## Public Hearing Agenda

Public Notice is hereby given of a Regular Council Meeting for Public Hearings being held on:

Monday, February 20, 2017-7 p.m.
Council Chambers, $1^{\text {st }}$ Floor
Richmond City Hall
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

## OPENING STATEMENT

Page

1. RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 9510 (RZ 14-678448)
(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009510; RZ 14-678448) (REDMS No. 5247325)
PH-6

Location:
Applicant:
Purpose:

6840 and 6860 No. 3 Road and 8051 Anderson Road
1004732 BC Ltd.
To create the new "City Centre High Density Mixed Use with Office (ZMU31) - Brighouse Village" zone and rezone the subject property from the "Downtown Commercial (CDT1)" zone to the new "City Centre High Density Mixed Use with Office (ZMU31) - Brighouse Village" zone, to permit development of a $18,701 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (201,292 sq.ft.), twelve (12) storey, mixed retail, office and residential use building.

First Reading: January 23, 2017

## Order of Business:

1. Presentation from the applicant.
2. Acknowledgement of written submissions received by the City Clerk since first reading.

PH-79
(a) Lana Chan, 8111 Anderson Road
3. Submissions from the floor.

## Council Consideration:

1. Action on second and third readings of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9510.
$\qquad$

## 2. RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 9664 (RZ 16-734667)

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009664; RZ 16-734667) (REDMS No. 5244412)
Location: 8140/8160 Lundy Road

Applicant: Xiufeng Zhang and Shufang Zhang
Purpose: To rezone the subject property 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.

First Reading: January 23, 2017

## Order of Business:

1. Presentation from the applicant.
2. Acknowledgement of written submissions received by the City Clerk since first reading.
3. Submissions from the floor.

## Council Consideration:

1. Action on second and third readings of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9664.

## 3. RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 9667 (RZ 15-700431) <br> (File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009667; RZ 15-700431) (REDMS No. 5258398 v. 3)

## Page

Purpose: To create the "Town Housing (ZT81) - Williams Road" Zone and to rezone the subject properties from "Single Detached (RS1/C)" and "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Town Housing (ZT81) - Williams Road", to permit development of 18 townhouse units with access from Williams Road.

First Reading: January 23, 2017
Order of Business:

1. Presentation from the applicant.
2. Acknowledgement of written submissions received by the City Clerk since first reading.
3. Submissions from the floor.

## Council Consideration:

1. Action on second and third readings of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9667.

2. RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 9669 (RZ 16-738480)
(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009669; RZ 16-738480) (REDMS No. 5265610 v. 2)
PH-128
See Page PH-128 for full report

Location: 23100, 23120 and 23140 Westminster Highway
Applicant: Trellis Seniors Services Ltd.
Purpose: This application is to rezone the subject site from "Single Detached (RS1/F)" to "Senior's Care Facility (ZR11) Hamilton Village (Hamilton)" to facilitate development of a three (3) storey, 135-bed senior’s care facility.

First Reading: January 23, 2017
Order of Business:

1. Presentation from the applicant.
2. Acknowledgement of written submissions received by the City Clerk since first reading.
3. Submissions from the floor.

## Page

## Council Consideration:

1. Action on second and third readings of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9669.
$\qquad$
2. RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW NO. 9671 (File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009671; 03-0900-01) (REDMS No. 5232673 v. 6)
Location: City Wide

Applicant: City of Richmond
Purpose: To add a definition of "marihuana dispensary" and add this use to the non-permitted use and definitions (Section 3.5) of the Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500 to prohibit "marihuana dispensary" in all zones.
First Reading: January 23, 2017

## Order of Business:

1. Presentation from the applicant.
2. Acknowledgement of written submissions received by the City Clerk since first reading.
3. Submissions from the floor.

## Council Consideration:

1. Action on second and third readings of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9671.
2. Adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9671.
$\square$
$\square$
3. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (DP 16-741981)
(File Ref. No. DP 16-741981) (REDMS No. 5217500)

| Location: | 10788 No. 5 Road (also referred to as 10780 No. 5 Road and <br>  <br> 12733 Steveston Highway) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Applicant: | Townline Gardens Inc. |

## Page

PH-276

PH-279

PH-280
PH-281
PH-282
PH-283
PH-285

## Purpose of the Permit:

1. To permit the construction of one (1) 10 -storey residential building and three (3) 3-storey residential buildings at 10788 No. 5 Road on a site zoned "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) - The Gardens (Shellmont)"; and
2. To vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
(a) For the most westerly building (Building E1), increase the maximum height over a parkade structure from six (6) storeys and 25.0 m , to ten (10) storeys and 33.6 m ; and
(b) For the most westerly building (Building E1), increase the allowable projection of unenclosed balconies into a side yard setback abutting the Agricultural Land Reserve, from a maximum of 0.9 m to 1.8 m .

Dates: Development Permit Panel Considered the application on November 30, 2016 (See Page PH-276 for minutes excerpt). Council referred the application to Public Hearing on January 9, 2017 (See Page PH-279 for minutes excerpt).

## Order of Business:

1. Presentation from the applicant.
2. Acknowledgement of written submissions received by the City Clerk.
(a) Peter McKenna-Small, 11400 Sealord Road
(b) Rae Nix, 11900 Seabrook Crescent
(c) Leung Pingsun, 10880 No. 5 Road
(d) Frank Suto, Richmond Resident
(e) Stefanie Weng, 8011 Ryan Road
3. Submissions from the floor.

## Council Consideration:

1. Action on Development Permit for 10788 No. 5 Road (also referred to as 10780 No. 5 Road and 12733 Steveston Highway) (16-741981).
$\square$

## ADJOURNMENT

$\square$

## 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 $6840 ~ \& ~ 6860 ~ N o . ~ 3 ~ R o a d ~ a n d ~$ |  |
|  | 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.
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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 |  |
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# 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 <br> 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;
$5258185 v 3$
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 <br> 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

### 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 $4,882 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m}$.
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

1. The minimum lot area is 4780 sq. m .
2. The minimum lot width is 45.0 m .
3. 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 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | LOT 3 EXCEPT: PARCEL "A" (EXPLANATORY PLAN 12388); SECTION 9 BLOCK |
| 4 NORTH RANGE 6 WEST NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT PLAN 8552 |  |
| P.I.D. | 003-609-944 |
|  | LOT "B" (RD58458E) SECTION 9 BLOCK 4 NORTH RANGE 6 WEST |
| NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT PLAN 8552 |  |
| P.I.D. | 002-850-702 |
|  | 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 READINGJAN 232017
PUBLIC HEARING
SECOND READING
THIRD READING
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- Send a Submission Online (response \#1001)

Follow up
Flagged

To Public Hearing Date: Feb 20,2017 14\%m 1
Re: 6840,6860 No.3Rd 8051 Anderson $R a$ RE 14-678448

## Send a Submission Online (response \#1001)

## Survey Information

| Site: | City Website |
| :---: | :---: |
| Page Title: | Send a Submission Online |
| URL: | http://cms richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx |
| Submission Time/Date: | 2/10/2017 9:17:17 PM |

## Survey Response

| Your Name | LANA S CHAN |
| :--- | :--- |
| Your Address | 11038111 ANDERSON RD |
| Subject Property Address OR <br> Bylaw Number | $6840 \& 6860$ No.3 Road and 8051 Anderson Road |
| Comments | Building should not be taller than Richmond City <br> Hall. |



## 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 Rear: Min. 6 m 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 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..


$\square$
Lots which can be subdivided under R1/E (Existing Policy)

Lots which can subdivide under R1/H

| Policy 5423 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Section 21, 4-6 |
| PH -91 |

## 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)
\$3,221.90
\$8,494.10
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

Bylaw 9664

## 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".

FIRST READING
JAN 232017
A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON
SECOND READING
THIRD READING


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.
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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 9700, 9720, 9800 WILLIAMS ROAD, RICHMOND, BC 9700, 9720, 9 goo WILLAMS ROAD, RICHMOND, BC
LOT $8 \&$ LOT 9 PLAN 11454. LOT 170 PLAN 36305 ALL SECTION 34, BLOCK 4 NORTH, RANGE 5 WEST NWD LOT $8 \&$ LOT 9 PLAN 11454, LOT 170 PLAN
3154 SM ( 33,9495 )
CURPENT: RS $1 / \mathrm{F}$ (PROPOSED: SITE SPECIFIC)
CURRENT: RS1/F, (PROFOSED: STTE SPECIFIC)
 D.73
2302 SM ( 24.778 SF) FLDDR AREA
18 UNITS 3 RENTAL UNITS (TTPE A1 1301 SQ. FT.)
[INCLUDING 3 RENTAL UNITS (TYPE A1 1301 SQ̣- F.)
TOTAL AFFORDABLE RENTAL AREA:
3903 SQ F (15\%)] SEE DWG A5]
43.6\% 14796 SQ. FT. (VARANCE REQ)
TOTAL NON POROUS AREA 19899 SO. F . $/$ S3399 SO. TT
 BUILDING HEIGHT - $11.98 M\left(39^{\prime} 4^{\prime}\right)$
FRONTTARD FACING WWAMS $-4.52 \mathrm{M}\left(14^{\circ} 10^{\circ}\right)$
 REAR YARD - 1/F; 4.52M (14'10") 2/F: 6.00 M ( $19^{\prime} 7^{\prime \prime}$ )

(1B REGULAR) (50\%)
$\qquad$ $\begin{array}{ll}\text { YSITOR BIIE RACK } & 4 \\ \text { RESIDENTALL } & 27 \\ 27 \\ \text { (INSIDE GARAGE) }\end{array}$

| MAX MAIN BUILDING HEIGHT - 12 M FRONTTARD FACING WILLLAMS - 4.5 M EAST AND WEST SIDEYARD - 3 M Rear yard - 4.5 M |
| :---: |
| 6.0 SM (64.58 SF) PER UNIT $65 \mathrm{M} \times 18=108 \mathrm{SM}(1163 \mathrm{SF})$ |
| 2 PER DWELLING UNITS $\times 18=36$ 0.2 VISITOR PARKING / UNIT X1B $=4$ TOTAL $=40$ REQUIRED |
| VISITOR BICYCLE <br> 0.2 PER DWELLING UNIT X18= 4 RESIDENTAL BICYCLE STORAGE <br> 1.25 PER DWELLING UNIT $\times 18=2$ | 1.25 PER DWELLING UNIT $\times 18=23$

DEVELOPMENT DATA
(A) CIVIC ADDRESS:
(B) LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
(C) LT ARE:
(D) ZONING USE
(D) ZONING US
(E) floor area ratid
(F) Number of unit:
(G) Bulloing coverage:


| CURRENT ZONING |
| :--- |
| (UNDER RS1 ZONING) |


| (E) FLOOR AREA RATID | 0.55 YO 454.5 SM <br> 0.3 TO REST OF SITE AREA | 0.73 <br> TOTAL FLOOR AREA <br> $0.73 \times 3154 ~ S M M=2302 ~ S M$. <br> $(24,778 ~ S F)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| (F) NUMBER OF UNIT: | i PER LOT | MAX $-40 \%$ |

$$
\max -45 \%
$$


max - $40 \%$
MAX HEIGHT $-9 M$
FRONTTARD $-6 M$
SIIEARD $-2 M$
REARYARD $-6 M$
(H) BULDING HEIGHT:
(1) SETEACK:

## (J) OUTDOOR AMENITY

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { PROPOSED REZZNING } \\
& \text { (STE SPECIFIC) }
\end{aligned}
$$ 3903 SQ. FT (15\%)] SEE DWG A5]
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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



## 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

1. The minimum lot width on minor arterial roads is 40.0 m .
2. The minimum lot depth is 35.0 m .
3. There is no minimum lot area.

### 17.81.8 Landscaping \& Screening

1. 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
JAN 232017
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 ft ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ ) | 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 ${ }^{2}$ | $5,885 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 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 <br> 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







| EA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| description | kEY | AREA |
| ESM Wothreter frimoge |  | ${ }_{622 \mathrm{ma}}$ |
| Esa antivar |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | dTAL | 1099 mz |





## 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 Sestion 01572
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:

PH - 176
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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 <br> 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 $50 \%$.
2. 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.
3. Common pedestrian entrance canopies, staircases, eaves, sunscreens and unenclosed balconies may project into any setback to a maximum distance of 2.3 m .
4. 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
3. The minimum lot width is 40.0 m and minimum lot depth is 80.0 m .
4. The minimum lot area is $5,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.
21.11.9 LANDSCAPING AND SCREENING
5. Landscaping and screening shall be provided according to the provisions of Section 6.0.
6. 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
JAN 232017
A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON
SECOND READING
THIRD READING
OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED
MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE APPROVAL
ADOPTED
"Schedule A attached to and forming part of Bylaw No. 9669 "


## Report to Committee

| To: | General Purposes Committee | Date: | January 10, 2017 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | Cecilia Achiam, MCIP, BCSLA | File: | 03-0900-01/2016-Vol 01 |
|  | Director, Administration and Compliance |  |  |
| Re: | Regulations for Marihuana Dispensaries |  |  |

## Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9671 to add a definition of "marihuana dispensary" and add this use to the non-permitted uses and definitions (Section 3.5) of the Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500 to prohibit "marihuana dispensary" in all zones, be introduced and given first reading.


Cecilia Achiam, MCIP, BCSLA
Director, Administration and Compliance
(604-276-4122)

|  | REPORT CONCURRENCE |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| ROUTED TO: | CONCURRENCE | CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER |
| Law |  |  |
| Development Applications |  |  |
| Policy Planning |  |  |
| REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / |  |  |

## Staff Report

## Origin

Marihuana laws are changing rapidly in Canada and the federal government recently released a report on a framework for the legalization of cannabis in Canada. This report recommends moving forward with a number of initiatives related to the recreational use of marihuana, including retail sales. Federal regulations that may result from the report's recommendations are expected as early as spring 2017.

This report proposes amendments to the Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500 as a proactive response to the potential Federal legalization of marihuana. Until legalization measures are taken by the Federal Government, the use and retail sale of cannabis is prohibited by existing Federal legislation and not required to be in the City's zoning bylaw. However, in order to manage the potential impacts arising at the local level, it is prudent for the City to implement zoning regulations to prohibit all retailing and/or dispensing of marihuana or cannabis products city-wide.

## Analysis

## Current Federal Regulations

Federally, marihuana (cannabis) is currently regulated by the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (CDSA) and the Access to Cannabis for Medical Purposes Regulations (ACMPR), formerly the Marihuana for Medical Purposes Regulations (MMPR). Currently, under this legislation there is no provision allowing for the retail sale or dispensing of marihuana or cannabis products.

## Current Municipal Regulations

When the federal regulations came into effect in 2013, in relation to addressing access to medical marihuana (MMPR), Council endorsed a zoning bylaw amendment that defined a medical marihuana production facility and a medical marihuana research facility. This amendment also brought regulations to prohibit these uses City-wide. Through this regulatory framework, caseby case consideration of rezoning applications for proposed medical marihuana production and/or research and development facilities have been reviewed based on Official Community Plan (OCP) policies developed to manage this land use. These zoning bylaw regulations and OCP policy specifically addressed medical marihuana production under the MMPR (now ACMPR).

Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 does not currently contain explicit provisions regarding retailing or dispensing of marihuana/cannabis because it is unlawful and contrary to the CDSA. In anticipation of federal legislation that may legalize and regulate marihuana, and to manage this issue within the context and priorities of Richmond, staff propose to:

- Define and add "marihuana dispensary" as a use definition in Section 3.5 (Non-Permitted Uses and Definitions) of the Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, wording as shown in the proposed Bylaw Amendment; and
- Include "marihuana dispensary" in Section 3.5 (Non-Permitted Uses and Definitions) of the Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, which would not permit this use in any zone citywide.

The proposed amendment to the zoning bylaw would provide clarity on the City's regulations on this type of business during the period until which time federal legislation on marihuana is brought forward. This approach would ensure that the City's regulations are consistent with current federal legislation, where marihuana retail and/or dispensaries remain unlawful operations.

This is an interim regulatory approach that can be re-visited in the future. Should the Federal Government proceed with implementation of legislation for the legalization of marihuana in Canada, staff will assess the regulatory framework and provide Council with a future report outlining any legalization initiatives and potential options related to marihuana use, including retail sale.

## Consultation

Staff have reviewed the proposed Zoning Bylaw amendment and advise that no public consultation is required beyond the public notification requirements.

## Financial Impact

None

## Conclusion

This staff report recommends that Richmond Zoning Bylaw No.8500, Amendment Bylaw 9671 be brought forward to define "marihuana dispensary" and prohibit them in all zones in the City. The City may make further amendments to respond to any new federal legislation.


Carli Edwards
Chief Licence Inspector
(604.276.4136)

KE:ce

## Richmond Zoning - Bylaw No. 8500 Amendment Bylaw No. 9671

The Council of the City of Richmond enacts as follows:

1) The Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 as amended, is further amended at Section 3.5 (NonPermitted Uses and Definitions) by:
a) Adding the following to Section 3.5.1:
"e) Marihuana dispensary"
b) adding the following definition of "marihuana dispensary", in alphabetical order to Section 3.5.2:
"Marihuana Dispensary means a business or other operation involving the sale, barter, storage, distribution or dispensing of cannabis, marihuana or any products containing or derived from cannabis or marihuana."
2) This Bylaw is cited as "Richmond Zoning - Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw 9671".
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| To: | David Weber <br> Director, City Clerk's Office | Date: January 4, 2017 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | Wayne Craig <br> Director, Development | File: | DP 16-741981 |
| Re: | Application by Townline Gardens Inc. for a Development Permit at <br> 10780 No. 5 Road, 10788 No. 5 Road and 12733 Steveston Highway |  |  |

The attached Development Permit was given favourable consideration by the Development Permit Panel at their meeting held on November 30, 2016.

It would now be appropriate to include this item on the agenda of the next Council meeting for their consideration.


Wayneeraig
Director, Development
KE:blg
Att.

## City of

 Richmond Report to Development Permit PanelTo: Development Permit Panel<br>Date: November 14, 2016<br>From: Wayne Craig<br>File: DP 16-741981<br>Director of Development<br>Re: Application by Townline Gardens Inc. for a Development Permit at 10780 No. 5 Road

## Staff Recommendation

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

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


## Staff Report

## Origin

Townline Gardens Inc. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to develop one (1) 10 -storey residential building (Building E1 - 'The Dahlia') and three (3) 3-storey residential buildings (Building F1/F2/F3 - 'The Jasmine') all above an underground parkade. The development would have 180 housing units in total: Building E1 would have 157 apartment units; and Buildings F1/F2/F3 would have 23 townhouse units.
'The Gardens' is a mixed-use development located at the northeast corner of Steveston Highway and No. 5 Road that has occurred in Phases 1-3 (Attachment 1). Council approved the rezoning (RZ 08-0450659) for the overall development on July 25, 2011. 'The Gardens' site was rezoned from "Service Station District (G2)", "Botanical Garden District 1 (BG1)" and "Botanical Garden District 2 (BG2)" to "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) - The Gardens (Shellmont)" through Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 8532. The vision is a 'Garden City' with compact, transit-oriented development, pedestrian-friendly streetscapes and small shops and restaurants within a landscaped setting of common gardens including urban agriculture areas.

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

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

The "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) - The Gardens (Shellmont)" Zone permits development of the overall site up to a maximum density of 1.43 FAR, provided that commercial use does not exceed $9,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ and that residential use does not exceed $53,511 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.

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

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

The applicant has applied for a new Development Permit (DP 16-741981) for the remainder of the site development (Building E1 - 'Dahlia' and Building F - 'Jasmine') through a revised
scheme that minimizes the number of housing units adjacent to the future Highway 99 road interchange. This would be achieved through replacing one (1) four-storey apartment building (Building F - 'Jasmine') with a cluster of three (3) three-storey townhouse buildings (Buildings F1/F2/F3 - 'Jasmine'). Additionally, the surplus floor area would be redistributed to Building E1 ('Dahlia') through an increase in height from eight storeys and 26.9 m to ten storeys and 33.53 m . A new variance is required to permit the proposed increased height, which exceeds the maximum six-storey ( 25 m ) in the "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) - The Gardens (Shellmont)" Zone. A second variance is required for the projection of balconies into the agricultural landscape buffer, which is identical to the previously approved variance for Building E2 ('Calla') (DP 15-708397).

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

## Surrounding Development

North: - A 12.2 acre dedicated 'Agricultural Park' zoned "Agriculture and Botanical Show Garden (ZA3) - Fantasy Gardens (Ironwood)".

South: Building A and Building B in Phase 1 of 'The Gardens' are immediately south of proposed Building E1, Building E2 and Building F across the traffic end point at the east end of the internal east-west shopping high street.

East: $\quad$ Beyond the development site is Highway 99, separated from the development site by a tall, evergreen hedge (within the subject site) and a large drainage ditch (within the highway right-of-way). Properties to the east of Highway 99 are agricultural.

West: Across No. 5 Road is an established, single-family neighbourhood with lots fronting No. 5 Road zoned "Single Detached (RS1/E)" and a townhouse project zoned "Low Density Townhouse (RTL4)" that fronts onto No. 5 Road.

## Development Information

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

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

## Related Policies and Bylaws

## Official Community Plan (OCP)

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

## Flood Plain Designation and Protection (Bylaw 8204)

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

## Affordable Housing Strategy

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

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

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

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

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

|  | Previous DP 15-708397 | Current DP 16-741981 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Studio | 1 | 0 |
| Accessible 1-Bedroom | 1 | 1 (Building E1) |
| 1-Bedroom | 0 | 0 |
| 2-Bedroom | 6 | 6 (Building E1 $=6$ ) |
| 3 Bedroom | 8 | 9 (Building E2 $=4$, Building <br> $\mathrm{E} 1=5)$, |
| Total area of units $\left(\mathbf{f t}^{\mathbf{2}}\right)$ | $14,260 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | $14,716 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ |

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

## OCP Accessibility Policy

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

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

## OCP Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

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

## Public Art Program (Policy 8703)

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

## Childcare Facility

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

## Agricultural Landscape Buffer Zone and Maintenance Plan

The applicant is proposes no changes to the agricultural landscape buffer from the earlier Phase 3 application (DP 15-708397). Registration of a legal agreement for an Agricultural Landscape Buffer Zone and Maintenance Plan was also required as a condition of the rezoning. The legal
agreement terms required that the applicant provide a plan with the appropriate details for the buffer zone between the north property line of the subject site and the 'Agricultural Park'. Prior to the issuance of the previous Development Permit (DP 15-708397), the agreement was released and simultaneously replaced with a RC with the landscape plan and maintenance provisions and a Statutory Right-of-Way to allow for the City to maintain the buffer area in the event that the strata corporation does not fulfill legal obligations for maintenance. Costs for the landscaping plan were included in the landscaping estimate for the subject site and were a component of the landscaping security.

## Riparian Management Area Landscape and Maintenance Plan

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

## Noise and CHMC Standards

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

## Rezoning and Public Hearing Results

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

## Public Consultation

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

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

## Zoning Compliance/Variances

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

The applicant requests to vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to:
(a) For the most westerly building (Building E1), increase the maximum height over a parkade structure from six (6) storeys and 25.0 m , to ten (10) storeys and 33.6 m .

Staff support the variance for building height because the relocation of residential floor area away from the future Highway 99 road interchange would significantly improve liveability for the more residents than the previous proposal. Additionally, the form and massing of Building E1 ('Dahlia') has been designed to minimize the visual impact of the increased height as seen from the internal high-street, the future park to the north, and the neighbourhood to northwest.
(b) For the most westerly building (Building E1), increase the allowable projection of unenclosed balconies into a side yard setback abutting the Agricultural Land Reserve, from a maximum of 0.9 m to 1.8 m .

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

Urban Design Response

## Advisory Design Panel Comments

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

## Analysis

## Conditions of Adjacency and Streetscape

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

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


## Site and Functional Planning

- This site is located at an important southern gateway to Richmond from Highway 99 where the vision for multi-storey (above a parkade structure) mixed-use commercial and
residential built forms spread throughout the site was intended to provide the genesis for a new neighbourhood along the north side of Steveston Highway.
- The original development vision included seven buildings all located on an internal eastwest 'high street' on top of the parking roof deck with apartments above ground-level commercial spaces. This pedestrian-scale retail street incorporates a variety of store frontages, a limited amount of surface parking, wide sidewalks, raised crosswalks, decorative paving and other special features intended to create an enjoyable pedestrian experience and to contribute to a vibrant 'urban village'.
- The proposed site plan for Buildings E1, E2 and F1/F2/F3 is generally consistent with the overall vision to create a vibrant, mixed-use, 'urban village'.
- The public realm between Buildings E1 and E2 and between Building E2 and Building F2 would consist of high-quality gardens, courtyards, plazas, and the 'pedestrian mews' connecting to the 'Agricultural Park' with trees, shrubs, plantings, outdoor seating and viewing areas that are appropriately detailed.
- The site orientation of Building F2 in relation to Building E2 would create a generous 'mouth' at the south edge of the pedestrian mews and the 'funnel' effect would encourage pedestrians to move toward the plaza at the north end of the mews and to cross over the 'grand staircase' and Agricultural Landscape Buffer and into the 'Agricultural Park'.
- Interruption of the public realm at the vehicle entry point to the underground parkade, along the west elevation of Building E1, would be softened through extensive plantings along the road and the private patios.
- Pedestrian connectivity would be further achieved through the completion of the sidewalk along the north side of the road between Buildings E1, E2 and F2/F3.


## Parking and Loading

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


## Architectural Form and Character

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


## Landscape Design and Open Space Design

- As part of the rezoning, the applicant was required to dedicate approximately 12.2 acres as an 'Agricultural Park' that will include trails, play areas, ponds, community gardens, horticultural and agricultural interpretive facilities in the various garden areas.
- Phase 1 and 2 provided a high quality of hard and soft landscape design, materials, detailing and furnishings. All soft landscape areas have an automatic irrigation system. Landscaping the internal road between Building D and E1 included 1.5 m wide boulevard planting strips with street trees and grass and 2.0 m wide sidewalks on both sides, which will also provide future pedestrian access to the 'Agricultural-Park'.
- Phase 3 landscaping would include the following:
- The courtyard between Buildings E1 and E2 would have five zones: a large amenity garden with a simple sheet of lawn and water feature; a summer flower
garden; a children's play area; a covered outdoor dining area and large semiprivate patios for the units facing the common spaces.
- The pedestrian mews would have a linear path with textured concrete pavers in a charcoal colour alongside grasses and other plantings that would visually and physically connect the mews to the semi-private patios of Buildings E2 and F1/F2. Its south end would have a trellis structure with seating oriented to north, and way-finding to the staircase and ramp to provide universal access to the park.
- The bike pavilion has a green roof that would be accessible to townhouse residents as a common garden area.
- The Agricultural Landscape Buffer Area would have cedar hedging and a variety of thorny plantings that would serve as an effective barrier between the ALR buffer and the development site, while providing an attractive landscape strip when seen from the park and Buildings E1, E2 and F1/F2/F3.

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

## Conclusions

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

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

## Helen Cain

Helen Cain
Planner 2
(604-276-4193)
$\mathrm{HC}:$ cas
Attachment 1: Context Plan for Phases of The Gardens Development
Attachment 2: Data Sheet
Attachment 3: Report for Public Open House on Phase 3 Development Permit with Variances, September 13, 2016, prepared by Townline Gardens Inc.

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

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

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

Table 1

| Phase | Unit Type | No. of Units | \% | Average Unit Size | Total Amount ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase 3 (Lot 2) <br> Buildings E1 | Studio | 0 | 0\% | n/a | n/a |
|  | 1 Bedroom | 0 | 0\% | n/a | n/a |
|  | Accessible 1 Bedroom | 1 | 8\% | 600 | 600 |
|  | 2 Bedroom | 6 | 50\% | 871 | 5,226 |
|  | 3 Bedroom | 5 | 42\% | 982 | 4,910 |
|  | Sub-Total | 12 | 100\% | - | 10,736 |
| Phase 3 (Lot 2) Building E2 | Studio | 0 | 0\% | n/a | n/a |
|  | 1 Bedroom | 0 | 0\% | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a |
|  | Accessible 1 Bedroom | 0 | 0\% | n/a | n/a |
|  | 2 Bedroom | 0 | 0\% | n/a | n/a |
|  | 3 Bedroom | 4 | 100\% | 995 | 3,980 |
|  | Sub-Total | 4 | 100\% | - | 3,980 |

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

Table 2

| Unit Type | Minimum Unit Sizes | Maximum <br> Monthly Rent | Total Household Annual <br> Income |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bachelor | $37 \mathrm{~m} 2(400 \mathrm{ft} 2)$ | $\$ 850$ | $\$ 34,000$ or less |
| One bedroom | $50 \mathrm{~m} 2(535 \mathrm{ft} 2)$ | $\$ 950$ | $\$ 38,000$ or less |
| Two bedroom | $80 \mathrm{~m} 2(860 \mathrm{ft} 2)$ | $\$ 1,162$ | $\$ 46,500$ or less |
| Three bedroom | $91 \mathrm{~m} 2(980 \mathrm{ft2})$ | $\$ 1,437$ | $\$ 57,500$ or less |

Notes:
${ }^{1}$ Denotes 2013 amounts adopted by Council on March 11, 2013.
${ }^{2}$ Household income may be increased annually by the Consumer Price Index.
2. Registration of a legal agreement on Lot 2 to secure the dedication of ten (10) surface parking stalls to the north of Building F3 for exclusive use of townhouse residents in perpetuity, to the satisfaction of the City.

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

1. Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
2. Obtain a Building Permit (BP) for any construction hoarding. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a public street, the air space above a public street, or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For additional information, contact the Building Approvals Division at 604-276-4285.

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

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

## Note:

* This requires a separate application.

Where the Director of Development deems appropriate, the preceding agreements are to be drawn not only as personal covenants of the property owner but also as covenants pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act.
All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall have priority over all such liens, charges and encumbrances as is considered advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall, unless the Director of Development determines otherwise, be fully registered in the Land Title Office prior to the issuance of the Development Permit.
The preceding agreements shall provide security to the City including indemnities, warranties, equitable/rent charges, letters of credit and withholding permits, as deemed necessary or advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements shall be in a form and content satisfactory to the Director of Development.
ATTACHMENT 1



## Development Application Data Sheet

Development Applications Department

## DP 15-708397

Address: 10780 and 10788 No 5 Road and 12733 Steveston Highway
Applicant: Townline Gardens Inc.
Owner: Townline Gardens Inc.
Planning Area(s): Shellmont Ironwood Sub-Area
Floor Area
Gross:
$18,010 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$
Floor Area Net: $15,345 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$

|  | Existing |  | Proposed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site Area: | 17, $088 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |  | 17, $088 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |  |
| Land Uses: | Vacant |  | Residential apartment |  |
| OCP Designation: | Limited Mixed Use |  | No change |  |
| Zoning: | "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU18) - The Gardens (Shellmont)" |  | No change |  |
| Number of Units: | 180 |  | 180 |  |
|  | Bylaw Requirement | Proposed |  | Variance |
| Floor Area Ratio: | 1.43 | 1.41 |  | none permitted |
| Lot Coverage: | Max. 50\% | 25.0\% |  | n/a |
| Setback - Front Yard (west): | Min. 6.0 m | 8.40 m (Building E1) |  | n/a |
| Setback - Rear Yard (east): | Min. 6.0 m | 11.60 m (Building E1) |  | n/a |
| Setback - Side Yard (north): | Min. 6.0 m <br> No projection into setback abutting ALR | 6.10 m (Building E1) Projection of 1.80 m for unenclosed balconies |  | Variance required |
| Setback - Side Yard (south): | Min. 3.0 m | 7.60 m (Building E1) |  | n/a |
| Height (m): | $\begin{gathered} \text { Max. } 25.0 \mathrm{~m} \\ 6 \text { storeys } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33.53 \mathrm{~m} \\ \text { 10storeys } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance required |
| Lot Size: | Min. 3,000 m ${ }^{2}$ | 17, $088 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |  | n/a |
| Off-street Parking Spaces Regular/Commercial: | 424 residential No commercial | 431 residential No commercial |  | n/a |
| Off-street Parking Spaces Accessible: | 8 | 8 |  | n/a |
| Total off-street Spaces: | 424 | 431 |  | n/a |
| Tandem Parking Spaces | 50\% for townhouses | 48\% for townhouses |  | n/a |
| Amenity Space - Indoor: | Min. $70 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | Provided in Phase 1 |  | n/a |

## RE: Public Information Consultation Report

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

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

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

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

Summary of responses to the questions in the feedback forms:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Question \#4 - As shown in the Open House Boards, the proposed townhouses would have tandem (front and back) parking for $\mathbf{2 1}$ of $\mathbf{2 3}$ units. Do you have any comments about parking arrangements?

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

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

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


Appendix A: Map of notice area


# RE: Public Information Session - Final Phase of 'The Gardens' Master Planned Community 10780, 10788 No. 5 Road and 12733 Steveston Highway 

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

Due to the potential impact of the proposed Massey Bridge and Highway 99 improvements, Townline Gardens Inc. has submitted a new Development Permit Application (DP-741981) to the City of Richmond, which further improves the overall design in line with the vision of 'The Gardens' Master Planned Community.
'The Gardens' Master Planned Community is located on the corner of Steveston Hwy and No. 5 Road.


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

Where: South Arm Community Centre 8880 Williams Rd, Richmond

South Arm Community Centre September 13, 2016 6:00-8:00pm
Willems ed
When: September 13, 2016
Time: 6:00-8:00 pm

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

For questions in advance of the public information session, please contact:
Stefan Slot
Development Manager - Townline
604-276-8823, ext 205
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## Public Information Session Townline is cordially inviting you and seeks your feedback．

Earlier this year，Council approved the Townline Gardens Inc． Development Permit Application（DP－15－70．3397）for the final phase of ＇The Gardens＇Master Planned Community－former＇Fantasy Gardens＇， located on the corner of No． 5 Road and Steveston Highway．
Duie to the potential impact of the proposed Massey Bridge and Highway 99 improvements，Townline Gardens Inc．has submitted a new Developrnent Permit Application （DP－741981）to the City of Richmond，which further improves the overall design in line with the vision of＇The Gardens＇Master Planned Community．
＇The Gardens＇Master Planned Community is located on the corner
 of Steverton Hwy and No． 5 Road．

Towniline is cordially inviting you to a public information session to present the proposed design and seeks your feedback．
Where：South Arm
Communliy Centra 8880 Williams Rd ， Richmond
When：September 13， 2016


Time；6：00－8：00 pm
Please note that this is not a City of Richmonid event however there will be a city planner present at the information session to answer general zoning and city process related questions．

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

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

## Feedback Form

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

Question \#1 - The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?
Question \#2
The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time
between the
havers of 12 noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you



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

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

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

Please provide other comments that you would like to share.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Feedback Form

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

Question \#1 - The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?
No concerns hooks fins

Question \#2 - The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of $\mathbf{1 2}$ noon and $\mathbf{3 p m}$ as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?


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

NO $\angle O N C D R N S$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Question \#4 - As shown in the Open House Boards, the proposed townhouses would have tandem (front and back) parking for $\mathbf{2 1}$ of $\mathbf{2 3}$ units. Do you have any comments about parking arrangements?
$\square$
NO PARKING SHOULD BE FIN

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

Please provide other comments that you would like to share.

$$
N D \cdot 0^{5}
$$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Feedback Form

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

Question \#1 - The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?
NO. I TuNK IT LOOW GOD. AND WONTT RE
VERU NOILCEARVE FO MoiT PEDRUE.

Question \#2 - The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of $\mathbf{1 2}$ noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?
NO. I THNK IT IS A MNOR ADDTL IMPACT

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

NO. IT is Mange
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Question \#4-As shown in the Open House Boards, the proposed townhouses would have tandem (front and back) parking for 21 of $\mathbf{2 3}$ units. Do you have any comments about parking arrangements?

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

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


Please provide other comments that you would like to share.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Feedback Form

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

Question \#1 - The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park? No, as more stories could not wale a difference.

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


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

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

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

Question \#5 - Do you support the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses?
Nu, as we ore covered by those buildings
anyway.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please provide other comments that you would like to share.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

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

Question \#1 - The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?
No. It makos sense as t the additional units
wien hare a great view of the. Dank.

Question \#2 - The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of $\mathbf{1 2}$ noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

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

$\qquad$

Question \#4 - As shown in the Open House Boards, the proposed townhouses would have tandem (front and back) parking for $\mathbf{2 1}$ of $\mathbf{2 3}$ units. Do you have any comments about parking arrangements?

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Question \#5 - Do you support the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses?
res
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please provide other comments that you would like to share.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

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

## Feedback Form

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

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


Question \#2 - The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of $\mathbf{1 2}$ noon and 3 pm as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?


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


Question \#4 - As shown in the Open House Boards, the proposed townhouses would have tandem (front and back) parking for $\mathbf{2 1}$ of $\mathbf{2 3}$ units. Do you have any comments about parking arrangements?


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

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please provide other comments that you would like to share.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Feedback Form

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

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


Question \#2 - The proposed revisions will create increased shadowing on parks lands in winter time between the hours of $\mathbf{1 2}$ noon and $\mathbf{3 p m}$ as identified in blue on the Shadow Studies Board. Do you have any concerns regarding the increased shadowing within the future park?


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


Question \#4 - As shown in the Open House Boards, the proposed townhouses would have tandem (front and back) parking for 21 of $\mathbf{2 3}$ units. Do you have any comments about parking arrangements?
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

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


Please provide other comments that you would like to share.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

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

## Feedback Form

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

Question \#1 - The Open House boards illustrate the views of the proposed development from five different points within the future park. Do you have any concerns about how the proposed additional height of one of the buildings would look and feel from inside the park?
No.

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

NO. IT'S.Immateriac.

Question \#3 - One of the proposed buildings will be higher than currently allowed in the zone for The Gardens. Based on the public views of the building from different locations in nearby areas, as shown in the Open House boards, do you have any concerns about this increase in building height?
INCREASING BULDING HEIGBT AND DEXSITY WILE BE TREND INRICHMOND.

Question \#4 - As shown in the Open House Boards, the proposed townhouses would have tandem (front and back) parking for 21 of $\mathbf{2 3}$ units. Do you have any comments about parking arrangements?
No.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Question \#5 - Da you support the proposed new development including the ten-storey building and the townhouses?
yes.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Please provide other comments that you would like to share.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

# Excerpt from the Minutes from <br> The Design Panel Meeting 

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

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

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

## Applicant's Presentation

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

## Panel Discussion

Comments from the Panel were as follows:

- the north façade of the project is not as successful at reading like a miniature cityscape as viewed from the park; buildings look disjointed and some building elements appear pasted on;
As noted at panel, the model was damaged during transportation. Due to the "frame" not being on the model when it was presented, we believe that this de-emphasized the miniature cityscape concept of our design. The panel did note that the concept was clear on the renderings and other presentation material. Also in response to panel comments, we have lifted the northwest frame up one level to create a clearer read on the north volume and eliminated the 'tacked-on' feel of the expression.
- lower portions of the proposed ten-storey building appear tall; many floors look the same; the building massing appears more prominent when viewed from the park;

We have taken steps to break up the façade on the courtyard side on Building E1. We have set up a more gradual/progressive shift in form and texture on this façade that we believe has broken up the mass and improved the
proportions of the building. By adding the 'zig-zag' balconies from level 8 to levels 6 and 7, there is a cleaner read in the shift of the massing as it runs up the building. Both the "base" of the building and the transition to the upper, recessed tier is also more clearly read.

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

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

- consider a larger setback at the $4^{\text {th }}$ or $5^{\text {th }}$ level of the ten-storey building; the low datum line and multiple storeys above it makes the ten-storey building appear heavy;
As noted, the introduction of the level 8 expression onto level 6 and 7 has made the read of the lower base levels read more clearly. The brick frame of the will be lifted on the north and west corners to visually bring up the datum.
- appreciate the overall scheme for the proposed development; "neighbourly" moves, e.g. creating interesting corners, introducing setbacks to the buildings behind the guardrails, and introducing bandings reduce the massing of the tenstorey building;
- the cluster of three 3-storey townhouse buildings are an improvement over the original proposal for a 4 -storey apartment building;
- concerned about thermal bridging; thermal breaks for projections are difficult and expensive; concrete projections and fins act like "radiators";
- increasing the height of the building from eight to ten-storeys is not a concern; however, diminishing the height and massing of the additional upper floors is challenging; the applicant's approach to lighten the two uppermost floors appears more successful in the renderings than in the model; consider alternate ways to lighten the two uppermost floors, e.g. changing the proposed window specifications and wall systems; also consider design development and change materials for the wood soffit to visually reduce the apparent height of the tenstorey building;
The wood soffit of the roof overhang has been deleted to eliminate the cornice/cap effect as noted by panel. The transition up to the uppermost tier is more gradual as noted above.
- appreciate the proposed roof terraces in townhouse building "F2"; consider introducing skylights or glazing at the stairs to introduce natural lighting inside the townhouse units;


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

- nice project; provides beautiful views of the park to the north;
- the project is on the right track from a sustainability perspective;
- proposed window design of buildings create an opportunity for good views to the park; however, it is also a thermal comfort concern; applicant needs to address this issue;
- extensive use of spandrel glass is also a concern from a thermal performance sustainability perspective;
All spandrel panel is backed by an insulated drywall, back-up wall. While the exterior of the building reads as large field of window wall, from the interior, the wall reads more like punched openings. An energy model was already performed for Building E2. Due to the insulated, drywall backup wall being implemented on the window wall system, we are actually surpassing the required performance values. The same exercise will be performed for Building E1.
- the project's target of four energy points with residential heat pumps may not be achievable;
This is a target only. The LEED certification is not being pursued.
- use of LED lighting and low-flow fixtures will enable the project to gain more energy points;
All common area lights will be LED and all fixtures will be low-flow.
- appreciate the applicant doing enhanced commissioning for energy credits; applicant needs to engage the commissioning agent as soon as possible; also appreciate the applicant doing measurement and verification to gain energy credits; not normally done in projects due to the additional costs involved;
The panelist was reading from an older DP submission. We are not pursuing points for either enhanced commissioning or verified measurements for this application as we currently have enough to satisfy the requirements.
- proposed use of compact fluorescent lighting is outdated and not currently considered a sustainable energy strategy; consider instead using LED lighting which is a more recent approach;
All common area lighting will be LED
- appreciate the affordable units will include universal design features; applicant needs to include detailed unit lay-outs in future presentations of the project; Boards with larger scale unit layouts were available at panel but were not viewed.
- consider replacing swing doors in bathrooms of apartment and townhouse units with sliding doors (i.e., barn door type or pocket doors) to enhance accessibility and provide more floor space;
Where possible, sliding doors will be implemented.
- agree with the comment that the proposed townhouse buildings are an improvement over the previous proposal;
- consider design development to the two uppermost floors of the ten-storey building as they currently appear "placed on";
As noted above.
- appreciate the height of buildings stepping down towards the highway;
" reconsider the reveal at the corner of building "E2" and consider a continuous treatment to read more as a façade that wraps instead of having a notch at the corner;

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

- townhouse residents should have access to the green roof to get views to the park;
The space above the bike pavilion has been made accessible to the Building F3 townhome units, providing residents with additional outdoor space. The green roof material has been replaced with artificial turf to enhance its usability for residents and raised planters provide a space for gardening for the residents.
- the proposed development is an improvement over the previous proposal;
- proposed increase in the height of building "E1" is not a concern; views of buildings from the park works well and gives the park a feeling of enclosure;
- appreciate the proposed cluster of townhouse buildings; hope that the future development of the park will achieve its fullest potential and commensurate with the quality of development facing the park; $\square$
- appreciate the wider walkway in the pedestrian mews;
- consider design development to the north end of the pedestrian mews to enhance the sense of openness from and to the park; look at the proposed structures and planting at the north end of the mews;
The feature trellis at the north end of the mews will be designed as a tall, open cantilevered structure as demonstrated in Section G on sheet L-2.1. This structure will mark the plaza as the focal point of the mews and establish a strong visual connection with the public park to the north and the urban village to the south. The cantilevered design minimizes the number of posts at the ground plane allowing for various site furnishing opportunities, while the angled roof structure opens to the north and south further enhancing visual connectivity and openness through the structure.
- consider introducing interesting paving materials for the internal roads in the cluster of townhouse buildings; look at precedence in the Olympic Village;
Concrete banding has been introduced in the internal roads in the cluster of townhome buildings to break up the asphalt.
- planting plan symbols in the plans provided by the applicant are hard to read;

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

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

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

## Panel Decision

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

CARRIED

| To the Holder: | TOWNLINE GARDENS INC. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Property Address: | 10780 NO. 5 ROAD, 10788 NO. 5 ROAD AND |
|  | 12733 STEVESTON HIGHWAY |
| Address: | C/O JOSEPH LAU, ZGF COTTER ARCHITECTS |
|  | $901-838$ WEST HASTINGS STREET <br>  |

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

This Permit is not a Building Permit.

| To the Holder: | TOWNLINE GARDENS INC. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Property Address: | 10780 NO. 5 ROAD, 10788 NO. 5 ROAD AND |
|  | 12733 STEVESTON HIGHWAY |
| Address: | C/O JOSEPH LAU, ZGF COTTER ARCHITECTS <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  |
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## 2. Development Permit 16-741981 <br> (REDMS No. 5217500)

## APPLICANT: Townline Gardens Inc.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 10780 No. 5 Road

## INTENT OF PERMIT:

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

## Applicant's Comments

Joseph Lau, ZGF Cotter Architects, accompanied by Stephen Slot, Townline Developments, provided background information on the proposed development and highlighted the following:

- the project is the last phase (Phase 3) of "The Gardens" mixed-used development;
- the original development permit application for Phase 3 was approved by Council in June 2016; however, the applicant is applying for a new development permit specifically for Building E1 and Buildings F1, F2 and F3 to respond to the Ministry of Transportation and Industry (MoTI) plan for a future expansion of Highway 99 as part of the George Massey Tunnel Replacement (GMTR) project;
- the revised scheme for Phase 3 will redistribute the density from housing units adjacent to Highway 99 to the center of the subject site, through replacing the original proposal for a four-storey apartment building with a cluster of three 3 -storey townhouse buildings and increasing the height of Building E1 from eight to ten storeys; and
- the applicant is requesting a variance to increase the height of Building E1 and another variance to increase the projection of unenclosed balconies of Building E1 from 0.9 meters to 1.8 meters into the side yard setback abutting the park to the north.

Dan Van Haastrecht, Durante Kreuk Ltd., briefed the Panel on the main landscaping features of the project, noting that the proposed design of the courtyard area between Buildings E1 and E2 and the central pedestrian mews that connects the site to the park to the north have remained largely unchanged in the new development permit application.
Mr. Van Haastrecht added that the proposed landscaping changes are in the areas around the cluster of townhouses including (i) improvements to the surface treatment of the drive aisle entrance, (ii) addition of east-west pedestrian connection for the townhouse cluster to the pedestrian mews, (iii) provision of accessible green roof area over the bicycle pavilion, and (iv) removal of the proposed dog park in the northeast section of the subject site which will be subject to future expropriation by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure for the future GMTR project.

## Staff Comments

Mr. Craig advised that (i) the proposed variance for increasing the projection of balconies is consistent with the previously approved development permit for Phase 3, (ii) the revised proposal reallocates the affordable housing units on the subject development, resulting in an increase in the total floor area for affordable housing being provided and an increase in family-oriented affordable housing units, (iii) no significant changes have been made to the overall landscape design for the project, and (iv) the proposed apartment and townhouse designs will conform to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) standards for mitigation of traffic-related noise as per the acoustical engineering report provided by the applicant.

## Panel Discussion

In response to queries from the Panel, Mr. Lau acknowledged that (i) changes in the architectural treatment for Building E1 will minimize the visual impact of its increased height, (ii) projected shadow impacts of Building E1 on the park and neighbouring developments to the northeast would be limited to the winter months and only for short durations during sunny days, (iii) the proposed additional two storeys for Building E1 would be accommodated with less than the normal corresponding increase in building height due to the proposed concrete construction, (iv) the applicant did not receive any negative comments regarding the proposed development during the public consultation meeting that was held on September 13, 2016, (v) the total number of proposed housing units for Phase 3 has been reduced as a result of the density transfer to the center of the subject development, and (vi) appropriate measures are expected to be undertaken by MoTI to mitigate the impact of traffic noise to the subject development when the Highway 99 road interchange will be constructed in the future.

The Panel expressed support for the project, noting that (i) the proposed redesign of the subject development and density transfer are well thought out, (ii) the shadow impacts of the increased height of Building E1 on the park and neighbouring developments would be minimal, and (iii) the proposed variations in building heights have made the subject development more visually appealing.

## Correspondence

None.

## Gallery Comments

None.

## Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded
That a Development Permit be issued which would:

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

## 3. New Business

4. Date of Next Meeting: December 14, 2016
5. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting be adjourned at 3:55 pran
CARRIED
5.

## Regular Council

Monday, January 9, 2017

## DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL

R17/1-10 15. It was moved and seconded
(1) That the minutes of the Development Permit Panel meetings held on November 30, 2016 and December 14, 2016 and the Chair's report for the Development Permit Panel meetings held on November 30, 2016, and December 14, 2016, be received for information; and
(2) That the recommendations of the Panel to authorize the issuance of a Development Permit (DP 16-723753) and a Heritage Alteration Permit (HA 16-723754) for the property at 3811 Moncton Street be endorsed, and the Permit so issued.

CARRIED
Wayne Craig, Director, Development, noted that the applicant for 10780 No. 5 Road had revisited the design of their proposal after information was made available regarding the proposed design of the George Massey Tunnel replacement project interchange. Comments were made regarding the placement of the units in relation to the adjacent highway and the proposed height of the buildings. The merits of referring the matter to a Public Hearing were discussed.

R17/1-11 It was moved and seconded
That Development Permit (DP 16-741981) for the property at 10780 No. 5 Road be forwarded to the Public Hearing on February 20, 2017, and that staff contact the applicant to convey the concerns expressed by Council with regards to tandem parking, building heights, and living conditions.

CARRIED
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## Send a Submission Online (response \#999)

Survey Information

| Site: | City Website |
| :---: | :---: |
| Page Title: | Send a Submission Online |
| URL: | http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx |
| Submission Time/Date: | 2/8/2017 5:10:02 PM |

## Survey Response

| Your Name | rae nix |
| :--- | :--- |
| Your Address | 11900 seabrook crescent |
| Subject Property Address OR <br> Bylaw Number | Townline Gardens Inc. |
|  | I have attended several meetings held by Townline. <br> The first sessions were back when they were telling <br> the community they had purchased the mall and <br> planned to build apartments. Most of the members <br> of the community made it very clear we did not <br> want buildings behond four stories. We got six. |
| Now they are wanting to build' even higher. I |  |
| oppose it. With all the added apartments in this |  |
| location and prospects of townhouses across the |  |
| street on No. 5 Rd. there is a dire need for better |  |
| infrastructure. Traffic is ridiculous now and we can |  |
| only expect that it will get worse with the increase |  |
| of building permits. |  |
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From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Follow Up Flag:
Flag Status:

Webgraphics
Wednesday, 8 February 2017 19:23
MayorandCouncillors
Send a Submission Online (response \#1000)

Follow up
Flagged
To Public Hearing
Dato:Feb 20.2017
tem 6
Pe. 10788 No. 5 Rd
$(D P 16-741981)$

To Public Mearing Dato: Fel 20, 2017 ltem 6 Re: 10788 No. $5 R \mathrm{Rd}$
(DP16-741981)

## Send a Submission Online (response \#1000)

## Survey Information

| Site: | City Website |
| :---: | :---: |
| Page Title: | Send a Submission Online |
| URL: | http://cms richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx |
| Submission Time/Date: | 2/8/2017 7:22:20 PM |

Survey Response

| Your Name | LEUNG PINGSUN |
| :---: | :---: |
| Your Address | 321-10880 NO. 5 ROAD, RICHMOND, BC |
| Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number | BYLAW 8500 |
| Comments | REJECT TO INCREASE THE MAX HEIGHT OVER A PARKADE STRUCTURE FROM 6 STOREYS TO 10 STOREYS. THE INCREASE WILL CREATE TOO MUCH TRAFFIC TO THIS AREA. |



## MayorandCouncillors

## From:

Sent:
To:
Subject:
Follow Up Flag:
Flag Status:

Frank Suto [fsuto@shaw.ca](mailto:fsuto@shaw.ca)
Thursday, 9 February 2017 18:33
MayorandCouncillors
The Gardens Public Hearing
Follow up
Completed

## To Public Hearing

Date:Feb. 20, 2017
Ptem
Re: 10788 No. 5 Ra.
(DP16-741981)

Feb 9, 2017

## Development Variances Requested by Townline for "The Gardens" project Feb 8 letter regarding a Public Information Session and Public Hearing from Townline Undated Notice of Public Hearing from the City of Richmond

I received both missives yesterday and offer the following comments:
While both reference the same development permit number (DP 16-741981) there is considerable variation in the information presented which I found to be confusing and suspect most will find confusing.

The notice form the City indicates a request from the developer to increase the height of an approved six story 25.0 m high structure to a ten story 33.6 m high structure and a request to increase the allowable projection of unenclosed balconies from 0.9 m to 1.8 m .
The notice from Townline indicates a request to increase the height of one of two approved eight-storey 24.2 m high structures to a ten-storey 30.2 m structure and moving from one four-storey structure to three three-story structures.

A call to the City provided a fuzzy clarification: While the City's notice was technically correct; the information within the Townline letter is a more complete description of what is already approved (including variances) and what is being requested.

I'm still scratching my head with regard to the difference between the City's notice and Townline's letter. Nevertheless as a resident of the area I am of the opinion that any structure taller than the approved 25.0 m height should not be approved. The approved 25.0 m height is, in my opinion, already too high and out of character for the area and will set a precedent and open the door for additional requests for tall structures in the area.

The new bridge will provide enough visual distraction without the addition of residential towers.
While I am sympathetic to Townline's issue of proximity to Hwy 99; Hwy 99 is still in the same place it was before the project was proposed. And based on what I've learned about the proposed Hwy 99 / Steveston Hwy interchange it won't be getting all that much closer.

As a result I would suggest that Townline stay with what's already approved or come up with a new plan that increases separation from Hwy 99 with increased low rise density (no more than four or five storeys) toward the western side of the property. The outcome may be a project with fewer than the presently approved 500 residential units.

Without an understanding of what structures would abut ALR land on the north side (and the setback) it's difficult to offer an opinion one way or another on balconies.

I'd also like to suggest that the City re-address the geometry of the No 5 Road and Westminster Hwy intersection.
Anyone travelling westbound along Steveston Hwy has to make a 110 to 115 degree right turn (should be 90 degrees) into
a narrow right lane to go north on No 5 Road only to run into a standing bus at a bus stop on a regular basis. Not a good situation, especially if eastbound Steveston Hwy traffic is turning left (less than 90 degrees) into the narrow No 5 Road northbound left lane.

Sincerely,
Frank Suto
Shellmont resident.
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## Send a Submission Online (response \#1002)

To Public Hearing<br>Date: Feb 20, 2017<br>Item $\%$<br>Ro: 10788 No .5 Rd (DP 16-741981)

## Survey Information



## Survey Response

| Your Name | Stefanie Weng |
| :--- | :--- |
| Your Address | $309-8011$ Ryan Road |
| Subject Property Address OR <br> Bylaw Number | Townline Gardens DP-16-741981. |
| Comments | As a long time resident in the area, we welcome <br> the new development at the Gardens. There have <br> not been any new apartments in the area for long <br> time. This development is a great addition to the <br> area. It is also in a very convenient location with <br> public transportation at the door step and close to <br> the highway to Vancouver or to the Surrey. The <br> park area is great and hard to find in any new <br> development. I fully support this new development. |


[^0]:    a7- Landscape area calculation

