) legal agreements were registered on the title of the subject Parcel 4 development site as part of the rezoning and development permit applications for the adjacent Parcel 3 development. These agreements facilitate both developments proceeding in a complementary manner and include:

- A statutory right of way over the shared "New Road" which is registered on Parcels 3 and 4 including the southern $7.0 \mathrm{~m}(23.0 \mathrm{ft}$.) of the subject Parcel 4 site and the northern 7.0 m ( 23.0 ft .) of the adjacent Parcel 3 site.
- An easement to allow for construction and maintenance of an interim landscape buffer on the southern 5.0 m ( 16.5 ft .) of the subject Parcel 4 site by the adjacent Parcel 3 developer to provide landscaped screening of the Parcel 3 parkade in the event that the subject Parcel 4 does not proceed before or concurrently with the Parcel 3 development.


## Transportation and Site Access

## Site Access

As noted above, vehicle and pedestrian access will be provided by the "New Road". The building's parkade entrance will be located near Westminster Highway. The subject Parcel 4 building and adjacent Parcel 3 building to the south include complementary large porte cocheres
to provide covered pedestrian entrances for Handy Dart buses and private vehicle drop-off and pick-up of pedestrians.

The Rezoning Considerations for this application include the registration of a reciprocal easement on Parcels 3 and 4 to allow for each developer to access the adjacent parcel to construct a functional "New Road" if the parcels do not develop concurrently. The considerations also include the requirement for a small extension of the existing "New Road" SRW further north onto Parcel 4 to secure public access for the sidewalk. There is a further requirement for a construction turn-around easement to be registered on the adjacent Parcel 3 development which is secured by a Letter of Agreement between the developers of Parcels 3 and 4.

## Parking

The subject development will provide for a total of 59 parking spaces within an enclosed parkade which exceeds the 45 spaces required under Zoning Bylaw 8500. There is also one (1) medium (SU9) loading space that meets the Zoning Bylaw's requirements.

The applicant will register an electric vehicle parking covenant on title requiring that $20 \%$ of resident parking stalls that will be equipped with 120 V electric plug-ins and that an additional $25 \%$ of the resident parking stalls will be pre-ducted to accommodate the future installation of electric vehicle charging equipment.

## LEED Development

As required by the Hamilton Area Plan, developers need to ensure that the project has been designed to achieve a sufficient score to meet the current Canadian Green Building Council LEED Silver rating. This will require review from a LEED certified consultant which confirms that buildings have been designed at Development Permit and constructed at Building Permit to achieve the required LEED certification or equivalent. The applicant has committed to VCH and the City that they will construct a LEED Gold equivalent building.

## Tree Retention and Replacement

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 on tree retention and removal relative to the proposed development. The Report assesses:

- 70 trees located on the development site to be removed and replaced.
- 15 trees located on neighbouring property located on adjacent neighbouring properties are identified to be retained and protected and to be provided tree protection as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.
- 4 (four) trees located on City property (Westminster Highway) which were assessed previously by City Parks and authorized for removal through the adjacent Parcel 3 rezoning application (RZ14-660662).

The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has reviewed the Arborist's Report and has the following comments (Attachment 7):

- Three (3) trees (tag\# 869, 871, 872) located on the development site are proposed to be removed, but are not in conflict with the proposed development and identified in "fair" condition. These trees are proposed to be retained and protected.
- A total of 134 replacement trees are to be specified at $2: 1$ ratio for the remaining 67 trees to be removed as per the OCP to be included within the Development Permit landscape plans.


## Tree Replacement

The applicant wishes to remove 67 on-site trees. The $2: 1$ replacement ratio would require a total of 134 replacement trees. The applicant has agreed to plant 72 trees on the development site.

The applicant will also plant a large number of smaller trees within the ESA compensation area to be determined with the QEP's Stage 2 Report and landscape plan included within the Development Permit for the project. The applicant has agreed to provide a voluntary contribution of $\$ 500$ per replacement tree to the City's tree compensation (e.g. $\$ 31,000$ ) for each of the remaining 62 replacement trees that are not be able to be secured for planting with the landscape plans within the Development Permit.

## Tree Protection

The above-noted three (3) on-site trees and 15 trees on the neighbouring property to the north are to be retained and protected 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.

## Elements to be Addressed in Development Permit

The forthcoming Development Permit application for the subject development needs to address the following elements:

- The detailed Phase 2 ESA report and landscaping plans which include the detailed specifications for the replanting of native plant species in the ESA compensation area with the appropriate detail for the Development Permit.
- Completion of the detailed landscape and on-site civil plans that include refined grading, planting soil profiles and wall details for aesthetic and trees preservation reasons.
- Completion of the architectural plans which include further design detail on the building cladding and materials along with additional elevation and perspective plans.


## Hamilton Area Plan Amenity Contributions

This Hamilton Area Plan requires amenity contributions for residential apartments of $\$ 49.50$ per square meter ( $\$ 4.60$ per square foot) amenity contributions. This rezoning permits a health care facility and not independent senior's residential units. The applicant has further confirmed that they have obtained VCH funding for $100 \%$ of the beds to be provided at below market rates. Thus, it is not subject to providing the Area Plan's amenity contributions which are applicable for residential apartments. In this regard, the applicant has provided written confirmation from the Vancouver Coast Health Authority that the development will be licenced for a senior's care facility under the Community Care and Assisted Living Act.

## Public Art Program

The City's Public Art Program is not applicable to this application as it is to allow for a senior's health care facility and not a residential apartment building that would be subject to the Program.

## Amenity Space

The proposed project will include $1,015 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(10,925 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of common indoor amenity space with dining rooms and lounges on each of the building's three (3) floors. There is a large multipurpose activity room on the third floor with access to a large south-facing sundeck.

There will also be $830 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(8,934 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of common outdoor amenity area located largely in two (2) courtyards located between the three (3) main wings of the building. Main features of these areas will include:

- Large open air and covered seating areas.
- Walking pathways encircling the courtyards.
- Garden planters.
- Water features.
- A gazebo and trellis structures.


## Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

## Westminster Highway Frontage Improvements

The applicant will be undertaking the following works under a Servicing Agreement on the site's road frontage: 3.0 m ( 9.8 ft .) wide concrete sidewalk, 1.75 m ( 5.75 ft .) boulevard with grass and street trees, and installation of street lights with pedestrian arm lights. There will also be pavement widening and line painting on Westminster to provide for a $1.8 \mathrm{~m}(5.9 \mathrm{ft}$.) wide northbound bike lane, left turn lane and landscaped median.

## Servicing Works

The servicing requirements are included within the Rezoning Considerations (Attachment 8) and are outlined below.

For water servicing, the applicant is required to install additional fire hydrants and replace the existing 300 mm diameter watermain along Westminster Highway to the limits of the road works. For storm servicing, the applicant is required to install a new storm service connection complete tie-in to the existing storm sewer along Westminster Highway.

Regarding sanitary sewer servicing, the applicant is required to:

- Receive confirmation from the City of the finalized sanitary servicing layout of the lots to the south (under RZ14-660662 and 14-660663 for Oris Parcels 2 and 3) prior to this rezoning application for Parcel 4 progressing to zoning adoption; or
- To provide alternative sewer servicing by either of the following two (2) alternative options in the event the developments to the south are delayed in construction:
- Install a new permanent sanitary sewer to the City's future pump station located potentially within the VLA Park on Willett Avenue; or
- If the construction of the proposed development proceeds ahead of the pump station, the applicant will be required to obtain an easement through the developments to the south and construct temporary sanitary sewers to the Metro Vancouver pump station on Gilley Road.


## Financial Impact or Economic Impact

There are no financial or economic impacts of note for the proposed project.

## Conclusion

The proposed senior's health care facility on Parcel 4 is the third rezoning application to be considered under the Hamilton Area Plan. The proposed development includes a 135-unit senior's health care facility that complements the adjacent 130 -unit independent living seniors building on Parcel 3 that has been considered by Council and is at $3^{\text {rd }}$ Reading.

This development will involve improvements to Westminster Highway and further contribute to the development of the pedestrian-oriented Hamilton Village Centre as envisioned under the Hamilton Area Plan.

Thus, it is recommended that Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9669 be introduced and given first reading.


Mark McMullen
Senior Coordinator - Major Projects
MM:rg
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## RZ 16-738480

Attachment 4
Address: $\quad 23100,23120$ and 23140 Westminster Highway
Applicant: Trellis Seniors Services Ltd.
Planning Area(s): Hamilton

|  | Existing | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Owner: | Trellis Seniors Services Ltd. | Trellis Seniors Services Ltd. |
| Site Size $\left(\mathbf{m}^{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{)}\right.$ : | $5,885 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $5,885 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Land Uses: | Single Family Residential | Seniors Health Care Facility |
| OCP Designation: | Residential | Residential |
| Area Plan Designation: | Neighbourhood Village Centre <br> (Residential 4 Storey 1.5 FAR) | Neighbourhood Village Centre <br> (Residential 4 Storey 1.5 FAR) |
| Zoning: | Single Detached (RS1/F) | Senior's Care Facility (ZR11) - <br> Hamilton Village (Hamilton) |
| Number of Units: | Three (3) single family dwellings | 135 senior's care units |
| Other Designations: | Environmentally Sensitive Area | Environmentally Sensitive Area |


| On Future Subdivided Lots | Bylaw Requirement | Proposed | Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio: | Max. 1.4 FAR | 1.32 FAR | none permitted |
| Buildable Floor Area ( $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ):* | Max. 8,239 m ${ }^{2}$ ( $88,684 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) | 7,745 m ${ }^{2}$ (83,366 ft ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ ) | none permitted |
| Lot Coverage (\% of lot area): | Building: Max. $50 \%$ | Building: Max. 46.3\% | none |
| Lot Size: | Min. 5,500 m ${ }^{2}$ | 5,885 m² | none |
| Lot Dimensions (m): | Min. Width: 40.0 m Min. Depth: 80.0 m | Width: 58.31 m Depth: 91.49 m | none |
| Setbacks (m): | Front: Min. 6.0 m Rear: Min. 6.0 m North Side: Min. 3.0 m South Side: Min. 10.0 m | Front: Min. 6.0 m Rear: Min. 6.0 m North Side: Min. 3.0 m South Side: Min. 10.0 m | none |
| Height (m): | Max. 17.0 m | 16.8 m | none |
| Off-street Parking Spaces - Total: | Min. 45 | 59 | none |
| Tandem Parking Spaces: | Permitted - Maximum of 50\% of required spaces | None | none |
| Amenity Space - Indoor: | Min. $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 1,015 m ${ }^{2}$ | none |
| Amenity Space - Outdoor: | Min. $810 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $830 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | none |

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

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


## Hamilton Area Plan

## Land Use Map
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## Trellis Seniors Services

## Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9669, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. Provincial Ministry of Transportation \& Infrastructure Approval.
2. Consolidation of all the three (3) lots into one development parcel (which will require the demolition of the existing dwellings).
3. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of $\$ 30,000$ to be held for a term of three (3) years for the three (3) trees that are to be retained (labelled with tag nos. 869, 871,872 in the revised Arborist Report from Vander Zalm \& Associates dated December 15, 2016).
4. Submission of a landscape plan for the Development Permit that includes 134 replacement trees based on a ratio of at least $2: 1$ to compensate for the 67 on-site trees to be removed. The applicant has confirmed that 72 replacement trees will be planted on the development site which leaves a shortfall of 62 trees. The required replacement trees are to be of the following minimum sizes, based on the size of the trees being removed as per Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057. The applicant will also plant a large number of smaller trees within the ESA compensation area to be determined with the Stage 2 ESA Report preferred by the QEP as required for the Development Permit for the project.
5. Provision of a voluntary contribution of $\$ 500$ per replacement tree to the City's tree compensation fund for the 62 replacement tree shortfall not included within the Development Permit (a total contribution of $\$ 31,000$ based on 62 trees).
6. Registration of a flood plain covenant on title identifying a minimum habitable elevation of 3.5 m GSC.
7. Extending North-South Greenway / Strollway: Registration of a cross-access easement, statutory right-of-way (SRW), and/or other legal agreements or measures, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development for a greenway/strollway over the most easterly 4.0 m of the site as shown on Attachment 4, that provides for a 2.5 m wide hard surface pathway, landscaping, way-finding signage, pedestrian lighting and retaining walls under an approved Development Permit, with the owner/developer being responsible for liability, construction and maintenance of these works, and provision for the City and/or its agents (adjacent property owner/developer) for removal the existing landscaping and retaining wall and completion of landscaping and extension the east-west "New Road" walkway over the easternmost 1.5 m of the SRW to complete works under a future Development Permit issued for the adjacent development to the east.
8. Extending "New Road" Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW): Registration amendment for Statutory Right-of-Way (shown on SRW Plan EPP 55269) to extend this existing SRW for public vehicle and pedestrian access over the additional area shown on Attachment 2, and a text amendment to allow for encroachment of a driveway canopy structure (port cochere) into the SRW on the subject Lot 4 development as permitted under an approved Development Permit.
9. Temporary Construction Access Turn-Around Easement: Registration of an easement and/or registration of other legal agreements in favour of the proposed Lot 4 over Lot 3, Block 5, North Range 4, Plan EPP55255, NWD as shown on Attachment 2 to allow for interim construction vehicle access and provide for developer construction of the road and supporting structure as necessary for development of both lots under approved Development Permits, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development; with the easement to be discharged once construction of ultimate "New Road" is completed for developments on both lots.
10. Interim Construction Easement for "New Road": Registration of a reciprocal easement and/or registration of other legal agreements in favour of the proposed Lot 4 and Lot 3, Block 5, North Range 4, Plan EPP55255, NWD over statutory right-of-way Plan EPP 55269 to allow for interim construction access, and construction of the road, sidewalk and supporting structure necessary to provide for permanent vehicle and pedestrian access to developments under approved Development Permits on both lots as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development.
11. Further to the Letter of Agreement in Attachment 5, the developer is required to provide a letter/report and diagram from their structural and geotechnical engineers describing how the portion of the parkade of Lot 3 can be constructed in the interim to support the temporary turnaround and part of New Road A required to provide access to the proposed Lot 4 development in the event that the Lot 3 development does not proceed simultaneously or prior to the proposed Lot 4 development.
12. Submission of a letter from a LEED certified consultant as a requirement of issuance of the development permit and building permit confirming that the development has been designed to achieve a sufficient score to meet the current Canadian Green Building Council LEED Gold score criteria. The submission of follow-up letter from a LEED certified consultant that confirms that buildings have been constructed to achieve LEED Gold certification or equivalent is required. Consideration should be given to building design with higher energy efficiency ratings than required by the BC Building Code and utilizing geo-exchange energy systems.
13. Registration of an electric vehicle parking covenant on title requiring that $20 \%$ of resident parking stalls that will be equipped with 120 V electric plug-ins and that an additional $25 \%$ of the resident parking stalls will be pre-ducted for future wiring to accommodate the future installation of electric vehicle charging equipment.
14. Ensure to the satisfaction of the City that the Construction, Phasing and Interim Design Measures in Appendix 1 of the Hamilton Area Plan (Schedule 2.14, Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000) are addressed, as applicable, in the Development Permit and Servicing Agreement.
15. The submission and processing of a Development Permit* that addresses the Area Plan and OCP Multiple Family Guidelines and the Environmentally Sensitive Area Guidelines, completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.
16. The developer is to be provide confirmation from the Vancouver Coast Health Authority that the development will be licenced under the Community Care and Assisted Living Act, or the City may accept the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute $\$ 49.50$ per buildable square meter or $\$ 4.60$ per buildable square foot (e.g. $\$ 383,484.00$ ) to the City's Hamilton Area Plan Amenity Reserve Fund (with the exact amount to be confirmed on the floor area within the Development Permit plans).
17. Enter into a Servicing Agreement* for the design and construction of works described in Attachment 3 - Servicing Works.

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

1. Incorporate the "Basic Universal Housing" provisions of Zoning 8500 for all units within the building.
2. Provide a dimensioned plan showing the following:

- Garbage collection (front end bin); cardboard collection (front end bin); food scraps collection using carts; medical waste collection; paper collection (cart); mixed containers collection (cart); glass container collection (cart); refundable bottles/cans collection (cart); and grease collection container.
- Wash basin with faucet and hose plus floor drainage in the garbage and recycling area.
- Illustrate or demonstrate how the garbage and recycling trucks will be servicing the bins and carts.

3. Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA): The developer is required to address the vegetation and habitat loss within the on-site ESA with compensation area in excess of $1: 1$ as provided in the Stage 1 Report dated December, 2016 from Pottinger Gaherty, Environmental Consultants Ltd. (QEP Report); the detailed planting and monitoring plans are to be included within the Stage 2 QEP Report prepared for the Development Permit for this project to the satisfaction of the Director of Development.
4. Landscape Plan: The developer is to provide additional detailed finished landscape plan that re-creates natural sloping grades as much as possible, reduces impacts on the preserved trees and prevents potential runoff onto adjacent properties.

## 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 SPLiN $\mathbf{0 1 5 7 2}$
2. Incorporation of the "Basic Universal Housing" provisions of Zoning 8500 for all units as provided in the Development Permit.
3. Submission of a Dewatering Plan to the satisfaction the Manager, Engineering Planning and Manager, Sustainability.
4. Obtain a Building Permit (BP) for any construction hoarding. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a public street, the air space above a public street, or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For additional information, contact the Building Approvals Division at 604-276-4285.
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 agreenents 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 Developinent. All agreements shall be in a form and content satisfactory to the Director of Development.

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


## Signed

## Date

Attachment 1 - Functional Road \& Plan of Proposed Lot 4

$\qquad$

## Attachment 2 - New SRW and Easement Areas


$\qquad$

## Attachment 3 - Servicing Works

The following works must be included with the Servicing Agreement:

## 1. Engineering Works

Drainage and water servicing shall generally follow the concepts and layouts proposed in the Hamilton Area Servicing Study (HASS) prepared for the City by KWL, dated Oct 29, 2014. Increased storm sewer diameters and other amendments to the HASS may be required to meet the City's minimum standards and meet existing conditions. All works and agreements will be to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering.

## - Water Works:

a. The Developer is required to:

- Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm the development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage and Building designs.
- Install additional fire hydrants as required along the developments frontages to achieve the City's standard spacing requirements.
- Replace the existing 300 mm diameter AC watermain along Westminster Hwy to the limits of the proposed road works, complete with tie-in to the watermain to the north and south.
- Install a new water service connection for each new lot complete with tie-in to the newly constructed watermain along Westminster Hwy.
- Cut and cap at main, all existing water service connections.
b. At the Developer's cost, the City will:
- Complete all tie-ins for proposed works to existing City infrastructure.


## - Storm Sewer Works:

a. The Developer is required to:

- Provide erosion and sediment control plans for all on-site and off-site works.
- Install a new storm service connection complete with inspection chamber for each lot, tie-in to existing 750 mm storm sewer along Westminster Hwy.
- Cut, cap and remove all existing storm service connections and inspections chambers.
- At the Developer's cost, the City will:
- Complete all tie-ins for proposed works to existing City infrastructure.


## - Sanitary Sewer Works:

- The Developer is required to receive confirmation from the City of the finalized sanitary servicing layout of the lots to the south (under the Servicing Agreement and Building Permit for the buildings associated with RZ14-660662 \& 14-660663 for Oris Parcels 2 and 3) prior to rezoning application for Parcel 4 progressing to zoning adoption. As all sanitary sewage is to be directed to the onsite sewer to the south, the architectural plans submitted for the Development Permit shall take into consideration the onsite sanitary servicing strategy for this site.
- If such City confirmation regarding on-site sanitary sewer servicing is not received, the Developer will be required to complete one of the following alternatives prior to the zoning bylaw amendment being adopted:
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- The Developer is required to install a new permanent sanitary sewer from the south property line on Westminster Highway to the future pump station located potentially within the park space on Willett Avenue. The developer shall inform the City on the timing of the projected occupancy for the proposed development and they shall coordinate the design and construction of the required permanent sanitary sewer with the future Willett sanitary pump station. The permanent sanitary sewer shall be sized using a sanitary catchment analysis based on OCP densities at the servicing agreement stage.
- If, through unforeseen circumstances, the construction of the new sanitary pump station is delayed and the proposed development proceeds ahead of the pump station, the Developer shall obtain an easement through the development to the south (RZ14-660662 and RZ14-660663) and construct temporary sanitary sewers to the Metro Vancouver pump station on Gilley Road; this will require the raising of Gilley Road by approximately 1.0 m , as well as raising of existing aboveground and at-grade structures and utilities, including but not limited to streetlights, catch basins, fire hydrants, new concrete curb \& gutter, new concrete sidewalk, etc. The Developer is responsible for confirming, prior to entering into any legal easement agreement with the owner/developer of RZ 14-660662 and RZ14-660663, who shall pay for the removal of the temporary sanitary works as well as the diversion of the sanitary flows from RZ16-738480 while RZ14-660662 and RZ14-660663 are under construction.
- In the event that the City confirms the on-site sewer servicing to the south, but the developments to the south (RZ14-660662 \& RZ14-660663) are delayed in construction or do not proceed as originally intended, the Developer will need to design and undertake works to complete one of the above sanitary servicing options.


## - General Items:

a. The Developer is required to:

- The City is aware of ongoing hydrocarbon contamination issues originating from a gas station located at 22490 Westminster Highway. At the developer's cost, the developer is required to manage any hydrocarbon contamination encountered during construction of the servicing agreement works in compliance with the Environmental Management Act.
- Locate all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks required to service the proposed development within the development site (see list below for examples). A functional plan showing conceptual locations for such infrastructure shall be included in the development design review process. Coordination is required with the respective private utility companies and the project's lighting and traffic signal consultants to confirm the requirements 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 SRWs that shall be shown in the functional plan and registered prior to SA design approval:

1. BC Hydro PMT -4 mW X 5 m (deep)
2. BC Hydro LPT $-3.5 \mathrm{~mW} \times 3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ (deep)
3. Street light kiosk -1.5 mW X 1.5 m (deep)
4. Traffic signal kiosk -1 mW X 1 m (deep)
5. Traffic signal UPS -2 mW X 1.5 m (deep)
6. Shaw cable kiosk-1mW X 1 m (deep) - show possible location in functional plan
7. Telus FDH cabinet -1.1 mW X 1 m (deep) - show possible location in functional plan

- Assess streetlight levels along Westminster Highway and areas of public rights-of-passage and install/upgrade lighting as required to meet City standards.
- Assess the potential differential settlement between the proposed piled buildings and the surrounding un-piled areas and design City utilities and service connections to accommodate this movement, to the City's satisfaction.
- Provide, prior to first SA design submission, a geotechnical assessment of preload and soil preparation impacts on the existing utilities fronting or within the development site and proposed utility/road installations and provide mitigation recommendations. The mitigation recommendations (if required) shall be incorporated into the first SA design submission or if necessary prior to pre-load.
- 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.
- Provide frontage improvements as per Transportation's requirements.


## 2. Transportation Works

1. Developer responsible for the design and construction of the following frontage works:

Westminster Highway (from the property line to north):

- 3.0 m wide concrete sidewalk.
- 1.75 m boulevard with grass and street trees to the satisfaction of City Parks.
- Within the same boulevard, street lights (City Pole Type 7) with 3000K LED lights with pedestrian arm lights with sufficient spacing to provide sufficient street lighting for full width of Westminster Hwy to the satisfaction of City Engineering.
- New 0.15 m wide curb and gutter.
- Pavement widening and line painting to provide for a 1.8 m wide northbound bike lane, 0.7 m wide painted buffer, 3.5 m wide northbound travel lane, 3.5 m wide southbound left turn lane, landscaped median and maintain existing southbound travel lane and shoulder.
- Outside the development frontage, interim pavement, markings and extruded concrete curb as shown on Attachment 1.
These works are to be included within the Servicing Agreement to be reviewed and approved by the City, secured with a Letter of Credit and built by the developer.

2. The required On-Site Works as shown on Attachment 1 include, but are not limited to:

- New Road A with a road width of 11.1 m .
- Adjacent 2.0 m wide concrete sidewalk and Proposed Entry as shown on Attachment 1

These works are to be included within the Servicing Agreement to be reviewed and approved by the City with respect to construction standards and to be built by the developer.

## Attachment 4 - Plan Showing North-South Greenway


$\qquad$

## Attachment 5 - Letter Agreement on Construction Interim New Road A

December 16, 2016
City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Rd
Richmond, BC
RE: Letter of Agreement between Oris Developments (Hamilton) Corp., 23100 Hamilton Holdings
Corp. and Hamilton Village Care Centre Holdings Ltd.
Dear Sir/Madam,
Dris Development (Hamilton) Corn., 23100 Hamilton Holdings Corp., and Hamilton Village Care Centre Holdings Ltd,, jointly agree to register a reciprocal easement over the "New Road A" SRW (as shown as Sketch A below) on Parcel 3 (Lot 3) and Parcel $4 / 5$ (Rem Lot 140).

In the event that the sale of Parcel 3 is completed between Oris Development (Hamiton) Corp. to 23100 Hamilton Holdings Corp, prior to the easement agreement being completed, the agreement will be between 23100 Hamilton Holdings Corp. and Hamilton Village Care Centre Holdings Ltd.

In the event the developments on Parcel 3 and Parcel $4 / 5$ are not developed at the same time, the City of Richmond requires an acceptable interim road and pedestrian access solution within the respective Parcels' boundaries including the portion of the development Parcels which will become the Road $A$ SRW (under EPP55269).

To clarify, each of Parcel 3 and Parcel $4 / 5$ has separately provided to the City of Richmond an interim solution for their respective developments which includes a functional road and pedestrian access within the Parcels' boundaries. The Parcel $4 / 5$ interim solution also will require a temporary easement over the north east comer of Parcel 3 to provide for the turning of service vehicles and each of Oris Development (Hamilton) Corp, and 23100 Hamilton Holdings Corp., as the case may be, agree to provide such additional easement if so required.


Dana Westermark
Oris Developments (Hamilton) Corp.


$\qquad$

Sketch A
(SRW for Future "Road A" under EPP55269)
(1)
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# Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9669 (RZ16-738480) 23100, 23120 and 23140 Westminster Highway 

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

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 is amended by inserting the following into Section 21 (Site Specific Residential (Other) Zones), in numerical order as follows:
"21.11 Senior's Care Facility (ZR11) - Hamilton Village (Hamilton)

### 21.11.1 PURPOSE

This zone provides for a senior's care facility with a maximum floor area ratio of 1.40 .
21.11.2 PERMITTED USES

- community care facility, major


### 21.11.3 SECONDARY USES

- health service, minor


### 21.11.4 PERMITTED DENSITY

1. The maximum floor area ratio is 0.40 for a residential apartment development.
2. Notwithstanding Section 21.11.4.1, the reference to " 0.40 " is increased to a higher density of " 1.40 " if, at the time Council adopts a zoning amendment bylaw to include the owner's lot in the ZR11 zone, the owner has provided confirmation from the Vancouver Coast Health Authority that the development will be licenced under the Community Care and Assisted Living Act, or the owner has paid $\$ 49.50$ per square meter of the total residential floor area into the Hamilton Area Plan community amenity capital reserve.

### 21.11.5 MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE

1. The maximum lot coverage for buildings is $50 \%$.

### 21.11.6 Yards \& Setbacks

1. The minimum setbacks are:
a) 6.0 m for the front yard;
b) $\quad 6.0 \mathrm{~m}$ for the rear yard;
c) $\quad 3.0 \mathrm{~m}$ for the north interior side yard;
d) $\quad 10.0 \mathrm{~m}$ to the building face for the south interior side yard; and
e) $\quad 0.30 \mathrm{~m}$ for a vehicular driveway canopy for the south interior side yard.
2. Common pedestrian entrance canopies, staircases, eaves, sunscreens and unenclosed balconies may project into any setback to a maximum distance of 2.3 m .
3. Notwithstanding the above setbacks, an enclosed parking structure may project into the setbacks provided that the structure either is not visible from the exterior of the building, or is landscaped or screened by a combination of trees, shrubs, ornamental plants or lawn as specified by a Development Permit approved by the City, and is no closer than 6.0 m from Westminster Highway.

### 21.11.7 MAXIMUM HEIGHTS

1. The maximum height for principal buildings is 17.0 m (not to exceed (3) storeys).
2. The maximum height for accessory buildings and accessory structures is 6.0 m .

### 21.11.8 SUBDIVISION PROVISIONS/MINIMUM LOT SIZE

1. The minimum lot width is 40.0 m and minimum lot depth is 80.0 m .
2. The minimum lot area is $5,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.

### 21.11.9 LANDSCAPING AND SCREENING

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

### 21.11.10

ON-SITE PARKING AND LOADING

1. On-site vehicle and bicycle parking and loading shall be provided according to the standards set out in Section 7.0.

### 21.11.11 OTHER REGULATIONS

1. In addition to the regulations listed above, the General Development Regulations in Section 4.0 and the Specific Use Regulations in Section 5.0 apply."
2. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following area and by designating it "Senior's Care Facility (ZR11) - Hamilton Village (Hamilton)":

That area outlined in bold on "Schedule A attached to and forming part of Bylaw No. 9669 "
2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9669".

| FIRST READING | RITCYOF |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }_{8}^{\text {APPROVED }}$ |
| A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON |  |
| SECOND READING | $\begin{aligned} & \text { APPROVED } \\ & \text { by Director } \\ & \text { or Solicitor } \end{aligned}$ |
| THIRD READING | al |

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED
MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE APPROVAL
ADOPTED
"Schedule A attached to and forming part of Bylaw No. 9669 "


City of
Richmond


## Report to Committee

| To: | Planning Committee | Date: January 10, 2017 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | Wayne Craig | File: | $08-4057-10 / 2016-$ Vol |
|  | Director, Development |  | 01 |
|  | Terry Crowe |  |  |
| Re: | Referral Response: Regulating the Size of Large Houses in the Agricultural <br>  <br>  |  |  |

## Staff Recommendation

1. That the staff report titled, "Referral Response: Regulating the Size of Large Houses in the Agricultural Land Reserve", dated January 10, 2017, from the Director of Development and the Manager of Policy Planning, be received for information; and
2. That staff be directed to conduct public consultations regarding the bylaw options presented in this report ("Referral Response: Regulating the Size of Large Houses in the Agricultural Land Reserve") regarding house size, farm home plate and setbacks, including residential accessory buildings.


Director, Development
(604-247-4625)


Manager, Policy Planning
(604-276-4139)

Att. 5

| REPORT CONCURRENCE |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ROUTED TO: | CONCURRENCE |  |
| Building Approvals | CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER |  |
| REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT I <br> AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE |  |  |

## Staff Report

## Origin

This report is in response to a referral from the November 22, 2016 Planning Committee Meeting, which requested staff:

To examine and prepare a report on limiting the size of homes in agricultural areas based on:
(1) The BC Ministry of Agriculture's report "Bylaw Standard for Residential Uses in the Agricultural Land Reserve" (currently entitled "Guide for Bylaw Development in Farming Areas, " 2015); and
(2) The Corporation of Delta's Zoning Bylaw, Part V, A1 Zone Agriculture; and
report back by the end of January 2017.
This report supports Council's 2014-2018 Term Goal \#3 A Well-Planned Community:
Adhere to effective planning and growth management practices to maintain and enhance the livability, sustainability and desirability of our City and its neighbourhoods, and to ensure the results match the intentions of our policies and bylaws.

## Findings of Fact

Since 1994, Richmond has been progressive in managing dwelling units in the provincial Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) when it established a $50 \mathrm{~m}(164 \mathrm{ft})$ maximum setback for dwelling units in its Agriculture (AG1) zone. This City Zoning Bylaw requirement has been effective in ensuring that dwelling units do not encroach onto viable agricultural land beyond this setback. Since Richmond established this $50 \mathrm{~m}(164 \mathrm{ft})$ setback, it has been used by the BC Ministry of Agriculture (Ministry) in their "Guide for Bylaw Development in Farming Areas", and is incorporated in the Corporation of Delta's Zoning Bylaw for the Agriculture (A1) zone.

In 2009, the City of Richmond began re-evaluating the issue of house size and footprint in agricultural areas. During the City's Zoning Bylaw review in 2009-2010, the City's Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) reviewed the issue with no consensus to pursue regulating agricultural house size limits and it was determined that accessory structures should not be included within the 50 m maximum setback. Further, the farming community and others expressed that no further house size limitations should be imposed in agricultural areas.

During this time, the BC Ministry of Agriculture \& Lands had a number of discussions and workshops with municipal officials about the Provincial trend towards larger homes in the ALR. A number of other municipalities such as Mission, Surrey, and Pitt Meadows attempted to introduce bylaws that would limit the size of homes on agricultural land, but were met with significant opposition. As the issue of limiting house sizes is difficult to implement at the local level, and the trend for larger homes is commonplace across the Province, on several occasions, Council lobbied the Province to establish ALR house size maximum regulations as the issue has

Provincial implications, and the establishment of consistent regulation is within the Ministry's mandate of preserving agricultural lands for agricultural production.

In 2011, the Ministry of Agriculture released a discussion paper entitled "Regulating the Siting and Size of Residential Uses in the ALR" and requested feedback from local governments. Richmond City Council and staff provided feedback and requested that the Province establish regulations in the Agricultural Land Commission Act rather than establish guidelines as guidelines are unenforceable and may be inconsistently applied.

In 2013, despite this request, the Ministry released a set of Guidelines entitled "Guide for Bylaw Development in Farming Areas". The Guide provided guidelines for municipalities to consider amending their zoning bylaws to manage farm areas in the ALR, including maximum dwelling unit setbacks from the road, farm home plate size, and house size. In 2015, the Guide was updated to include changes to the appendix and setbacks for farm buildings.

In July 2016, with no Ministry ALR house size and farm home plate regulations, the issue of managing houses in the ALR in Richmond was brought to the attention of Planning Committee when Building Approvals staff advised that they had cancelled a Building Permit application for a house in the ALR, which proposed a floor area of $3,809 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(41,000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ and 21 bedrooms. The Building Permit cancellation prompted Council to send letters to both the ALC and the Ministry, to again request the Ministry to establish provincial regulations to control the maximum house size and location of houses in the ALR. Throughout the Province, the Ministry is responsible for establishing ALR regulations and the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) is responsible for enforcing them. The Ministry responded by indicating that they would not establish ALR house size regulations. The ALC indicated that they would only assist municipalities in interpreting the Guidelines. Staff's assessment is that the Provincial government and agencies are highly unlikely to move ahead with the necessary province-wide regulations at this time.

On November 22, 2016, Planning Committee requested staff to examine the issue further and prepare a report on options to limit the size of homes in agricultural areas based on the Ministry's Guidelines and the Corporation of Delta's Agriculture (A1) zone.

On December 1, 2016, at the City's request, City staff met with ALC and Ministry senior staff to again request them to establish province-wide regulations, to manage house size and location in the provincial ALR as:
a) Limiting ALR large house size is not unique to Richmond, the trend is increasing and will not go away, and many municipalities are facing the same problem in the Province;
b) The Province has an ongoing and long term responsibility to protect and enhance agricultural viability in the ALR, and by establishing such consistent regulations, not Guidelines, would greatly assist in achieving these objectives;
c) Varied local government regulations would not promote consistency across the Province; and
d) Uniform provincial regulations would discourage ALR land speculation and speculators from leapfrogging their large house size proposals to municipalities, which, either do not limit house size and location in the ALR, or allow larger houses with fewer restrictions.

Despite these reasons that this issue be addressed by the Province by establishing province-wide regulations, which could be consistently applied and enforced across the ALR, both the ALC and Ministry senior staff indicated that the Ministry Guidelines are sufficient and they are unwilling to establish province-wide regulations at this time.

## Analysis

## House Size Trends in the ALR

In 2010, the average total floor area of houses in the ALR within Richmond was $681 \mathrm{~m}^{2}(7,329$ $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) and by 2015 , it increased to $1,123 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(12,087 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$. The trend is for increasingly large house construction in the ALR.

Without Provincial regulations to uniformly control the ALR maximum house size and location, house size trends in the ALR may increase.

## Summary of the Ministry's Guidelines, Delta's Regulations and Richmond's Regulations

Attachment 1 provides a summary of house size regulations from the Ministry of Agriculture's guidelines, the Corporation of Delta's A1 zone, and the City of Richmond's AG1 zone. The residential uses described below include: (1) the principal dwelling unit, (2) additional dwelling units (for full-time farm workers), and (3) seasonal farm labour accommodation, as well as their accessory buildings (e.g., garage, shed) and accessory structures (e.g., swimming pools, tennis courts). As non-residential and farm-related buildings (e.g., barns, greenhouses) are beyond the scope of this report; the regulations remain the same in the attached draft bylaws.

## 1. Ministry of Agriculture Guidelines

The Ministry of Agriculture's "Guide for Bylaw Development in Farming Areas" (2015) outlines three options for addressing the impacts of residential development on ALR land. These are:

1. restricting the size of dwelling units on a farm;
2. regulating the siting of residential uses; and
3. restricting the size of the farm home plate.

The three can work together to minimize residential development on agricultural lands and increase farm viability.

Maximum Farm Home Plate: The Guide defines the term 'farm home plate' as that portion of a lot that consists of a principal dwelling unit, any additional dwelling units, any residential accessory buildings (e.g., garage, shed) or accessory structures (e.g., artificial ponds, tennis courts, swimming pools). The farm home plate also includes driveways and landscaping.

The Guide suggests that the maximum size of the farm home plate should be $2,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(21,528 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for the principal dwelling unit, plus $1,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(10,764 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each additional dwelling unit where permitted, plus another $35 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(376.7 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation where permitted. All residential accessory buildings and accessory structures, including seasonal farm labour accommodation must be located on a farm home plate and cannot be split into multiple farm home plates. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate how a farm home plate works. For a corner lot, the location of the farm home plate would be determined by the location of the permitted road access.

Maximum Setbacks (Siting): The Guide suggests that residential building setbacks should be as close as possible to the road. On lots that are $33 \mathrm{~m}(108 \mathrm{ft})$ or wider, the maximum depth of the farm home plate is suggested to be $60 \mathrm{~m}(197 \mathrm{ft})$ as depicted in Figure 1. On lots that are narrower than 33 m ( 108 ft ), the Guide suggests that the maximum depth of a farm home plate may exceed $60 \mathrm{~m}(197 \mathrm{ft})$, up to the maximum farm home plate area as illustrated in Figure 2. The Guide suggests that all dwelling units must remain within the $50 \mathrm{~m}(164 \mathrm{ft})$ maximum setback regardless of lot width, which is consistent with Richmond's current zoning regulations.

Figure 1: Ministry of Agriculture's Farm Home Plate on a lot 33 m or wider

ROAD


Figure 2: Ministry of Agriculture’s Farm Home Plate on a lot narrower than 33 m ROAD


Note: Farm Home Plate concept illustrated in green. Overall farm home plate to not exceed $2000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ regardless of lot width.

Maximum Floor Area: The Guide suggests that the maximum floor area for a dwelling unit be the lesser of a floor area commensurate with urban areas or $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(5,382 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for a principal dwelling unit, up to $300 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,229 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each additional dwelling unit where permitted, and up to $15 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(161.5 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation where permitted as shown in Table 1. For a floor area to be commensurate with urban areas, the Guide suggests using the density calculations commonly found in urban residential zones. For Richmond, this would be the RS1 zone. If the floor area ratio from the RS1 zone were used, a property in the

ALR would require a lot size of $1,279.6 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(13,767 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ in order to achieve the suggested maximum principal residential floor area of $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(5,382 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$.

Table 1: Ministry of Agriculture's Maximum Floor Area Guidelines

| Type of Dwelling |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Principal Dwelling Unit (one per lot) | Lesser of floor area: <br> commensurate with urban areas or <br> a maximum of $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(5,382 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| Additional Dwelling Unit <br> (for full time workers on the farm where <br> permitted by the local government) | $300 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,229 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ <br> $($ Guidelines do not specify the maximum number of <br> additional dwelling units; this would be up to the <br> local government $)$ |
| Seasonal Farm Labour Accommodation <br> (one building is permitted when the farmer has <br> justified to the local government that seasonal <br> workers are needed) | $15 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(161.5 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each occupant up to a <br> maximum building size of $400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(4,305 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| Residential Accessory Buildings (e.g., garage, <br> shed, covered pool) | Not regulated for size |

## 2. Corporation of Delta's A1 Zone

The Corporation of Delta updated their Agriculture (A1) zone in 2007, prior to the publication of the Ministry's Guidelines noted above. The regulations in the Delta Zoning Bylaw use the recommended three approaches to limiting house sizes.

Maximum Farm Home Plate: The term farm home plate in Delta's bylaw is very similar to the Ministry's definition of farm home plate, but indicates that the septic tank for a dwelling unit is included in the farm home plate. The maximum farm home plate area is $3,600 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(38,750 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for the principal dwelling unit. As Delta allows one additional dwelling unit for a full-time farm worker regardless of the size of the lot, the maximum farm home plate area for two dwelling units is $5,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(53,819.5 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$. An additional farm home plate of up to $1,400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(15,069 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ is permitted for a seasonal farm labour accommodation where permitted. This would allow an absolute maximum farm home plate of $6,400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(68,889 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$.

Maximum Setbacks (Siting): Delta's A1 zone has a maximum buildable setback of $50 \mathrm{~m}(164 \mathrm{ft})$ for all dwelling units from the road. A maximum farm home plate depth of $60 \mathrm{~m}(197 \mathrm{ft})$ is permitted for all accessory structures and buildings to allow for a $10 \mathrm{~m}(32.8 \mathrm{ft})$ backyard as shown in Figure 3. A maximum farm home plate depth of $100 \mathrm{~m}(326 \mathrm{ft})$ is allowed if the farm home plate is located on the same parcel as a contiguous seasonal farm labour accommodation.

Figure 3: Corporation of Delta's Farm Home Plate and Floor Area on a lot less than 8 ha


Note: A maximum floor area of $465 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(5,005 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ is allowed for a single family dwelling on lots 8 ha (20 acres) or greater

Maximum Floor Area: The following maximum residential floor areas outlined in Table 2 are allowed in Delta's A1 zone.

Table 2: Corporation of Delta's Maximum Floor Area Regulations

| Type of Dwelling | Lots <8 ha (20 acres) in area | Lots 8 ha or greater in area |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Single Family Dwelling (one per lot) | $330 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,552 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $465 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(5,005 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| Additional Single Family Dwelling <br> (for full time workers on the farm where <br> permitted; no more than one is <br> permitted per lot) | $180 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,937.5 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $233 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,508 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |
| Seasonal Farm Labour <br> Accommodation (one building <br> permitted where approved) | $10 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(107.6 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ regardless of lot size for each occupant <br> up to a maximum of $420 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for 42 workers |  |
| Residential Accessory Buildings | Not regulated for size |  |

## 3. City of Richmond's AG1 Zone

Maximum Setbacks (Siting): Implemented prior to the Ministry's Guidelines, a maximum buildable setback of $50 \mathrm{~m}(164 \mathrm{ft})$ from the road is permitted for a dwelling unit as illustrated in Figure 4. The distance between the dwelling unit and any residential accessory building or accessory structure must be between $1.2 \mathrm{~m}-50 \mathrm{~m}(4 \mathrm{ft}-164 \mathrm{ft})$, which may extend the depth of residential development to more than $100 \mathrm{~m}(328 \mathrm{~m})$. Additional seasonal farm labour accommodation must be within the $50 \mathrm{~m}(164 \mathrm{ft})$ buildable setback from the road.

Maximum Floor Area: The City imposes a maximum floor area ratio in the AG1 zone of 0.6 for both residential and farm buildings ( 0.75 floor area ratio if this includes greenhouses provided that 0.7 is used for greenhouses) for the entire farm parcel as shown in Table 3. The maximum house size would increase with the lot area. With respect to seasonal farm labour accommodation, a minimum floor area for each occupant is $10 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(107.6 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ up to a maximum building size of $400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(4,305.5 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ where permitted.

Figure 4: City of Richmond's Buildable Setback on Farm Parcel ROAD


Table 3: City of Richmond's maximum floor area

| Type of Dwelling | Maximum Floor Area |
| :--- | :--- |
| All principal and accessory residential and farm <br> buildings on the parcel | 0.60 FAR |
| All residential and farm buildings on the parcel <br> (with greenhouses) | 0.75 FAR, of which at least 0.70 FAR must be used <br> for greenhouses |
| Seasonal Farm Labour Accommodation | Minimum floor area for each occupant is $10 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ <br> $\left(107.6 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ up to a maximum building size of $400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ <br> $\left(4,305.5 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ where permitted |

Additional Dwelling Units: Richmond's AG1 zone allows for additional dwelling units for fulltime farm workers for a farm operation provided that the need is justified by a professional agrologist. One additional dwelling unit may be considered on a lot between 8 ha -25 ha ( 20 acres -61.7 acres), two additional dwelling units may be considered on a lot between 25 ha 30 ha ( 61.7 acres -74 acres) and three additional dwelling units may be considered on a lot over 30 ha ( 74 acres).

Seasonal Farm Labour Accommodation: Seasonal farm labour accommodation is only permitted in Richmond's AG3 zone within the ALR. The property must be designated as Agriculture in the Official Community Plan (OCP), and classified as farm under the BC Assessment Act. Only one seasonal farm labour accommodation is permitted per farm operation which must be located on the same lot as an existing dwelling unit. The property must have a minimum farm operation size of 8.09 ha ( 20 acres), the building used for seasonal farm labour accommodation cannot exceed $400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(4,305.5 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$, and a maximum of 40 occupants is permitted. To date, there are no properties zoned as AG3.

## 4. Options and Draft Bylaws

To address the referral, staff have prepared four draft bylaw options for consideration, as follows:

- Option 1 - Bylaw 9665 (Attachment 2) is based on the Ministry of Agriculture Guidelines to control house size, farm home plate and setbacks and would:
i. maintain a maximum buildable setback for a dwelling unit at $50 \mathrm{~m}(164 \mathrm{ft})$;
ii. establish a maximum buildable setback for all residential accessory buildings and structures for lots $33 \mathrm{~m}(108 \mathrm{ft})$ or wider at $60 \mathrm{~m}(197 \mathrm{ft})$;
iii. allow the maximum buildable setback for all residential accessory buildings and structures for lots less than $33 \mathrm{~m}(108 \mathrm{ft})$ wide to exceed $60 \mathrm{~m}(197 \mathrm{ft})$, up to the maximum farm home plate area;
iv. limit the farm home plate for a principal dwelling unit to $2,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(21,527 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$, plus $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(10,764 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each additional dwelling unit, plus $35 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(376.7 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation where permitted; and
v. limit the floor area for:
- a principal dwelling unit to $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(5,382 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$,
- $300 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,229 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each additional dwelling unit,
- $15 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,236 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation where permitted.
- Option 2 - Bylaw 9666 (Attachment 3) is based on the Ministry of Agriculture Guidelines to control only house size and would:
i. limit the floor area for a principal dwelling unit to $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(5,382 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$;
ii. allow $300 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,229 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each additional dwelling unit; and
iii. allow $15 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,236 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation where permitted.
- Option 3 - Draft Bylaw 9678 (Attachment 4) is based on the Corporation of Delta's A1 zoning regulations to manage house size, farm home plate and setbacks) and would:
i. maintain a maximum buildable setback for a dwelling unit at $50 \mathrm{~m}(164 \mathrm{ft})$, and 100 m ( 328 ft ) for a seasonal farm labour accommodation;
ii. establish a maximum buildable setback for all residential accessory buildings and structures at $60 \mathrm{~m}(197 \mathrm{ft})$;
iii. limit the farm home plate for a principal dwelling unit to $3,500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(38,750 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right), 5,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ $\left(58,819 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for any additional dwelling units, and an additional $1,400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(15,069 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for a seasonal farm labour accommodation where permitted;
iv. on lots less than 8 ha ( 20 ac .) limit the floor area of a principal dwelling unit to $330 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (3,552 $\left.\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$; and
v. on lots 8 ha ( 20 ac .) or greater:
- limit the floor area of a principal dwelling unit to $465 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(5,005 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$;
- allow $233 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(2,508 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each additional dwelling unit; and
- allow $10 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(107 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation where permitted.
- Option 4 - Bylaw 9679 (Attachment 5) is based on the Corporation of Delta's A1 zoning regulations to control only house size and would:
i. on lots less than 8 ha ( 20 ac .) limit the floor area of a principal dwelling unit to $330 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (3,552 $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ );
ii. on lots 8 ha ( 20 ac .) or greater:
- limit the floor area of a principal dwelling unit to $465 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(5,005 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$;
- allow $233 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (2,508 $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) for each additional dwelling unit; and
- allow $10 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(107 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation where permitted.

Each draft Bylaw incorporates the respective regulations from the Ministry's Guidelines and the Corporation of Delta's A1 zone, and complements Richmond's Zoning Bylaw (e.g., definitions, floor area exemptions).

All four draft Bylaws use terminology that is consistent with the City's Zoning Bylaw. Further, the draft Bylaws do not establish a size limit for residential accessory buildings and structures, as neither the Ministry Guidelines or Delta's A1 zone address the matter. See the Public Consultation Section below regarding how this matter may be addressed.

For clarification, the two draft Bylaws (i.e., Bylaw 9665 - Attachment 2, and Bylaw 9678 Attachment 4) that address farm home plate would include the following in the farm home plate area:

- principal dwelling unit, additional dwelling unit(s) and any accessory buildings or accessory structures,
- driveways, decorative landscaping, artificial ponds not serving drainage, irrigation needs or aquaculture use, and
- sewerage septic tanks and field.


## Non-Conforming Uses

If any bylaw is adopted that limits the size and footprint of residential buildings, legal nonconforming status would apply to all existing buildings and structures as per the Local Government Act. This means that any new development will need to conform to the adopted bylaw, but existing development is acknowledged to be lawfully in existence before a new zoning bylaw comes into effect.

## Public Consultation

As the issue of regulating house size, farm home plate and setbacks, as well as the size of residential accessory buildings in the ALR, is anticipated to be controversial, staff recommend holding one public consultation open house at City Hall and seeking comments from the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) in March 2017, and reporting back to Planning Committee afterwards. The March meetings are proposed to avoid any conflicts with other public consultations scheduled in February (e.g., House Massing Review, Tree Protection Bylaw Information Sessions). Staff also recommend consulting regarding the size of residential accessory buildings, as none of the proposed bylaws address the matter and clarity is needed. Staff will prepare appropriate residential accessory building size options for public comment during the consultation.

## Financial Impact

None.

## Conclusion

The report responds to the referral made by Planning Committee to examine house size limitations as recommended by the Ministry of Agriculture's "Guide for Bylaw Development in Farming Area", and the Corporation of Delta's regulations under the Agriculture (A1) zone.
Draft bylaws reflecting the Ministry's suggested guidelines and Delta's A1 zone are attached for information.

John Hopkins
Senior Planner
(604-276-4279)

JH:cas
Att. 1: Comparison of Buildable Setback, Home Plate and House Size Limitations
2: Draft Bylaw 9665 based on the Ministry of Agriculture's Guidelines - to manage house size, farm home plate and setbacks
3: Draft Bylaw 9666 based on the Ministry of Agriculture's Guidelines - to manage house size only
4: Draft Bylaw 9678 based on the Corporation of Delta's A1 Zone - to manage house size, farm home plate and setbacks
5: Draft Bylaw 9679 based on the Corporation of Delta's A1 Zone - to manage house size only
Comparison of Buildable Setback, Home Plate and House Size

| Item to Regulate | Type of Structures | Ministry of Agriculture | Corporation of Delta |  | City of Richmond |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buildable Setback (Maximum) | All dwelling units including seasonal farm labour accommodation | 50 m (164 ft) | $50 \mathrm{~m}(164 \mathrm{ft})$ for a dwelling unit, and $100 \mathrm{~m}(328 \mathrm{ft})$ if a dwelling unit with seasonal farm labour accommodation |  | 50 m (164 ft) |
|  | Accessory residential buildings and structures | 60 m (197 ft) | 60 m (197 ft) |  | Distance between dwelling unit and accessory building from 1.2 m $50 \mathrm{~m}(4 \mathrm{ft}-164 \mathrm{ft})$. |
| Farm Home Plate (Maximum) | Principal Dwelling Unit (one per lot) | The lesser of a footprint commensurate with urban areas or $2000 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \quad\left(21,528 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $3,500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(38,750 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ |  | The Farm Home Plate is not currently regulated in the Richmond Zoning Bylaw. |
|  | Additional Dwelling Unit(s) | Plus $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(10,764 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each additional dwelling unit (where permitted by the local government) | Plus $1,500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(16,145 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ if there are two dwelling units (only one additional dwelling unit permitted for a full-time farm worker) |  |  |
|  | Seasonal Farm Labour Accommodation | Plus $35 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ( $376.7 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) for each temporary worker's residence up to $1,400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(15,069 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right.$ ) (where permitted by the local government) | Plus $1,400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(15,069 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ (only one building permitted on a lot size greater than 8 ha) |  |  |
| House Size (Maximum Floor Area) | Principal Dwelling Unit (one per lot) | Lesser of a floor area commensurate with urban areas or $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(5,382 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 330 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \\ & \left(3,552 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right) \text { on } \\ & \text { lots less than } \\ & 8 \text { ha ( } 20 \text { acres }) \end{aligned}$ | $465 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ <br> (5,005ft ${ }^{2}$ ) on lots 8 ha or greater | A maximum 0.60 floor area ratio (FAR) for residential and farm buildings, except where greenhouses are located on the lot, in which case the maximum FAR would be 0.75 , of which at least 0.70 FAR must be used for greenhouses. |
|  | Additional Dwelling Unit(s) | $300 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,229 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each additional dwelling unit (where permitted by the local government) | $180 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,937 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ on lots less than 8 ha (20 acres) | $233 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ <br> ( $2,508 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) on lots 8 ha or greater |  |
|  | Seasonal Farm Labour Accommodation | $15 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (161 $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation up to $400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ $\left(4,305 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ (where permitted by the local government) | $10 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(107 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation up to $420 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (4,520 $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) (only one building permitted on a lot size greater than 8 ha ) |  | $400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (4,305.5 ft ${ }^{2}$ ) (only one building permitted on a lot size greater than 8 ha; subject to rezoning to AG3) |
| Farm-Related Buildings (e.g. barns, stables) |  | Permitted subject to local government setback regulations | Permitted subject to setback and site coverage regulations |  | Permitted subject to 0.6 FAR and setback regulations |

## Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9665 (House Size, Farm Home Plate and Setback Regulations in the Agricultural Land Reserve)

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

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 , as amended, is further amended at Section 3.4 by adding the following definition of "farm home plate", in alphabetical order:
"Farm home plate

Farm home plate setback
means the portion of a lot including or located between a principal dwelling unit, additional dwelling unit(s), and any accessory buildings or accessory structures, including driveways to dwelling unit(s), decorative landscaping, artificial ponds not serving farm drainage, irrigation needs or aquaculture use, and sewerage septic tanks and field.
means the distance that the rear of a farm home plate may be set back from a lot line or any other features specified by this Bylaw."
2. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 14.1.4. (Permitted Density) and replacing it with the following:

## "14.1.4 Permitted Density

1. The maximum floor area is:
a) the lesser of
i. the floor area ratio of 0.55 applied to a maximum of $464.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of the lot area, together with 0.30 applied to the balance of the lot area in excess of $464.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, or
ii. $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$,
for a principal dwelling unit;
b) $\quad 300 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for each additional dwelling unit, where permitted as per Section 14.1.4.5; and
c) $15 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation.
2. The maximum floor area ratio is 0.60 , except where greenhouses are located on the lot, in which case the maximum floor area ratio is 0.75 , of which at least 0.70 floor area ratio must be used for greenhouses.
3. The maximum area of the farm home plate is:
a) $2,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for a principal dwelling unit; and
b) $\quad 1000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for each dwelling unit where permitted as per Section 14.1.4.5; and
c) $35 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation where permitted.
4. The maximum density is one principal dwelling unit per lot.
5. The following additional dwelling units for full-time farm workers for a farm operation employed on the lot in question are permitted provided that the need for the additional dwelling units is justified by a certified professional registered with the BC Institute of Agrologists (P.Ag) and that the lot has the lot area specified below:
a) 1 additional dwelling unit on a lot between 8.0 ha and 25.0 ha ; or
b) 2 additional dwelling units on a lot between 25.0 ha and 30.0 ha ; or
c) 3 additional dwelling units on a lot over 30.0 ha.
6. For lots zoned AG4, the maximum floor area ratio is 0.11 ."
7. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 , as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 14.1.6. (Yards \& Setbacks) and replacing it with the following:

## "14.1.6 Yards \& Setbacks

1. The maximum farm home plate setback from the front lot line to the rear of the farm home plate is 60 m . A property with a lot width less than 33 m are exempted from the 60 m farm home plate setback for the farm home plate from the front lot line; however, the farm home plate must be located at the front of the lot to a maximum of $2,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.
2. No portion of a single detached housing building, including any additional dwelling units, shall be located further than 50.0 m from a constructed public road abutting the property. On a corner lot or double fronting lot, the 50.0 m setback from a constructed public road abutting the property shall be determined based on the location of the permitted access to the single detached housing building or additional dwelling unit(s).
3. The minimum yards for single detached housing, including any additional dwelling units and all accessory buildings or accessory structures to the single detached housing are:
a) 6.0 m in the front yard;
b) on an interior lot, 1.2 m on one interior side yard and
i) $\quad 3.0 \mathrm{~m}$ on the other interior side yard for lots less than 0.8 ha ; or
ii) $\quad 6.0 \mathrm{~m}$ on the other interior side yard for lots of 0.8 ha or more;
c) on a corner lot, 1.2 m on the interior side yard and 3.0 m on the exterior side yard regardless if the lot is less than 0.8 ha or is 0.8 ha or more; and
d) $\quad 10.0 \mathrm{~m}$ in the rear yard for single detached housing, including any additional dwelling units.
4. All accessory buildings or accessory structures to the single detached housing shall have a minimum building separation space of 1.2 m .
5. The minimum yards for all agricultural buildings and structures for:
a) front yard and exterior side yard is:
i) 15.0 m for mushroom barns, livestock barns, poultry brooder houses, confined livestock areas, fur farming sheds, livestock shelters, milking facilities, stables and hatcheries; and
ii) $\quad 7.5 \mathrm{~m}$ for all other agricultural buildings and structures.
b) interior side yard and rear yard is:
i) $\quad 15.0 \mathrm{~m}$ for livestock barns, poultry brooder houses, confined livestock areas, fur farming shelters, livestock sheds, milking facilities, stables and hatcheries;
ii) $\quad 7.5 \mathrm{~m}$ for mushroom barns, apiculture hives, honey houses and shelters; and
iii) $\quad 4.5 \mathrm{~m}$ for all other agricultural buildings and structures.
6. For lots zoned AG4, the minimum setbacks for buildings and structures are:
a) 20 m for west and east setbacks;
b) $\quad 18 \mathrm{~m}$ for south setbacks; and
c) 13 m for north setbacks.
7. For lots zoned AG4, the minimum setbacks for accessory buildings and structures is 9 m to all property lines."
8. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9665". FIRST READING

PUBLIC HEARING
SECOND READING $\qquad$
THIRD READING


## ADOPTED

## Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 <br> Amendment Bylaw 9666 <br> (House Size Regulations in the Agricultural Land Reserve)

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

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 , as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 14.1.4. (Permitted Density) and replacing it with the following:

## "14.1.4 Permitted Density

1. The maximum floor area is:
a) the lesser of
i. the floor area ratio of 0.55 applied to a maximum of $464.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of the lot area, together with 0.30 applied to the balance of the lot area in excess of $464.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, or
ii. $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$,
for a principal dwelling unit;
b) $\quad 300 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for each additional dwelling unit, where permitted as per Section 14.1.4.4; and
c) $15 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation.
2. The maximum floor area ratio is 0.60 , except where greenhouses are located on the lot, in which case the maximum floor area ratio is 0.75 , of which at least 0.70 floor area ratio must be used for greenhouses.
3. The maximum density is one principal dwelling unit per lot.
4. The following additional dwelling units for full-time farm workers for a farm operation employed on the lot in question are permitted provided that the need for the additional dwelling units is justified by a certified professional registered with the BC Institute of Agrologists (P.Ag) and that the lot has the lot area specified below:
a) 1 additional dwelling unit on a lot between 8.0 ha and 25.0 ha ; or
b) 2 additional dwelling units on a lot between 25.0 ha and 30.0 ha; or
c) 3 additional dwelling units on a lot over 30.0 ha .
5. For lots zoned AG4, the maximum floor area ratio is 0.11 ."
6. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9666". FIRST READING

CITY OF
RICHMOND
APPROVED
by

APPROVED
by Director or Solicitor

## Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9678 (House Size, Farm Home Plate and Setback Regulations in the Agricultural Land Reserve)

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

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 3.4 by adding the following definition of "farm home plate", in alphabetical order:
"Farm home plate

Farm home plate setback
means the portion of a lot including or located between a principal dwelling unit, additional dwelling unit(s), and any accessory buildings or accessory structures, including driveways to dwelling unit(s), decorative landscaping, artificial ponds not serving farm drainage, irrigation needs or aquaculture use, and sewerage septic tanks and field.
means the distance that the rear of a farm home plate may be set back from a lot line or any other features specified by this Bylaw."
2. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 14.1.4. (Permitted Density) and replacing it with the following:

## "14.1.4 Permitted Density

1. The maximum floor area is:
a) $330 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for a principal dwelling unit on a lot less than 8 ha in area;
b) $465 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for a principal dwelling unit on a lot 8 ha or greater in area;
c) $233 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for each additional dwelling unit, where permitted as per Section 14.1.4.5; and
d) $10 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation.
2. The maximum floor area ratio is 0.60 , except where greenhouses are located on the lot, in which case the maximum floor area ratio is 0.75 , of which at least 0.70 floor area ratio must be used for greenhouses.
3. The maximum area of a farm home plate is:
a) $3,600 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for a principal dwelling unit; or
b) $5,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ if there is a principal dwelling unit and any additional dwelling unit(s) where permitted as per Section 14.1.4.5; and
c) $1,400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for a seasonal farm labour accommodation where permitted.
4. The maximum density is one principal dwelling unit per lot.
5. The following additional dwelling units for full-time farm workers for a farm operation employed on the lot in question are permitted provided that the need for the additional dwelling units is justified by a certified professional registered with the BC Institute of Agrologists (P.Ag) and that the lot has the lot area specified below:
a) 1 additional dwelling unit on a lot between 8.0 ha and 25.0 ha; or
b) 2 additional dwelling units on a lot between 25.0 ha and 30.0 ha; or
c) 3 additional dwelling units on a lot over 30.0 ha .
6. For lots zoned AG4, the maximum floor area ratio is 0.11 ."
7. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 14.1.6. (Yards \& Setbacks) and replacing it with the following:
"14.1.6 Yards \& Setbacks
8. The maximum farm home plate setback from the front lot line to the rear of the farm home plate is 60 m . Where a farm home plate accommodates a dwelling unit and seasonal farm labour accommodation, the maximum combined farm home plate setback from the front lot line to the rear of the farm home plate is 100 m .
9. No portion of a single detached housing building, including any additional dwelling units, shall be located further than 50.0 m from a constructed public road abutting the property. On a corner lot or double fronting lot, the 50.0 m from a constructed public road abutting the property shall be determined based on the location of the permitted access to the single detached housing building or additional dwelling unit(s).
10. The minimum yards for single detached housing, including any additional dwelling units and all accessory buildings or accessory structures to the single detached housing are:
a) 6.0 m in the front yard;
b) on an interior lot, 1.2 m on one interior side yard and
i) $\quad 3.0 \mathrm{~m}$ on the other interior side yard for lots less than 0.8 ha ; or
ii) $\quad 6.0 \mathrm{~m}$ on the other interior side yard for lots of 0.8 ha or more;
c) on a corner lot, 1.2 m on the interior side yard and 3.0 m on the exterior side yard regardless if the lot is less than 0.8 ha or is 0.8 ha or more; and
d) $\quad 10.0 \mathrm{~m}$ in the rear yard for single detached housing, including any additional dwelling units.
11. All accessory buildings or accessory structures to the single detached housing shall have a minimum building separation space of 1.2 m .
12. The minimum yards for all agricultural buildings and structures for:
a) front yard and exterior side yard is:
i) $\quad 15.0 \mathrm{~m}$ for mushroom barns, livestock barns, poultry brooder houses, confined livestock areas, fur farming sheds, livestock shelters, milking facilities, stables and hatcheries; and
ii) $\quad 7.5 \mathrm{~m}$ for all other agricultural buildings and structures.
b) interior side yard and rear yard is:
i) $\quad 15.0 \mathrm{~m}$ for livestock barns, poultry brooder houses, confined livestock areas, fur farming shelters, livestock sheds, milking facilities, stables and hatcheries;
ii) $\quad 7.5 \mathrm{~m}$ for mushroom barns, apiculture hives, honey houses and shelters; and
iii) $\quad 4.5 \mathrm{~m}$ for all other agricultural buildings and structures.
13. For lots zoned AG4, the minimum setbacks for buildings and structures are:
a) 20 m for west and east setbacks;
b) $\quad 18 \mathrm{~m}$ for south setbacks; and
c) $\quad 13 \mathrm{~m}$ for north setbacks.
14. For lots zoned AG4, the minimum setbacks for accessory buildings and structures is 9 m to all property lines."
15. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9678". FIRST READING


ADOPTED

## Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9679 <br> (House Size Regulations in the Agricultural Land Reserve)

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

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 14.1.4. (Permitted Density) and replacing it with the following:

## "14.1.4 Permitted Density

1. The maximum floor area is:
a) $330 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for a principal dwelling unit on a lot less than 8 ha in area;
b) $465 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for a principal dwelling unit on a lot 8 ha or greater in area;
c) $233 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for each additional dwelling unit, where permitted as per Section 14.1.4.4; and
d) $10 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for each occupant of a seasonal farm labour accommodation.
2. The maximum floor area ratio is 0.60 , except where greenhouses are located on the lot, in which case the maximum floor area ratio is 0.75 , of which at least 0.70 floor area ratio must be used for greenhouses.
3. The maximum density is one principal dwelling unit per lot.
4. The following additional dwelling units for full-time farm workers for a farm operation employed on the lot in question are permitted provided that the need for the additional dwelling units is justified by a certified professional registered with the BC Institute of Agrologists (P.Ag) and that the lot has the lot area specified below:
a) 1 additional dwelling unit on a lot between 8.0 ha and 25.0 ha ; or
b) 2 additional dwelling units on a lot between 25.0 ha and 30.0 ha; or
c) 3 additional dwelling units on a lot over 30.0 ha.
5. For lots zoned AG4, the maximum floor area ratio is 0.11 ."
6. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9679".

## FIRST READING



ADOPTED


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Appendix I

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ See Appendix II

