

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

## Monday, June 18, 2012 - 7 p.m.

## Council Chambers, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Richmond City Hall 6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

## **OPENING STATEMENT**

### Page

PH-11	1.		Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8750 (RZ 06-344606) (File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-8750, RZ 06-344606) (REDMS No. 3519618, 3188236)			
			See Page <b>PH-11</b> for full report			
		Loc	ation:	22560, 22600, 22620 Gilley Road		
		Арр	olicant:	Kaiman Enterprises Co. Ltd.		
		Pur	pose:	To rezone the subject property from "Single Detached (RS1/B)" to "Town Housing (ZT11) – Hamilton", to permit development of a 35 unit townhouse project with vehicle access provided from Gilley Road only.		
		Firs	st Reading:	April 26, 2011		
		Ord	ler of Busine	ss:		
		1.	Presentation	n from the applicant.		
		2.	Acknowled since first re	gement of written submissions received by the City Clerk eading.		
PH-49			(a) Wend	y Walker, 4525 Fraserbank Place		
		3.	Submission	s from the floor.		
		Council Consideration:				
		1.	Action on s	econd and third readings of Bylaw 8750.		

PH-51	2.	Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8769 (RZ 10-516267) (File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-8769, RZ 10-516267) (REDMS No. 3213418, 3218464)			
			See Page <b>PH-51</b> for full report		
		Loc	ation:	9160 No. 2 Road	
		Арр	licant:	Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd.	
		Purpose:		To rezone the subject property from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3)", to permit development of eighteen (18) three-storey townhouse units on the site with vehicle access from Maple Road.	
		Firs	t Reading:	July 11, 2011	
		Ord	er of Busines	SS:	
		1.	Presentation	from the applicant.	
		2.	Acknowledg since first re	gement of written submissions received by the City Clerk ading.	
PH-154			(a) Kelvin	Kelvin Leung, 28-6099 Alder Street	
PH-158			(b) Peter k	) Peter Kho, 9293 Romaniuk Drive	
PH-159			(c) Rong Zhang, 6431 No. 2 Road		
PH-160			(d) Ajmer Ghag, on behalf of the residents of 5260 Maple Road		
PH-162			(e) Ajita Fung, 114-8751 General Currie Road		
PH-163			(f) Mun Ling Cheung, 5451 Maple Road		
PH-164			(g) Man Y	Man Ying Lee, 6240 Maple Road	
PH-165			(h) Gord 7	Gord Turner, 6631 Juniper Drive	
PH-166			(i) John C	Cantello, 6120 Maple Road	
PH-167			(j) Five pe	etition letters, from Neighbourhood Concern Group	
PH-170			(k) Felix F	Fei Lu, 6071 Martyniuk Place	
		3.	Submissions	from the floor.	
		Cou	ncil Conside	ration:	

1. Action on second and third readings of Bylaw 8769.

### **PH-171** 3. **Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8825 (RZ 11-582830)**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-8825, RZ 11-582830) (REDMS No. 3374326, 3520405)

See Page <b>PH-171</b> for full report				
Location:	4820 Garry Street			
Applicant:	Armit Maharaj			
Purpose:	To rezone the subject property from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Single Detached (RS2/A)", to permit development of two (2) single-family lots.			
First Reading:	May 28, 2012			

### 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 Bylaw 8825.

#### PH-183 4. Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 8880 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8881 (RZ 12-601319)

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-8880/8881) (REDMS No. 3482714, 3487963)

#### See Page PH-183 for full report

**Location:** 23591 Westminster Highway

**Applicant:** City of Richmond

#### **Purpose of OCP Designation Amendment:**

To amend the Land Use Designation in the Hamilton Area Plan to designate the subject property "Community Facilities" in order to permit child daycare use.

#### **Purpose of Zoning Amendment:**

To rezone the subject property from "Single Detached (RS1/F)" to "School & Institutional Use (SI)", to permit development of a 33 space licensed child daycare facility.

First Reading: May 28, 2012

### **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 Bylaws 8880 and 8881.

### PH-213 5. Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 8888

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-8888, 084045-20-10/2012-Vol 01) (REDMS No. 3517757, 3517752)

### See Page PH-213 for full report

Location:	City Centre Area
-----------	------------------

Applicant: City of Richmond

**Purpose:** To amend Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Schedule 2.10 (City Centre Area Plan) to clarify that within the City Centre the City may, in its discretion, include in the calculation of site area (for the purpose of determining buildable floor area) lands voluntarily dedicated or otherwise transferred to the City (i.e., fee simple lot) by developers for minor streets, lanes, mews, parks, and open spaces for which Richmond's Development Cost Charge (DCC) program provides no financial compensation.

First Reading: May 28, 2012

### 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 & third readings of Bylaw 8888.
- Adoption of Bylaw 8888. 2.

#### **PH-223** 6.

**Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8890 (RZ 11-586782)** (File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-8890, RZ 11-586782) (REDMS No. 34978834, 3499097, 3499005)

		(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-8890, RZ 11-586782) (REDMS No. 34978834, 3499097, 3499005)		
		See Page PH-223 for full report		
		<b>Location:</b> 6471, 6491, and 6511 No. 2 Road		
		Applicant:         Matthew Cheng Architect Inc.		
		Purpose:To rezone the subject property from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)", to permit development of 15 townhouse units.		
		First Reading: April 23, 2012		
		Order of Business:		
		1. Presentation from the applicant.		
		2. Acknowledgement of written submissions received by the City Clerk since first reading.		
PH-243		(a) Wendy Leung, 5791 Garrison Road		
PH-245		(b)		
		3. Submissions from the floor.		
		Council Consideration:		
		1. Action on second and third readings of Bylaw 8890.		
PH-247	7.	Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8893 (RZ 12-600991) (File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-8893, RZ 12-600991) (REDMS No. 3504576, 3507376)		
		See Page PH-247 for full report		
		Location: 6471 Blundell Road		
		Applicant:Xi Chen (Chen Design Studio)		

**Purpose:** To rezone the subject property from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Coach Houses (RCH)", to permit development of two (2) coach house lots each with a single-family residence on it and a second dwelling unit above a garage, with vehicle access from a rear lane extension.

First Reading: May 14, 2012

### 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 Bylaw 8893.

### **PH-261** 8. Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8895 (RZ 10-522194)

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-8895, RZ 10-522194) (REDMS No. 3508396, 3508444)

	See Page <b>PH-261</b> for full report		
Location:	11340 Williams Road		
Applicant:	Khalid Hasan		
Purpose:	To rezone the subject property from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Compact Single Detached (RC2)", to permit development of two (2) compact single family lots with		

vehicle access from an existing rear lane.

First Reading: May 14, 2012

### 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 Bylaw 8895.

#### PH-277 9. Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 8900 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8901 (RZ 11-596457)

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-8900/8901, RZ 11-596457) (REDMS No. 3518170, 3519132)

#### See Page PH-277 for full report

Location: 7431 Francis Road

**Applicant:** Avion Homes Ltd.

#### **Purpose of OCP Designation Amendment:**

- To redesignate the subject property from "Community Institutional" to "Neighbourhood Residential" in Attachment 1 to Schedule 1 of Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100 (Generalized Land Use Map); and
- (2) To redesignate the subject property from "Community Institutional" to "Low-Density Residential" in Attachment 2 to Schedule 1 of Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100 (Specific Land Use Map).

### **Purpose of Zoning Amendment:**

To rezone the subject property from "Assembly (ASY)" to "Single Detached (RS2/E)", to permit development of a single-family dwelling on site.

### First Reading: May 28, 2012

### Order of Business:

- 1. Presentation from the applicant.
- 2. Acknowledgement of written submissions received by the City Clerk since first reading.
- (a) Roy Budai, 7451 Francis Road
- 3. Submissions from the floor.

### **Council Consideration:**

1. Action on second and third readings of Bylaws 8900 and 8901.

**PH-292** 

PH-293	10.	Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8902 (RZ 09-496145) (File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-8902, RZ 09-496145) (REDMS No. 3496755, 3521256)					
		See Page <b>PH-293</b> for full report					
		Location:	7840 Bennett Road				
		Applicant:	Timothy Tse				
		Purpose:	To rezone the subject property from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Infill Residential (RI2)", to permit development of two (2) new lots, each with a front and back duplex, and vehicular access from the proposed rear lane extension only.				
		First Reading:	May 28, 2012				
		Order of Business:					
		1. Presentation	n from the applicant.				
		2. Acknowled since first r	gement of written submissions received by the City Clerk eading.				
PH-315		(a) Wen J	Jun Mo, 7808 Bennett Road				
		3. Submission	s from the floor.				
		Council Conside	eration:				
		1. Action on s	econd and third readings of Bylaw 8902.				
PH-317	11.	Zoning Amendm (File Ref. No. 08-4040	nent Bylaw 8904 -01) (REDMS No. 3522269, 3522826)				
		See Page PH-317 for full report					
		Location:	City-Wide				
		Applicant:	City of Richmond				
		Purpose:	To set a maximum height for freestanding tele-				

communication towers and antennas at 15 m (48 ft.) or the maximum accessory structure height in a given zone, whichever is greater; and allow for building-mounted telecommunication antennas to extend 3.0 m (9.8 ft.) above the maximum building height permitted in the zone.

		First	t Reading:	May 28, 2012					
		Order of Business:							
		1.	Presentat	ion from the applicant.					
		2.	Acknowle since first	edgement of written submissions received by the City Cle t reading.	rk				
PH-324			(a) Jerr	y Flynn					
		3.	Submissi	ons from the floor.					
		Соц	ncil Consi	ideration.					
		1.		a second and third readings of Bylaw 8904.					
		1.							
		2.	Adoption	of Bylaw 8904.	]				
			Ĩ	·					
		_		_					
PH-329	12.			<b>dment Bylaw 8884 (RZ 11-585209)</b> 660-20-8884, RZ 11-585209) (REDMS No. 3498893v5, 3497848, 3443571, 3492342	2)				
				See Page <b>PH-329</b> for full report					
PH-419		Extr	act from th	Minutes of the Public Hearing held on May 22, 2012					
PH-430		Extract from the Mi		e Minutes of the Special Council Meeting held on June 4, 2012	2				
		Loca	ation:	7731 & 7771 Alderbridge Way					
		Applicant:		Onni 7731 Alderbridge Holding Corp. and Onni 77' Alderbridge Holding Corp.	71				
		Purpose:		To rezone the subject property from "Industrial Retail (IR1 to "High Density Low Rise Apartments (RAH2)" and main minor amendments to the RAH2 zone in order to facilita development of a 660-unit project in four, six-storey woo frame buildings over two (2) concrete parking structures.	ke ate				
		First	t Reading:	April 23, 2012					
		Orde	er of Busi	ness:					
		1.	Presentat	ion from the applicant.					
		2.	Acknowle since first	edgement of written submissions received by the City Cle	rk				
PH-421	1 (a) Mike Way			e Rasberry, Tim Hortons Restaurant, #125-7771 Alderbrid	ge				

PH-426		(b)	William Cao, Legal Counsel, Tim Hortons, The TDL Group Corp.
PH-428		(c)	Helmot Eppich, Chairman of the Board, Richard Eppich, CEO and President, Ebco Industries Ltd., 7851 Alderbridge Way
PH-432		(d)	Beau Jarvis, V.P. Development, ONNI Real Estate Development, 300-550 Robson Street
PH-434		(e)	Sally Mercer, 303-8880 No. 1 Road
	3.	Subn	nissions from the floor.

### **Council Consideration:**

1. Action on third reading of Bylaw 8884.

## ADJOURNMENT



То:	Planning Committee	Date:	May 7, 2012
From:	Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development	File:	RZ 06-344606
Re:	Application by Kaiman Enterprises Co. Ltd. f 22620 Gilley Road from Single Detached (RS		

### Staff Recommendation

Hamilton

That Bylaw No. 8750, for the rezoning of 22560, 22600 and 22620 Gilley Road from "Single Detached (RS1/B)" to "Town Housing (ZT11) - Hamilton", be referred to the June 18, 2012 Public Hearing.

hakaon

Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development

BJ:ke Att.

	FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY				
ROUTED TO: Transportation Engineering Planning Sustainability Unit	Concurrence Y M N D Y M N D Y M N D	CONCURRENCE OF ACTING GENERAL MANAGER MARAMACASA			

### Staff Report

### Origin

Kaiman Enterprises Co. Ltd has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 22560, 22600 and 22620 Gilley Road (Attachment 1) from Single-Detached (RS1/B) to Town Housing (ZT11) – Hamilton zoning in order to permit development of a 35 unit townhouse project.

### Public Hearing Referral - May 16, 2011

At Public Hearing on May 16, 2011, Richmond City Council referred the subject rezoning application back to staff and the applicant to review the following as it related to the proposed townhouse development:

"That the application by Kaiman Enterprises Co. Ltd. for a rezoning at 22560, 22600 and 22620 Gilley Road be referred back to staff for further review of the following:

- (i) Routing of traffic through the neighbourhood;
- (ii) Soil and fill conditions in the neighbourhood generally, and specific to the proposed project;
- (iii) Vehicle access to the site from Gilley Road during construction and on a permanent basis;
- (iv) Other options for development of this site, including the pros and cons of the type of fill required for a townhouse project compared to construction of a single-family houses; and
- (v) Parking and fill arrangements in existing townhouse developments in the Lower Westminster Area that have incorporated parking on the first level, underneath the residences."

### Purpose

This report responds to and presents new information related to the May 16, 2011 Council referral and brings forward a revised townhouse rezoning proposal.

### Revised Project Description

The proposal involves development of a 35 unit townhouse development in the Lower Westminster Sub-Area contained in the Hamilton Sub Area, which permits a variety of lowdensity residential land uses (single-family; multi-family).

Vehicle access to the subject site has been revised with all access to be from Gilley Road. The vehicle access is located at the northeast corner of the development. No vehicle access for the proposed townhouse development will be provided from either Turner Street or Rathburn Drive in response to the concerns from neighbourhood residents. The developer is required to dedicate land and design/construct the Turner Street and Rathburn Drive connection as part of the development proposal, which will complete the neighbourhood road system that services the single-family dwellings in this area. Therefore, the Rathburn Drive/Turner Street connection will be a significant upgrade to the local road system enabling improved access and traffic circulation for residents in the neighbourhood.

Gilley Road is able to accommodate all vehicular traffic generated from the development. Minor works will be undertaken along Gilley Road, which will be discussed in latter sections of this report.

Internal traffic circulation for the townhouse development is arranged to enable traffic flow through the development site and around a centrally located outdoor amenity space. A public walkway is also being secured through this development to provide pedestrian linkages from Rathburn Drive to Gilley Road that will improve neighbourhood connections in Hamilton.

Townhouse building typologies consist of 3 storey massing (2 levels over parking) in duplex, triplex and fourplex configurations. Duplex unit types are concentrated along the Rathburn Drive/Tumer Street frontage to be consistent with the existing form and character of existing single-family homes in the area. Due to the existing grade difference on the subject site (lower elevations along Gilley Road with higher elevations at Rathburn Drive/Turner Street), units that front onto Rathburn Drive/Turner Street will exhibit 2 storey massing as the first level parking will be concealed as a result of the grade difference. Please refer to Attachment 2 for a preliminary site plan and elevations.

### Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details about the proposal is contained in **Attachment 3**.

A copy of the staff report considered at May 16, 2011 Public Hearing is contained in **Attachment 4**.

### Surrounding Development

To the North: Properties zoned Agricultural (AG1) in the ALR to the west and properties zoned Single-Detached (RS1/B) to the east on the north side of Gilley Road

To the East: A low-density townhouse development zoned Town Housing (ZT11) – Hamilton and properties zoned Single-Detached (RS1/F).

To the South: Properties zoned Single-Detached (RS1/B).

To the West: Properties zoned Single-Detached (RS1/B).

### Project Response to Public Hearing Referral Items

This section responds to the referral arising from the May 16, 2011 Public Hearing.

1. Routing of traffic through the neighbourhood

The access/egress to the townhouse site previously proposed from Rathburn Drive/Turner Street has been removed, with all access to the development from Gilley Road. This development will still be required to dedicate land and complete all necessary road works to complete the Rathburn Drive/Turner Street connection, which improves traffic circulation to the existing single-family neighbourhood only. Works to complete the Rathburn Drive/Turner Street connection will be designed and constructed to meet the existing standard in the neighbourhood. The proposed townhouse development will not result in the routing of additional traffic through existing neighbourhoods and the proposed road improvements will benefit the neighbourhood.

- 2. <u>Soil and fill conditions in the neighbourhood generally, and specific to the proposed project</u> The entire Hamilton Sub Area Plan (including the subject site and neighbouring residential areas) is in an area that requires a Flood Construction Level (FCL) for residential habitable space at 3.5 m. For existing residential developments in the surrounding neighbourhood, this results in two primary responses to accommodate residential development:
  - Placement of fill on a development site to raise the overall grade elevation so that the concrete slab of the building/dwelling is able to be at or above the minimum 3.5 m FCL. This approach to development is predominant for existing single-family residential lots developed and constructed in the early to mid 1990's in the residential neighbourhood surrounding the subject site. As a result, single-family dwellings in the area utilize a combination of fill to raise the grade of the site and construction of crawl spaces to comply with the necessary FCL.
  - Low-density residential townhouse developments in the Lower Westminster Area portion of the Hamilton Area Plan have minimized the placement of fill on sites as these projects have garages at grade, which enables habitable space for the remainder of the dwelling unit to occupy the second and third floors. This approach involves minimal placement of fill on the development site to permanently raise the site grade.

The surrounding neighbourhood also contains a number of sites and single-family dwellings that have minimal modifications to the grade elevation as these buildings were developed prior to the establishment of minimum flood construction level requirements.

A majority of the site is at or near the elevation to Gilley Road and minimal soil fill has occurred. Existing structures and dwellings on the site were demolished in 2007 and a thin layer of sand has been placed and graded level. At the south edge of all three development parcels (fronting onto the future Rathburn Drive/Turner Street connection), the elevation increases significantly to meet the existing grade of the road and single-family residential subdivision (i.e., approximately 4.1 m geodetic).

The proposed 35 unit townhouse development is not undertaking any significant soil filling activity. As the townhouse building typology enables garages to be situated at grade, FCL requirements are complied with as the second floor (containing habitable space) meets or exceeds the 3.5 m FCL. The townhouse scheme utilizes the grade difference along the south adjacency of the site along the future Rathburn Drive/Turner Street connection by concealing the ground level parking for units fronting the future road and presenting two storey massing similar to surrounding single-family dwellings. Please refer to Attachment 5 for an illustration of this grade difference.

3. <u>Vehicle access to the site from Gilley Road during construction and on a permanent basis</u> A traffic and road impact study has been undertaken by the developers' Transportation Engineer to review use of Gilley Road as the subject site's means of access/egress during construction and on a permanent basis. This study confirmed that Gilley Road can accommodate construction traffic, vehicle traffic generated by the townhouse development and existing traffic generated from the 12 existing single-family lots that have direct access along this portion of Gilley Road west of Westminster Highway (Gilley Road is not a thru road west of Westminster Highway). To address neighbourhood concerns about construction traffic, the developer is required to submit a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to be reviewed and approved by City Transportation staff. In response to specific concerns raised, the following measures will be included in the plan:

- No construction related parking or staging of trucks on Gilley Road or in the surrounding neighbourhood.
- Dedicated areas for construction staff parking on sites/areas secured by the developer for this purpose.
- Dedicated construction loading/staging areas on the subject development site only.
- Construction vehicle access/egress is prohibited from utilizing Rathburn Drive or Turner Street.
- Construction vehicles will be required to travel at a reduced speed down Gilley Road.

The portion of Gilley Road west of Westminster Highway has designated Riparian Management Areas (RMA) (5 m) on both sides of the road in conjunction with the existing watercourses. The existing 5 m RMA designations on both sides of Gilley Road place limitations on the extent of road upgrades that can be implemented without having significant impacts to the watercourse and related habitat.

As a result, the following cross-section is proposed along Gilley Road that will be implemented from Westminster Highway to the development's entrance on Gilley Road (northeast corner of site). This cross-section minimizes impacts on the existing RMA's and facilitates upgrades to Gilley Road to accommodate minor road widening and an interim walkway.

- Minimum 6.1 m wide asphalt driving surface.
- Minimum 1.5 m wide asphalt pedestrian pathway (interim) along the south side of the road and north of the existing watercourse with appropriate pavement markings and/or delineators for the walkway and tie-in to the top-of bank of the canal.
- Minimum 0.6 m wide gravel shoulder tie-in to the existing watercourse on the north side of Gilley Road.
- The detailed design and construction of identified works to Gilley Road from the development site's access to Westminster Highway will be completed through a Servicing Agreement.
- 4. Other options for development of this site, including the pros and cons of the type of fill required for a townhouse project compared to construction of a single-family houses. All three properties under rezoning application have existing Single-Detached (RS1/B) zoning. Therefore, the lots have existing subdivision potential and could be developed into single-family lots similar to the pattern established in the neighbouring residential subdivision (which is also zoned RS1/B). Based on the size of the three subject properties, development of a minimum of 12 new single-family lots can be created based on existing zoning (i.e., 6 lots fronting Gilley Road and 6 lots fronting the future Rathburn Drive/Turner Road connection).

If single-family subdivision occurred as described, a significant amount of soil fill would be placed on the subject site in order to raise the elevation so that the habitable space for the dwelling meets the 3.5 m FCL requirement. In conjunction with fill to raise the site's elevation, some habitable space may be situated over a crawl space to meet FCL requirements. The benefits associated with a single-family subdivision and raising the site significantly with fill is that the grade of the lots would be close to matching the existing residential lots fronting Rathburn Drive and Turner Street and FCL requirements would be met. Associated costs would be a resulting grade difference between the raised development site and existing lots fronting Gilley Road. Extensive amounts of fill to be placed on the development site to permanently raise the grade of the site also has the potential to settle over time due to the combined weight of the buildings and additional fill compressing underlying soils. This potential settling, over the long-term, could have negative impacts on the foundations and buildings developed on the subject site or on properties adjacent to the development site. The soil fill approach for single-family development may also result in the implementation of retaining walls adjacent to single-family developments to deal with the grade difference.

For a townhouse project, minimum additional fill is required to be placed on the development site permanently as the first level containing the garage and off-street parking would enable the second level, containing the habitable living space, to be situated at the 3.5 m FCL requirement. An advantage to this development approach is that new grade differences will not be introduced between the subject site and surrounding properties. The townhouse proposal will also be able to utilize the existing grade difference along the south edge of the site, which enables two storey building massing to be presented to the surrounding single-family neighbourhood as the first floor parking is concealed due to the subject sites lower elevation compared to Rathburn Drive/Turner Street. In summary, a townhouse proposal results in a significantly smaller amount of permanent fill to be placed on the site when compared to a single-family development.

In addition to any permanent fill to be placed on the development site for either a singlefamily or townhouse development, temporary preload materials will need to be placed in addition to fill to raise the site as part of the required site preparation prior to construction. An alternative means of site preparation utilized in Hamilton has been the placement of piles throughout the development site. However, concerns have been raised by residents through this rezoning application about the potential impacts site piling will have. As a result, the applicant will not be undertaking piling as a method of site preparation. For the townhouse proposal, the applicant plans to:

- Minimally raise the base elevation of the site from approximately 0.8-1.0 m (existing) to 1.75 m.
- Temporarily place 2-3 m of materials on top of the base elevation as part of the site preload preparations for townhouse development. This material will be removed once preload activities are completed.
- 5. Parking and fill arrangements in existing townhouse developments in the Lower Westminster <u>Area that have incorporated parking on the first level, underneath the residences</u> Virtually all of the recent townhouse developments in the Lower Westminster Area of Hamilton have implemented parking/garage space (i.e., tandem parking configuration) on the first level, with second and third levels containing the living/habitable space. For this type of residential townhouse development, the amount of fill placed on property is minimal. In

most cases, townhouse development sites will match the existing elevation of the fronting street/sidewalk; therefore resulting in minimal differences in grade.

This model of townhouse development in the Lower Westminster Area has developed adjacent to existing single-family dwellings, City parks and other townhouse developments. Each development integrates well with surrounding land uses as elevation increases to the site are kept at a minimum and the site transitions to the public road/sidewalk or neighbouring development are achieved without the need for retaining walls/terraces or sloping of grade. In some cases, townhouse developments are next to existing retaining walls that have been implemented as a result of permanent fill placed on properties to increase elevation.

### Public Correspondence Received Since May 16, 2011 Public Hearing

One piece of correspondence has been received from the property owners of land whose backyard is adjacent to Gilley Road (north side), which has vehicle access to Fraserbank Place (refer to Attachment 6). In the emails to City staff, the resident notes concerns about the following land use issues related to the rezoning proposal:

- Concern about the change in the proposal to enable vehicle access to the development from Gilley Road.
- Concerns about the existing width of Gilley Road and no sidewalks.
- Lack of parking on Gilley Road when compared to an abundance of parking available in the Rathburn Drive/Turner Street neighbourhood.

The revised development proposal proposing vehicle access from Gilley Road has been reviewed and approved by Transportation Division staff. Minor upgrades involving 6.1 m road widening and provisions for a 1.5 m paved pathway (interim) on the south side of Gilley Road are proposed along Gilley Road, which also does not involve extensive modification to the existing watercourses and habitat.

### Staff Comments

### Policy Planning

The revised 35 unit townhouse development, with vehicle access provided from Gilley Road, complies with the Hamilton Sub Area Plan (Lower Westminster Area) designation for residential redevelopment on the subject site.

### Transportation

The applicant's transportation consultant reviewed the establishment of a vehicle access to the development from Gilley Road in coordination with Transportation Division staff. As a result of this review, minor upgrades are proposed to Gilley Road, which is supported for use by the proposed development.

### Engineering Planning

A servicing capacity analysis to review City systems has been completed and approved by the City with no upgrades identified. All works to tie-in to City storm, water and sanitary systems are required to be done in accordance with the approved capacity analysis. A Servicing Agreement is required to be completed as a rezoning consideration for the proposed development for the design and construction of off-site road works and upgrades (i.e., Rathburn Drive/Turner Street connection; Gilley Road works) and on-site pedestrian pathway works.

### Environmental Sustainability

Along the subject site's Gilley Road frontage, there is an existing 5 m wide RMA associated with watercourses on both sides of the road. The development's on-site pathway and off-site Gilley Road works has been located and designed to incur minimal disturbance to existing RMA's.

As the above works will be undertaken within the 5 m RMA, the developer is required to engage a professional environmental consultant to review all proposed works and include recommendations for mitigation and enhancement of the RMA where applicable. All works within the RMA and proposed mitigation/enhancement measures is required to be approved by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. The Servicing Agreement will include the RMA mitigation/enhancement strategy, as approved by DFO.

### Description of Works and Requirements for Revised Development

The following sections highlight new works and rezoning considerations associated with the proposed 35 unit townhouse development and summarizes the original rezoning considerations to remain in place (based on the rezoning considered at Public Hearing on May 16, 2011).

### Gilley Road Upgrades

Completion of a Servicing Agreement (prior to final adoption of the rezoning) is required to design and construct the following road cross-section along Gilley Road from the development's vehicle access to Westminster Highway:

- Minimum 6.1 m wide asphalt driving surface.
- Minimum 1.5 m wide asphalt pedestrian pathway (interim) along the south side of the road and north of the existing watercourse with appropriate pavement markings and/or delineators for the walkway and tie-in to the top-of bank of the canal.
- Minimum 0.6 m wide gravel shoulder tie-in to the existing watercourse on the north side of Gilley Road.

### On-Site Pedestrian Pathway

A new east-west running pedestrian pathway along the north edge of the subject site (adjacent to the Gilley Road frontage) is proposed. This will be a permanent pathway established on the development site connecting to the proposed north-south running pathway proposed along the western edge of the site. The "L" shaped walkway will facilitate a connection from the completed portion Rathburn Drive, through the development site and onto the interim pathway established along Gilley Road through the associated upgrades.

To secure this pathway through the development site, a 4.5 m wide public-rights-of-way statutory right-of-way is required as a rezoning consideration along the entire west and north edge of the subject site and the Servicing Agreement will address design and construction. The pathway design will consist of a minimum 2.5 m wide hard surface pathway with appropriate landscape buffering. The public-right-of-passage statutory right-of-way will be required to be registered with Land Titles to allow public access for pedestrians, cyclists, scooters, wheelchairs (motorized and non-motorized) and similar types of non-vehicle related means of transport. The

agreement will also specify that the maintenance of the surrounding landscaping and related elements (fencing) along with the general upkeep of the pathway (i.e., snow, ice, debris removal; walkway upkeep in a safe condition) will be by the future strata corporation. The City will maintain the hard surface portion of the walkway.

To accommodate this walkway along the north edge of the development site, townhouse units are setback 7.5 m from Gilley Road to allow sufficient space for the 4.5 m pathway right-of-way and front yard space for the residential units.

The 1.5 m wide pathway established off-site along the south side of Gilley Road that provides a connection from the public pathway established on the subject site out to Westminster Highway is a interim measure to facilitate improved connections (for pedestrians and other non-motorized means of transport) to the area east of Westminster Highway/Gilley Road intersection (containing the community centre, elementary school and commercial services). The long-term solution is to establish a pathway located solely on development sites to the east that would run adjacent to Gilley Road between the subject properties and Westminster Highway (similar to the east-west running public pathway proposed in this townhouse proposal). Once a contiguous public pathway has been established on development sites that connect from the north-south running walkway (from Rathburn Drive) to Westminster Highway, the interim pathway on Gilley Road can be removed and the entire paved road width can be utilized for vehicle travel.

### New Rezoning Considerations

The following is a summary of new rezoning considerations resulting from the current townhouse proposal (refer to Attachment 7 for a consolidated list of new and existing rezoning considerations for the proposed development).

- Through the City's Servicing Agreement process, design and construct road upgrades along Gilley Road from the vehicle access to the site to Westminster Highway to establish a 6.1 m wide asphalt driving surface, 1.5 m wide asphalt pathway, appropriate delineation measures between the road and pathway and gravel shoulders on both sides of the road.
- Registration of a legal agreement to secure the 4.5 m wide public-rights-of-passage statutory right-of-way for a pedestrian pathway running along the entire north edge of the site along with design and construction of the pathway to the appropriate standard through the City's Servicing Agreement process.

<u>Rezoning Considerations that Remain Unchanged from May 16, 2011 Public Hearing</u> The following is a summary of existing rezoning considerations that remain unchanged and attached to the development (see Attachment 7). These rezoning considerations are required to be completed prior to final adoption of the rezoning amendment bylaw.

- Consolidation of the three subject sites and land dedication (approximately 12.2 m wide) for the southern portions of 22560 & 22600 Gilley Road for the Rathburn Drive/Turner Street connection.
- Registration of a legal agreement to secure the 4.5 m wide public-rights-of-passage statutory right-of-way for a pedestrian pathway running along the entire west edge of the site.
- Submission and approval of a Servicing Agreement to design and construct:
  - o The Rathburn Drive/Turner Street connection.
  - o Public pathways (north-south/east-west).

- Removal of all existing driveway culvert crossings along the subject site's Gilley Road frontage and installation of a new culvert crossing along Gilley Road for the townhouse development.
- Installation of an oil grit sump infrastructure associated with the on-site drainage system to filter storm water from the development site.
- RMA mitigation and enhancement for all works in or adjacent to the RMA along Gilley Road, based on the environmental consultant's recommendations and approved by the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans.
- Voluntary contributions (in the applicable amount) to the City's affordable housing, public art and cash in lieu of indoor amenity space fund.
- Registration of the appropriate legal agreements to:
  - o Secure a Flood Plain Covenant (with a minimum FCL of 3.5 m).
  - o Secure the ALR landscape buffer along Gilley Road.
  - Restrict the conversion of off-street tandem parking areas to habitable space.
- Approval from the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure.

### Summary Analysis

Modifications to the townhouse site plan have been undertaken to remove the access from Rathburn Drive/Turner Street, implement an access to Gilley Road at the northeast corner of the site and provisions for a public pedestrian pathway running along the north edge of the site (adjacent to Gilley Road) connecting to a public pathway proposed along the west edge of the site.

Revisions to provide access to the development from Gilley Road responds directly to neighbourhood concerns about routing of traffic through the single-family residential area south of the site. This townhouse project will not result in any additional traffic volume in this neighbourhood and improves the existing road network through the new Rathburn Drive/Turner Street connection to be completed by this development.

Use of Gilley Road for vehicle access to the townhouse site has been reviewed and approved by Transportation Division staff. Minor upgrades will be undertaken to slightly widen the paved driving area and create a interim public walkway on the south side of the road while also taking into account the existing RMA's to ensure road works result in minimal impact to the watercourses.

In response to comments arising from the May 16, 2011 Public Hearing, the following has been confirmed:

- 2-3 m of temporary fill material will be placed on the subject property as part of the preload site preparation for the proposed townhouse development.
- No piling will be undertaken as part of the site preparation.
- A townhouse development will result in less permanent fill/soil materials placed on the site when compared to a single-family subdivision and redevelopment.
- The existing grade difference of the subject site being approximately 3 m below the higher grades of the road and dwellings to the south along Rathburn Drive and Turner Street benefits the proposed townhouse site plan as the change in elevation enables the first floor of the units fronting the future Rathburn Drive to be concealed; therefore resulting in 2 storey massing immediately adjacent to existing residential dwellings.

• This approach to site preparation and minimum amounts of permanent fill placed on property to raise elevation responds to concerns from the neighbourhood about impacts of fill and piling methods and related disturbances to surrounding properties.

### Conclusion

The proposal to rezone the subject site to Town Housing (ZT11) – Hamilton zoning to permit a 35 unit low-density residential development has been revised to respond to the neighbourhood concerns and Council referral arising from the May 16, 2011 Public Hearing. Staff support the revised rezoning application.

Kevin Eng Planner 1

KE:cas

- Attachment 1: Location Map
- Attachment 2: Preliminary Site Plan and Building Elevations

Attachment 3: Development Application Data Sheet

Attachment 4: Copy of Staff Report Considered at May 16, 2011 Public Hearing

Attachment 5: Diagram of Grade Differences on Subject Site

Attachment 6: Public Correspondence

Attachment 7: Rezoning Considerations







**PH - 24** 

T 2



PH - 25







City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1 www.richmond.ca 604-276-4000

## Development Application Data Sheet

### RZ 06-344606

**Attachment 3** 

Address: 22560, 22600 and 22620 Gilley Road

Applicant: Kaiman Enterprises Company Ltd.

Planning Area(s): Hamilton Sub Area Plan – Lower Westminster

	Existing	Proposed
Owner:	Kaiman Enterprises Ltd.	No change
Site Size (m <sup>2</sup> ):	6,441 m <sup>2</sup> for combined three properties	5,776 m <sup>2</sup> (consolidated lots minus road dedications)
Land Uses:	Single-family zoned lots - vacant	Low-density townhouses
OCP Area Plan Designation:	Small and Large Lots Single- Family Residential; Two Family Residential; Townhouse Residential; & Institutional	<ul> <li>Complies with Townhouse Residential.</li> <li>Complies with 25 units per acre maximum</li> </ul>
Zoning:	Single-Detached (RS1/B)	Town Housing Hamilton (ZT11)
Number of Units:	N/A Vacant	35 units
Other Designations:	Riparian Management Area – 5 m along Gilley Road frontage	No change

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Density (units/acre):	25 upa identified in Hamilton Area Plan – Lower Westminster	24 ира	none permitted
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.6 FAR	0.6 FAR	none permitted
Lot Coverage – Building:	Max. 35%	35%	none
Setback – Gilley Road Front Yard (m):	Min. 6 m	7.5 m	none
Setback – Rathburn Drive Front Yard (m):	Mìn. 6 m	6 m	none
Setback – Side & Rear Yards (m): West	None	4.5 m	none
Setback – Side & Rear Yards (m): East	None	3 m	none
Height (m):	10.6 m	9.73 m	none
Off-street Parking Spaces – Regular (R) / Visítor (V):	70 (R) and 7 (V) per unit	70 (R) and 7 (V) per unit	none

۰.

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Tandem Parking Spaces:	No provisions	35 stalls parked in tandem	variance requested
Amenity Space – Indoor:	п/а	Cash-in-lieu	поле
Amenity Space – Outdoor:	6 m <sup>2</sup> per unit	210 m <sup>2</sup>	none

Other: N/A

# COPY OF MAY 16 2011 PUBLIC HEARING

## STAFF REPORT

City of Richmond

Planning and Development Department

<b>Report</b>	to	Com	mittee
---------------	----	-----	--------

Re:	Director of Development Application by Kalman Enterprises Co. Lt	,	-
From:	Brlan J. Jackson Director of Development	File:	RZ 06-344606
То:	Planning Committee	Date:	March 30, 2011
		•	

Hamilton

### Staff Recommendation

That Bylaw No. 8750, for the rezoning of 22560, 22600 and 22620 Gilley Road from "Single Detached (RS1/B)" to "Town Housing (ZT11) - Hamilton", be introduced and given first reading.

Noxon

Brian J. Jackson Director of Development

BJ:ke Att.

FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY			
ROUTED TO;	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER	
Affordable Housing	YOND	- pre trilg	

#### Staff Report

#### Orlgin

Kaiman Enterprises Co. Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 22560, 22600 and 22620 Gilley Road (Attachment 1) from Single-Detached (RS1/B) to Town Housing (ZT11) – Hamilton zoning in order to permit development of a 35 unit townhouse project.

#### Project Description

The subject properties, located in the Hamilton Area, are contained in the Lower Westminster Sub-Area where land uses permit a variety of low-density residential developments. This project facilitates the completion of Rathburn Drive and Tumer Street that would service the proposed townhouse project and surrounding single-family residential subdivision in the neighbourhood. Vehicle access to the proposed townhouse development will be from the newly constructed Rathburn Drive/Turner Street connection. No vehicle access will be provided from Gilley Road. The project will have townhouse units fronting Gilley Road to the north and Rathburn Drive/Turner Street to the south. Townhouse buildings range from duplex to fourplex 3 storey building typologies that are arranged around a centrally located outdoor amenity area. Please refer to Attachment 2 for a preliminary site, building elevation and landscape plan.

A public pedestrian pathway along the west side of the subject site is being secured through this development. This will enable a direct connection between the residential subdivision and Gilley Road, which will facilitate improved pedestrian movements to the community services and shopping centre located to the east of Westminster Highway and Gilley Road intersection.

#### FindIngs of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details about the proposal is contained in Attachment 3.

#### Surrounding Development

To the North: Properties zoned Agricultural (AG1) in the ALR to the west and properties zoned Single-Detached (RS1/B) to the east on the north side of Gilley Road

To the East: A low-density townhouse development zoned Town Housing (ZT11) – Hamilton and properties zoned Single-Detached (RS1/F).

To the South: Properties zoned Single-Detached (RS1/B).

To the West: Properties zoned Single-Detached (RS1/B).

#### Related Policies & Studies

#### Official Community Plan - Hamilton Sub Area Plan

The subject sites are located in Hamilton and subject to the land use policies and designations applicable to this sub area. Residential growth and redevelopment is permitted in the area of Hamilton that is generally located south of Gilley Road along Westminster Highway.

This area is contained in the Lower Westminster Area Plan of Hamilton (Attachment 4), which identifies a variety of permitted residential land uses ranging from single-family, duplex and townhouse. The low-density townhouse project complies with the land use designation for this Area of Hamilton.

The Lower Westminster Area Plan includes additional density limitations that range from 11 to 25 units per acre (upa). The subject site's proposed density is 24 units per acre developed at a floor area ratio of 0.6. This complies with the area plan and is consistent with the development density of a number of recent townhouse projects that have been constructed in the area.

A 700 unit maximum is also identified in the Lower Westminster Area Plan applicable to all new residential development. Currently, there are a total of 532 units that have been built (or approved for development through rezoning) in the Lower Westminster Area Plan. Based on this figure, the development proposal complies with the overall unit maximum and permits additional growth (approximately 133 units) on the remaining properties that have not redeveloped.

#### Agricultural Land Reserve Buffer

The OCP also contains guidelines for providing an appropriate buffer to developments that are adjacent to or across from the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). For this proposal, Gilley Road separates the subject site from the ALR area. The OCP guideline for buffers where there is a separating road requires a minimum 5 m (16.5 ft.) buffer distance measured from the edge of the curb or road. The subject proposal's frontage along Gilley Road will generally be maintained with upgrades to install a 1.5 m walkway (existing open ditch/Riparian Management Area to remain). All buildings are also setback a minimum of 6 m (20 ft.) from Gilley Road. The combined width of the building setback and existing frontage to be maintained along the south side of Gilley Road enables sufficient space to meet OCP ALR buffer guidelines. The Development Permit application will detail the on-site landscape scheme to be implemented on the development site.

#### Riparian Management Area

A 5 m Riparian Management Area (RMA) exists along the subject site's Gilley Road frontage. The 5 m RMA is associated with a watercourse/canal located on the north and south sides of Gilley Road. The watercourse consists of an open canal where storm water drains from the road and fronting properties. Immediately fronting the development site, the open canal contains some existing mature trees, driveway crossings and existing shrubbery and vegetation.

A survey has confirmed the location of the 5 m RMA setback line (measured from top of bank). The site plan indicates that no works associated with the townhouse development (buildings and/or landscaping) encroaches into the 5 m RMA.

Forthcoming works along Gilley Road will likely be located within the 5 m RMA. These works are associated with the following:

- Pedestrian walkway works on the south side of Gilley Road and associated walkway crossing over the watercourse at the northwest corner of the development site.
- Removal of existing driveway crossings.
- Potential removal of trees and vegetation.

Further review of the impact of these works along with any measures of protection during construction on the RMA will be undertaken along with the necessary consultation with and approval from external agencies (Department of Fisheries and Oceans) through the Development Permit and Servicing Agreement process. Recommended mitigation measures will also be examined as part of the RMA assessment.

#### Consultation

#### Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC)

The rezoning proposal was referred to the AAC for review and comment in July 2007 as the subject site is located adjacent to the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) to the northwest. Gilley Road currently consists of a paved road, gravel/grass shoulders and ditches on both sides that separates the existing residential development to the south and agricultural areas to the north. The AAC had no objections to the project and supported the proposed buffer area within the 6 m setback along Gilley Road. Some concerns were noted about the alignment of the proposed pedestrian pathway running along the west edge of the development, which would increase the potential amount of pedestrian traffic adjacent to agricultural areas.

Staff reviewed the location of the pedestrian pathway through the site based on AAC concerns and recommend that the public walkway be maintained on the west side of the site for the following reasons:

- Gilley Road provides an existing separation between the development and ALR lands. The road, in conjunction with open ditches on both sides, serves as a significant buffer to discourage potential trespassing onto farmland for pedestrians walking along Gilley Road.
- An existing walkway approximately 100 m west of the subject sites already provides pedestrian access for the single-family residences south of Gilley Road. The provision of a publicly accessible walkway through the development site will potentially reduce the exposure distance between farmland and pedestrians walking along Gilley Road, which will further minimize opportunities to trespass onto agricultural areas.
- The proposed location of the walkway on the west edge of the site is the optimal location to ensure maximum visibility and usage by pedestrians.

Further details about the composition of the walkway and ALR landscape buffer will be determined through the forthcoming Development Permit application, which will also be reviewed by the AAC.

#### Public Input

#### Correspondence Received

Correspondence identifying questions and concerns about the land use proposal and related impacts is contained in Attachment 5. Throughout the processing of the rezoning application, staff responded to a number of inquiries relating to the status of the application and concerns about site works and preparation activities on the subject properties.

### Staff Response to Public Comments

The following are staff responses to concerns raised in the received correspondence;

- Land use issues and growth The subject site is located in an area where residential redevelopment has been approved in accordance with the density and unit/per acre figures identified in the Lower Westminster portion of the Hamilton Sub Alea Plan.
- Routing of traffic through single-family residential neighbourhood The proponent has submitted a Traffic Impact Assessment in relation to the rezoning application, which has also been reviewed and approved by the Transportation Division.

The assessment concluded that the proposed access (from the newly constructed Rathburn Drive/Turner Street) and surrounding road network is sufficient to accommodate the townhouse development.

Concerns were also noted about the intersection at McLean Avenue and Westminster Highway, which is one of the access/egress points to and from the neighbourhood and townhouse site. The signal at McLean Avenue and Westminster Highway was recently upgraded to a fully signalized intersection to minimize queuing along McLean Avenue and improve traffic improvements in and out of the neighbourhood.

• Gilley Road (Access, parking and pedestrian walkway) - Concerns were noted about use of Gilley Road as an access and parking to the townhouse development. The vehicle access will be from the south of the subject site through the newly constructed Rathburn Drive and Turner Street. Vehicles will not travel down Gilley Road to access the townhouse site. The subject development also has 7 on-site visitor parking stalls, which complies with City requirements.

A pedestrian pathway will be provided along the Gilley Road frontage that connects to the north-south pathway located on the west side of the site. These works will facilitate improved pedestrian infrastructure for travel from the single-family residential neighbourhood and townhouse site to the commercial shopping centre, community centre and elementary school located on the east side of Gilley Road/Westminster Highway intersection.

• For the construction Activities – Concerns were also noted about the impact of construction activities, geo-technical issues, site preparation and construction related traffic.

In relation to concerns about vibrations and related impacts to surrounding properties due to construction activities associated with site foundation work, the proponent has consulted a geotechnical engineer. There is a significant drop in elevation (approximately 2.5m) from the grades of Rathburn Drive at the southern portion of the site to Gilley Road to the north. As a result, the overall development plan utilizes the existing grade difference to minimize significant modifications to the subject site's elevation. The proponent has indicated that the foundation for the townhouses will involve a concrete base poured over piles. To address these concerns, the applicant has indicated that piling activities will be monitored by a geotechnical consultant who will also work with concerned neighbours to set up appropriate sensors. Depending on vibration generated from construction activities, measures can be taken to minimize impact (i.e., pre-auger pile holes).

Neighbourhood residents also noted concerns related to the condition of properties and site preparation activities that occurred through the processing of the rezoning application. In 2007, the applicant obtained the necessary permits to demolish the existing three single-family dwellings on the subject site due to site security. vandalism and trespassing.

Construction traffic and parking will be addressed through the "Traffic and Parking Plan During Construction" plan that is required to be submitted and approved to the Transportation Division prior to issuance of the building permit. This plan will address construction parking, deliveries and loading along with any requested road closures.

#### Examination of Issues and Analysis

#### Land Use Adjacency

The surrounding land uses consist of a mix of single-family dwellings and townhouses. Public road setbacks along Gilley Road and Rathburn Drive (to be constructed) will be a minimum of 6 m, which is consistent with surrounding residential developments. Side and rear yard setbacks throughout the townhouse site range from 3 m (for side yard adjacencies) and 4.5 m (for rear yards), which provide sufficient setbacks to neighbouring sites.

<u>Transportation</u> The project will facilitate the completion and connection of Rathburn Drive to Turner Street, which will also be the primary vehicle access to the townhouse development site at the south end of the property. A Traffic Impact Assessment was submitted and approved by the Transportation Division in support of the townhouse development that concluded that the existing surrounding road network was sufficient to accommodate traffic generated by the project.

The townhouse project provides two parking stalls for each townhouse unit with a total of 7 visitor parking stalls, which complies with zoning bylaw requirements. 70 parking stalls are proposed in tandem arrangement, which will require a variance to be reviewed through the Development Permit. A restrictive covenant to ensure that tandem parking spaces are not converted to living spaces is required to be registered on title as a rezoning consideration. The internal drive-aisle is arranged to accommodate loading and fire-truck turning movements throughout the townhouse project.

#### Road Improvements

Completion and connection of Rathburn Drive and Turner Street will also be facilitated through this project. The southern portion (approximately 12.2m wide) of 22560 and 22600 Gilley Road will be dedicated to allow for construction of the necessary road works. The dedication and works will facilitate completion of a municipal standard road within a 17 m wide road right-ofway (8.5 m paved road, curb and gutter, 1.5 m sidewalk and related City services). The design and construction of the road works will be through the City's standard servicing agreement. No Development Cost Charge (DCC) credits are applicable to the identified road works. Land dedication and roadwork construction (through a Servicing Agreement) are rezoning

3170734

considerations to be completed as part of this development (Attachment 6 - Consolidated list of Rezoning Considerations)

An undeveloped road end currently exists adjacent to the southeast corner of the subject site. This road end is not required for the connection of Rathburn Drive or Turner Street or for the extension of the street further to the east. Upon redevelopment, dedication and roadwork associated with the subject site, this dedicated road end will remain with the potential to develop into a single-family dwelling (currently zoned RS1/B). If initiated in the future, disposition of this dedicated road end will be undertaken by the Real Estate Services Division in accordance with the applicable Council process.

#### Pedestrian Improvements

#### North-South Public Walkway

A public pedestrian pathway on the west side of the development site is being secured through a public rights-of-passage (PROP) statutory right-of-way (ROW) to facilitate the implementation of a north-south walkway connecting Rathburn Drive with Gilley Road. The public rights-of passage statutory right-of-way will be 4.5 m wide and secured as a rezoning consideration. Implementation and construction of the public walkway will be through a Servicing Agreement (secured as a rezoning consideration). The walkway design will consist of a minimum 2.5 m wide hard surface pathway with landscape buffering on each side. The public right-of-passage statutory right-of-way will be required to be registered with Land Titles to allow public access for pedestrians, cyclists, scooters, wheelchairs (motorized and non-motorized) and similar types of non-vehicle related means of transport. The agreement will also specify that the maintenance of the surrounding landscaping and related elements (i.e., fencing) along with general upkeep of the walkway (i.e., snow, ice, debris removal; walkway upkeep in a safe condition) will be by the future strata corporation. The City will maintain the hard surface portion of the walkway.

#### Public Walkway - Gilley Road

Works along the subject site's Gilley Road frontage are also proposed as part of this development proposal to improve pedestrian related infrastructure. Establishment of a separated pedestrian walkway along Gilley Road will connect to the public north-south running walkway through the development site. Pedestrian related upgrades along Gilley will facilitate improved movements to the area east of Gilley Road/Westminster Highway intersection, which is a focus of commercial, community and school activities for the Hamilton Area.

Along the subject site's frontage, works will involve development of a 1.5 m wide asphalt walkway on the south side of Gilley Road, which will be separated from traffic by an appropriate concrete extruded curb. These works are contained within the City's existing road allowance and will be completed through a Servicing Agreement. When the area to the west of the subject properties redevelop, the remainder of the pedestrian walkway works along Gilley Road to the intersection at Westminster Highway will be implemented.

#### **Bngineering** Capacity Analysis

Engineering capacity analyses have been completed and approved for City storm, water and sanitary sewer systems. Based on the findings capacity analyses, existing City systems have sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed development. All works to tie-in to City storm, water and sanitary systems are required to be done in accordance with the approved capacity analysis.

3170734
#### Flood Construction Level

The Flood Construction Level is 3.5 m on the subject site. As a result, a Flood Plain Covenant is required to be registered on title that identifies a minimum Flood Construction Level of 3.5 m.

#### Servicing Agreement

Completion and approval of a Servicing Agreement is a rezoning consideration attached to the project. This servicing agreement will address works associated with the design and construction of:

- · Roadwork associated with the Rathburn Drive and Turner Street connection.
- A 4.5 m wide public pedestrian pathway along the development site's west property line (with appropriate culvert crossing).
- A 1.5 m wide separated public pedestrian walkway along the south side of Gilley Road.
- Removal of any existing driveway culvert crossings along the subject site's Gilley Road frontage.
- Installation of an oil and grit sump infrastructure associated with the on-site drainage system to filter storm water from the development site.
- Any additional RMA mitigation and enhancement works based on the review by the appropriate professional consultant and conditions associated with environmental and Department of Fisheries and Oceans approval.

#### ALR Landscape Buffer

A landscape buffer is proposed along the subject site's Gilley Road frontage as a result of the ALR adjacency to the northwest. A more detailed landscape buffer scheme will be developed through the forthcoming Development Permit application. As a condition of rezoning, a restrictive covenant will be registered on title that indicates landscaping implemented along the north side of the development site's Gilley Road frontage cannot be removed or modified without City approval. The covenant would identify that the landscape planting is intended to be a buffer to mitigate the impacts of noise, dust and odour generated from typical farm activities. A 6 m setback along Gilley Road enables sufficient space to implement the necessary landscape buffer.

#### Tree Retention and Removal

A tree survey and accompanying arborist report was submitted and reviewed by City staff. A summary of tree removal and retention is provided in the following table:

	Total number of trees	Trees to bro ratalged	Gompensation: required	Comments
Oņ-site bylaw sized trees	17	Q	34 trees	<ul> <li>All on-site trees to be removed have been recommended for removal by the consulting arborist.</li> <li>6 trees recommended for removal have been identified in poor health and not</li> </ul>

				<ul> <li>suitable for retention.</li> <li>11 trees recommended for removal have been identified in poor health and within the proposed building locations.</li> </ul>
Off-site Trees (Gilley Road)	8	TBD	TBD	Trees within City road allowance also within RMA. To be reviewed through Development Permit and Servicing Agreement application.
Off-site Trees (Neighbouring lots)	Cedar hedgerow	To be retained	N/A	Tree protection zone fencing to be installed

Based on the condition of trees, supporting arborist report and overall site plan, a majority of onsite trees will be removed. A total of 34 trees will need to be replanted for compensation. A preliminary landscape plan has been submitted to indicate that the minimum number of compensation trees can be accommodated within the development site. Review and finalization of the landscape plan will be undertaken in the forthcoming Development Permit application.

#### Affordable Housing

The subject rezoning was submitted in 2006 prior to the approval of the City's current Affordable Housing Strategy in May 2007. As a result, the City's Interim Affordable Housing Strategy applies to the development proposal that requires a voluntary contribution of \$0.60 per square foot of developable density. The developer has agreed to submit a voluntary contribution for cash-in lieu in the amount of \$22,388 based on the provisions of the Interim Affordable Housing Strategy, which will be secured as a rezoning consideration for the subject application.

#### Indoor and Outdoor Amenity Space

An outdoor amenity space is provided in a central location on the development site and meets size requirements based on the number of units in the project. Further design refinement and landscaping details will be reviewed through the forthcoming Development Permit application.

A voluntary contribution has been agreed to by the developer to provide cash-in-lieu of dedicated indoor amenity space. The contribution is based on \$1,000 per unit (\$35,000 total contribution based on 35 units). The voluntary contribution is being secured as a rezoning consideration.

#### Public Art Program

The developer has agreed to a voluntary contribution to the City's Public Art Fund. The contribution is based on \$0.60 per square foot of developable density (\$22,388 total contribution). The voluntary contribution is being secured as a rezoning consideration.

#### **Development Permit Application**

A Development Permit application will be required to undertake a review of the overall architectural form and character of the project, landscaping and urban design. The Development Permit application is required to be processed to a satisfactory level to fulfil the rezoning considerations attached to the proposal.

Specific issues for this project to be examined through the Development Permit application are as follows:

- Finalized design of the ALR landscape buffer along Gilley Road.
- Finalized design of the public walkway running along the west edge of the site.
- Opportunities to implement measures to improve sustainability (i.e., permeable pavers, native plantings, enhancements to the RMA).
- Minor variances for any proposed building projections into setbacks.
- Environmental and Department of Fisheries and Oceans approval for works within RMA and recommended mitigation/enhancement measures.

#### Financial Impact or Economic Impact

None.

#### Conclusion

The application to rezone 22560, 22600 and 22620 Gilley Road to permit the development of 35 townhouse units complies with the OCP land use designation for the area and is similar to other forms of multi-family housing in the Hamilton Area. Staff recommend support of the rezoning application.

Kevin Eng Planner 1

KE:cas

Attachment 1: Location Map and Air Photo Attachment 2: Conceptual Development and Landscape Plans Attachment 3: Development Application Data Sheet Attachment 4: Hamilton – Lower Westminster Sub Area Plan Attachment 5: Public Correspondence Attachment 6: Rezoning Considerations Concurrence

# **ATTACHMENT 5**



ł

### Eng, Kevin

 From:
 Eng, Kevin

 Sent:
 Friday, 15 July 2011 13:48

 To:
 'Wendy Walker'

 Cc:
 MayorandCouncillors

 Subject:
 RE: 22560/22600/22620 Gilley Road Rezoning (RZ 06-344606)

Hi Wendy,

Thank you for the email emphasizing your previous concerns and the additional comment about stability of home foundations in the neighbourhood.

At the public hearing, these concerns were brought up by other residents and as a result, the issues surrounding soil and fill conditions in the neighbourhood and specific to the proposed project are to be reviewed by staff and the applicant and addressed in any forthcoming application to be considered by Council.

Regards, Kevin Eng Policy Planning City of Richmond P: 604-247-4626 F: 604-276-4052 keng@richmond.ca

From: Wendy Walker [mailto:wgwalker@shaw.ca] Sent: Friday, 15 July 2011 11:20 AM To: Eng, Kevin; Wendy Walker Cc: MayorandCouncillors Subject: Re: 22560/22600/22620 Gilley Road Rezoning (RZ 06-344606)

Dear Kevin,

Sorry - I meant to also mention that another main concern that brought everyone together at the meeting mentioned below was potential damage to homes in the area that might occur during the building process. Those present stated there are homes in their area that are sinking and some owners have had their homes slab jacked to stabilize them while others have visible signs of sinking. It was also mentioned that some properties have their homes and or yards sinking down towards the proposed development. During the parts of the discussion I was able to be part of this was discussed as a major concern far more than traffic flow or parking. This is definately a concern for us as stated in earlier communications.

Regards,

Wendy Walker

----- Original Message -----

From: Wendy Walker To: Eng, Kevin Cc: MayorandCouncillors Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 4:05 PM Subject: Re: 22560/22600/22620 Gilley Road Rezoning (RZ 06-344606)

Dear Kevin,

Thank you for your reply. I was very disappointed when I learnt that the local residents who came to the last meeting focused their concerns only on the traffic routing. Just prior to the meeting at City Hall, there were a group of residents including myself that came together via email as we all had concerns about the townhouses. It was agreed we should all meet and I was asked by Carrie Murray to hold it at my house.

It was originally meant to discuss concerns that the the size of the townhouse development in the middle of single family homes was inappropriate. The question of access onto Gilley Road came up as an option to Turner and I said I was advised that access would definitely be via Turner which was also noted on the documents you had forwarded. There were many comments from those present about lack of parking in front of their homes when more than one neighbour had a family gathering at the same time. In addition, they all commented on the great many secondary suites in the homes in that area. As we live on a cul de sac I didn't see this as a major concern to perhaps have friends park 1/2 block away - it is a fact of life for us and many.

Even though everyone present spoke great English and I was the only person in the group that did not speak Chinese, the conversation switched largely to Chinese. I was asked if I thought the city would listen if they were vocal enough and I said I believed yes. I was than asked if I would draw up a petition as they said most people in the area would not come out or may not have enough English to understand the issue but they could get them to sign something. In good faith I did this. The final petition was translated to Chinese but the wording was also changed from what I put together and of course I don't know what the actual translation says. I don't know how many signatures were turned in via the petitions but I would question the validity of these.

Again, when I walk or drive through the area in question around Turner, there is always has plenty of street parking, easy access for passing, and very little pedestrian traffic. I have also noticed **most driveways are also usually empty though they have room for at least 2 cars each**. Given how quiet this area is, the width of the streets, sidewalks and available parking it is hard to believe that Gilley could ever be considered an option. I would suggest that everyone in concern take a road trip to see this section of Gilley Road if they haven't already done so. Especially when school is back in and the foot traffic increases, I cannot invision how Gilley could ever work as an option.

Regards,

Wendy Walker

Subject: RE: 22560/22600/22620 Gilley Road Rezoning (RZ 06-344606)

Hi Wendy and George Walker,

Thank you for the email and communicating your observations about the streets in the area and concerns about use of Gilley Road by the proposed townhouse development.

The rezoning application was referred by Richmond City Council at the May 16, 2011 Public Hearing with the direction to address a number of the concerns raised at the meeting. Two specific issues raised at Public Hearing are the routing of traffic through the neighbourhood and providing access to the proposed development from Gilley Road.

Staff and the applicant are in the process of reviewing these issues raised at Public Hearing by area residents and Council.

The rezoning application is required to proceed through the statutory rezoning process (including a Public Hearing).

Your email will be included in any forthcoming report on the application so that Council is aware of your comments and concerns.

Regards, Kevin Eng Policy Planning City of Richmond P: 604-247-4626 F: 604-276-4052 keng@richmond.ca

From: Wendy Walker [mailto:wgwalker@shaw.ca] Sent: Wednesday, 13 July 2011 12:02 PM To: Eng, Kevin Cc: MayorandCouncillors; PlanningDevelopment Subject: Re: 22560/22600/22620 Gilley Road Rezoning (RZ 06-344606) Importance: High

# Dear Kevin,

We were shocked to recently hear from a realtor that the rezoning of 22560/22600/22620 Gilley Road (RZ 06-344606) is going ahead with the traffic now being diverted to Gilley Road. This is completely contrary to what we have been sent in attachments from the city. We have been verbally told in the past that Gilley was not an option.

The original documents state that all traffic will be diverted via Turner Street. In speaking with the city they also advised that once the dead end near Turner was completed it would actually create a greater traffic flow on Turner.

We have heard complaints from residents on Turner and surrounding streets not wanting the additional traffic. They stated it was because many of their homes have secondary suites and in addition the majority have regular, large family gatherings that place a demand on parking. We have made it a point over the past several months to walk and drive through that area at various times of day and night on a very regular basis. It is a very quiet street and area. There is always has plenty of street parking, easy access for passing, no traffic blocks and very little pedestrian traffic.

Turner and other streets in that subdivision are 29.9 feet wide AND in addition they also have sidewalks that add to the safety of pedestrians.

**Gilley Road is only 16 feet wide with no sidewalks and virtually no parking.** It is difficult for two vehicles to often pass each other especially if one is a truck or such. I live on Fraserbank Place but my kitchen window looks over Gilley. Over the years I have witnessed many close calls as pedestrians have no choice but to walk on the road There is a lot of foot traffic on Gilley from the sub division above especially during the school season and there are no sidewalks and minimal shoulders to walk on. It is a dead end street and also popular with people racing mini bikes and such and most vehicles travel above the speed limit - garbage trucks are amongst the worst.

The ditches are full of wild life including beavers and a year ago we found a dead beaver on the should that had been hit by a car. Gilley is already so unsuited to the amount of foot traffic given its width and other conditions it is unimaginable it could become a main access for the new homes.

We would like to request an update on the status of the development and do understand it is likely to go ahead. However, Gilley Road at a mere 16 feet, with no sidewalks, the ditches etc. is absolutely the wrong street for access. We live on a cul de sac where many neighbours also have family gatherings and we manage. These events do not reflect the true traffic/parking conditions.

Regards,

Wendy and George Walker

# Rezoning Considerations 22560, 22600 and 22620 Gilley Road RZ 06-344606

Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8750, the developer is required to complete the following:

- 1. Consolidation of the 3 subject properties into one development parcel.
- 2. Provide a 12.2 m wide land dedication along the southern most portions of 22560 and 22600 Gilley Road to facilitate a road right-of way with a minimum width of 17 m.
- 3. Registration on title of a 4.5 m wide public rights-of-passage statutory right-of-way along the consolidated development site's west and north property line for the purposes of a public pedestrian walkway that includes the following provisions:
  - a. A minimum 2.5 m wide hard surface walkway is to allow public access for pedestrians, cyclists, scooters, wheelchairs (motorized and non-motorized) and similar types of non-vehicle related means of transport.
  - b. Maintenance of the surrounding landscaping and related elements (i.e., fencing) along with general upkeep of the walkway (i.e., snow, ice, debris removal; walkway upkeep in a safe condition) will be by the future strata corporation.
  - c. The City will maintain the hard surface walkway.
- 4. Submission of a report by a professional environmental consultant to review all proposed works in or adjacent to the existing 5 m RMAs. All works and mitigation/enhancement measures recommended by the developer's environmental consultant must be approved by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans prior to final approval of the Servicing Agreement.
- 5. Submission and approval of a Servicing Agreement\* for the design and construction of the following works (No Development Cost Charge Credits available):
  - a. Rathburn Drive and Turner Street connection works include, but are not limited to 8.5 m pavement width, curb & gutter on both sides of the road, 1.5 m wide sidewalk and boulevard. Road works are required to match and connect with existing road standard implemented for Rathburn Drive and Turner Street.
  - b. Pedestrian pathway within the 4.5 m wide public rights-of-passage statutory right-ofway running along the west and north edge of the consolidated development site to consist of a minimum 2.5 m wide hard-surface pathway, appropriate landscape buffering and fencing (i.e., 4 ft. maximum height). The design is also required to include a culvert crossing to Gilley Road at the northeast corner of the site in conjunction with the vehicle driveway access to the site.
  - c. Gilley Road upgrades between the vehicle access to the subject site and Westminster Highway to achieve the following road cross section:
    - i. Minimum 6.1 m wide asphalt driving surface.
    - ii. Minimum 1.5 m wide asphalt pedestrian pathway (interim) along the south side of the road and north of the existing watercourse. The pathway would be

delineated with pavement markings or other traffic devices (i.e., delineators or raised pavement markers). The 1.5 m wide pathway is required to be designed to accommodate vehicle travel.

- iii. Appropriate tie-in to the top-of bank of the canal on both sides of Gilley Road.
- iv. Minimum 0.6 m wide gravel shoulder tie-in to the existing watercourse on the north side of Gilley Road.
- d. Removal of all existing culvert crossings along the subject site's Gilley Road frontage and installation of a new culvert crossing along Gilley Road for the townhouse development.
- e. Installation of an oil and grit sump infrastructure associated with the on-site drainage system to filter storm water from the development site.
- f. Inclusion of mitigation and enhancement works to the RMA along Gilley Road as recommended by the professional environmental consultant's report and approved by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.
- 6. Registration on title of a Flood Plain Covenant identifying a minimum Flood Construction Level of 3.5 m.
- 7. Registration on title of a covenant that restricts the conversion of off-street parking areas to habitable space.
- Registration on title of a restrictive covenant that prevents the removal or significant modification of the 6 m wide landscape buffer screening along the development site's Gilley Road frontage, which is to be adequately maintained by the property owner for the purposes of mitigating against typical noise, dust and odour activities associated with adjacent agricultural operations.
- 9. City's acceptance of a voluntary contribution of \$22,388 (\$0.60 per square foot of developable density) to the City's affordable housing fund.
- 10. City's acceptance of a voluntary contribution of \$22,388 (\$0.60 per square foot of developable density) to the City's public art fund.
- 11. City's acceptance of a voluntary contribution of \$35,000 (\$1,000 per unit) for cash-in-lieu of on-site indoor amenity space.
- 12. Approval from the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure.
- 13. Submission and processing of a Development Permit completed to a level deemed acceptable to the Director of Development.

Prior to issuance of the Development Permit\*, the developer is required to complete the following:

- 1. Submission of a letter of credit for the appropriate amount based on the approved Development Permit landscape plan for the subject site.
- 2. Installation of tree protection fencing to the City's specification for the hedge located on the neighbouring property at the north-west corner of the site and engage a certified professional arborist to oversee, inspect and approve the installed tree protection fencing.

- 3 -

- 1. Submission and approval of a construction parking and traffic management plan to be provided to the Transportation Division that includes location for parking for services, deliveries, loading, application for request for any lane closures (including dates, times, and duration), and proper construction traffic controls as per Traffic Control Manual for Works on Roadways (Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure). The construction parking and traffic management plan is required to include the following provisions:
  - a. No construction related parking or staging of trucks on Gilley Road or in the surrounding neighbourhood.
  - b. Dedicated areas for construction staff parking on sites/areas secured by the developer for this purpose.
  - c. Dedicated construction loading/staging areas on the subject development site.
  - d. Construction vehicle access/egress is prohibited from utilizing Rathburn Drive or Turner Street.
  - e. Construction vehicles will be required to travel at a reduced speed down Gilley Road.

\*Requires separate application submission

[Signed original on file]

Signed

Date





# Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 8750 (RZ 06-344606) 22560, 22600 & 22620 GILLEY 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 TOWN HOUSING (ZT11) - HAMILTON.

P.I.D. 003-911-985 Parcel "A" (Explanatory Plan 29178) Lot 2 Section 2 Block 4 North Range 4 West New Westminster District Plan 5334

P.I.D. 003-558-622 Parcel A (RD14733E) Lot 1 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 79860, Section 2 Block 4 North Range 4 West New Westminster District Plan 5334

P.I.D. 010-724-915 Easterly Half Lot 1 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 79860, Section 2 Block 4 North Range 4 West New Westminster District Plan 5334

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 8750".

FIRST READING	APR 2 6 2011	CITY OF RICHMOND
A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON	MAY 1 6 2011	APPROVED
SECOND READING		APPROVED by Director
THIRD READING		or Sciletor
MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE		<del></del>
DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED		
ADOPTED		

MayorandCouncillors		To Public Hearing Date: June 18, 2012
From:	City of Richmond Website [webgraphics@richmond.ca]	Re: Cylaw 8750
Sent:	June 14, 2012 8:21 AM	
To:	MayorandCouncillors	
Subject:	Send a Submission Online (response #690)	

Categories: 12-8060-20-8750 - 22560/22600/22620 Gilley Rd - RZ 06-344606

# Send a Submission Online (response #690)

# Survey Information

Site:	City Website	
Page Title:	Send a Submission Online	
URL:	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx	
Submission Time/Date:	6/14/2012 8:25:11 AM	1919

# Survey Response

Your Name:	Wendy Walker
Your Address:	4525 Fraserbank Place
Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number:	RZ 06-344606
	We wish to speak at Mondays hearing and also to submit the following written concern. We were shocked to receive a Notice of Public Hearing regarding the rezoning of 22560/22600/22620 Gilley Road (RZ 06- 344606) with vehicle access being diverted to Gilley Road. This is completely contrary to what we have been sent in attachments from the city. We have been verbally told in the past that Gilley was not an option. The original documents state that all traffic will be diverted via Turner Street. In speaking with the city they also advised that once the dead end near Turner was completed it would actually create a greater traffic flow on Turner. Residents on Turner and surrounding streets say they do not want the additional traffic because many of their homes have secondary suites. In addition some say they have regular, large family gatherings that place a demand on parking. We have made it a point over the past several months to walk and drive through that area at various times of day and night on a very regular basis. It is a very



PH - 49

quiet street and area. There is always has plenty of street parking, easy access for passing, no traffic blocks and very little pedestrian traffic. Turner and other streets in that subdivision are 29.9 feet wide AND in addition they also have sidewalks that add to the safety of pedestrians. Gilley Road is only 16 feet wide with no sidewalks and virtually no parking. On Gilley, it is difficult for two vehicles to often pass each other especially if one is a truck or such. We live on Fraserbank Place and our kitchen window looks over Gilley. Over the past 20 years plus, I have witnessed many close calls as pedestrians have no choice but to walk on the road. There is a lot of foot traffic on Gilley from the sub division above and it is the main access for a great many school children walking and biking to school as well as other residents. There are no sidewalks and minimal shoulders to walk on. Parking is very challenging for the homes already there. It is also a dead end street and at times is also popular with people racing mini bikes and such; many vehicles travel above the speed limit on this little dead end stretch - Canada Post and garbage trucks are amongst the worst. The ditches are full of wild life including beavers and a year ago we found a dead beaver on the should that had been hit by a car. Gilley is already so unsuited to the amount of foot traffic given its width and other conditions it is unimaginable it could become a main access for 35 new homes. We would like to request an update that everyone involved come to view Gilley and Turner to see the differences. Gilley Road at a mere 16 feet, with no sidewalks, the ditches etc. is absolutely the wrong street for access. We live on a cul de sac where many neighbours also have family gatherings and we manage. These events do not reflect the true traffic/parking conditions. Again, from the beginning, the city advised that once the dead end near Turner was completed it would actually create a greater traffic flow on Turner and the subdivision was designed with this in mind. Regards, Wendy and George Walker

Comments:



To:	Planning Committee	Date:	April 23, 2012
From:	Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Acting General Manager, Planning and Development	File:	RZ 10-516267
Re:	Supplemental Report: Application by Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd. for Rezoning at 9160 No. 2 Road from Single Detached (RS1/E) to Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3)		

#### Staff Recommendation

- That Bylaw No. 8769, for the rezoning of 9160 No. 2 Road from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3)", be forwarded to Public Hearing, to be held on Monday, June 18, 2012; and
- 2. That the Public Hearing notification area be expanded from the standard 50 m radius to include the area shown in Attachment 14 of the Report to Committee dated June 17, 2011.

caxion!

Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Acting General Manager, Planning and Development

BJJ:el

Att.

FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY ACTING				
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER		
Affordable Housing Transportation		[Maxpelloop		

# Staff Report

## Origin

Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 9160 No. 2 Road (Attachment A) from Single Detached (RS1/E) to Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3) in order to permit the development of 18 three-storey townhouse units on the site with vehicle access from Maple Road.

# Background

A Report to Committee (Attachment B) on the subject rezoning application was taken to Planning Committee on July 5, 2011. The Committee endorsed the staff recommendation to forward the subject application to Public Hearing but requested information on potential signalization at the corner of Maple Road and No. 2 Road.

Prior to Public Hearing, the applicant decided to revise the proposed and requested to have the application removed from the Public Hearing agenda. The application was therefore deleted from the September 7, 2011 Public Hearing agenda and referred back to staff.

This supplemental report is being brought forward now to provide information regarding signalization at the corner of Maple Road and No. 2 Road, a discussion on vehicle access to the proposed development, a summary of revisions made to the project, and the result of the second open house for the proposed development held on March 29, 2012.

# **Findings of Fact**

Please refer to the attached updated Development Application Data Sheet (Attachment C) for a comparison of the proposed development data with the relevant Bylaw requirements. Please refer to the original staff report dated June 17, 2011 (Attachment B) for information pertaining to related City's policies and studies, pre-Planning Committee consultation process and result, as well as staff comments related to tree retention, site servicing, and frontage improvements.

# **Review of Transportation Issues:**

# Signalization at the Corner of Maple Road and No. 2 Road

Typically, new traffic signals are funded through the City's Road DCC Program and prioritized based on the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) Signal warrant Analysis.

Based on the TAC analysis, it is found that a traffic signal is not warranted at this location. The anticipated traffic volume generated by the proposed 18 unit townhouse development will result in only a marginal increase and the intersection will continue to perform adequately with the stop control operation. However, staff recognize that the likely ultimate signalization at the intersection will be required in the future due to growth. Currently, the eastbound left-turn traffic on Maple Road does experience some delays during the morning peak period due to commuter traffic on No. 2 Road.

In light of the developer's commitment for the design and construction of the traffic signals, staff can support signalizing the Maple Road intersection as part of this development to stop traffic on No. 2 Road for local access from Maple Road and help to address neighbourhood concerns related to traffic delay.

As a condition of rezoning, the developer is committed to enter into a standard Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of the No. 2 Road/Maple Road upgrades with full traffic signals, complete with audible pedestrian signals (APS). The works will include but not be limited to: roadway widening, utility relocation, reconstruction of Maple Road on the east and west leg, pavement markings and signage changes. In order to determine the requirements of the Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of off-site works, a functional plan including road dimensions and road cross sections for all approaches is required. All proposed transportation and traffic improvements are subject to review and final approval of the Director of Transportation and the Director of Engineering. All works to be provided at developer's sole cost with no applicable DCC credits.

# Vehicle Access

# Site Access on Maple Road

Residents from the single-family neighbourhood east of No. 2 Road (on Maple Road, Martyniuk Place, and Romaniuk Drive) have expressed concerns about the location of vehicle access to the townhouse development on Maple Road. They feel that the increased traffic generated by the townhouse development would increase the delay at the No. 2 Road and Maple Road intersection during peak hours.

# Site Access on No. 2 Road

Residents from the adjacent senior apartment and the users of the church to the south object to a No. 2 Road driveway for the proposed townhouse development. A letter from the Christian Reformed Senior Housing Society (Attachment D) and a petition from the Tapestry Church with 121 names was submitted (Appendix I). They feel that the proposed driveway would be too close to their shared driveway, making it more difficult to enter and exit their shared driveway, posing a safety concern. In addition, the nine (9) units in the senior apartment that look out over the proposed driveway would be impacted by the noise, exhaust fumes, and bright headlights at night from vehicles using the driveway.

In addition to the comments from the area residents, staff considered the following factors when reviewing the two possible site access locations:

- The hierarchy of roads, i.e., their functions and capacity. No. 2 Road is classified as an Arterial Road while Maple Road is classified as a local road.
- The distance of the proposed driveway from the intersection and other driveways.
- Tree preservation and it benefits to the neighbourhood. At least two (2) additional bylaw-sized trees and four (4) under-sized trees that were identified for retention would be removed to accommodate vehicle access off No. 2 Road
- The gain and/or loss of on-street parking spaces.
- The applicant's proposal to upgrade the existing Special Crosswalk at the north leg of the No. 2 Road/Maple Road intersection to a full traffic signal without requiring any City roads DCC funding.

Upon reviewing both site access options, Staff concluded either an access on Maple Road or No. 2 Road would be workable.

### **Review of Proposed Revisions:**

## Entry Driveway on Maple Road

The applicant has considered relocating the entry driveway from Maple Road to No. 2 Road. Based on the comments received from the neighbourhood, the applicant proposes to keep the entry driveway on Maple Road; however, the proposed driveway location has been shifted west to reduce potential impacts on the neighbouring property to the east.

### Site Layout

The site layout has been revised (Attachment E). The developer is now proposing six (6) duplex units with a pedestrian walkway along the east property line. The duplexes will be set back 6 m from the east property line and a hedgerow will be planted along a portion of the east property line to provide backyard privacy for the neighbouring property to the east.

All proposed units fronting on Maple Road are now in duplex form, creating a similar massing and character as the adjacent single-family developments. In addition, the four-plex in the central part of the site has been split into two (2) duplexes, the free standing electrical rooms along the south yard setback have been removed, and the outdoor amenity area has been relocated to the Maple Road frontage.

Same as the original proposal, every unit has two (2) side-by-side parking spaces. A total of four (4) visitor parking spaces are provided throughout the site, including one (1) accessible parking space. The applicant has indicated that eight (8) of the double car garages are deeper than usual and each of these garages may accommodate up to three (3) compact vehicles.

Detailed design of the project, including site design, architectural form, and landscaping, will be reviewed at the Development Permit stage.

# Consultation:

# Petition Received August 31, 2011

In addition to the comments letters attached to the Report to Committee dated June 17, 2011 (Attachment B), 213 petition letters (with 447 signatures) in opposition to the proposal was submitted on August 31, 2011 (Appendix II). A sample petition letter can be found in Attachment F.

#### Open House March 29, 2012

The applicant held a second public Open House on March 29, 2012 at the Thompson Community Centre. An Open House flyer was sent by mail to the owners and residents of over 140 neighbouring properties. Approximately 57 people attended representing 49 households in the City, in which 19 households are located within the notification area and an additional 6 households are located within the immediate neighbourhood bounded by Francis Road, Woodwards Road, Gilbert Road, and No. 2 Road. Staff attended the Open House as observers. Comment sheets were provided to all the attendee space 43 responses were received (Appendix

III). A copy of the Open House Summary prepared by the applicant is included in Attachment G. A mapping of the responses received at the open house can be found in Attachment H. The survey result is as follows:

- 16 attendants from 15 households within the notification area oppose the proposal;
- 4 attendants from 4 households within the immediate neighbourhood (bounded by Francis Road, Woodwards Road, Gilbert Road, and No. 2 Road) oppose the proposal;
- 1 attendant from a household within the immediate quarter section support the proposal;
- 20 attendants in 16 households in Richmond, but outside of the immediate quarter section, support the proposal; and
- 2 attendants did not indicate whether they support or oppose the proposal.

Most attendants who oppose the proposal feel that nothing has changed since this application was forwarded to Planning Committee in July 2011. The concerns raised by these attendants are similar to the comments received on the first round of consultation.

# Petition Received April 12, 2012

Pursuant to the second open house, a second petition from the area residents with 196 petition letters (350 signatures) in opposition to the proposal was submitted on April 12, 2012 (Appendix IV). A sample petition letter can be found in Attachment I. A mapping of the households in opposition to the proposal is included in Attachment J. Staff have subsequently met with representatives of the neighbourhood group to review the revised proposal and answer questions.

# Public Input

A copy of the petitions and comment sheets from the second open house (Appendix I to IV) has been compiled into a binder. Copies of the binder have been placed in the Councillor's lounge for City Council reference and also at the City Hall information desk for public viewing.

A list of major concerns raised by the area residents is provided below, along with responses in *italics*:

1. The single-family residential character should be maintained.

The subject townhouse development is not the first multiple-family development on this block of No. 2 Road between Maple Road and Woodwards Road. There is an existing 4-storey seniors' apartment building located to the immediate south of the subject site. The subject site, along with the properties on both side of No. 2 Road, between Francis Road and Woodwards Roads, is identified for townhouse development under the Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy in the Official Community Plan (OCP). Townhouse developments are limited to properties fronting onto arterial roads, such as No. 2 Road, and are not envisioned in the internal subdivision.

Duplex units are being proposed along the Maple Road frontage to create a massing and character similar to the adjacent single-family homes.

2. The proposed density is too high; 18 units are too many.

Please see Analysis section for the discussion on the proposed density in term of Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.). The City does not restrict the number of units, as long as the proposal complies with all zoning requirements.

3. The proposed three-storey buildings are too tall.

The Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy permits 3-storey height (above the Flood Plain Construction Level (FCL)). In order to address the adjacency issue and to preserve mature trees on site, the proposed development will be built on existing grade, which is approximately 1.37 m below the FCL, 0.80 m below the No. 2 Road sidewalk elevation, and 0.25 m below the existing Maple Road elevation. The ground floor will be for parking only and no habitable area is permitted. A low sloped 4-in-12 roof is proposed to keep the apparent building height along the fronting streets as low as possible. The proposed buildings will appear to be  $2\frac{1}{2}$  storeys above the FCL, which would be similar in height as the newer/future single-family homes on Maple Road.

4. Four (4) visitor parking spaces are not enough for 18 townhouse units. The proposed development would create parking and traffic problems on Maple Road.

The proposal includes two (2) side-by-side parking spaces per unit and a total of four (4) visitor parking spaces on site, which is in compliance with the bylaw requirement.

At present, no parking is permitted on both sides of No. 2 Road but there is no restriction along Maple Road. With the new traffic signal and the proposed development in place, no parking should be allowed on the south side of Maple Road between No. 2 Road and the proposed site access. From the site access to the easterly property boundary, it is feasible to accommodate three (3) on-street parking spaces on the south side of Maple Road. Onstreet parking on the north side of Maple Road is very limited due to the existing property driveways.

The applicant has indicated that some of the garages may accommodate up to three (3) compact cars (see Alternate Parking Plan in Attachment E). The developer has also agreed to explore the opportunities to provide additional visitor parking stalls on site at Development Permit stage,

5. Increased traffic generated by the townhouse development would make the already problematic intersection at No. 2 Road and Maple Road more dangerous.

Transportation Division staff have conducted field traffic counts and performed an intersection operational analysis as part of their review; the applicant has retained Bunt & Associates to prepare a Traffic Impact Study. Both Transportation Division staff and the Traffic Impact Study concluded that the proposed development would have a insignificant traffic impact to the existing operations at the No. 2 Road and Maple Road intersection; the existing vehicle access to No. 2 Road is within the existing roadway and intersection geometry.

In addition, as part of the development, the pavement on Maple Road along the site frontage will be widened to provide additional travelling space on Maple Road.

Furthermore, the provision of full traffic signal at Maple Road and No. 2 Road will allow traffic making left turns out from Maple Road with the protection of signalization.

6. The proposed traffic light on Maple Road is too close to Francis Road.

The Maple Road approaches carry very moderate traffic volumes; the introduction of a new traffic signal at Maple Road will not adversely impact traffic progression along No. 2 Road currently through Maple and Francis. Final signal timing plans can be worked out in the detailed design stage to optimize traffic progression and minimize vehicle delays. The new signal at Maple will improve existing traffic conditions at the intersection by providing protected pedestrian crossings across No. 2 Road and adequate capacity for Maple Road left-turn traffic to No. 2 Road northbound.

7. The diverters on Maple Road will be removed in the future.

While some residents suggested removal of the existing diverters on Maple Road at Romaniuk Drive (between No. 2 Road and Gilbert Road) to ease traffic congestion at the No. 2 Road and Maple Road intersection, many have concerns that such removal will create serious safety issues in the neighbourhood.

Transportation Division staff noted that the existing mid-bock closure of Maple Road was instated several years ago in response to concerns raised by residents regarding speed and traffic short-cutting on Maple Road. Opening up the Maple Road link between the two (2) arterial roads will create a potential for a significant increase of traffic volume and speed on Maple Road, impacting the intersection at No. 2 Road. The diverters would still be required to manage traffic levels and speed in the area. Therefore, the removal of the existing diverters are not recommended.

# Analysis

# Official Community Plan (OCP) Compliance

The proposed development is consistent with the Development Permit Guidelines for multiplefamily projects contained in the Official Community Plan (OCP). The proposed height, siting and orientation of the buildings respect the massing of the existing single-family homes to the north and east and the apartment building to the south:

- The proposed 3-storey townhouses will be built on existing grade, so their 3-storey appearance will be somewhat lessened. The proposed top floor is also about the same height as the second floor of the adjacent seniors' apartment.
- The site grade along the east property line will be raised to achieve the minimum Flood Construction Level (FCL). The duplexes along the east property line are considered 2½ storey in height above the FCL. Thereby, the interface with single-family along the east property line is considered in compliance with the Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy in terms of building height and setback.
- Units are laid out along the No. 2 Road and Maple Road to provide a pedestrian scale along the street fronts. Duplex units with direct street entry are proposed along Maple Road, creating a coherent streetscape with the existing single-family homes on the block.
- The rest of the townhouse blocks on-site are laid out with an east-west orientation to provide view corridors (north-south) from the adjacent seniors' apartment.

These proposed design features will be controlled through the Development Permit process.

# Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3)

The proposed zoning (RTM3 with a maximum density of 0.7 FAR) and the proposed density (0.675 FAR) complies with the Low-Density Residential land use designation contained in the Official Community Plan (OCP) for development on the City's arterial roads. Densities above the base density, for townhouse development along arterial road, of 0.6 floor area ratio (FAR) are usually considered in conjunction with development sites in close proximity to a Community Centre and/or Neighbourhood Service Centre. The subject site is across from a local commercial site and is within walking distance to the Blundell Shopping Centre (approximately 650 m). To qualify for the proposed density and to satisfy the requirements of the RTM3 zone, the applicant is:

- Preserving eight (8) bylaw-sized trees and four (4) under-sized trees on-site, as well as
  protecting all trees on adjacent properties, located in proximity to the development site;
- Providing a voluntary contribution to the Affordable Housing Strategy reserve fund; and
- Providing at least one (1), possibly two (2), convertible units which are designed to accommodate a vertical lift.

# Development Variances

The proposed development is generally in compliance with the Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3) zone. Based on the review of revised site plan for the project, no variance is being requested.

# Design Review and Future Development Permit Considerations

A Development Permit will be required to ensure that the development at 9160 No. 2 Road is sensitively integrated with adjacent developments. The rezoning conditions will not be considered satisfied until a Development Permit application is processed to a satisfactory level. In association with the Development Permit, the following issues are to be further examined:

- Guidelines for the issuance of Development Permits for multiple-family projects contained in Section 9.3 (Multiple-Family Guidelines);
- Detailed review of the site plan to ensure a 4.3 m minimum vertical clearance is provided over the entire 6.7 m width of the internal drive aisle and that corner cuts are provided at the internal intersections on-site;
- Opportunities to provide additional visitor parking stalls on site;
- Detailed review of the site plan to ensure semi-private space is distinguished from private spaces including the design and location of visitor parking;
- Detailed review of building form and architectural character including elimination of significant projections into required yard setbacks as well as unit design that facilitates conversions of garage area into habitable space;
- Unit entry design with respect to CPTED principles;
- Review of site grade to ensure the survival of protected trees and to enhance the relationship between the first habitable level and the private outdoor space;
- Ensure there is adequate private out out of sprease for each unit; and

 Landscaping design, site grading, and enhancement of the outdoor amenity area to maximize use.

### Conclusion

The proposed 18-unit townhouse development is consistent with the Official Community Plan (OCP) regarding developments along major arterial roads and meets the zoning requirements set out in the Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3) zone. Overall, the proposed land use, site plan, and building massing relates to the surrounding neighbourhood context. The applicant is proposing to upgrade the No. 2 Road/Maple Road intersection with full traffic signals, complete with audible pedestrian signals (APS), to address concerns raised by delegations to Planning Committee related to traffic. A Transportation Functional Plan will be provided prior to the Servicing Agreement stage to determine ultimate transportation and traffic improvements.

Further review of the project design is required to ensure a high quality project and design consistency with the existing neighbourhood context, and this will be completed as part of the Development Permit application review process.

The updated list of rezoning considerations is included as Attachment K, which has been agreed to by the applicants (signed concurrence on file).

While the proposal generates significant concerns from the immediate neighbourhood, the proposal does address all of the concerns raised and is in compliance to the City's Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy. The subject site is specifically identified in the OCP for multiple family development. On this basis, staff recommends support for the rezoning application.

Edwin Lee Planner 1 (604-276-4121)

EL:rg

- Attachment A: Location Map
- Attachment B: Report to Committee dated June 17, 2011
- Attachment C: Development Application Data Sheet
- Attachment D: Letter from Christian Reformed Senior Housing Society dated April 2, 2012
- Attachment E: Revised Development Concept
- Attachment F: Sample Petition Letter dated August 5, 2011 (received on August 31, 2011)
- Attachment G: Open House Summary
- Attachment H: Public Consultation Responses (Open House, March 29, 2012)
- Attachment I: Sample Petition Letter dated April 1, 2012 (received on April 12, 2011)
- Attachment J: Mapping of Petition received April 12, 2012
- Attachment K: Rezoning Considerations Concurrence
- Appendix I: Petition from Tapestry Church
- Appendix II: Petition Received August 31, 2011
- Appendix III: Comment Sheets Received at Open House Held on March 29, 2012
- Appendix IV: Petition Received April 12PH12 59





PH - 61



# City of Richmond Planning and Development Department

**Report to Committee** 

To:	Planning Committee	Date:	June 17, 2011
From:	Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development	File:	RZ 10-516267
Re:	Application by Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd. for Rezoning at 9160 No. 2 Road from Single Detached (RS1/E) to Medium Density		

# Staff Recommendation

Townhouses (RTM3)

- 1. That Bylaw No. 8769, for the rezoning of 9160 No. 2 Road from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3)", be introduced and given first reading;
- 2. That the Public Hearing notification area be expanded from the standard 50 m radius to include the area shown in Attachment 14; and
- 3. That Bylaw No. 8769 be forwarded to a Special Public Hearing, to be held on Tuesday, July 26, 2011, at 7:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers.

relean

Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development

EL:blg Att.

FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY			
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER	
Affordable Housing Transportation		- pe Erreg	
		/	

# Staff Report

# Origìn

Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 9160 No. 2 Road (Attachment 1) from Single Detached (RS1/E) to Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3) in order to permit the development of 18 three-storey townhouse units on the site with vehicle access from Maple Road (Attachment 2).

# Findings of Fact

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

# Surrounding Development

To the North: Across Maple Road, existing single-family dwellings on large lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/E);
To the East: Existing single-family dwellings on large lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/E);
To the South: Four-storey senior apartment building (three-storeys over parking) zoned Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1) and Christian Reformed Church Of Richmond on a large piece of property zoned Assembly (ASY); and
To the West: At the southwest corner of No. 2 Road and Maple Road, a commercial retail building on a property zoned Local Commercial (CL); at the northwest corner of Maple Road, a recently approved 3-lot subdivision on a site zoned Single Detached (RS1/B) fronting on Maple Road.

# **Related Policies & Studies**

# Arterial Road Redevelopment and Lane Establishment Policies

The Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy is supportive of multiple family residential developments along major arterial roads, especially in locations such as the subject site, which are within walking distance of commercial services and where public transit is available.

The subject site is a large single-family lot fronting No. 2 Road with a lot depth much deeper than a standard single-family lot in the area. This site is identified for townhouse development under the Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy and the proposed development is generally consistent with the Policy. While this proposal is the first townhouse development proposal on the east side of No. 2 Road between Maple Road and Woodwards Road, the proposal is not the first multiple family development on the block as there is an apartment building for seniors located to the immediate south of the site. It is noted that there is a predominant presence of other previously approved townhouses along the east side of No. 2 Road between Woodwards Road and Williams Road. It is envisioned that the rest of the single-family and duplex lots on this block between Maple Road and Woodwards Road could be redeveloped for multiple family residential under the Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy in the OCP.

# Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

The applicant is required to comply with the Flood Plain Designation and Protection Bylaw (No. 8204). In accordance with the Flood Management Strategy, a Flood Indemnity Restrictive Covenant specifying the minimum flood construction level is required prior to rezoning bylaw adoption.

# Affordable Housing Strategy

The applicant proposes to make a cash contribution to the affordable housing reserve fund in accordance to the City's Affordable Housing Strategy. As the proposal is for townhouses, the applicant is making a cash contribution of \$2.00 per buildable square foot as per the Strategy; making the payable contribution amount of \$47,003.23.

# Public Input

The applicant has forwarded confirmation that a development sign has been posted on the site. There has been significant interest from the neighbouring residents regarding this proposed rezoning. Staff have received:

- Two (2) support letters from two (2) households on Romaniuk Drive and Gilbert Crescent within the immediate quarter-section, and one (1) support letter from a household in the King George/Cambie Neighbourhood (Attachment 4);
- Eight (8) opposition letters from nine (9) households on Maple Road, Martyniuk Place, No. 2 Road, and Ramaniuk Drive (Attachment 5); and
- A petition with 37 signatures from 33 households within the immediate neighbourhood in opposition to the proposed development (Attachment 6).

Concerns expressed by the public include changes in neighbourhood character, increased density, increased traffic, parking, safety at the No. 2 Road and Maple Road intersection, tree preservation, building height, and loss of privacy.

# <u>Open House</u>

The applicant has conducted public consultation regarding the rezoning application through a public Open House on March 15, 2011 at the Richmond City Hall. An Open House flyer was hand delivered by the applicant to over 140 neighbouring single-family homes (see **Attachment 7** for the Notification Area). Approximately 19 people attended representing 12 households of neighbouring residents. Staff attended the Open House as observers. Comments sheets were provided to all the attendees and 16 responses were received. A copy of the Open House Summary prepared by the applicant is included in **Attachment 8**. An updated petition, with a total of 192 signatures from 148 households, was submitted to the City in April, 2011 (**Attachment 6**).

A mapping of the petition, including all written submissions, is included in Attachment 9. A list of major concerns raised by the area residents is provided below, along with the responses in **bold italics**:

1. The proposed density is too high; the single-family residential character should be maintained.

(The subject townhouse development is not the first multiple-family development on this block of No. 2 Road between Maple Road and Woodwards Road. There is an existing 4-storey seniors' apartment building located to the immediate south of the subject site. The subject site, along with the properties on both side of No. 2 Road, between Francis Road and Woodwards Roads, is identified for townhouse development under the Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy in the Official Community Plan (OCP). Townhouse developments are limited to properties fronting onto arterial roads, such as No. 2 Road, and are not envisioned in the internal subdivision.

The developer has agreed to explore the opportunities to break the townhouse block fronting Maple Road down to duplexes or triplexes, at the Development Permit stage, to make the form and massing of the townhouses more compatible to the existing single-family developments on Maple Road. The developer will also explore the opportunities to shift the entry driveway on Maple Road westwards to reduce possible impacts to the neighbouring single-family home.)

2. Increased traffic generated by the townhouse development would make the already problematic intersection at No. 2 Road and Maple Road more dangerous.

(In order to address this concern, Transportation Division staff have conducted field traffic counts and performed an intersection operational analysis as part of their review; the applicant has retained Bunt & Associates to prepare a Traffic Impact Study. Both Transportation Division staff and the Traffic Impact Study concluded that the proposed development would have insignificant traffic impact to the existing operations at the No. 2 Road and Maple Road intersection; the existing vehicle access to No. 2 Road is within the existing roadway and intersection geometry.

It is also noted that, with the pavement widening on Maple Road, two (2) outbound lanes to No. 2 Road will be provided; this arrangement will provide additional capacity on Maple Road compared to the existing single outbound lane approach.

Some residents suggested removal of the existing mid block closure of Maple Road between No. 2 Road and Gilbert Road to ease traffic congestion at the No. 2 Road and Maple Road intersection. Transportation Division staff noted that this closure was instated several years ago in response to concerns raised by residents regarding speed and traffic short-cutting on Maple Road. Reinstating the Maple Road link between the two (2) arterial roads will create a potential for a significant increase of traffic volume and speed on Maple Road, impacting the intersection at No. 2 Road.

Some residents suggested installation of a traffic signal at the No. 2 Road and Maple Road intersection. Both Transportation Division staff and the Traffic Impact Study concluded that a full traffic signal is not warranted at this intersection due to the projected traffic volumes.)

3. The proposed development would create a parking problem on Maple Road.

(The proposal includes two (2) side-by-side parking spaces per unit and a total of four (4) visitor parking spaces on site, which is in compliance with the bylaw requirement. In addition, as part of the development, the pavement on Maple Road **PH - 65** 

along the site frontage will be widened to provide additional parking/travelling space on Maple Roud. Transportation Division staff indicated that Maple Road is a typical local road which is designed for on-street parking on either side without hindering vehicle movements.)

4. The proposed three-storey buildings are too tall and would create privacy and overlook concerns.

(The proposed development will be built on existing grade, which is approximately 1 m below the existing road elevation. The building will appear to be 2½-storey along Maple Road.

A 10.9 m setback from the east property line to the 3-storey townhouse is being proposed. The developer has agreed to explore the opportunities to reduce the height of the easternmost townhouse block to 2½ storey with a minimum 6.0 m setback, at the Development Permit stage, to address the privacy and overlook concerns.)

5. The proposed development would change the streetscape of No. 2 Road by removing the beautiful big trees along the frontage.

(Two (2) of the ten (10) bylaw-sized trees along the site's No.2 Road frontage are being proposed for removal due to poor condition. The applicant has agreed to maintain existing site grade along No. 2 Road to preserve as many trees as possible. Custom design crossing between the sidewalk and the unit entries is proposed to minimize the disruption to the root systems. The applicant is also proposing to plant additional trees and shrubs along the No. 2 Road frontage to enhance the streetscape. Staff will work with the applicant on the landscaping scheme to ensure that these design elements are include in the landscape design at the Development Permit stage.)

#### Consultation with Covenant Court Residents

The applicant has also hosted a consultation meeting with the residents at Covenant Court (the seniors' apartment located adjacent to the subject site) on April 4, 2011. Approximately 13 residents and two (2) officials of the Christian Reformed Senior Housing Society attended the meeting. Staff also attended the meeting as an observer. A copy of the Meeting Summary prepared by the applicant is included in Attachment 10. A comment letter from the Christian Reformed Senior Housing Society submitted to the City after the consultation meeting is included in Attachment 11. A list of major concerns raised by the residents in the seniors' apartment building is provided below, along with the responses in *bold italics*:

1. The proximity of the townhouses to the south property line would reduce privacy and sunlight to the existing residential units in the adjacent apartment building to the south.

(The proposed townhouses will be built on existing grade. The applicant has confirmed that the proposed first habitable floor is at a lower elevation than the neighbours' first floor; and the proposed top floor is of about the same height as the seniors' apartments second floor. All proposed windows on the side elevations facing the seniors' apartment building are high and small to minimize overlooking potential). 2. Increased traffic on No. 2 Road makes it more difficult to enter and exit Covenant Court's driveway, which is shared with the church next door; relocating the existing northbound bus stop and No. 2 Road cross walk from north of Maple Road to south of Mapie Road would make the intersection safer for pedestrians.

(Coast Mountain Bus Company requires all bus stops to be located at the far side of an intersection, which is typical of the bus stops on No. 2 Road. Pedestrian crosswalks are preferred to be located in proximity to a bus stop. Relocating the crosswalk to the south poses vehicular and pedestrian conflicts due to an adjacent active driveway).

3. Special consideration should be given to minimize noise emanating from the proposed outdoor amenity space.

(The proposed children's play area is located along the east property line, away from the seniors' apartment. At the Development Permit stage, staff will work with the applicant on the landscaping scheme to ensure that an adequate buffer or separation between the proposed play area and the adjacent residential developments is provided).

# Staff Comments

# Tree Retention and Replacement

A Tree Survey and a Certified Arborist's report were submitted in support of the application. 33 bylaw-sized trees were identified on the Tree Survey and reviewed by the Arborist. The majority of the trees in the center of the site are old fruit trees in very poor condition, whereas the majority of the trees along the periphery of the site (No.2 Road and Maple Road frontages) are conifers in good condition.

The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has reviewed the Arborist Report and concurred with the Arborist's recommendations to preserve eight (8) bylaw-sized trees along No. 2 Road and four (4) under-sized trees on site along the south property line (see Attachment 12 for a Tree Preservation Plan). Among the 25 trees proposed for removal:

- Three (3) trees are in fair condition, but are proposed for removal due to over-crowding.
- One (1) Birch tree along the south property line is in good condition; however, it is proposed for removal due to building conflicts that cannot be mitigated unless one (1) townhouse unit is deleted.
- Four (4) on-site trees and two (2) off-site trees along the Maple Road frontage are in good condition, but warranted for removal due to conflicts with required servicing upgrades and frontage improvements that cannot be mitigated. Parks Operations staff have agreed to the proposed removal of the off-site trees and have determined a 2:1 compensation for the Hazelnut tree (\$1300) and a 3:1 compensation for the Cedar tree (\$1950). Prior to the removal of any City trees, the applicant will need to seek formal permission from Parks Operations Division and removal of the hedges will be at the owner's cost.
- 15 trees are in poor condition.

Based on the 2:1 tree replacement ratio goal stated in the Official Community Plan (OCP), 46 replacement trees are required for the removal of 23 bylaw-sized trees on-site. According to the Preliminary Landscape Plan (Attachment 2), the developer is proposing to plant 35 PH - 67 replacement trees on-site and provide cash-in-lieu (\$500/tree) for off-site planting of the balance of the required replacement trees (i.e. \$5,500 cash contribution for 11 replacement trees). Staff will work with the landscape architect to explore additional tree planting opportunity on-site at the Development Permit stage. Should the applicant wish to begin site preparation work after Third Reading of the rezoning bylaw, but prior to Final Adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant will be required to obtain a Tree Permit, install tree protection around trees to be retained, and submit a landscape security (i.e. \$23,000) to ensure the replacement planting will be provided.

In order to ensure that the eight (8) protected trees will not be damaged during construction, as a condition of rezoning, the applicant is required to submit a \$24,000 tree survival security. The City will retain 50% of the security until the proposed landscaping is planted on-site. The City will retain the remaining 50% of the security for one (1) year after inspection of the completed landscaping to ensure that the protected trees have survived.

All neighbouring trees are to be protected. Tree protection fencing on-site around the driplines of all trees to be retained will be required prior to any construction activities, including building demolition, occurring on-site. In addition, a contract with a Certified Arborist to monitor all works to be done near or within all tree protection zones (for both on-site and off-site trees) must be submitted prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. Tree protection barriers, as per the Tree Retention Plan (Attachment 12), must be installed on-site prior to any construction or demolition works commencing.

# Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

An independent review of servicing requirements (sanitary and storm) has been conducted by the applicant's Engineering consultant and reviewed by the City's Engineering Department. The Capacity Analysis concludes that no sanitary upgrades are required to support the proposed development, however, storm upgrades to the existing system are required. Prior to issuance of the forthcoming Building Permit, the developer is required to enter into a standard Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of the storm upgrades as identified in the capacity analysis (please see Attachment 13 for details).

Prior to final adoption, the developer is required to dedicate a 4 m x 4 m corner cut at Maple Road and No. 2 Road, provide a 2.0 m wide Public Rights-of-Passage (PROP) along the entire No. 2 Road frontage for future road widening, and provide a \$3,000 contribution for the upgrade of the pedestrian signal on the north leg of the No. 2 Road/Maple Road intersection. As part of the Servicing Agreement for the servicing upgrades, the design and construction of frontage improvements is also required. Improvement works include but are not limited to widening of Maple Road with new curb and gutter, grass and treed boulevard, and a 1.5 m sidewalk along the new property line (see Attachment 13 for details).

# Indoor Amenity Space

The applicant is proposing a contribution in-lieu of on-site indoor amenity space in the amount of \$18,000 as per the Official Community Plan (OCP) and Council policy.

# Outdoor Amenity Space

Outdoor amenity space will be provided on-site and is adequately sized based on Official Community Plan (OCP) guidelines. The design of the children's play area and landscape details will be refined as part of the Development Permit application.

# Public Art

The Public Art Program Policy does not apply to residential projects containing less than 20 units.

# Analysis

# Official Community Plan (OCP) Compliance

The proposed development is generally consistent with the Development Permit Guidelines for multiple-family projects contained in the Official Community Plan (OCP). The proposed height, siting and orientation of the buildings respect the massing of the existing single-family homes to the north and east and the apartment building to the south:

- The proposed 3-storey townhouses will be built on existing grade, which is approximately 1 m below the existing road elevation, so their 3-storey appearance will be somewhat lessened. The proposed top floor is also about the same height as the second floor of the adjacent seniors' apartment.
- The 2½-storey interface with single-family along the east property line complies with the requirements under the Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy in the OCP.
- The 2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>- to 3-storey massing is also a result of the design intent to leave existing grade as is, which requires non-habitable space below the road elevation.
- Units are laid out along the No. 2 Road and Maple Road to provide a pedestrian scale along the street fronts. The rest of the townhouse blocks on-site are laid out with an east-west orientation to provide view corridors (north-south) from the adjacent seniors' apartment.

These proposed design features will be controlled through the Development Permit process.

# Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3)

The proposed zoning (RTM3 with a maximum density of 0.7 FAR) and the proposed density (0.69 FAR) complies with the Low-Density Residential land use designation contained in the Official Community Plan (OCP) for development on the City's arterial roads. Densities above the range of 0.6 floor area ratio (FAR) are usually considered in conjunction with development sites in close proximity to a Community Centre and/or Neighbourhood Service Centre. The subject site is across from a local commercial site and is within walking distance to the Blundell Shopping Centre (approximately 650 m). To qualify for the proposed density and to satisfy the requirements of the RTM3 zone, the applicant is:

- Preserving eight (8) bylaw-sized trees and four (4) under-sized trees on-site, as well as
  protecting all trees on adjacent properties, located in proximity to the development site;
- Providing a voluntary contribution to the Affordable Housing Strategy reserve fund; and 3213418

 Providing at least one (1), possibly two (2), convertible units which are designed to accommodate a vertical lift.

# Development Variances

The proposed development is generally in compliance with the Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3) zone. Based on the review of current site plan for the project, no variance is being requested. However, the following variances are envisioned should the proposal be revised to provide some 2- to 2½-storey units with the same overall floor area and unit yield as currently proposed:

- i. Increase in lot coverage for buildings; and
- ii. reduction in lot coverage for landscaping with live plant materials.

# Design Review and Future Development Permit Considerations

A Development Permit will be required to ensure that the development at 9160 No. 2 Road is sensitively integrated with adjacent developments. The rezoning conditions will not be considered satisfied until a Development Permit application is processed to a satisfactory level. In association with the Development Permit, the following issues are to be further examined:

- Guidelines for the issuance of Development Permits for multiple-family projects contained in Section 9.3 (Multiple-Family Guidelines);
- Opportunities to shift the entry driveway west;
- Detailed review of the site plan to ensure a 4.3 m minimum vertical clearance is provided over the entire width of the internal drive aisle and that corner cuts are provided at the internal intersections on-site;
- Opportunities to reduce the height of the easternmost townhouse block to a maximum of 2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> storeys;
- Opportunities to break the townhouse block fronting Maple Road down to duplexes or triplexes better match the form and character of the large single-family houses on Maple Road;
- Detailed review of building form and architectural character including elimination of significant projections into required yard setbacks;
- Review of the location and design of the convertible unit and other accessibility features;
- Review of site grade to ensure the survival of protected trees and to enhance the relationship between the first habitable level and the private outdoor space;
- Ensure there is adequate private outdoor space for each unit;
- Landscaping design and enhancement of the outdoor amenity area to maximize use; and
- Opportunities to maximize permeable surface areas and articulate hard surface treatment.

# Public Hearing Notification Area

Should the application be endorsed by Council and proceed to Public Hearing, it is recommended that the notification area be expanded. The statutory requirement for notification of Public Hearing is 50 m (164 ft.) from the development site, which generally includes all immediate neighbours. An expanded notification area as shown in Attachment 14 is proposed.

During the public consultation process, neighbours within the area identified in Attachment 7 were notified and invited to the meetings. It is recommended that the Public Hearing notices be sent to the same notification area to ensure that residents who were involved in the earlier public consultation process are advised of the Public Hearing date.

In addition, a significant number of residents reside outside of the area identified in Attachment 7 signed the petition in opposition to the subject proposal (see mapping of the petition, including written submissions received, in Attachment 9). It is recommended that the Public Hearing Notices also be sent to these residents to ensure that they are advised of the Public Hearing date.

#### Financial Impact or Economic Impact

None.

### Conclusion

The subject application is consistent with the Official Community Plan (OCP) regarding developments along major arterial roads. Further review of the project design will be required to ensure a high quality project. This review will be part of the future Development Permit process. On this basis, staff recommend that the proposed rezoning be approved

Edwin Lee Planning Technician - Design (604 - 276 - 4121)

EL:blg

- Attachment 1: Location Map
- Attachment 2: Conceptual Development Plans
- Attachment 3: Development Application Data Sheet
- Attachment 4: Support Letters
- Attachment 5: Opposition Letters
- Attachment 6: Petition
- Attachment 7: Open House Notification Area
- Attachment 8: Open House Summary
- Attachment 9: Public Consultation Responses
- Attachment 10: Consultation Meeting Summary (Covenant Court)
- Attachment 11: Letter from Christian Reformed Senior Housing Society (Covenant Court) PH 71

3213418

.

Attachment 12: Tree Preservation Plan

Attachment 13: Rezoning Considerations Concurrence

Attachment 14: Proposed Public Hearing Notification Area






ATTACHMENT 2



No 2 Road













ELEVATIONS BUILDING 3 SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"

20

5 10









#### PLANT LIST

PROJECT ADDRESS HARRINGTON COURT RICHMOND

¢£۱	QTI	BOTANICAL NAME	COMPON NAL	227
TREES				
	D			
ACC	1	ACE & CACENATUR	VEEMALL	GOM CALL BOD & STEMS MIN
A.2	,	ACER PALMATUR	JOPANCSE HAPLE	SCH CAL BOT
ARA	2	ACTER ALLO RUSA "ARMSTRICHIG"	ARMSTRONG MAPLE	10.0cm CAL, BAB 1.8m 57D.
MSL.	٤.		FURALE SAUCCE MACNOLIA	FLOOM CALL BAR
PC0	1	PICEA ONORKA	SEAMAN SPELICE	J.Sm H(), BA3
79	14	POPULUS TREMULOIDES	QUAKING ASPEN	5. Dom EAL 86 8
10		PTRUS COMPLINIS	FURCHEAN PEAN	6,0cm CAL, 86 R 1,8m SPD.
TF4		THUA OCCIDENTALIS 'FASTISATA'	PTRAMOAL CEDAR	1,Z Sm HT,
TF 3	13	THUIA OCCIDUNTAUS 'S ASTIGATA'	PYRAMIDAL CEDAN	1_Som 141.
201185				
A1		AZALSA JAPONICA **	APANEST AZALEA	AL HOT
bX		BLOGIS SEMPERVIRENS	COMMON HDROWOOD	101 54
FC.		ERICA CARNEA	WINTER HEATHER	#2 POT
1.4		LEVODITIOF MULLARS	CDAST LEIXOTHOS	#2 PGY
บ็	7	LIGUSTRUM JAPONICAR TEXANUM	LAPANESS PRIVET	0 101
MA	45	HANDMA ADUITOULM	OREGON GRAPE	E) PO1
XD		NANDINA DOMESTICA	LEAVENLY LAMEGO	F2 POT
PJF	6	PERIS JAHONICA 'FOREST FLAMP	LILY OF THE VALLEY	F3 PO1
PL	E.	PRIMITS LUGTANICA	PORTLASE SE LAUTUEL	F3 P01
euī.	40	IT KODODENDRON **	IS COUGLNDRON	LDOm NT.
124	40	ROSA VEDILAND	HEIDILAND ROSE	#1 POT
517	16	SARCDODCCA / UNILIS	IdHALAYAN SARGOCOCLA	#2 PDT
AL2	7	STRALA LAUDNICA "ANTHON" WATCHER	ANTI-ONY WATLELK SP-AAEA	#7 PDT
¥0	11	VIEWER DAVICE	DAVID'S VIEWRAM	#2 PO1
VSD	,	VIBURNUK X ROOMANTENSE DAWN	DAWN VRUENUM	2.00 <del></del> ዞገ.
GROUND		85		
ALC		ASCTOSTAPHILOS WA UKS	KOANOOH MOX	×IP-9 POT
5	415	CAULTI (RA SHALL ON	SAL AL	rsi'y pot
VINES				

#### REPLACEMENT TREE PLAN HARRIGIAN COULT ROSSHORD

SUR OF REMOVED DRIES	Inter al	SER OF MENT YREES	MEDIAL OF ANY OF	PHOPOSED TREES	Sel ANCE
NºM-OSP	5	DICH CAL /1.5 MM	1	25(0-71/0-2)	1 m
AND-HOCH	1	ESCH CAL/4.0m HT.	1	1	2
040-SOCH	1	BOCH CAL/S.DW. HT.	1	0	1 1
150-EOCH	1	LINES CALISSM HT	- 0	1	1 2
Mil-70CH	1	OISCH CAL/C. Due HT		0	- A

.

HAT IS 2018 MANN.

> MAR 1 (01): Le bres secondad Barn anno 1 ar De

CCT ALTOIC: Interfaced action made and Start and action and action strategy and action and action strategy for the

NA DA DA DA \_\_\_\_

Card I SALE ST ANE

101 11 100 ....

Row.

#### PERENMALS/ANNUALS/FERNS/GRASSES/AQUATIC PLANTS

AAA	1	ASTILLE & ARENDER ANOTHINT	MEADOW SWEET	21 POT
a C	16	REAGENTA CRASSIFULIA	HEARTLEAF HELGENIA	#1 POT
CMA.	126	CAREK NORKOWN 'AUTO-VAREGATA'	CARSX	#1 PO1
LVA	10/	LAVANDULA ANGUSTO OLLA	ENGLISH LAVENDER	KS POY
Ēсм	\$58	FOLYSTICI AN MUNITUM	WESTERN SWORD FERK	=1 POT
ANH	80	ASMUALS		7593 201

NOTES

" DENOTES SHE'DES AND VARIETY TO BE ASPROVED BY THE LANDSCAPE AND HTECT,

ALL MATEMALE AND EXECUTION SHALL BE IN ACCORD THE MOST RECEIPT BRANDED ALL MATEMALE AND ACCORD ACCORD

FLANTS IN THIS PLANT LET ARE SPECKED ADDREADER TO THE ONTA STANDARDS FOR MURSERY STOOK AND THE ROUMA STANDARDS FOR COM MIRLY GROWN PLANTS.

.

ALL M ANT QUANTITY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN PLAN AND MANT UST SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT FOR CLARFICATION PROF TO SUBJITTING FIGH.

ALL MATEAULS AND WORKMANNER SHALL BE CURRENTEED FOR ONE PALL YEAR WITER THE DATE OF SUBSTANTIAL PERFORMANCE, SUBSTANTIAL PERFORMANCE SHALL OCCUR WERE USAN OF A COMPARET HAS BEEN COMPLETED TO THE SATURACTION OF THE LANDSCAPE ADDRETCT.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MARYTAN ACCORDANCE TO THE LANDSCAPT STANDARDS UNTEL THE WORK IS TURNED OVER TO THE DWIVER.

HARRINGTON COURT

Looking free PLANTLIST







L5 "



City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1 www.richmond.ca 604-276-4000

# Development Application Data Sheet

# RZ 10-516267

Address: 9160 No. 2 Road

Applicant: Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd.

Planning Area(s): Blundell

	Existing	Proposed
Owner:	Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd.	No Change
Site Size (m <sup>2</sup> ):	3,127 m <sup>2</sup> (33,660 ft <sup>2</sup> )	3,119 m <sup>2</sup> (33,574 ft <sup>2</sup> )
Land Uses:	Single-Family Residential	Multiple-Family Residential
OCP Designation:	Low-Density Residential	No Change
Area Plan Designation:	N/A	No Change
702 Policy Designation:	N/A	No Change
Zoning:	Single Detached (RS1/E)	Medium-Density Townhouses (RTM3)
Number of Units:	1	18
Other Designations:	Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy – Multiple Family Development	No Change

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Density (units/acre):	N/A	23.3 ира	n/a
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.7	0.69	none permitted
Lot Coverage - Building;	Max. 40%	35.4%	none
Lot Coverage – Non-porous Surfaces	Max. 70%	60.7%	none
Lot Coverage – Landscaping:	Min. 25%	25% min.	none
Setback – Front Yard – No. 2 Road (m):	Min. 6 m	6.0 m	none
Setback – Exterior Side Yard – Maple Road (m):	Min. 6 m	6.0 m	none
Setback – Interior Side Yard (South) (m):	Min. 3 m	3.2 m	none
Setback –Rear Yard (East) (m):	Min. 3 m	10.9 m	none

Attachment 3

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Height (m):	Max. 12.0 m (3 storeys)	9.15 m (3 storeys)	none
Lot Size (min. dimensions):	Min. 40 m wide x 30 m deep	Approx. 50.29m wide x 62.18 m deep	none
Off-street Parking Spaces – Resident (R) / Visitor (V):	2 (R) and 0.2 (V) per unit	2 (R) and 0.22(V) per unit	none
Off-street Parking Spaces - Total:	40	40	none
Tandem Parking Spaces:	not permitted	0	none
Amenity Space ~ Indoor:	Min. 70 m <sup>2</sup> or Cash-in-lieu	\$18,000 cash-in-lieu	none
Amenity Space - Ouldoor:	$\begin{array}{r} \text{Min. 6 m}^2 \times 18 \text{ units} \\ = 108 \text{ m}^2 \end{array}$	132 m <sup>2</sup> min.	none

Other: Tree replacement compensation required for removal of bylaw-sized trees.

# LEO CHAN

9297 Romaniuk Drive, Richmond BC V7E 5G6

Tel: 604-377-7748 (C) / 604-448-9297(H)

March 2, 2011

The Urban Development Division City Hall 6911 No.3 Road, Richmond, B.C.

V6Y 2C1

Ref: RZ 10-516267

Dear Sir,

I saw that the property at the corner of Maple Road and No.2 Road is finally demolished, cleaned up and will be developed. I am in full support of the development. That area was an eye-sore for many years and the land was under-used. The townhouse development will improve the look and value of the neighborhood and the criminal occurrence in any case.

I hope the City will approve the project.

Yours truly,

Leo Chan Shu Woon 9297 Romaniuk Drive Richmond BC V7E 5G6

March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011

Urban Development Division

City of Richmond

6911 No.3 Road,

Richmond, B.C. V6Y-2C1

Re : Re-Zoning Application to rezone 9160 No.2 Road, Richmond.

Dear Sir or Madame :

- My name is Tom Cheng and I reside at 9651 Gilbert Crest in Richmond, B.C.
  - I hereby to express my support for the rezoning application from Western Maple Holdings Ltd to rezone 9160 No.2 Road from a single detached (RS1/E) to a townhouse (ZT69) zone.

Should you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully Yours,

Tom Cheng

May 31, 2011

Tiffany Kwong #77-12500 McNeely Drive Richmond, B.C. V6V 2S4

Planning Department
City of Richmond
6911 No.3 Road
Richmond, B.C.
V6Y 2C1

Ref: RZ 10-516267

#### Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Tiffany Kwong and I live in #77-12500 McNeely Drive, Richmond, B.C. Canada. 1 am living with my parent now and I am graduating from Simon Fraser University this summer. I have an uncle who lives in the Maple Road/Gilbert Road area. My uncle and his family live in a pretty nice and big house. I heard from my uncle that a proposed townhouse projects in that area is getting a lot of opposition, simply because the residents in that area do not want any smaller and multiple family homes. I think this is a totally wrong idea. If we maintain this idea, Richmond will become a city that will be occupied only by rich people. People like me and many of my high school classmates who do not have rich parents will be forced to move out of Richmond, where we grew up and have many friends and relatives. We like to stay in Richmond. My uncle is rich and he helped his children to buy their own homes in Richmond. As the newspaper said, housing in Richmond is getting very expensive and unaffordable, the City official should, whenever possible, allow more houses to be built. This will help to make housing more affordable to the younger generation people like me and my friends. The townhouse project that is getting all the opposition is on No.2 Road. It is on a busy street, a location more suitable for multiple family and more affordable housing. Actually, I do not understand why the people living on Maple Road and Gilbert Road oppose to the project, because it has very little effect on this end of Maple Road. Richmond City officials should not listen only to the rich people, they should be aware of the situation of the average and not so rich. citizens. They should allow this townhouse and similar projects to go ahead, so that more houses are built and Richmond becomes more affordable to live.

Yours truly,

panification

Tiffany Kwong

The Township of Richmond Urban Development Dept

### Proposed Development at Maple & Two Road

The destruction of the property and the construction of eighteen townhouses is going to negatively impact the lives of many of the senior citizens who live at 9260 Two Rd. (Already, since the demolition of the buildings on the property, we have had an invasion of large carpenter ants.) Many wildlife animals and birds inhabited the property – no doubt the surrounding homes will inherit them. It's already creating an increase in our Budget for Pest control.

On the north side of the building the residents, especially those on the first and second floors, will lose quiet enjoyment, view and light when the development is completed. (The reasons we moved here in the first place) Plus during construction the dust that inevitably comes with building will invade our homes making it next to impossible to keep them clean. Many of the seniors who live here are allergic to dust. It follows that they will suffer health problems (in some cases, severe) from the pollution and it will cost more to keep our homes clean

With eighteen units there will be a dramatic increase in vehicles producing more pollution. They will have to turn on to Two Rd (a road that is already one of the busiest in Richmond – but not well serviced by Translink) as there is **no exit** from Maple to the east.

We seniors have to cross Maple Rd to get to and from the bus.

In all likelihood there will be an increase in accidents as none of us move quickly.

On top of that we understand that the building will be only ten feet from our fence, so those of us on the north side will have to keep our window coverings closed all the time. And the noise level will increase dramatically.

All of this will contribute to a decrease in market value for our homes. (Not to mention less inheritance for the families we leave behind.)

It is our hope that if the application to rezone is approved (and from the work that has already been done this seems to be a 'done deal') there will at least be a restriction on the number of units to be built. Also some way to decrease the problems the residents at Covenant Court (9260 Two Rd) will face. Sincerely, Ellen Langan 110-9260 No 2 Rd., Richmond, BC V7E2C8 604-277-0994 or email omato4@gmail.com

Man Ying Lee 6240 Maple Road Richmond BC V7E 1G5-

John & Cleanor Contello 6120 Maple Road Richard IT. VTEIG5

March 29, 2010

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

Dear Sir / Madam: EBWIN LEE'

Re: Rezoning Application on 9160 No. 2 Road Richmond (File No. RZ10-516267)

I am writing to oppose the abovementioned rezoning application. The concerns include the following:

- 1. This project will not conform to the norm, stereotype of our neighborhood as the size of each proposed individual dwelling would be too small and too dense (size of each of the neighborhood single-family house is over 2,000 sq. ft.).
- 2. Increased flow of traffic and corresponding increased parked cars along Maple Road and its interception with No. 2 Road will be hazardous to the drivers and the residents living in this area.
- 3. It will be even more dangerous when the main entrance of this site is set on Maple Road as it is too close to the junction of No. 2 Road. Cross-traffic accidents may be easily occurred.
- 4. The proposed 3-storey building would no doubt affect the private lives of our neighbors, especially when the proposed 3-storey building is constructed facing the East and/or facing the North of Maple Road.
- 5. Increased density of population will inevitably hamper the quality of life, the harmony and peaceful environment of this quiet community.

In view of the foregoing, your decision to decline this rezoning application would be highly appreciated. We would highly appreciate this too. Yours faithfully We feel the same as Mr. Lee.

Yours faithfully

Man Ying Lee Owner and Occupant

your faithfully John E. Cantello. of my Wife Eleonor. Owners & Occupants

6280 Maple Road Richmond BC V7E1G5

March 29, 2010.

City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Road Richmond BC V6Y2C1

Dear Sir/Madam:

#### Strongly oppose the rezoning application on 9160 No. 2 Road Richmond (File No. RZ10-516267)

I am writing to oppose the above mentioned rezoning application. The concerns include the following:

- 1. This project will not conform to the norm, stereotype of our neighbourhood as the size of each proposed individual dwelling would be too small and too dense (size of each of the neighbourhood single-family house is over 2,000 sq. ft.).
- 2. Increased flow of traffic and corresponding increased parked cars along Maple Road as it is too close to the junction of No. 2 Road will be hazardous to the drivers and the residents living in this area.
- 3. It will be even more dangerous when the main entrance of this site is set on Maple Road as it is too close to the junction of No. 2 Road. Cross-traffic accidents may be easily occurred.
- 4. The proposed 3-storey building would no doubt affect the private lives of our neighbours, especially when the proposed 3-storey building is constructed facing the East and /or facing the North of Maple Road.
- 5. Increased density of population will inevitably hamper the quality of life, the harmony and peaceful environment of this quiet community.

In view of the foregoing, your decision to decline this rezoning application would be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully

Alan Wong Owners and Occupants

MARY A. JARDINE 205 - 9260 NO. 2 ROAD RICHMOND B.C. CANADA V7E 2C8

-0.5 hope 1 - 0.4 20 --. If was decorporate Accursion -Lizity Hall 6-9.11 No. 3 Roman Fichmondin G.C. Vby JC1 Afear! Marian) Jui ort: Westerne drap in Hacketing Let and a second It stana the advance company his -applied for planning to begod 9140 - no 2 at in from single detaided (RS1/E) to Devolution (2769) paraproced 18 Hometer 3 ATany - Abis property is a competent of - maple in me a Roud with the developing -foring maple not Du 2 Board - I finly believe this should slivy as -it is - proyles detacked Qn To 2 Road it is theen met a drucking : denildenige Chingshar - man 7103 - Ravili - deautiful big Trees cut down De

- developmente con ling in mong Auntre the Eliese do not allow this change. as that have in facing Diaples Dot 720 - 2 Kon el Aincurely. . ..... Mary\_ Quadeni ---- JARUINE

Edmund San 6180 Maple Road, Richmond, B.C. V7E 1G5

CITY OF RICHMOND

APR 132010

RECEIVED

April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 City of Richmond 6911No. 3 Road, Richmond B.C. V6Y 2C1

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Rezoning Application on 9160 No. 2 Road, Richmond (File No. RZ10-516267)

We are writing to oppose to the captioned rezoning application. Our reasons for objections are:

- This project is of high density in nature crowded with 18 smaller townhouse units. This does not conform with our neighbourhood with mostly larger single family houses on bigger lots.
- This project will have an adverse impact on the parking situation on Maple Road. No. 2 Road is not allowed for parking at all times and occupants and visitors of this 18 units will greatly increase the number of cars parked on Maple Road.
- This increased flow of traffic along Maple Road and its interception of No. 2 Road will be hazardous to the drivers and residents in the area.
- The proposed 3 storey building would invade the privacy of us as the east facing units are overlooking directly onto our backyards.

We strongly oppose to any high density developments in this area and your decision to decline this rezoning application would be highly appreciated.

Yours truly,

Edmund San

J. & S. Bjelos 6100 Maple Road Richmond, BC V7E 1G5

April 29, 2010

City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, BC

Dear Sir/Madam:

# RE: Rezoning Application on 9160 No. 2 Road, Richmond (File No. RZ10-516267)

We are writing to you to express our opposition and concerns regarding the above mentioned rezoning application. Please note the following concerns:

- The proposed project at 3 stories does not conform to our neighbourhood's profile. The height of the buildings will impede on the homes around the project. IT WOULD BE PREFERRABLE THAT THE PROJECT BE KEPT TO 2 STORIES IN HEIGHT. This would be a much better fit and keep the flow of the existing neighbourhood.
- 2. The Increase in density is of concern as well. The increase in traffic created by the project will affect the flow and congestion of both Maple & No. 2 Road in a negative fashion.
- 3. Privacy The height of the project will negatively affect the levels of privacy that the residential home occupants have.

With reference to the foregoing, your decision to decline this rezoning application or at the very least, review and change to 2 storey application would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

John & Stella Bjelos Owner

Unjetos 24, pl





F\*>C%[\*\*\* F215

#### Lee, Edwin

From:	Al and Harriet [deboer1867@shaw.ca]
Sent:	August 24, 2010 9:04 PM
To:	Lee, Edwin
Cc:	Hingorani, Sonali
Subject:	Townhome proposal
Follow Up Flag	: Follow up
Flag Status:	Green

Dear Edwin,

This e-mail concerns the townhome development proposal at No. 2 Rd and Maple Rd. . The file number is RZ10516267.

I was given your name to contact with my concerns.

My name is Harriet deBoer and I live at 9248 Romaniuk Drive which is just around the corner from the above. My husband and I are concerned about the traffic that will inevitably become much busier should this developement be allowed. Already, it is very difficult to make a left turn onto No. 2 Rd. and many in the neighborhood choose not to and make a right-turn instead but then are also adding to their driving distance. Even turning right on this street can take awhile because of traffic volume on No. 2 Rd.. Maple Rd. turns into my street Romaniuk Drive at the barrier on Maple Rd. Therefore my way out is mainly at this point. An 18 unit townhome, will increase traffic significantly regardless of where the entrance to the developement is planned.

Also, this area is comprised of all single family homes, from Francis Rd. north to Woodwards Rd.. I think it should be kept that way. The other developments that are happening at this moment - 2 on Maple Rd. close to the above mentioned site are large single family homes. I am concerned that a townhouse development will hinder the house values in this area.

The block - off in the mid point of Maple Rd between Gilbert and No.2 Rd. was created years ago due to traffic concerns, when our area was developed. People feared cars racing to Gilbert or No. 2 Rd. with young children living on Maple Rd. Now that No. 2 Rd. has become much busier and Gilbert less busy I would suggest opening up Maple Rd. again so we can travel either east or west to our destinations, whatever is prudent. A round-about in place of the barrier will prevent through traffic from speeding through. I think there is enough room, as on the east side of the barrier, the road is a large cul-desac.

l would appreciate your feed back on this matter. Thank you in advance for your consideration to our concerns, Sincerely, Harriet deBoer 604-271-1867

#### Lee, Edwin

From:	Aliard Lau [aliardlau@gmail.com]
Sent:	April 25, 2011 9:28 PM
To:	Lee, Edwin
Subject:	Folder # 10 516267 000 00 RZ - Rezoning of 9160 No 2 Road to 18 units townhouse
Follow Up Flag	: Follow up
Flag Status:	Purple

Hi,

Further to our phone conversation of April 14, 2011, I am emailing you my personal opinion on the above rezoning. I apologize of missing the public hearing last month.

### I disagree to open up the barrier on Maple and I suggest the access to the townhouse through No 2 Road instead of Maple.

I live at 6100 Martyniuk Place, Richmond for more than 10 years. I like the setup in my area because there are 2 cul-de-sac and a few more near the park area, plus one barrier on Maple and the other one on Woodwards to block the traffic. The only entrance and exit to the whole area is the intersection at No 2 Road and Maple.

I believe this set up is to ensure road safety and to prevent car accident for the reasons below:

## (1) walk / bike to elementary and secondary school

My son is currently 14 years old. His elementary school was Errington and secondary school Steveston-London. He has to walk through Maple, through the park area, cross the street to get to his school. It is a 20-30 minutes walk to Errington and 15-20 minutes to Steveston-London.

In addition to my son, I believe there are other kids walk to school or bike to school every day. Errington has about 200-250 students (Age 5 to 12) and Steveston-London about 1200-1300 students (Age 12 to 17). That is probably why we have barriers on both Maple and Woodwards to reduce the traffic in the area.

## (2) walk / bike to the park

My mom is currently 83 years old. She walks to the park almost every day, again through Maple, to meet her friends from the neighbourhood Her eyesight and hearing is not as good as before and she walks slow. Lesser traffic is for sure more encouraging for seniors to continue exercising and walk to the park as a daily routine. I believe there are other seniors and adults walk (with a dog) / bike to the park every day.

I prefer no change to the current set up in the area and I disagree to open up the barrier on Maple. The followings explain the probable impact if opened.

(1) Opening up the barrier on Maple could be attracting more traffic, from east of the barrier to the intersection of No 2 Road and Maple

If there is no barrier on Maple, people can choose which main road to take - Gilbert or No 2 Road. If the parent drives the kid to Steveston-London, probably will turn right on Gilbert. If the driver wants to go to Richmond Centre, Airport or Vancouver during peak hours, probably will turn right on No 2 Road, then No 2 Bridge to Vancouver.

During peak hours, people tend to turn right - less lanes and traffic to worry about before making the turn, and less chance to be held responsible if car accidents happen.

#### (2) Potential re-zoning to another townhouse directly across the street from the current site

I notice that the houses on Maple, directly across the street from this 18 units townhouse were recently sold. With the opening up of the barrier, it would enhance the developer to re-zone these single detached houses into another townhouse or condo next year. If this is the case, the traffic at this intersection of No 2 Road and Maple would become a seious issue.

The re-zoning of 9160 No 2 Road from 1 single detached home to 18 units townhouse in this 0.77 acres lot result in <u>everything being 18 times more as compared to before - cars, garbage, visitors etc</u>. It is a plus that each unit of the townhouse has double garage and there are 6 visitor parkings. However, if it snows and stays in winter times, the owners of these townhouse tend to park their cars along Maple for easy access. During holidays like Christmas and New year, the visitors to this same 0.77 acres lot become 18 times more than before and the overflow has to park along Maple. The 6 visitor parking could be just comparable to the driveway of the previous 1 single detached home.

## **Conclusion**

The traffic increases as a result of this re-zoning into a 18 units townhouse. As explained above, the opening up of the barrier on Maple is not a good option. To minimize the impact on the neighbourhood, I suggest to have the townhouse accessed through No 2 Road instead of Maple. By the way, the official address of the site is <u>9160 No 2 Road</u>, Richmond. The City cannot sacrifice the intent of the current set up and the interests of the other owners (kids and seniors) in the whole area to accommodate 1 owner - the developer of 9160 No 2 Road.

In addition, there should be more visitor parking in this 18 unit townhouse complex to reduce the likelihood of cars parking along Maple.

The approval of current proposal plan could set a precedence for future rezoning and development, like the potential sites directly across the street from this 18 unit townhouse. As explained above, the opening up of the barrier on Maple and the entrance to the townhouse through Maple could increase the likelihood of car accident in the area with a probable result of holding Richmond City Hall responsible.

Please email me if you need any clarification. Hopefully, this email is not too late for consideration by Richmond City Hall.

Thanks.

April 28, 2010

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

Attn: Urban Development Division

Dear Sir / Madam:

Re: Rezoning Application on 9160 No. 2 Road Richmond (File No. RZ10-516267)

We are writing to oppose the abovementioned rezoning application. The concerns include the following:

- 1. This project will not conform to the norm, stereotype of our neighborhood as the size of each proposed individual dwelling would be too small and too dense (size of each of the neighborhood single-family house is over 2,000 sq. ft.).
- 2. Increased flow of traffic and corresponding increased parked cars along Maple Road and its interception with No. 2 Road will be hazardous to the drivers and the residents living in this area.
- 3. It will be even more dangerous when the main entrance of this site is set on Maple Road as it is too close to the junction of No. 2 Road. Cross-traffic accidents may be easily occurred.
- 4. The proposed 3-storey building would no doubt affect the private lives of our neighbors, especially when the proposed 3-storey building is constructed facing the East and/or facing the North of Maple Road.
- 5. Increased density of population will inevitably hamper the quality of life, the harmony and peaceful environment of this quiet community.

In view of the foregoing, your decision to decline this rezoning application would be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully

Owners and Occupants Maple Road Richmond BC

Encl. 37 Specimen Signatures for 33 oppers/epopymers and occupants of Maple Road opposing this rezoning application.

SPECIMEN SIGNATURES OF OWNERS AND OCCUPANTS OPPOSING REZONING APPLICATION FILE NO: RZ10-516267-

BIQINE DOWNE / Name Blaine Powell Brandon Cheng FAVIA LIU 6191 MAPLE RD Name 9151 Romaniule ! RICHMOND, B.C., VTE-194 Address Richmond BC Name 9/5/ Romaniule Dr. Name Address Address 6360 Martynuk Pl. Richmond PETTR CHELNGT Mike Cheng. May MIN Name 9091 MARTYNIUKGARZName Address 6288-1491+4-11.414 Address 6135 Maple Rd. Address v7E6L7 Richmond B.C. PEGN KWOK WQa Edmond Lau Name 63.00 Martyniuk Place Name 6191 MARTYNIUK Name last Address Address Edillond Lan Address 1E 6E1. Ju Kiong Name 6231 MARTY Name JASON' AN Name Address 6320 Martynink PL Address 6200 MARTYMNK PL Address VIELK VIE 6K VAE GK May yu 2HI TANG. PIK HA CECILIA TANG Name \$329 Martynook Name 6060 Maple toad Name 6291 Martynink Place Address VIE 165 Address AAD V7E 6K1 Address VJE 6K1 778-PP9-PT63. 778-889-2118

SPECIMEN SIGNATURES OF OWNERS AND OCCUPANTS OPPOSING REZONING APPLICATION FILE NO. RZ10-516267

MARX LOA Eleanor Cantello Name //hains Name 6120 Maple Rd. Vame 6120 Maple Rd. Address 6200 Maple Road Richmond BC V7E165 Address Rich Address Richt. BC VTE 165 ele John cotelus net V15165 logmary Chotmail.com Jouce & ALAN Wong of Man Ymg Lee. ABEEKEMA Name Name Name Address & 2 MAPLE ROAD Address 62010 maple Road Address mytse 28 Chatmart. com 6140 Mople Rd. RICHMOND Richard Wang ALICE & FELIX HO Chen Cuijuan pe Name Name Address 6160 Maple Road. Address 9111 Martyniuk Gate Address 6.315 MAPLE ROAD. V7E 6L7 RICHMOND VIE IGG ben for Terence Chav Klimas Focked Name Name Name Address 62>1 maple Rd Richmond Address 6291 MAPLE Row 2 Address V75 44 RICHMOND. 6220 MADle Rd .. STOVE VUONG Sto My Many Gine & Name SWAIDIN LAM Name Name Address 6220 mople K Address SOPO MARTYNICLE GT. Address 9100. MARTY NUIL GATE PICHHOND BC

SPECIMEN SIGNATURES OF OWNERS AND OCCUPANTS OPPOSING REZONING APPLICATION FILE NO. RZ10-516267

Esther Yu: WAN YIN FUNG Xiao Name Address 627/ MARIYNIUK PLACE Name Name<sup>.</sup> Address Address 6333 MARTYNIALK PL 6233 Martynink PL Lun-Woan Ming Duh. Name Name Name Addressi Address Address 6211 Maple Rd., Richman Dr. CONNETH Lee KIA ZHANG Address bypo haple Road Name Name Address Address ٠**۲** EIG. 92 REMANIUE Name Name Name Address Address Address Name Name Name Address Address Address

2011 April 08

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

Attention: City Clerks Department

Dear Sirs:

Re: Rezoning Application File No. RZ10-516267

Please find enclosed lists of signatures of homeowners/occupants opposing the above rezoning. Please note that a letter with a list of signatures, (attached) was sent to the Urban Development Division on 2010 April 28 and those signatures are now included in the new list provided along with a copy of the letter.

My husband and myself have lived on Maple Road for 38 years and have come up against a few developers wanting to change the zoning. This road should remain as single family residences, we have beautiful expensive (\$3,000,000 plus) homes being built and sold on our road and think townhouses are not suited to our neighbourhood.

The undersigned would like to be notified of any upcoming meetings regarding this property.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sue Plett 6611 Maple Road Richmond, BC V7E 1G4 (604) 274-7302

cc: Urban Developmen Division, w/encls.



SPECIMEN SIGNATURES OF OWNERS AND OCCUPANTS OPPOSING REZONING APPLICATION FILE NO. RZ10-516267

( man long ( obtaina) Jelina Chlune Name TONY CHELING Name Sophia Chan Address 6341 Juniper Drive Address 6571 Juniper Dr Address 6411 Juniper DY. Cleg Chywai p Nañ Ye U. alintela Name U. DIRNFELD Name Address 6511 SUNIDER DRIVE Address Gt71 Juniper DY. RICHMOND Sally Chenny heing CHO . IName Name Nelson cheung Name Address 6571 JUNIPER DE Address 6571 Juniper Drive Address 6571 Juniper DR Michael Cherry herme War for Michael cheung Name Grace Chourg Name Name Address 6571 JUNIPER DEA'VE Address 6571 JUNIPER Drive Address 6571 JUNIPER DR 159 Name Samartha Cheurp Name Julleymo Schueber Name 6580 Juniper D. Address 6571 Juniper Drive. Address 6451 Juhiper Ur Address RICHTM0HD

Alice lee Ghag Ai JonathanLee Name JhDh. Lec 0927@gma;1 Name Name Address 5380 maple Rd. Address 5260 maple Rd Address 5728 Maple Rd. Com 609-667-8384 604-275-9022 lindh Wy Fabian Tam Gerald Lee Name tam-fabian Thotmail.com Name Name Address 5720 Maple Rd. Address 5382 Maple Rd. Maple Roa 5120 Address 604-81235 Simon (ay Dendy Co tong CHAO 6044678886 Name V170 An Name Name Address John Maple Rd Address M And Address maple Rd. 604-6238062 (mo 4 Dolly BAINS AMAFRANCES MAKAM Name 5460 MAPLE ROAD MAPLE JZJ3 Maple R Name Name Address RICHANGOND. R.C. Address Address 804-275.0330 Top 863 3621 1604 LLOYD Kylie Lee Ho Name VINCENT CHAN dulloyd @live.ca Name Kyky. lee@gmail.com Name Address 5386 MAPLE ROAD RICHMOUD & C. Address 5300 Maple Rd. Address 5360 MAPLE BL 6016-271-8762 V7E163

## SPECIMEN SIGNATURES OF OWNERS AND OCCUPANTS OPPOSING REZONING APPLICATION FILE NO. RZ10-516267

EDGE Jacky 15 TKRATE Name Tatiana Kraitman Name JACKY HU Address 9466 Romaniuk Place Address Address 9273 Romanink Dr. 9299 Lom ANUIVIC Richmond 604-272-13-83 AURIE MARK ARON GUIMAN TAU in Andrew 9487 PremAniuk PL Name Name Address 9433 Roman INM PLACE RICHMONES B.C. Address Address 9444 ROMATION Douch Shan. EDMUND CHY mornon Name Wandy TDug Name Name Address 92.77 Roly Arvine K Dr. Address Address 9462 ROMANIUK PL 439 ROMANINE PL V7E 546 RICHAR FELINTHOUNTY Name Jula Robinch Name Diane Smithson Name Address 9464 Romaniuk Pl. Address 9473Roman-ul Pt. Address KonANUL DE martisa Name BEXTKITID CHEN Name M' Wor Name R. SMITHBON Address 9286 ROMANIUR DR Address Address 9464 ROMANIUR PL

.

Hemen		2 Cel
ame He Mei	Name Simil KALE	Name TRACY LEE
ddress 609, imaple rd	Address 6026 MAZTINIUKPL RIOIMINES, BC, V.FEBKI.	Address 6035 MARTYNILIK PLAC RICHMOND, BC V7E6K
BEELEE ANG	-H.M. A00.	A-62-
ame	Name HUNG-NIN SCO.	Name Jenny Jing
ddress 6151 MARTYNIUK PL	Address 6031 MARTYNICK PL.	Address 6071 Martyninic Place, Richmund, BCV7E6K
Alarcidan	Northan	P. Draper)
vame Mec Cheen	Name PATRICK HUJENNY	Name Paul Praper
Address Aliand Lav 6100 Martynivk Place	Address 6111 MARTYNNICK PLACE	Address 6280 Martynuck Plu Rechmond, RD
Cham Viming Guon	Ronn	· · ·
Name CHUN IN UNG CHAN	Name Hinno.	Name
Address	Address	Address
6138. Martynink Place	6171 martiniuk .PL-	
John 1.1	Chne V Jand	
Name 6.040 Martynich Plan	Name Chih-in en Kuoulang	Name
Address	Address Buf Martyniuk Pl.	Address
THEA'S LOBERT LOSENSTOCK Chilley Ochwale DARKEL SESKIN Name Address 6560 DNIPER DR. Name Strinley Schwabe Name Address 6560 DNIPER DR. Address 6600 Juniper Dr. Address 9160 JUNIPER Gate Ricomono Be. mad B.C VTE4Z6 Richmond BC VTESA9 WOO Name Jop O'Locyhlin Name Name 1000 Junipu Gate Address 9291 Komaniula Address 6540 Juniper Vo. Address RILHMOND; V715561 C VIESTAY AL + HARRIET DEBOER JOHN + KARON WONG YRIVE Name Name Name 6551\_JUNIPER DR. Address Address Address RMD, BC VTE 424 Humy David Guo Name 6800 Juniper Dr Name 6)1 Name Juni Address Address Address XA CHUNHUA WU Ben Chen Orgehich Address 6760 JUNIPER DR. Name Tuniker Name Address

PH - 109

KUT LEUNG WONG SALLY KVO. Geo Zhong Wen Name Name Name 6428 MAGNOLIA DR. Address 6531 Magnolia Dr Address 6620 MAGNOLIA DR Address RICHMOND BC. VTE 6MT RICHMOND 1766M7. Richmond BC VZE6MY zhi HENG HAD CHSU Rni Tarza Guochang Hin Name Name Name Address 6531 Magzolia Dr 6555 Magnolia 7R Address Address MAGNOLIA 6560 DR KUCIAMOM Rich mond BC VTE6M 7E 6NIT ALBERT NES KANTHY Richmond B.C. VTE 6MT CHUN) LFE Name Name Name Address 647, MAGNOLIADR Address 6500 Magnolia Dr. Address RICHMOND BC 6522 MAGNOLI DR V7E6M AUMOK SAU CHUN YEUNG RICHMOND. BE VIE 6MI Name JIANA NO-Name 6488 MAGnolia DR. Name nolia Dr Address Address Address Rithmond DC GE6M7 6533 MAGNOLIA DRIVE E.600 JAMES & NINA CHENG SIFCIY GONCHIMEUN trong / him Name Name 43 6511 Magnolia Name Address 6577 MAGNOUA DA Address RMQ - BC VIE DMY Address (agno R. Chrim

DawnStewart SFRODIOD BLAZZICENC Name Breffer Bleggine Name Name PATRICK WON Address U. 6700 Maple Rd. Address 6720 Maple Rong Address 6360 maple ad Jusin Min TRUDIE LAI Name SULINI MUSSIG Name STEWARD SIY VZ(~ Name Address 6 740 Miple Kit. Address 6571 Maple Rd. Address 6391 MAPLE ROAD PANG LAN-KI4 Name Ling" WENDELL TAN Name Name (Itinitisa) Address 6571 Maple Rd Address Address 6860 MAPLE RA 64.60 Maple RD Sandr SERENA LAI Name Com Name JOCELYNE VERANDO Name STMCLU CHENG Address Address 657, Mayole Rol. Address 6751 MAMERCI 6520 MORIERO P Name 1 TTE Un Rain Name ( E MCForla 1) Name HEIVRY LIN Address 60 26 MAPLE RD Address 6711 Maple RC Address ESU -Magnolisec RUHMOND BC Rich word BC VTEIG6

Xn Ci ter Name Name Name ESGE Maugmilian), Address Address Address 647 6280 mon/1 0 Ke Maple Wintra Name Name Name Warde Rand Address Address 6471 Maple Koold 6440 Maple Yuzhu Name Name Name Address 6451 MAPLE 2D. Address 6500 Miciple Rd Address Maple Rol. In Xang 13mg HOW WITE Name Name Name Address 6933 maple Rol Address 6.631 Maple Fel. Made Rd. Address here Chang Michael Sophie Wong Name Aller Name Name Address 6771 Whip Cellel. Addreşş Address 6348 Maple 6471 Maple Rol

6325 Lense Mar Vanera 5820 Maple Name Name Address GUII Maple RO Address Address Elinha YEUNG WALCHUNG mights Name Name Addressin 340 Mayle Ral. Address 6340 Maple Ral Address 6480 maple. Sue Plett Mei Ima Man Men Name Address lebil Maple Road Name Address 2591 NegnieRd Address 6591 MapleRd David Grilo Name Richard NICHTELA'S KOWATN Name Name Address 6760 Maple Rd. Address And Alignet Re Address 6731 MAPLE ROAD HINING Hav Min Sherry! PRIAL 17 Name hood Address 66 60 Name Name Address 6571 MAPLE RD. Address Maple ZA Mafle

.

. .

. .

.

· ·

Allora	Warrange de-	
	NEW AN VICE	Name
Address 6113 maple Rd. Richman	Address 6113 MAPLE RD1, RICHALOND	Address
V72164		
In-	M. anne Bricha	
Name Stephen yiek	Name M. Anne Prucha	Name
Address 6113 MAP by RICHMAND	Address 6420 Maple Rd.,	Address
V7E 164	Richmond VIEIG5	
霍杨	Ahn Aucho	
Name 12 ta	Name JOHN PTUCHA	Name
Addross	Address 6.420 MAPLE ROAD	Address
6115 Maple RD Bichmid.	RICHMONY VIELGS	
ZTU	De Clitts	
Name Engl	Name DON PLETT	Name
Address 6115 Maple Dona. Richmond VTELGH	Address 6611 MOPLE RD	Address
Richmond 17E164	RICHMOND UZEIG4	
Tina		
Name Tina Tong	Name	Name
Address 6115 Maple Roca	Address	Address
Richmond VTE164		

.

Michael Chan Name Name Name Address 6668Magno Lia Draddress 6520 Magnolia Dr. Address Richmond CV7F6m When - IEN Name 6688 MAGNELIA DR Name Name Varial a pr. Address Address Address V72 647 1 no no Fung Due Shong 1 Hinly mon Somaqno lin Dr. Name Address 6633 Maynolica DR. V7E6M7 Richmond B.C. RIQMONK: V726M7 Name 6480 magno lin Dr. Name Address Address JANTZEN pun MAGNOUR DR Name Name Name 6460 MAGNOLLODR Address Address Address RICHMEND BC mon D RL ERIC 210 Name 6491 Magnolia Dr Address Richmond BICVTE 6MT Name Name Address 6611 Magnolia PR Richmond RC Address

.

i 11-12		
QUESTE-		
ame	Name	Name
ame I ddress 9020 Martyniuch Gatz	Address	Address
Name BREELE	Name	Name
N 1-24	Address	Address .
9091 Martegnick Gate		
Û		
Name	Name	Name
Address	Address	Address
Name	Name	Name
Address	Address	Address
Name	Name	Name
Address	Address	Address



## 9160 No.2 Road (RZ 10-516267) Report on Public Information <u>held on March 15, 2011 at the City Hall of Richmond, B.C.</u>

- A total of 152 invitations were delivered to the residents in the Maple Road and No.2 Road neighborhood, as per catchment plan provided by City Staff. Separate invitations were sent to the residents of the senior housing complex, Covenant Court.
- 19 persons (some are from the same family) attended the meeting.
- The developer, Wayne Fougere, the Architect and Masa Ito, the Landscape Architect were present.
- Edwin Lee from the City was also present.
- The meeting lasted from 5:30 to 7:30 pm.
- Plans, drawings and renderings were presented for viewing.

The following is the summary of the comments from the residents attended the meeting:

- 1. The townhouses do not conform to the single family housing in the neighborhood. The density is too high, the units are too small.
- 2. The 3 storey buildings are too tall.
- 3. The 18 units of townhouses will create traffic and parking problems on Maple Road and No.2 Road, particularly for cars trying to turn left from Maple Road onto No.2 Road in the morning.
- 4. The road block on the middle of Maple Road can be removed so that traffic can go from No.2 Road to Gilbert Road, hence easing the south-turn traffic from Maple Road onto No.2 Road.
- 5. The entrance to the townhouse project can be on No.2 Road.
- 6. A traffic light can be installed on the junction of No.2 Road and Maple Road, or on No.2 Road and Woodward.
- 7. The market value of the properties in the neighborhood will be adversely affected.

Our response to the above mentioned concerns are as follows:

- 1. Our property is situated on the south-eastern corner of No.2 Road and Maple Road. Immediately to our south is a senior housing apartment complex, and on our east is an older 2 storey house. In the immediate neighborhood, forms of development include, older small bungalows, older walk-out basement bungalows, new modest-sized two-storey homes (with double car garages facing the street, two storey entries and auto courts), newer large twostorey homes (with auto courts, three car garages and two storey entries), a three and a half storey apartment building, (the senior housing immediately to the south of the subject property), a church (with a large parking lot) and a small commercial development. Within a block radius of the property there are also several townhouse developments, duplexes and a small commercial centre.
- 2. Smaller homes in the neighborhood will provide affordable housing for young people and families, many of who would prefer to stay in the neighborhood they grew up in, close to their parents. Smaller homes will also allow long time area residents who find themselves empty nesters to downsize from a large family home without moving out of their neighborhood.
- 3. Along No.2 Road between Westminster Highway and Steveston Highway, there are 23 multi-family housing projects, some situated on corner properties, some in the middle of the block. The proposed project will be one of the most attractive ones among them.
- 4. Eighteen homes will generate a limited amount of traffic, base on the Traffic Study performed by Bunt and Associates.
- 5. All of the homes have a garage for parking two cars side-by-side. The City requires us to provide an extra four cars for visitor parking but potentially we may provide six visitor parking stalls (a 50% increase in the required visitor parking).
- 6. More street parking will be available due to our improved roadway frontage on Maple Road and the location of a single driveway crossing situated at the eastern property line.
- 7. The property east of our development will be screened with a row of tall trees and there is ample open space separating it from the townhouses.
- 8. Our three storey buildings will be built below the road elevation and will appear to be two and a half storey tall along our Maple Road Frontage. The windows in our homes will be the same types of windows in the homes on the north side of Maple Road (entry, living room, master bedroom and stair).
- 9. Garage doors will not face Maple Road.

10. As to the increase density. These new townhomes are of very high quality, with side-by-side double car garages and very modern and eye-pleasing exterior finishes. They will compare very well with the neighboring homes and certainly will add value to the area. A few more friendly people in the neighborhood will add to the quality of life, increase the number of residents keeping watch over the neighborhood and will deter the criminal elements by increasing the number of eyes on the street.



## 9160 No.2 Road (RZ 10-516267) Report on Public Information Meeting held on April 4, 2011 <u>at Covenant Court, 9260 No.2 Road, Richmond, B.C.</u>

The meeting was attended by 13 residents and the officials of the Christian Reformed Senior Housing Society, Nick Loenen and Simon Hanemaayer. The meeting was also attended by Edwin Lee of the City of Richmond.

After the assembly had a chance to view the plans, drawings and renderings. Wayne Fougere gave a brief run-down of the proposed townhouse project. The residents then took turn to ask questions and comment. A summary of the comments are as follows:

- The 3 units adjacent to the senior housing apartment building are too close and there are concerns of loss of privacy, sunlight and view.
- The density bonus given to the townhouse development is not justified and one unit in the middle of the project should be removed so that an open space becomes available.
- The driveway should not be too close to the senior housing.
- The playground, if there is one, should be situated away from the apartments and there. should not be too many toys and games that will create excessive noise.
- The townhouses will create traffic problems.

Our response to the above mentioned concerns are as follows:

The above-mentioned concerns were presented to us over a year ago and we have since then made drastic changes to our design and site layout. The plans and renderings presented in this meeting have the following features:

- Only 3 units with east-west orientation are now situated adjacent to the neighboring apartment building, with no window opening and no deck looking onto any of their balconies and windows. The apartment is situated on the southern property line, and their residents are only looking onto the side-yards of the three townhouses.
- The original grade was maintained so that even though the townhouses are 3 storey in height, the top floor is of about the same height as the apartments' second floor. No townhouse residents will be looking onto the apartment units as the first floor of the apartment is a parkade, and the window openings of the townhouses are high and small.
- The entrance to the project is on Maple Road, away from the apartments.

- We agreed to plant some trees on the apartment property to create more shelter and pleasant look, as the services right-the-way on the project's property does not allow any tree planting along the property line.
- The exterior of the townhouse will be painted with light color and climbing plants and flowers will be planted on the fences. A new privacy fence with lattice will be built.
- The roof slopes have been reduced significantly.
- We will commission a traffic study to assess the future traffic impact and if needed implement remedies. (The traffic report was done)
- The density bonus was a result of our effort to save the trees along No.2 Road and Maple Road. In doing so, we need to build the townhouses on the present grade, requiring the construction of bridges to access the units fronting on No. 2 Road. Density bonus is also given to a project for its contribution in up-grading the underground services and road work, which will benefit the area. The project will incur substantial costs in this regard.

On a whole, the residents were pleased that we listened to their concerns and have made a good effort to make changes to accommodate their suggestions.

# Christian Reformed Seniors Housing Society

April 11, 2011

City of Richmond Planning Department Att: Edwin Lee Re: RZ-10-516267

Dear Mr. Lee:

Thank you for attending the information meeting. Following the presentation our residents agreed to submit this letter. It contains our corporate response while recognizing that each Strata Lease Holder is entitled to make a personal submission.

## Covenant Court (9260 #2 Rd.,)

Covenant Court, located adjacent to and south of subject property, is a 26 unit frame construction apartment building on 3 floors above a concrete parkade. It is designed for seniors 55 years and over.

The units are strata titled. Twenty-one units are owned by their occupants under a long term lease called Life-Estates. These Life-Estates are contracts between the non-profit Christian Reformed Seniors Society and the occupants. Life-Estates are registered against title. Five suites are rented to provide affordable housing to persons of limited financial means.

The governing bodies are the Society's Board of Directors and the Strata Council.

## Impact on Covenant Court

The developer proposes 18 units in 4 blocks or strips of townhouses, one parallel and adjacent to Maple, three parallel to # 2 Rd. Nine suites of Covenant Court face north. Residents of those suites will look at the endwalls of these blocks of townhouses. Those three end-walls will be 10 feet from the fence. Their height from existing grade is three levels plus a roof. The 10 feet setback is further reduced by a two foot cantilevered baywindow space, without glass. The Covenant Court building is 25 feet within the fence. The potential negative impact of the proposed development includes:

- Loss of view
- Loss of daylight, making the north facing suites dark and dismal even during daytime.
- Loss of privacy, particularly for the 9 outside patios
- Increased noise, such as radios, car doors slamming, playground noise, basketball thumping, etc.
- Increased traffic congestion particularly at the Maple/#2 Rd. intersection and exiting the Covenant Court driveway will be more dangerous.

## Relationship with Developer

Since this application for rezoning was first made over a year ago, the developer, Mr. Thomas Leung and his staff, have been respectful, understanding, and helpful. Their attitude and approach is much appreciated. Twice there were private meetings. In addition, on April 4 the developer and his staff held an information meeting strictly for the residents of Covenant Court, Mr. Edwin Lee representing Richmond Planning was also in attendance.

As a result the current proposal incorporates significant changes that help address some of the concerns expressed by our residents. The changes include:

- Reduced total height.
- Reduced and relocated windows facing south and limiting their total area to reduce loss of privacy for Covenant Court suites.
- Reduced roof slope.
- An undertaking to apply light colours to outside finish on end walls.
- An undertaking to replace aging fence.

## **Remaining Concerns**

## 1. Proximity of the middle block.

The greatest deprivation of daylight and loss of view is for the centre most suites on the first and second floors of Covenant Court. We request that consideration be given to eliminating the southern most unit of the centre block, thus increasing the set-back from 10 to 30 feet, for that block only. That would reduce density and eliminate the density bonus the applicant has applied for. This seems only just, because why should a density bonus be allowed in exchange for preserving trees when Richmond's tree by-law imposes a duty on all property owners to preserve trees?

So far, the developer has been hesitant to agree to this specific request on the basis that reducing density will make this project less profitable. Money is important but it is equally important for both sides. We ask the Planning Department and City Council to also consider the negative financial impact on the nine suites that face north. Is their financial well being not also important? And if so, what is the dollar value of their loss and how does that compare to the potential profit for the developer on just one unit?

It is our belief that rezoning is never a right, particularly where a development is allowed a mere 10 feet set-back when ours is 25 feet. A rezoning can only be justified if there is a public interest and if there is no harm inflicted on others. We ask you to consider the harm inflicted on our suites under the current proposal and to accept reasonable accommodations to off-set such harm. We respectfully submit that our request is reasonable and not unduly self serving or an excessive burden to the developer.

## 2. Traffic

Traffic volume along #2 Rd. may require additional signals at the Maple Street intersection. West bound traffic turning left onto #2 Rd. is particularly at risk. In addition, our residents find it increasingly more difficult to exit and enter Covenant Court's driveway which is shared with the church next door.

Another improvement would be to move the existing bus stop along the east side of #2 Rd. from north of Maple to south of Maple and to move the #2 Road cross walk also to the south side of Maple. Most car traffic is on the north side of this intersection. Placing the cross walk and bus stop on the south side of the intersection would separate car and pedestrian traffic more effectively.

In the event it is not possible to move the bus stop, consideration should be given to move at least the cross walk to the south side. There is significantly more vehicular traffic on the north side of the intersection than on the south side. If the light-controlled sidewalk were on the south side, Maple vehicular traffic, both east and west, can turn onto #2 Road to go north, and south-bound #2 Road traffic can turn into Maple while the cross walk is occupied, without endangering pedestrians. Currently that is not possible and yet cars are constantly tempted to do this, hoping to beat the pedestrians.

Moving that cross walk will make for a much safer intersection. For example, it will greatly help the residents of Covenant Court, all of whom are seniors and many of whom use the bus, and it will also help church traffic. That church operates a daycare, programs for youth, and is in use every day of the week. Currently, both Covenant Court residents and church users who come by bus south-bound on #2 Road must cross #2 Road, once, and Maple, twice. The Maple crossings are without the benefit of a light or crosswalk. By moving the cross walk south the two Maple crossings are eliminated for those persons. It is true that this gain is off-set by area residents who live north of Maple and now enjoy the benefit of not having to cross Maple twice. But that group is fewer in number and will be even more so when this proposed development is in place.

The primary reason for moving the crosswalk is that nearly all car traffic that comes out of or goes into Maple is on the north side of the intersection.

3. Noise

Mindful that Covenant Court is home to seniors we ask that playground areas not be equipped with noise producing features such as a basketball hoop and special consideration be given to minimize noise emanating from playground areas.

Thank you for your consideration.

On behalf of all residents.

Dorinne Hudie President, Strata Council LMS 1251 Nick Loenen President, Christian Reformed Seniors Housing Society



ATTACHMENT 12

## Rezoning Considerations 9160 No. 2 Road RZ 10-516267

Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8769, the developer is required to complete the following:

- 1. Dedication of a 4m x 4m corner cut at Maple Road and No. 2 Road.
- 2. The granting of a 2.0 wide Public Rights-of-Passage (PROP) right-of-way along the entire west property line (No. 2 Road frontage) c/w a 4m x 4m corner cut at Maple Road for future road widening.
- 3. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on Title. The minimum Flood Construction Level is 2.9 m (geodetic) or 0.3 m above the surveyed top of the crown of the adjacent public road.
- 4. City acceptance of the developer's voluntary contribution of \$2.00 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$47,003.23) to the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund.
- 5. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$5,500 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of eleven (11) replacement trees within the City.
- 6. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of \$24,000 for the eight (8) protected trees to be retained on-site. 50% of the security will be released upon completion of the proposed landscaping works on site (design as per Development Permit for 9160 No. 2 Road). The remaining 50% of the security will be release one year after final inspection of the completed landscaping in order to ensure that the trees have survived.
- 7. Issuance of a separate Tree Cutting Permit for the removal of two (2) street trees along the Maple Road frontage. The City's Parks Division has reviewed the proposed tree removal and concurs with it. Identified compensation in the amount of \$3,250 is required.
- 8. Submission of a Contract entered into between the applicant and a Certified Arborist for supervision of any on-site and off-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.
- 9. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$3,000 towards the upgrade of the pedestrian signal on the north leg of the No. 2 Road/Maple Road intersection.
- 10. Submission of cash-in-lieu for the provision of dedicated indoor amenity space in the amount of \$18,000.
- 11. Submission and processing of a Development Permit application\* to the acceptance of the Director of Development.

Prior to issuance of Demolition Permit:

- 1. Installation of appropriate tree protection fencing on-site around all trees to be retained on site and on adjacent properties to the north and east prior to any construction activities, including building demolition, occurring on-site.
  - Note: Should the applicant wish to begin site preparation work after Third Reading of the Rezoning Bylaw, but prior to Final Adoption of the Rezoning Bylaw, the applicant will be required to obtain a Tree Permit and submit a landscape security (i.e. \$23,000) to ensure the replacement planting will be provided.

Prior to issuance of Building Permit:

- 1. Enter into the City's standard Servicing Agreement to design and construct off-site works on both frontages. Works include, but are not limited to:
  - a. No 2 Road: (this ALL subject to the health & proximity of the existing trees along the No 2 Road edge)...Removal of the existing sidewalk, pouring a new 1.5m sidewalk at the new property line and establishing a grass and treed boulevard;
  - b. Maple Road:
    - i. Per the capacity analysis, upgrade the storm sewer across the Maple Road frontage to 900mm diameter on a manhole to manhole basis.
    - Widen Maple Road to 11.2m, relocating the curb & gutter, creating a grass & treed boulevard c/w davit arm street lighting and installation a 1.50m sidewalk at the property line.
    - iii. It is noted that the Maple Road widening will be over a 150mm AC watermain. The design Engineer may recommend that the watermain be replaced as part of the design/construction process (all existing watermain breakages during construction are the clients sole responsibility).

Note: All works are at the clients sole cost; i.e. no DCC credits apply.

2. A construction parking and traffic management plan to be provided to the Transportation Department to include: location for parking for services, deliveries, workers, loading, application for request for any lane closures (including dates, times, and duration), 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: This requires a separate application.

[Signed original on file]

Signed

Date





City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1 www.richmond.ca 604-276-4000

## Development Application Data Sheet

#### RZ 10-516267

Attachment C

Address: 9160 No. 2 Road

Applicant: Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd.

Planning Area(s): Blundell

	Existing	Proposed
Owner:	Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd.	No Change
Site Size (m <sup>2</sup> ):	3,127 m <sup>2</sup> (33,660 ft <sup>2</sup> )	3,119 m <sup>2</sup> (33,574 ft <sup>2</sup> )
Land Uses:	Single-Family Residential	Multiple-Family Residential
OCP Designation:	Low-Density Residential	No Change
Area Plan Designation:	N/A	No Change
702 Policy Designation:	N/A	No Change
Zoning:	Single Detached (RS1/E)	Medium-Density Townhouses (RTM3)
Number of Units:	1	18
Other Designations:	Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy – Multiple Family Development	No Change

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Density (units/acre):	N/A	23.3 upa	n/a
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.7	0.675	none permitted
Lot Coverage – Building:	Max. 40%	35.2%	none
Lot Coverage – Non-porous Surfaces	Max. 70%	70% Max.	none
Lot Coverage – Landscaping:	Min. 25%	25% Min.	none
Setback – Front Yard – No. 2 Road (m):	Min. 6 m	6.0 m	none
Setback – Exterior Side Yard – Maple Road (m):	Min. 6 m	6.0 m	none
Setback – Interior Side Yard (South) (m):	Min. 3 m	3.0 m Min.	поле
Setback -Rear Yard (East) (m):	Min. 3 m	6.0 m	none

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Height (m):	Max. 12.0 m (3 storeys)	11.7 m (3 storeys)	none
Lot Size (min. dimensions):	Min. 40 m wide x 30 m deep	Approx. 50.29m wide x 62.18 m deep	none
Off-street Parking Spaces – Resident (R) / Visitor (V):	2 (R) and 0.2 (V) per unit	2 (R) and 0.22(V) per unit	none
Off-street Parking Spaces - Total:	40	40	none
Tandem Parking Spaces:	not permitted	0	none
Small Car Parking Stalls:	Max. 50% x 40 stalls = 20 stalls	18	none
Amenity Space - Indoor:	Min. 70 m <sup>2</sup> or Cash-in-lieu	\$18,000 cash-in-lieu	none
Amenity Space – Outdoor:	Min. 6 m <sup>2</sup> x 18 units = 108 m <sup>2</sup>	110 m <sup>2</sup> min.	none

Other: Tree replacement compensation required for removal of bylaw-sized trees.

## ATTACHMENT D

# Christian Reformed Seniors flousing Society

April 3, 2012 City of Richmond Planning Department Att: Edwin Lee and Planning Committee of Council Re: RZ-10-516267

Dear Mr. Lee and Planning Committee:

This is an Addendum to our submission dated April 11, 2011.

We wish to re-confirm that in principle we are not opposed to this development particularly since it has been Council's policy to permit multiple family rezoning all up and down Number 2 Rd.,

We appreciate the developer's positive response to several requests we have made as noted in last April's letter. We note that in addition to those improvements the developer is now also committing to signalization of the Number 2 Rd.,/Maple Rd. intersection.

However, we are concerned that some people are calling for this development's driveway to be placed onto Number 2 Road.

Such a driveway impacts not only Covenant Court and its residents but all who use the shared driveway between Covenant Court and the adjacent church. We circulated a petition among Covenant Court residents and those who regularly use our common driveway. The 121 name petition in opposition to a Number 2 Rd. driveway is attached.

We wish to register our objection to a Number 2 Rd. driveway in the strongest possible manner. The reasons for our objection are as follows:

- A Number 2 Rd. driveway contravenes the Official Community Plan guidelines which recommend driveways be kept off arterial roads whenever possible.
- All up and down Number 2 Rd. developments in recent years have been made to comply with the OCP's guidelines to keep driveways off arterial roads. Why should this development be treated

differently?

- It is against the original staff recommendations.
- It places the future residents of this proposed development at greater risk both when coming and going.
- This driveway will add to the difficulty of going into and out of our shared driveway with the church, thus placing even more people at risk.
- The 9 suites that look out over the proposed development will be impacted far more severely with noise and exhaust fumes from cars, garbage trucks, delivery vans and at night bright headlights etc. The quiet enjoyment of the use of those 9 outdoor patios and sundecks in particular will be severely curtailed.

It has been suggested that traffic on the proposed driveway would be 'rightin and right-out' only. That sounds nice but it is unenforceable and highly impractical. Consider yourself a future resident wishing to run an errant at the nearest shopping centre -- Blundell and Number 2 Rd. Going is fine, but coming back is highly problematic.

You are south-bound on Number 2 Rd. At Francis Rd. you must turn either left or right. It matters not which way you turn; either way the trip will be extended nearly four times. Suppose you turn right, you proceed to Railroad, turn left to Williams. On Williams you go back to Number 2 Rd. then turn left and proceed to your driveway. The just over 0.5 mile return trip has now become just shy of 2.5 miles. Does anyone seriously believe that people are actually going to do that? If you assume that future residents will actually do it, why would you impose such a dreadful penalty on these folks, particularly when there is an alternative readily available?

It is not as though Maple Rd. is burdened with traffic. As you know, Maple is blocked between Number 2 Rd. and Gilbert. Hence, the traffic on Maple east of Number 2 Rd., where the subject property is, is but a fraction of the traffic on Maple west of Number 2 Rd.

Traffic along Number 2 Rd. is very heavy almost anytime of the day<sup>1</sup>. There is a double yellow line, which many wrongly assume does not permit southbound traffic to turn into the church driveway and when cars do, as happens

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> One of our residents observed the following numbers of cars on Sunday, Oct. 23, 2011 between 11:15 am and 12:130 pm. Right turns from Church drive 93; left turns from Church driveway 38; coming into Church driveway 17.

frequently, following motorists get very annoyed. They have just left the signaled intersection and must now unexpectedly brake, stop and wait. This proposal would create two such bottle necks, one immediately after the other. Is that sound traffic planning?

To allow this latest proposed driveway is very, very poor planning. The much revered, late Jane Jacobs taught that livable communities need to be planned with people in mind. Coming home in the dark, having to cross a double center line, two lanes of traffic and a sidewalk which the elderly residents from our seniors housing use in scooters and walkers is not planning with people in mind – it is more like abandoning people.

Can any of you doubt that future residents of this proposed development if given an opportunity would choose Maple Rd. over Number 2 Rd. as a preferred way to enter and leave their home property?

We sincerely hope planning for people will prevail and the location of the driveway will remain on Maple Road.

In closing it is our view that the signalization of Maple and Number 2 Rd. will be a benefit to our residents but also all the traffic which tries to get onto Number 2 Rd. from west of Maple. That traffic has currently a hard time particularly in the morning when nearly all that traffic turns left to go north along Number 2 Rd.

hoerce.

Nick Loenen President, CRSHS.



ATTACHMENT E



**PH - 138** 







## ATTACHMENT F

Áugust 5, 2011

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

#### Dear Sir/Madam,

#### <u>Re: Application by Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd. for Rezoning at 9160 No. 2 Road from Single Detached</u> (RS1/E) to Medium Density Townhouses [RTM3] – File: RZ 10-516267

We are writing to strongly oppose the captioned rezoning application. We are extremely disappointed that, despite opposition by numerous households and residents in the vicinity, via in writing and in person, the City still decides to proceed and give the rezoning application first reading.

We now reiterate our/firm opposition to this proposed rezoning. Our concerns are:

- This development will not conform in character and be compatible with adjacent properties. The site may
  fall within the general Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy, but the proposed townhouses, be they 2 or 3
  storeys, are certainly not harmonious in scale and form with this particular surrounding area, as required
  by the City Multiple-Family Guidelines. Here, the neighburing properties are large high-grade detached
  single-family houses situated on huge lots, many around or even over 10,000 sq. ft. each.
- 2. The Increase in population will no doubt ruin the long-time serene, quiet and peaceful environment and lifestyle of this low-density community. '
- 3. Increased traffic and parking along Maple Road and at the interception with No. 2 Road will be hazardous to pedestrians as well as the drivers. Residents are used to the existing light traffic, and will find it difficult to cope with. In particular, many seniors and children, who walk to the park, school and bus stop every day, will be exposed to serious danger. The Maple Road main access of this development and the proposed 2 outbound lanes on Maple Road will not solve, but will aggravate, the problem.
- 4. It is underliable that this project will greatly de-value the neighbouring properties.

We sincerely appeal to the City not to sacrifice the well-being of numerous neighbouring residents over the interests of only one developer. We would appreciate your kind consideration of our strong objections and reject the subject rezoning application. Otherwise, we will be obliged to take further action.

	Thank you very much.	م ۲۰۰۰			
	Yours faithfully, and and solution of the second se		·		
e siles	Mame(s) '	<u> </u>			
	Address:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		DATE DATE	
	Telephone	,,,		( SEP 0 2 2011	1
	· · ·		PH - 142	RECEIVED	
				C.L.CEIVED	

## ATTACHMENT G

## Western Maple Holdings Ltd.

## 9160 No.2 Road (RZ 10-516267) Report on Public Information Meeting held on March 29, 2012 at the Thompson Community Centre

- A total of 164 invitations were delivered to the residents in the Maple Road and No.2 Road neighborhood, as per address labels provided by City Staff. A separate presentation was presented to the residents of the senior housing complex, Covenant Court.
- 57 persons (some are from the same family) attended the meeting.
- The developer and his staff, and Wayne Fougere, the Architect, were present.
- Edwin Lee from the City was also present.
- The meeting lasted from 5:45 to 7:45 pm.
- Plans, drawings and renderings were presented for viewing.
- There were questions and answers, and discussion among the people present.

## THE FOLLOWING IS THE SUMMARY OF THE COMMENTS FROM THE RESIDENTS ALONG MAPLE ROAD BETWEEN NO.2 ROAD AND GILBERT ROAD WHO ATTENDED THE MEETING:

- 1. The townhouses do not conform with the single family housing in the neighborhood. 18 units is too dense. Prefer single family homes.
- 2. The 3 storey buildings are too high compared to the single family homes.
- 3. The 18 units of townhouses will create traffic and parking problems on Maple Road and No.2 Road, particularly for cars trying to turn left from Maple Road onto No.2 Road in the morning.
- 4. The entrance to the townhouse project is better on No.2 Road instead of Maple Road as there will be traffic congestion caused by traffic entering No.2 Road from Maple Road.
- 5. Suggesting a traffic light to be installed on the junction of No.2 Road and Maple Road. However, one commented that a traffic light on this junction is no good, as there is one light on Francis and No.2 Road already.
- 6. Suggesting removal of blockade at Romaniuk Drive to ease traffic.
- 7. The market value of the properties in the neighborhood will be adversely affected.

- 8. There will be too much parking on the street. There is not enough visitors' parking in the complex.
- 9. The residents on the east side of Romaniuk Drive are worried that the blockade at Romaniuk Drive will be removed because of the townhouse development. They opposed to the project because they do not want to see more cars driving to their side of Maple Road.

### THE FOLLOWING IS THE SUMMARY OF THE COMMENTS FROM THE RESIDENTS WHO LIVE OUTSIDE OF THE MAPLE ROAD VICINITY AND ATTENDED THE MEETING:

- 1. Will support the project if the traffic light is installed on No.2 Road and Maple Road, and the barricade blocking traffic between No.2 Road and Gilbert Road on Maple Road remains.
- 2. Support the project as it is along a main road, with easy access to school and public transit. It is also next to another condo complex, plus other multi-family projects along No.2 Road. No reason to reject this project.
- 3. Support the project because Richmond needs more affordable housing for young and less wealthy people, other than single family homes for wealthy people.
- 4. The project is well-designed and conforms to Richmond's City Policy.
- 5. The City is getting less affordable and needs more projects like this one.
- 6. As a young professional, townhouses and condos are the only housing that is affordable. The townhome complex will provide bigger community support and networking for young families, young couples and single professionals. High density development also provides higher taxes for the City.
- 7. The townhouse development brings balance to the community.
- 8. Multi-family is the trend on busy street like No.2 Road. A new development will beautify the entire neighborhood with new designs and planning. In this case, replacing a very old house, and represents best use for the land.
- 9. The traffic light will make it safer for pedestrians crossing No.2 Road.
- 10. The project has little effect on the homes situated on the eastside of Maple Road on the side of Gilbert Road.
### OUR RESPONSE TO THE VISITORS AT THE MEETING REGARDING THEIR CONCERNS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. Our property is situated on the south-eastern corner of No.2 Road and Maple Road. Immediately to our south is a senior housing apartment complex, and on our east is an older 2 storey house. In the immediate neighborhood, forms of development include, older small bungalows, older walk-out basement bungalows, new modest-sized two-storey homes (with double car garages facing the street, two storey entries and auto courts), newer large two-storey homes (with auto courts, three car garages and two storey entries), a three and a half storey apartment building, (the senior housing immediately to the south of the subject property), a church (with a large parking lot) and a small commercial development. Within a block radius of the property there also several townhouse developments, duplexes and a small commercial centre.
- 2. Smaller homes in the neighborhood will provide affordable housing for young people and families, many of who would prefer to stay in the neighborhood they grew up in, close to their parents. Smaller homes will also allow long time area residents who find themselves empty nesters to downsize from a large family home without moving out of their neighborhood. Townhouse represents a good alternative between condo and single family home, and it is in fact preferred by many people.
- 3. Along No.2 Road between Westminster Highway and Steveston Highway, there are 23 multifamily housing projects, some situated on corner properties, some in the middle of the block. The proposed project will be one of the most attractive ones among them.
- 4. Eighteen homes will generate a limited amount of traffic, based on the Traffic Study performed by Bunt and Associates, and the Traffic Experts in the City concur with this opinion, after a separate study of their own. We will install a full function traffic light at the junction of Maple Road and No.2 Road. This will actually improve the traffic flow in this area, particularly for the traffic coming from Maple Road onto No.2 road from the westside of No.2 Road.
- 5. All of the homes have a garage for parking two cars side-by-side. The City requires us to provide an extra four cars for visitor parking. Some of our units will have 3 car garages.
- 6. More street parking will be available due to our improved roadway frontage on Maple Road and the location of a single driveway crossing situated at the eastern property line. If single family homes are built instead, the frontage will be taken by driveways instead of for on-street parking.
- 7. The property east of our development will be screened with a row of tall trees and there is ample open space separating it from the townhouses. The height of the townhouses is not too much higher than the new single family homes in the area.

- 8. Our three storey buildings will be built below the road elevation and will have about the same height as the newer single family homes built along Maple Road. The windows in our homes will be the same types of windows in the homes on the north side of Maple Road (entry, living room, master bedroom and stair). These Maple Road fronting homes will be all duplexes, (so are the units situated on the eastern property line facing our eastern neighbor), making them more similar to the single family homes.
- 9. Garage doors will not face Maple Road. It makes the exterior look better than some single family homes in which the garages are the prominent feature.
- 10. As to the increase density. These new townhomes are of very high quality construction, with side-by-side double car garages on the back side, and very modern and eye-pleasing exterior finishes. They will compare very well with the neighboring homes and certainly will add value to the area. A few more friendly people in the neighborhood will add to the quality of life, increase the number of residents keeping watch over the neighborhood and will deter the criminal elements by increasing the number of eyes on the street.
- 11. The blockade that blocks the traffic on Maple Road at Romanuik Drive will remain. This will ease the mind of the residents living east of this blockade, who does not want to see through traffic from No.2 Road to Gilbert Road.

# ATTACHMENT H



## ATTACHMENT I

April 1, 2012

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

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

# Re: Application by Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd. for Rezoning at 9160 No. 2 Road from Single Detached (RS1/E) to Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3) – File: RZ 10-516267

The purpose of this letter is to note our fervent objection to Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd.'s application to rezone 9160 No. 2 Road. The developer's rezoning application, submitted last year, was met with strong opposition by 447 neighbourhood residents, and at that time the Mayor and Councillors were notified either in writing or in person. The developer withdrew his plan from the scheduled public hearing last September.

However, the developer's current revised design is still totally unacceptable. It ignores our concerns as he still plans to build 18 three-storey townhouses where a single house went down. The slight modifications he proposes are purely cosmetic in nature and do not resolve any of our neighborhood's concerns.

We are left with no choice but to once again reiterate our firm opposition to this proposed rezoning. Our concerns are as follows:'

- 1. This proposed townhouse development in no way conforms in character to any adjacent properties. As you deliberate on this matter, you should not take the biased view that only the continued multiunit development along No. 2 Road should be considered. The proposed townhouse development will have a large footprint along Maple Road, which consists entirely of detached single-family dwellings! You should also look at the rest of the immediate neighborhood: Maple Road, Martyniuk Gate and Place, Romaniuk Drive, Magnolia Drive, Juniper Gate and Drive, and other arterials. The properties in this area consist of large, high-grade detached single-family houses situated on oversized lots. Townhouses of the type and quantity proposed are not in character with this particular area, as required by the City Multiple-Family Guidelines.
- 2. Currently, residents in this area are already experiencing traffic problems at the intersection of Maple Road and No. 2 Road, particularly in the mornings and early evenings. With the influx of eighteen more households where a single house stood before, including visitors to the proposed complex, the increase in vehicular traffic will certainly create hazards, further delays, and present inconvenience for both drivers and pedestrians of this neighborhood. The proposed traffic light will not ease the problems. This traffic light --- if it is ever installed -- will only be a few houses from the traffic light at No. 2 and Francis Rds. There have already been numerous accidents at that intersection. Another traffic light so close to that main intersection will only aggravate this problem.

- 3. The consequent population increase in the 18 units will doubtless negatively affect the serenity and peacefulness of this low-density community.
- 4. An increase of 18 households will no doubt create a parking problem along Maple Road. Many city dwellers today use their garages for storage and therefore have to park their cars on the street. Residents of the proposed complex would be forced to park along Maple Road. But there is no allowance for this. Visitors to the proposed complex would also be parking along Maple Road, since there are too few designated visitor parking spots in the proposed complex. This is clearly unacceptable in this quiet and unassuming neighborhood.

Our community sees no rationale for why the City has to sacrifice the well-being of numerous neighbourhood residents over the business interests of one developer. Hence, we appeal for the second time to the City to listen to our deep-seated concerns about this proposed development and reject the rezoning application. As an alternative, we ask you to consider the development on the southwest corner of Gilbert and Blundell. Here, three lots were rezoned to permit the construction of a total of six single detached houses. Could that not be a model for the development on No. 2 Road and Maple? Also, on the northwest corner of Maple and No. 2 Rd., plans call for three single-family homes to be constructed on that lot. This development, again, fits into the character of the surrounding neighborhood. This is all we ask for. Please do not fundamentally change our neighborhood for the sake of another multiunit development.

Your thoughtful consideration is much appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Signatures(s)	·	· · ·
Name(s)		
Address:		
Talanhana		<del></del>

PH - 149



ATTACHMENT J



# ATTACHMENT K

## **Rezoning Considerations**

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

Address: 9160 No. 2 Road

File No.: RZ 10-516267

# Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8769, the developer is required to complete the following:

- 1. Dedication of a 4m x 4m corner cut at Maple Road and No. 2 Road.
- 2. The granting of a 2.0 wide Public Rights of Passage (PROP) right-of-way along the entire west property line (No. 2 Road frontage) c/w a 4m x 4m corner cut at Maple Road for future road widening.
- 3. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
- 4. Enter into a Servicing Agreement\* for the design and construction of off-site works on both frontages. Works include, but may not be limited to:
  - a) No 2 Road:

Removal of the existing sidewalk, pouring a new 1.5 m sidewalk at the new property line and establishing a grass and treed boulevard (this ALL subject to the health & proximity of the existing trees along the No 2 Road edge);

- b) Maple Road:
  - i. Per the capacity analysis, upgrade the storm sewer across the Maple Road frontage to 900mm diameter on a manhole to manhole basis.
  - ii. Widen Maple Road to 11.2m, relocating the curb & gutter, creating a grass & treed boulevard c/w davit arm street lighting and installation a 1.50 m sidewalk at the property line.
  - iii. It is noted that the Maple Road widening will be over a 150mm AC watermain. The design Engineer may recommend that the watermain be replaced as part of the design/construction process (all existing watermain breakages during construction are the clients sole responsibility).
- c) No. 2 Road/Maple Road Intersection:

Upgrade the intersection with full traffic signals, complete with audible pedestrian signals (APS). The works will include but not be limited to: roadway widening, utility relocation, reconstruction of Maple Rd. on the east and west leg, pavement markings and signage changes. In order to determine the requirements of the Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of off-site works, a Transportation Functional Plan including road dimensions and road cross sections for all approaches is required. All proposed transportation and traffic improvements are subject to review and final approval of the Director of Transportation and the Director of Engineering.

Note: All works are at the developer's sole cost; i.e. no DCC credits apply.

- 5. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$2.00 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$47,003.23) to the City's affordable housing fund.
- 6. Contribution of \$1,000 per dwelling unit (e.g. \$18,000) in-lieu of on-site indoor amenity space.
- 7. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$5,500 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of eleven (11) replacement trees within the City.
- 8. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of \$24,000 for the eight (8) trees to be retained. 50% of the security will be released upon completion of the proposed landscaping works on site (design as per Development Permit for 9160 No. 2 Road). The remaining 50% of the security will be release one year after final inspection of the completed landscaping in order to ensure that the trees have survived.
- 9. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$3,250 to Parks Division's Tree Compensation Fund for the removal of a Hazelnut tree and a Cedar tree located on the city boulevard on Maple Road.

- 10. 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.
- 11. The submission and processing of a Development Permit\* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.

### Prior to Demolition Pcrmit Issuance, the developer must complete the following requirements:

- 1. Installation of appropriate tree protection fencing on-site around all trees to be retained on-site and on adjacent properties to the north and east prior to any construction activities, including building demolition, occurring on-site.
  - Note: Should the applicant wish to begin site preparation work after Third Reading of the Rezoning Bylaw, but prior to Final Adoption of the Rezoning Bylaw, the applicant will be required to obtain a Tree Permit and submit a landscape security (i.e. \$23,000) to ensure the replacement planting will be provided.

### 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 Division. Management Plan shall include location for parking for services, deliveries, workers, loading, application for any lane closures, and proper construction traffic controls as per Traffic Control Manual for works on Roadways (by Ministry of Transportation) and MMCD Traffic Regulation Section 01570.
- 2. Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoniug and/or Development Permit processes.
- 3. 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.

#### 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.

[Signed original on file]

Signed

Date

### Bylaw 8769



### Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 8769 (10-516267) 9160 NO. 2 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 Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3).
  - P.I.D. 010-776-443

Lot J Except: Firstly: Part Subdivided By Plan 31630 Sccondly: Part Subdivided By Plan 38285, Block "B" Section 30 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 2777

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 8769".

FIRST READING	MIL 1 1 2011	CITY OF RICHMOND
A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON		APPROVED by
SECOND READING		APPROVED by Director
THIRD READING		er Solicitor
DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED		
ADOPTED		

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER

# KELVIN WAI-TUNG LEUNG

28 - 6099 Alder Street Richmond BC V7Y 0A8 · (P) 604.805.5323 · (F) 604.214.8844 · (E) Kliners

May 31, 2012

Mayor & Councilors City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Road Richmond BC V6Y 2C1

Dear Mayor & Councilors,

### Re: Maple Road Development RZ 10-516267.

During the Planning Committee Meeting held on May 23, 2012 with regards to the above mentioned rezoning application, we were told by a lawyer that Council must listen to the people and not always side with the developer. I totally agree. When the community has raised their concerns they should be attended too. However, their concerns should be based on facts, have common sense, and be judged on fairness to all those concerned. Let us do a small recap. It was first raised that the Maple Development will have a negative impact on property values. But the new development actually replaces a very old and run down house. A new and well-designed complex will increase the property value in the area. The Maple Development might even be the best looking homes on the street! It was then raised that traffic is and will be an issue. The Developer committed to have a traffic light installed on Maple and 2 Road. Then "they" rejected it because it didn't make sense. Lastly, the Maple Road barrier has been demanded to stay in place. It was said that the Developer has a hidden agenda to remove the barricade. Let's make this crystal clear. The City wants to keeps the barricade. And the Developer wants to keep the barricade. However, I find it funny that when I read through "some" of the comments made by the residents of Maple Street, I read, "please remove the barricade". It has become very clear to me that anything under the sun is said so that the Maple Development does not go ahead.

The residents of Maple Road have argued they have paid a premium to live on Maple Road and continue to pay this premium in property taxes. This is simply not true, especially if they have lived in the neighborhood before 2002. Richmond has become a popular place to live the last 10 years because City Staff and Council have designed an OCP that put into motion a balanced and organized development plan for the City and made it one of the most livable places in the world. A plan that the people of Richmond support. One of the policies in this plan is the ability to rezone on artery roads for multi family housing. These types of policies have made Richmond a prized destination of RIC, this is the main driver in property value increases and predictably property taxes in DATE Richmond. This in turn has made the owners of Maple Road millionaires if Net multi millionaires. However, there is a caveat. Traffic will increase in the neighborhoods. Once in a while people might have to wait an extra minute or two at the intersections 2012 Moreover, owners and their guests might not be able to park in front of they homes. They may have to park in/a spot that is a short stroll away. I do not think we are taking two



Page 1 of 3

PH - 154

# KELVIN WAI-TUNG LEUNG

28 - 6099 Alder Street Richmond BC V7Y 0A8 · (P) 604.805.5323 · (F) 604.214.8844 · (E) Kliners@gmail.com

these peoples' living standards but I do admit minor inconveniences are created, but not to a point where a pregnant woman has to worry about the safety of her unborn child. Is it fair to say that all 18-unit owners as well as the current residents will drive out of their driveway at the same time and come home at the same time creating a log jam? Looking at our previous townhouse purchasers, and the ages of the protestors, highly unlikely. You will be surprised how many people are retired, don't work and/or empty nesters. Along No. 2 Road, Lancer Road, Langton Road, Colville Road, street after street in Richmond has allowed their neighborhoods to be developed, and have made their small sacrifice. They have taken on these small inconveniences to increase the standard of living of Richmond as a whole. But the residents on Maple Road think they are above these other neighborhoods. They are above Richmond's policies. These residents want to be protected from these little inconveniences. What they want is what they want and that is the only things that matters. And they have said just as much. These people have shown up at the wrong place at the wrong time. Their voices should be heard at OCP meetings to change the artery road policy. This policy has been in operation for over 10 years and has been amended three times. But they have never showed up and probably never will. You know why? Because the policy is a good policy. They just don't want it to affect their street! Is this fair to all concerned, or does this sound a little selfish?

The Developers has given much time and thought into the Maple Development. Mv heart goes out to the architect who has spent many hours designing a beautiful project with a very pleasing landscape. For residents to make comments such as ugly and unattractive is unintellectual. To make a biased comment to get what they want is unbecoming. The Developer has compromised, compromised and compromised, listening to all of the neighbors' concerns. If staff and Council had always sided with Developers, this project would have been completed by now and the residents of Maple Road would have 18 new friends (at least 18 more homes paying property taxes into the City's coffers). The Development signs have been damaged and vandalized twice, and it was cut down and stolen the third time. Thomas, the Developer, who has lived in this community for the last 20 years has heard from some neighbors that the dissenting group have endlessly pressure them into signing their forms and putting up their signs. I personally have a friend who fully supports the project but is too scared to voice his opinion publicly because he does not want to be castrated by this dissenting group. He actually is rather scared of this mob. Furthermore, there has been a lot of disinformation created which are outright lies. One person was told that the subject property was a park, and we are destroying the park and killing the animals to make townhouses.

I would say that the residents have a legitimate concern that some developers are not the most faithful and are greedy. We are not one of them. We have operated in Richmond for over thirty years. I have lived in Richmond for 33 years and in this neighborhood for 15 (though not currently). Furthermore, as the future owner of Western Construction I can say we aren't going anywhere and have a vested interest in the City of Richmond, as well as a vested interest in our reputation. How many people

# KELVIN WAI-TUNG LEUNG

28 - 6099 ALDER STREET RICHMOND BC V7Y 0A8 · (P) 604.805.5323 · (F) 604.214.8844 · (E) KLENERS@GMAIL.COM

would buy our homes if they found out we ruined a neighborhood? We rely on expert opinions and experience. When two traffic experts say that traffic is not any different than any similar street in Richmond and the impact of 18 townhouses is minimal. We can only concur.

At the end of the day, the Maple Development is within the OCP and policies of Richmond, and most importantly the policy involved is an effective policy to encourage diversification of home ownership, to create an affordable form of housing close to single family homes, to encourage the use of public transportation and to support neighborhood commercial centers. A comprehensively designed townhouse project at the junction of No. 2 and Maple Road, next to a senior home apartment and church where day care facilities are available, a few blocks from the Blundell Centre, and across the street from a small convenience store, and with direct bus services, represents the best use of the land. It will enhance the property value of the neighborhood, increase the tax base and is exactly what the City had in mind when it effected the artery road development policy. I have attached a schedule showing 36 multi-family developments that have been built along No. 2 Road alone.

In closing, let's put this situation under a different light. If a gay couple moved into said neighborhood, do the residents of the community have a right to prevent their entry for fear that the area will be turned into a gay neighborhood? Should the neighborhood get their wish because100% is against gay rights? Individual councilors may be for or against gay rights, but they are sitting in their seat to uphold the policies and bylaws of Richmond, whether or not they agree or disagree with some of them. The people of Richmond rely on Council to make the tough but right decisions, and some of these decisions might not be the most popular amongst some corners. Council's responsibility and obligation is to serve the better good of the City, not just the good of a special interest group. I hope and trust that you will not make a decision based on politics, and the popularity of this comparatively very very small group, who want to build a wall around themselves and jeopardize the well being of other Richmond citizens.

Sincerely,

Kelvin Leung.

List of Multi-family complex built along No.2 Road

į

Address	Location	Туре	
1. 10795 No. 2 Road (10 units)	No. 2 & Steveston	Townhouse	
2. 10980 No. 2 Road (15 units)	No. 2 & Steveston	Townhouse	
3. 10900 No. 2 Road (12 units)	No. 2 & Steveston	Townhouse	
4. 10040 and 10042 No. 2 Road	No. 2 & Steveston		Duplex
5. 9733 No. 2 Road (13 units)	No. 2 & William	Townhouse	
6, 9688 No. 2 Road (15 units)	No. 2 & William	Townhouse	
7. 6100 Woodward Road (50 units)	No.2 & Woodward	Townhouse	
8. 9420 and 9440 No. 2 Road	No.2 & Woodward		Duplex
9, 9391 and 9393 No. 2 Road	No.2 & Woodward		Duplex
10. 9380 and 9382 No. 2 Road	No.2 & Woodward	······································	Duplex
11. 9360 and 9362 No. 2 Road	No.2 & Woodward		Duplex
12, 9340 and 9342 No. 2 Road	No.2 & Woodward		Duplex
13. 9260 (old folks home 26 units)	No.2 & Maple	Senior Home	
14. 9100 and 9120 No. 2 Road	No. 2 & Francis		Duplex
15. 5651 Lackner Cr (22 units)	No. 2 & Lackner	Townhouse	
16. 6031 Francis Road (10 units)	No. 2 & Francis	Townhouse	
17. 8380 No. 2 Road (14 units)		Townhouse	
18. 5933 Colville Road (10 units)	No. 2 & Colville	Townhouse	
19. 8391 and 8392 No. 2 Road	No. 2 & Colville		Duplex
20. 8351 and 8371 No. 2 Road	No. 2 & Colville		Duplex
21. 8311 No. 2 Road (12 units)	No. 2 & Colville	Townhouse	
22. 8271 and 8273 No. 2 Road	No. 2 & Colville		Duplex
23. 8171 No. 2 Road (10 units)	No. 2 & Blundell	Townhouse	
24. 8133 and 8155 No. 2 Road	No. 2 & Blundell		Duplex
25. 5988 Lancing Road (24 units)	No. 2 & Lancing	Townhouse	
26. 7660 No. 2 Road (4 units)	No. 2 & Lancing	Townhouse	
27. 7560 and 7580 No. 2 Road	No. 2 & Lancing		Duplex
28. 7391 and 7411 No. 2 Road	No. 2 & Lancing		Duplex
29. 7260 Langton Road (15 units)	No. 2 & Langton	Townhouse	
30. 7240 Langton Road (20 units)	No. 2 & Langton	Townhouse	
31. 7231 No. 2 Road (26 units)		Townhouse	
32. 7240 and 7242 No. 2 Road	No. 2 & Comstock		Duplex
33. 6020 and 6022 Comstock Road	No. 2 & Comstock		Duplex
34. 5980 Granville Ave (7 units)	No. 2 & Granville	Townhouse	
35. 5740 Garrison Road (57 units)	No. 2 & Garrison	Townhouse	
36. 6675 No. 2 Road (9 units)		Townhouse	
		21	15
	No.2 & William	1	
37. 9900 No.2 Road (24 units 3 storey)	1 VO.Z CA VVIDICISTI		
37. 9900 No.2 Road (24 units 3 storey) Project re-zoning approved in Summer 2011			

i

Date: June 18, 2012 Item # 2 Ro: bylaw 8169	To	Public Hearing
Ro: bylaw 8769	Date:	* 2
	Re:	bylaw 8769

### MayorandCouncillors

From:	City of Richmond Website [webgraphics@richmond.ca]	
Sent:	June 11, 2012 10:33 AM	
То:	MayorandCouncillors	
Subject:	Send a Submission Online (response #683)	

Categories: 08-4100-02-01 - Development - Inquiries and Complaints - General

# Send a Submission Online (response #683)

## Survey Information

Site:	City Website	
Page Title:	Send a Submission Online	
URL:	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx	
Submission Time/Date:	6/11/2012 10:37:23 AM	

## Survey Response

Your Name:	Peter Kho
Your Address:	9293 Romaniuk Dr
Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number:	8769
Comments:	This is TOO LARGE a development for this property. The access road from Maple is too close to the intersection. Cars turning left from No 2 Road would be backed up on No 2 Road. It is a short distance from Francis to Maple and this would create a lineup of cars on No 2 Road waiting to turn left. If have lived in this area for the past 22 years. I have been witness to numerous accidents on No. 2 Road between Francis and Maple. Adding more traffic to this intersectiom would create an even more hazardous situation. Densification is a good thing on the right property. This property is not a suitable property as it creates a dangerous road situation. Please keep in mind the residents af this area do NOT want to densify this property. The development does not conform to the character of this area. Does it make sense to satisfy the needs (profit) of 1 develper over the wishes of the citizens who have lived here for many years. This property would be best kept zoned as single housing . Thanks for your attention . P. Kho



		To Public Hearing
		Date: June 18 2012
Mayoran	ndCouncillors	item # 2-
From:	City of Richmond Website (webgraphics@richmond.ca)	Ro: 62100 - 8769
Sent:	June 11, 2012 5:50 PM	
To:	MayorandCouncillors	

Subject: Send a Submission Online (response #684)

Categories: 12-8060-20-8769 - 9160 No 2 Road

# Send a Submission Online (response #684)

## Survey Information

Site:	City Website
Page Title:	Send a Submission Online
URL:	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx
Submission Time/Date:	6/11/2012 5:53:33 PM

## Survey Response

Your Name:	Rong Zhang
Your Address:	6431 Maple Road
Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number:	9160 No.2 Road
Comments:	Dear Whomever This May Concern: Hello, I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the rezoning at 9160 No. 2 Road. The proposed townhouse development will create serious traffic and parking problems for the residence of Maple Road. Also, the amount of noise brought by the increased amount of traffic also creates a problem for our quiet neighourhood. Lastly, as a parent, I no longer feel safe to let my young children play outside on our sidewalks due to the increased amount of traffic. Thank you.



To Public Hearing Date: June (8, 2012
Item # 2 Ro: Bylaw 8769
1

INT DW GJ MR

June 10, 2012

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

Attn: Director, City Clerk's Office

Dear Mr. Lee,

RE: Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8769 (RZ 10-516267)

We are writing to express our opposition to the proposed development at 9160 No. 2 Road. Our concerns are similar to those of other residents of Maple Road, with the primary issues being:

- 1. The project design and density does not conform to the norm of the neighborhood. Presently, Maple Road consists primarily of single family homes on large lots, introducing a townhouse development to this area will upset the current neighborhood aesthetics in addition to devaluing properties immediately surrounding the proposed development site.
- 2. The potential for increased traffic from this development has been deemed negligible by Bunt & Associates, however we feel that the analysis does not fully account for the fact that this area of Richmond is not nearly as well served by public transit as central Richmond, thus necessitating each new household in the development will add an additional 2 cars, at minimum. This increased traffic, in addition to the large potential number of visitors to the development is significant when the current intersection services just over 100 households to the East (approximation based on number of households on the eastern side of Maple Road needing to use the No. 2 Rd intersection). This would be an addition of nearly 20%.

One proposed solution to this issue was the installation of a full traffic signal. This would create several other significant issues. We fervently oppose the installation of a full traffic signal at the intersection of Maple Road and No. 2 Road. The portion of Maple Road to the West of No. 2 Road is currently a through street, connecting to both No. 2 Road and Railway Avenue. Implementing a traffic signal at No. 2 Road and Maple Road would encourage traffic to use the Western section of Maple Road as a shortcut between No. 2 Road and Railway Avenue. As a resident of this side of Maple Road I can attest to the current poor design in terms of pedestrian safety on this side of Maple Road. On several occasions in the 4 years we have lived here, we have seen pedestrians nearly struck by traffic speeding down our street. Were a traffic light to be introduced, it would encourage even more drivers to use this route as a shortcut and endanger countless residents, including the many children that walk along Maple Road to get to school. Furthermore, a full traffic signal would have a negative impact to traffic conditions along No. 2 Road, especially during peak hours, as the signal would be far to close to the intersection of No. 2 Road and Francis Road. If you insist on installing a full traffic signal at Maple Road and No. 2 Road, traffic calming measures must be installed on Maple Road, West of No. 2 Road to prevent drivers from using it as a main thoroughfare.

If by "full traffic signal" the developer were speaking of a pedestrian activated traffic signal, like that at Woodwards Road and No. 2 Road, then the aforementioned issues would not arise.

- 3. The proposed 3 storey structures would impede upon the privacy of the immediate neighbors, especially the seniors residence to the south.
- 4. The developer has proposed to construct the project below grade to maintain the appearance that the development height is in line with other properties on Maple Road, however there would then be the potential for the proposed development to flood, as water would drain into the new below-grade development. We believe that there should be fewer units constructed on an at-grade site at a height of 2 storyes, rather than the current proposal.

In conclusion, we strongly oppose the current redevelopment submission for 9160 Maple Road. Instead, they should either develop single-family homes similar to what has been constructed at Gilbert Road and Blundell Road, or the density and height of the current proposal should be greatly reduced.

Thank you for you consideration.

Sincerely,

Ajmer Ghag, On behalf of the residents of 5260 Maple Road

Dates		ne (		2012
Item	#	2		
Re:	Bul	aw	81	69

May 30, 2012

Anita Fung #114-8751 General Currie Road Richmond, BC V6Y 3T7

The Honorable Mayor and City Councillors City of Richmond 6911 No.3 Road Richmond, B.C. V6Y 2C1

RE: 9160 No.2 Road - RZ 10-516267

Dear Sir and Madam,

My name is Anita Fung and I have lived in Richmond for the majority of my life. I graduated from UBC and am working in Richmond, a city where I grew up in and a city where my parents also have been long term residents. I understand that recently, there is a lot of opposition against the application for rezoning of lands to multi-family, such as townhouses uses. The above mentioned re-zoning application is an example. I also read in the newspapers that Richmond has become a "millionaire's city", where the average home costs over \$1 million. Some of these homes are too big and unpleasant looking, changing the way I imagined Richmond to present it. I believe one newspaper article states that Richmond is becoming a "Ghost Town" with big and dark houses all over the place, a sad but true reality.

Many of my high school and UBC friends who grew up in Richmond are now forced to live in places like Surrey, Langley, Coquitlam or further away into the Fraser Valley away from their parents and older relatives. Financially, Richmond is out of their reach and will soon become a city of seniors and wealthy citizens. City Council and City Planners should think seriously about this consequence. Better use of existing land and a balanced growth should be promoted. Single-family houses are indeed the predominant type of housing but as time progresses, more intense use of the land and smaller and denser units should be allowed. The quality rather than the quantity of the housing should receive attention.

For the inviting and close community that I believe Richmond is, the restriction of building monster homes should be intensified and the promotion of more affordable multi-family developments encouraged.

Yours truly.

Anita Fung



PH - 162

Mayoran	dCouncillors	To Public Hearing Date: June 18, 2012
From:	City of Richmond Website [webgraphics@richmond.ca]	Re: by (aw 8769
Sent:	June 13, 2012 4:03 PM	
то:	MayorandCouncillors	
Subject:	Send a Submission Online (response #686)	

Categorles: 12-8060-20-8769 - 9160 No 2 Rd RZ 10-516267 - Western Maple Lane Holdings

# Send a Submission Online (response #686)

## Survey Information

Site:	City Website
Page Title:	Send a Submission Online
URL:	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx
Submission Time/Date:	6/13/2012 4:05:49 PM

## Survey Response

Your Name:	Mun Ling Cheung
Your Address:	5451 Maple Road Richmond BC V7E 1G2
Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number:	RZ 10-516267
Comments:	My family and I have been living in the neighborhood for over 13 years. I have notified many developments in recent years and I would like to object this one even though I have not objected any before. My reasons are as below: 1) 18 three-storey townhouse units are too too much in such a proposed rezoning area. 2) Traffic is one of my main concerns as many southbound vehicles will turn left on No.2 Road at Maple Road. 3) Safety, noices, nuisances, parkings, and many many others are problems when rezoning is approved. 4) To be honest I don't have a single reason to accept this rezoning except that I am the developer. Finally, I strongly object this rezoning.



To Public Hearing Date: June 18, 2012 Item # Re: law &

Man Ying Lee 6240 Maple Road Richmond BC V7E 1G5

-8 JUN 2012

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

Dear Sir / Madam:

Re: Rezoning Application on 9160 No, 2 Road Richmond (File No. RZ10-516267)

I am writing to oppose the abovementioned rezoning application. The concerns include the following:

- 1. This project will not conform to the norm, stereotype of our neighborhood as the size of each proposed individual dwelling would be too small and too dense (size of each of the neighborhood single-family house is over 2,000 sq. ft.).
- 2. Increased flow of traffic and corresponding increased parked cars along Maple Road and its interception with No. 2 Road will be hazardous to the drivers and the residents living in this area.
- 3. It will be even more dangerous when the main entrance of this site is set on Maple Road as it is too close to the junction of No. 2 Road. Cross-traffic accidents may be easily occurred.
- 4. The proposed 3-storey building would no doubt affect the private lives of our neighbors, especially when the proposed 3-storey building is constructed facing the East and/or facing the North of Maple Road.
- 5. Increased density of population will inevitably hamper the quality of life, the harmony and peaceful environment of this quiet community.

In view of the foregoing, your decision to decline this rezoning application would be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully

Man Ying Lee Owner and Occupant



PH - 164

Mayora	ndCouncillors	To Public Hearing Date: June 18 2012
From:	City of Richmond Website [webgraphics@richmond.ca]	Re: By aw 8169
Sent:	June 13, 2012 7:14 PM	
To:	MayorandCouncillors	

Subject: Send a Submission Online (response #687)

Categories: 12-8060-20-8769 - 9160 No 2 Rd RZ 10-516267 - Western Maple Lane Holdings

# Send a Submission Online (response #687)

## Survey Information

Site:	City Website
Page Title:	Send a Submission Online
URL:	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx
Submission Time/Date:	6/13/2012 7:18:20 PM

### Survey Response

Your Name:	Gord Turner
Your Address:	6631 Juniper Dr
Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number:	RZ 10-516267
Comments:	We have no objection to this development as long as it does not include the removal of the traffic barricade on Maple Road. This structure was put in place over 25 years ago to prevent through traffic, If it was a ggod idea then, it is an even better idea now when there are many more homes both sides of the barricade. It's about livable neighbourhoods.



Send a Submission Online	(response #	(691)
--------------------------	-------------	-------

Page 1 of 1

To Public Hearing Date: June 18, 2012

mylaw 8769

Item #

Re:\_

Mayoran	dCouncillors
---------	--------------

From:	City of Richmond Website [webgraphics@richmond.ca]
Sent:	June 14, 2012 9:55 AM

To: MayorandCouncillors

Subject: Send a Submission Online (response #691)

Categories: 12-8060-20-8769 - 9160 No 2 Rd RZ 10-516267 - Western Maple Lane Holdings

# Send a Submission Online (response #691)

### Survey Information

Site:	City Website
Page Title:	Send a Submission Online
URL:	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx
Submission Time/Date:	6/14/2012 9:59:08 AM

### Survey Response

Your Name:	John Cantello
Your Address:	6120 Maple Road
Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number:	(RZ 10-516267) 9160 No. 2 Road.
Comments:	My wife & I can not make it to this hearing this time as we have an end of season meeting to go to. We have been to three meetings before this about this property. So we would like to submit one last word on this by E-mail. Our plea is that you will not let the wishes of one developer stand against our whole neighbourhood of Maple Road. Thank You, Richmond Councillors, John & Eleanor Cantello.



June 12, 2012

To Public Hearing Date: <u>June (8, 2012</u> Item #\_2 Re: <u>Gry(an</u>) 8769

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

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

### Re: Application by Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd. for Rezoning at 9160 No. 2 Road -

### File: RZ 10-516267

Further to our letters to you on April 12, 16 & 30, and May 16, 2012, we now submit 6 more petition letters. Our submissions in 2012 now cover a total of 242 houses (with 417 signatures).

Adding the batch submitted in 2011, our objection letters currently cover a total of 291 houses (with 499 signees)! These overwhelming figures undoubtedly demonstrate the public's fervent objections to the rezoning. Your thoughtful consideration will be much appreciated.

Neighbourhood Concern Group

\* 5 letters received, not 6, sample attached



April 1, 2012

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

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

# <u>Re: Application by Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd. for Rezoning at 9160 No. 2 Road from Single Detached [R\$1/E] to Medium Density Townhouses [RTM3] – File: RZ 10-516267</u>

The purpose of this letter is to note our fervent objection to Western Maple Lane Holdings Ltd.'s application to rezone 9160 No. 2 Road. The developer's rezoning application, submitted last year, was met with strong opposition by 447 neighbourhood residents, and at that time the Mayor and Councillors were notified either in writing or in person. The developer withdrew his plan from the scheduled public hearing last September.

However, the developer's current revised design is still totally unacceptable. It ignores our concerns as he still plans to build 18 three-storey townhouses where a single house went down. The slight modifications he proposes are purely cosmetic in nature and do not resolve any of our neighborhood's concerns.

We are left with no choice but to once again reiterate our firm opposition to this proposed rezoning. Our concerns are as follows:

- 1. This proposed townhouse development in no way conforms in character to any adjacent properties. As you deliberate on this matter, you should not take the biased view that only the continued multiunit development along No. 2 Road should be considered. The proposed townhouse development will have a large footprint along Maple Road, which consists entirely of detached single-family dwellings! You should also look at the rest of the immediate neighborhood: Maple Road, Martyniuk Gate and Place, Romaniuk Drive, Magnolia Drive, Juniper Gate and Drive, and other arterials. The properties in this area consist of large, high-grade detached single-family houses situated on oversized lots. Townhouses of the type and quantity proposed are not in character with this particular area, as required by the City Multiple-Family Guidelines.
- 2. Currently, residents in this area are already experiencing traffic problems at the intersection of Maple Road and No. 2 Road, particularly in the mornings and early evenings. With the influx of eighteen more households where a single house stood before, including visitors to the proposed complex, the increase in vehicular traffic will certainly create hazards, further delays, and present inconvenience for both drivers and pedestrians of this neighborhood. The proposed traffic light will not ease the problems. This traffic light -- if it is ever installed -- will only be a few houses from the traffic light at No. 2 and Francis Rds. There have already been numerous accidents at that intersection. Another traffic light so close to that main intersection will only create more problems. The Maple Road entrance and exit from this proposed development will only aggravate this problem.

- 3. The consequent population increase in the 18 units will doubtless negatively affect the serenity and peacefulness of this low-density community.
- 4. An increase of 18 households will no doubt create a parking problem along Maple Road. Many city dwellers today use their garages for storage and therefore have to park their cars on the street. Residents of the proposed complex would be forced to park along Maple Road. But there is no allowance for this. Visitors to the proposed complex would also be parking along Maple Road, since there are too few designated visitor parking spots in the proposed complex. This is clearly unacceptable in this quiet and unassuming neighborhood.

Our community sees no rationale for why the City has to sacrifice the well-being of numerous neighbourhood residents over the business interests of one developer. Hence, we appeal for the second time to the City to listen to our deep-seated concerns about this proposed development and reject the rezoning application. As an alternative, we ask you to consider the development on the southwest corner of Gilbert and Blundell. Here, three lots were rezoned to permit the construction of a total of six single detached houses. Could that not be a model for the development on No. 2 Road and Maple? Also, on the northwest corner of Maple and No. 2 Rd., plans call for three single-family homes to be constructed on that lot. This development, again, fits into the character of the surrounding neighborhood. This is all we ask for. Please do not fundamentally change our neighborhood for the sake of another multiunit development.

Your thoughtful consideration is much appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

To Public Hearing
Date: JUNE 18,2012
Item #
 Re: By19W 8769

### MayorandCouncillors

From: City of Richmond Website [webgraphics@richmond.ca]

Sent: June 14, 2012 12:09 PM

To: MayorandCouncillors

Subject: Send a Submission Online (response #692)

Categories: 12-8060-20-8769 - 9160 No 2 Rd RZ 10-516267 - Western Maple Lane Holdings

# Send a Submission Online (response #692)

### Survey Information

Site:	City Website
Page Title:	Send a Submission Online
URL:	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx
Submission Time/Date:	6/14/2012 12:13:04 PM

### Survey Response

Your Name:	Felix Fei Lu
Your Address:	6071 Martyniuk Place, Richmond BC
Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number:	Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8769 (RZ 10- 516267)
Comments:	I strongly oppose proposed rezoning for townhouse in this quiet community. I believe that everyone in this neighbourhood oppose this rezoning. Also I want to let you know: I have faith that city council will listen to the voice of majority people in this community over one developer. After all, it's the people in the community matters. if I were still in China, I wouldn't bother to write this email or something else, because government alway side with real estate developer. I had really bad experience about that and today I'm so lucky to live in such great country! Thanks!





Re:	Application by Amrit Maharaj for Rezoning at 4820 Garry Street from Single		
From:	Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development	File:	RZ 11-582830
To:	Planning Committee	Date:	April 26, 2012

# Detached (RS1/E) to Single Detached (RS2/A)

### Staff Recommendation

That Bylaw No. 8825, for the rezoning of 4820 Garry Street from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Single Detached (RS2/A)", be introduced and given first reading.

Brian J. Vackson, MCIP Director of Development

EL: rg Att.

FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY ACTING			
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER	
Affordable Housing	YUND	mangarban	

### Staff Report

### Origin

Amrit Maharaj has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 4820 Garry Street (Attachment 1) from Single Detached (RS1/E) to Single Detached (RS2/A) in order to permit the property to be subdivided into two (2) single-family residential lots.

### Findings of Fact

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

### Surrounding Development

The subject site is located on the south side of Garry Street, west of Railway Avenue. The surrounding area is an established residential neighbourhood consisting predominantly of newer single-family dwellings on small lots created through subdivision, with a few remaining older single-family dwellings on large lots. Other land uses also exist further west in the neighbourhood (i.e. institutional, multi-family, public open space).

### **Related Policies & Studies**

### Lot Size Policy 5471

The subject site is located within the area covered by Lot Size Policy 5471 (adopted by Council July 29, 2002) (Attachment 3). This Policy permits rezoning and subdivision of lots on this section of Garry Street in accordance with "Single Detached (RS2/A)". This redevelopment proposal would enable the property to be subdivided into two (2) lots, each approximately 9.75 m (32 ft.) wide and 387 m<sup>2</sup> (4,165 ft<sup>2</sup>) in area.

### Affordable Housing

The Richmond Affordable Housing Strategy requires a suite on at least 50% of new lots, or a cash-in-lieu contribution of \$1.00 per square foot of total building area toward the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund for single-family rezoning applications.

The applicant has agreed to provide a voluntary cash contribution for affordable housing based on \$1 per square foot of building area for single-family developments (i.e. \$4,582). Should the applicant change their mind about the Affordable Housing option selected (prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw) to providing a legal secondary suite on one (1) of the two (2) future lots at the subject site, the applicant will be 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 the City's Zoning Bylaw. This legal agreement will be a condition of rezoning adoption. This agreement will be discharged from Title on the lot without the secondary suite, at the initiation of the applicant, after the requirements are satisfied.

### Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

The applicant is required to comply with the Flood Plain Designation and Protection Bylaw (No. 8204). In accordance with the Flood Management Strategy, a Flood Indemnity Restrictive Covenant specifying the minimum flood construction level is required prior to rezoning bylaw adoption.

### Public Input

There have been no concerns expressed by the public about the development proposal in response to the placement of the rezoning sign on the property.

### Staff Comments

### Tree Protection

A Certified Arborist's Report was not required as the site survey provided by the applicant confirmed that there are no trees on site. The three (3) trees on the adjacent property to the west, as shown on the topographic survey (Attachment 4), have been removed by the property owner of adjacent site as part of the redevelopment of 4800 Garry Street (RZ 10-508885 and SD 10-508886). The three (3) trees were approved for removal as part of the rezoning application.

#### Tree Planting

Council Policy 5032 encourages property owners to plant a minimum of two (2) trees per lot in recognition of the benefits of urban trees (minimum 6 cm calliper deciduous or 3 m high conifer). The applicant has agreed to plant and maintain a total of four (4) trees on the future lots [two (2) per future lot]. Prior to rezoning adoption, the applicant must submit a security in the amount of \$2,000 (\$500/tree) to ensure new trees are planted and maintained on-site.

#### Site Servicing & Vehicle Access

There are no servicing concerns with rezoning.

Vehicular access to the site at future development stage will be from Garry Street. The existing pedestrian cross walk on the frontage of the east half of the site will require some modifications in order to accommodate driveway access to the proposed east lot. The road works that will be required at future subdivision stage include, but not limited to, relocating the crosswalk and wheelchair ramps, curb extension reconstruction (north side of Garry Street), eradicating the existing crosswalk and restriping with thermoplastic paint at the new location, and relocating a street tree in front of the site. All of these works will be done through a City Works Order at the developer's cost.

### **Subdivision**

At future Subdivision stage, the developer will be required to pay Development Cost Charges (City and GVS & DD), School Site Acquisition Charge, Address Assignment Fee, and Servicing Costs.

3374326

### Analysis

This is a relatively straightforward redevelopment proposal. This development proposal is consistent with Lot Size Policy 5471 and is located within an established residential neighbourhood that has a strong presence of small lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/A and RS2/A), created from larger lots. All the relevant technical issues have been addressed. Several remaining lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/E) along Garry Street have the potential to rezone and subdivide.

### Conclusion

This rezoning application to permit subdivision of an existing large lot into two (2) smaller lots complies with Lot Size Policy 5471, all applicable policies and land use designations contained within the Official Community Plan (OCP), and is consistent with the direction of redevelopment in the surrounding area. The list of rezoning conditions is included as **Attachment 5**, which has been agreed to by the applicant (signed concurrence on file). On this basis, staff recommend support of the application.

Edwin Lee Planner 1 (604-276-4121)

EL:rg

Attachment 1: Location Map/Aerial Photo Attachment 2: Development Application Data Sheet Attachment 3: Lot Size Policy 5471 Attachment 4: Topographic Survey/Proposed Subdivision Layout Attachment 5: Rezoning Considerations Concurrence





City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Road

Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1 www.richmond.ca 604-276-4000

## Development Application Data Sheet

### RZ 11-582830

Attachment 2

Address: 4820 Garry Street

Applicant: Amrit Maharaj

Planning Area(s): Steveston (Schedule 2.4)

	Existing	Proposed	
Owner:	Amrit T Maharaj, Arti R Maharaj, Ambalika Maharaj	To be determined	
Site Size (m <sup>2</sup> ):	Approx 774 m <sup>z</sup> (8,332 ft <sup>2</sup> )	Two lots – each approximately 387 m <sup>2</sup> (4,165 ft <sup>2</sup> )	
Land Uses:	One (1) single-family dwelling	Two (2) single-family dwellings	
OCP Designation:	Generalized Land Use Map designation – "Neighbourhood Residential"	No change	
Area Plan Designation:	Single-Family	No change	
702 Policy Designation:	Policy 5471 permits subdivision to "Single Detached (RS2/A)" along this section of Garry Street.	No change	
Zoning:	Single Detached (RS1/E)	Single Detached (RS2/A)	
Number of Units:	1	2	

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.55	Max. 0.55	none permitted
Lot Coverage - Building:	Max. 45%	Max. 45%	none
Lot Coverage - Non-porous:	Max. 70%	Max. 70%	none
Lot Coverage - Landscaping:	Min. 20%	Min. 20%	none
Lot Size (min. dimensions):	270 m²	387 m²	none
Setback – Front & Rear Yards (m):	Min. 6 m	Min. 6 m	none
Setback – Side Yard (m):	Min. 1.2 m	Min. 1.2 m	none
Height (m):	Max. 2 ½ storeys	max. 2 ½ storeys	none

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



PH - 177



# **City of Richmond**

**Policy Manual** 

Page 1 of 2	Adopted by Council – July 29, 2002	POLICY 5471
File Ref: 4045-00	SINGLE-FAMILY LOT SIZE POLICY IN QUARTER-SECTI	ION 2-3-7

#### POLICY 5471:

The following policy establishes lot sizes for properties along **Garry Street**, between No. 1 Road and Railway Avenue (in a portion of Section 2-3-7):

That properties located along Garry Street between No. 1 Road and Railway Avenue, in a portion of Section 2-3-7, be permitted to subdivide in accordance with the provisions of Single-Family Housing District Subdivision Area A (R1/A) in Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300 provided that no new accesses are created onto Railway Avenue and No. 1 Road; and

That properties located at 4771, 4109, 4111, 4211, 4160, 4180, 4011 Garry Street and the north-westerly portion of 4200 Garry Street be deemed eligible for townhouse development; and

That this policy be used to determine the disposition of future single-family and townhouse 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.



### ATTACHMENT 4




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

# Address: 4820 Garry Street

File No.: RZ 11-582830

# Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8825, the developer is required to complete the following:

- 1. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
- 2. The City's acceptance of the applicant's voluntary contribution of \$1.00 per buildable square foot of the single-family development (i.e. \$4,582.00) to the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund.

Note: Should the applicant change their mind about the Affordable Housing option selected prior to final adoption of the Rezoning Bylaw, the City will accept a proposal to build a secondary suite on one (1) of the two (2) future lots at the subject site. To ensure that a secondary suite is built to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the Affordable Housing Strategy, the applicant is required to enter into a legal agreement registered on Title as a condition of rezoning, stating that no final Building Permit inspection will be granted until a secondary suite is constructed to the satisfaction of the City, in accordance with the BC Building Code and the City's Zoning Bylaw.

3. Submission of a Landscaping Security to the City of Richmond in the amount of \$2,000 (\$500/tree) for the planting and maintenance of four (4) new trees (minimum 6 cm calliper deciduous or 3 m high conifer, including a mix of coniferous and deciduous trees) on site.

# Prior to Subdivision Approval, the developer must complete the following requirements:

- 1. Payment of Development Cost Charges (City and GVS & DD), School Site Acquisition Charge, Address Assignment Fee, and Servicing Costs.
- 2. Roadworks to be done at the developer's sole cost via City Work Order. Roadworks include, but not limited to, relocating the crosswalk and wheelchair ramps, curb extension reconstruction (north side of Garry Street), eradicating the existing crosswalk and restriping with thermoplastic paint at the new location, and relocating a street tree in front of the site.

Note: If on-site street tree relocation is not possible, a 2:1 replacement compensation will be required.

Note:

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.

[signed original on file]

Signed

Date





# Bylaw 8825

CITY OF

APPROVED

HВ

APPROVEO by Director

# Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 8825 (RZ 11-582830) 4820 GARRY STREET

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/E).

P.I.D. 004-041-682 Lot 57 Section 2 Block 3 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 31520

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 8825".

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER

MAY 2 8 2012



То:	Planning Committee	Date:	May 7, 2012
From:	Brian J. Jackson Director of Development	File:	RZ 12-601319

# Re: Application by City of Richmond for Rezoning at 23591 Westminster Hwy. from Single Detached (RS1/F) to School & Institutional Use (SI)

#### Staff Recommendation

That:

- 1. That Bylaw No. 8880 to amend the Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100, by repealing the existing land use designation in Schedule 2.14 (Hamilton Area Plan) for 23591 Westminster Hwy. and by designating it "Community Facilities", be introduced and given first reading.
- 2. That Bylaw No. 8880, having been considered in conjunction with:
  - the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program;
  - the Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;

is hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3)(a) of the Local Government Act.

- 3. That Bylaw No. 8880, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is hereby deemed not to require further consultation.
- 4. That Bylaw No. 8881, for the rezoning of 23591 Westminster Hwy. from "Single Detached (RS1/F)" to "School & Institutional Use (SI)" be introduced and given first reading.

Brian J. Jackson Director of Development

BJ:dcb Att. 6

FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY CONCURRENCE OF ACTING GENERAL MANAGER

# Staff Report

# Origin

The City of Richmond has applied for permission to rezone 23591 Westminster Highway from Single Detached (RS1/F) to School and Institutional Use (SI) in order to develop a new daycare facility. The subject property (see location map in **Attachment 1**) was dedicated to the City as part of the community contributions provided through the rezoning for the Translink Operations and Maintenance Bus Facility at 4111 Boundary Road (RZ 09-484669 adopted Oct 8, 2010). Translink also provided significant funds toward the site preparation and construction of the daycare facility.

Accommodating the proposed daycare use at the subject property necessitates an amendment of the land use designation in the Hamilton Area Plan (Land Use Map) to redesignate the site from "Residential (Mixed Multiple and Single-Family)" to "Community Facilities".

# **Project Description**

The 2,287.5 m<sup>2</sup> site will be developed to accommodate a licensed child daycare facility approximately  $315 \text{ m}^2$  (3,400 ft<sup>2</sup>) in size to provide care for up to 33 children: (e.g., one group of up to eight infants and toddlers and another group of up to twenty-five children of thirty months to school age). The site will remain City owned but the facility will be leased at nominal cost to a licensed non-profit child care provider to operate the facility.

The main building will consist of wood-frame modular units installed on a permanent concrete foundation with a crawlspace. A wood truss roof will be constructed on site. The site will be raised to ensure that the underside of the floor structure is above the flood plain elevation of 3.5m GSC.

In terms of site planning, the applicant's submission notes "the site will be developed with retaining walls, fencing, planting, site furniture, and hard and soft landscaping surfaces to provide play areas for children attending the daycare. Sidewalks and ramps graded to appropriate slopes will be provided to ensure the accessibility of the building and the play areas." Special attention has been given to minimize any grade differences between the building and the play areas.

The site plan provides for both covered outdoor play areas (approx. 57.3m<sup>2</sup> total) and open outdoor play areas (approx. 658.6 m<sup>2</sup> total). These play areas well exceed the BC Child Care Licensing requirements. The site will be fenced and landscaped to ensure child safety is maintained.

Bylaw requirements for both vehicle parking and bicycle parking are fully satisfied under the proposed site plan. The site will include ten regular sized parking stalls, one loading bay and a handicapped stall. Four of the stalls are in a tandem arrangement. Transportation staff are supportive of this arrangement since the tandem stalls will be used for drop off parking and will abut stalls used by the facility's employees. This arrangement will be self managed. Collectively, these stalls will accommodate the facility employees, the parent's drop off needs and on-site waste pickup / delivery needs of the facility. One Class 1 (indoor) and two Class 2 (outdoor) bicycle stalls are also provided.

The operation will conform to the BC Child Care Licensing Regulation in terms of the number of employees to children ratios. It is anticipated that the facility will typically operate with five employees with a maximum of eight employees on site at any one time to facilitate continuous care from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm subject to demand.

The construction program is being managed by the City's Project Development & Facility Services Department. Facilities staff are targeting the daycare facility to be operationally open by September, 2013.

The conceptual site plan is provided in Attachment 2. Although the building will be done through a design build process which could result in modifications, preliminary conceptual design plans are also included in Attachment 2.

No significant trees are located on the site. The conceptual landscape plan indicates that 16 trees are planned to be installed on site.

# Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details about the development proposal is attached (Attachment 3). No Zoning variances are being requested with this application.

On December 19, 2011, Council resolved "That the Society of Richmond Children's Centres (SRCC) be endorsed as the operator of the City-owned child care facility to be constructed at 23591 Westminster Highway." The SRCC is a non-profit society.

# Surrounding Development

To the North: A 30m wide treed linear park strip connecting to the North Arm of the Fraser River. North of the park strip is the 73,259m<sup>2</sup> Translink Operations and Maintenance Bus Facility (RZ 09-484669 adopted Oct 8, 2010; DP 10-535726 in circulation). The Translink site is zoned Light Industrial (IL).

To the East: Westminster Highway and Highway 91A.

To the South: Westminster Highway and a large 6,673m<sup>2</sup> vacant lot owned by the BC Transportation Financing Authority and zoned Single Detached (RS1/F).

To the West: Two large single family residential lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/F).

# Related Policies & Studies

# Official Community Plan Amendment

The Land Use Map in Schedule 2.14 (Hamilton Area Plan) of the Official Community Plan (OCP) currently designates the subject property for "Residential (Mixed Multiple and Single-Family)". As the intended use of this City owned site is to accommodate a licensed child daycare facility the more appropriate land use designation within the Hamilton Area Plan accommodating the use is "Community Facilities". The Staff recommendations include an amendment to the Land Use Map in the Hamilton Area Plan to redesignate the subject site to "Community Facilities". No other amendments to the Hamilton Area Plan are required.

## Council Resolution

On June 28, 2010, Council adopted the following resolution related to the proposed child daycare facility:

That the Community Amenity Benefits negotiated through the TransLink site rezoning be used, as proposed in the Director of Development's report to Planning Committee dated December 10, 2009, for the establishment of a City-owned child care facility on the Community Amenity Lands given that, prior to opening the facility, staff have addressed safety concerns raised by the Hamilton Community Association in the following ways:

- 1. vehicular access to the Community Amenity Lands be situated at the north-east corner of the site on Westminster Highway;
- 2. an asphalt walkway with extruded curb be provided on the north side of Westminster Highway, from the western edge of the Community Amenity Lands to Smith Crescent, at the estimated cost of \$45,000;
- 3. a special crosswalk with advanced warning signage be installed on Westminster Highway at Smith Crescent, at the estimated cost of \$40,000;
- 4. an extruded curb be installed between the existing eastbound travel lane and shoulder on the east side of Westminster Highway, from Smith Crescent to Gilley Road, to create a delineated walkway and cycling path at the estimated cost of \$70,000;
- 5. a new bus stop for the westbound bus be located in close proximity to the Community Amenity Lands on Westminster Highway; and
- 6. staff comment on the issues surrounding the pedestrian improvements on the north side of Westminster Highway.

Although a response was provided for each of the above parts of the Council resolution in the report by the General Manager – Community Services (dated June 10, 2010, REDMS #2907876) the updated status of each part of this resolution is further addressed in the Analysis section of this report.

# Consultation

# Hamilton Community Association

City staff from Project Development and Facility Services, Transportation and Planning and Development met with the board members of the Hamilton Community Association (HCA) on March 20, 2012. Staff presented the proposed site plan to the Board members, discussed planned facility capacity and planned road/pedestrian improvements both in front of the site and in other locations along Westminster Highway within Hamilton. Staff also provided information and responded to questions on how each of the safety concerns previously identified by the HCA were being addressed.

# School District

Although this development project will not result in any increase in the number of new children to the area, basic information about the project was provided to the Richmond School District staff with a request for contact should they require any further information. To time of writing, no requests for additional information have been received from the School District.

## Vancouver Coastal Health

Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH) representatives have indicated that they are aware of this project and are familiar with the proposed operator whom they know to be informed of the criteria for operating a licensed child daycare. VCH staff will continue to work with the City and the operator as this project develops but to date of correspondence VCH had no concerns with the project as proposed (pers. comm. Feb 28<sup>th</sup>, 2012).

# Richmond Advisory Design Panel

Although a Development Permit is not required for this daycare facility as it is considered an "institutional use" the project was taken to the Advisory Design Panel on April 18, 2012, for informal comments and feedback primarily focused on the facility site planning. Comments provided by the Panel are shown in Attachment 4. The project Architect's responses to each of the ADP comments are provided in Attachment 5.

Facilities staff have agreed to include the Panel's comments with the Design Build Terms of Reference which will be put out to tender so that the prospective builder will have the opportunity to incorporate appropriate design changes into their submission to the extent possible given the project budget.

Overall, the ADP comments were complementary and focused on ideas to tweak the plans should the budget and site conditions permit.

# Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI)

Preliminary Approval has been granted by MoTI (letter dated February 29, 2012) for one year pursuant to section 52(3)(a) of the Transportation Act. No other concerns or restrictions have been made by the Ministry.

# Consultation with Adjacent Neighbour

City staff from Project Development and Facility Services met with the only adjacent residential neighbours (i.e. 23551 Westminster Hwy.) to the subject site on March 20, 2012. The expected development plan, site plan and construction schedules were outlined for the neighbours. As the subject site is being raised, up to a 2.24m (approx.) grade difference will exist between the daycare's slab elevation and the existing grade of the neighbour's property to the west.

Concerns for the neighbours include:

- Managing drainage impacts during preload and post construction given the expected grade differences between the properties.
- Ensuring that fencing on top of the retaining wall and the retaining wall itself will not look unattractive and meet both property's needs.
- Potential impacts on their sanitary septic field. They had questions as to whether a sanitary connection to the City's system was anticipated in the future.
- Whether the new linear park along their northern property line would be fenced.

Recognizing that each property owner is responsible for managing drainage on their own site, Facilities staff will be exploring options that would benefit both properties by incorporating perimeter drainage on the daycare site at the base of the future retaining wall. Fencing at the top of the retaining wall must meet child safety requirements. Given that constraint however, Facilities staff have committed to meeting with the adjacent neighbours to look at some options for the fencing material that will address both parties needs. The retaining wall itself will consist of decorative Allen block to create an attractive appearance from the neighbour's property.

The neighbours have been advised that, at this time, there are no immediate plans to extend the sanitary sewer system to their property nor are there any plans to add new fencing along the linear park. Parks Staff have noted that there will be a defined pedestrian trail through the Park and that natural understorey growth within the 30 m wide strip will help confine pedestrian movements to the trail. Park Staff will, however, monitor the use of the area over time and reassess this issue if required in the future.

Project Development and Facility Services staff have, and will continue to work cooperatively with the neighbours to ensure that their concerns are addressed to the extent possible. They have also conveyed to the neighbours that, with their permission, a pre-construction building and property survey will be undertaken at the City's expense to ensure that any impacts upon the adjacent property as a result of the daycare site's construction can be readily identified and addressed.

# Public Input

With exception to the above noted agencies and individuals, no further public input was sought for this application. It is noted, however, that the rezoning application is subject to a Public Hearing as part of the normal rezoning approval process. To time of writing, no correspondence has been received from the public regarding the project.

# Staff Comments

No significant technical concerns were identified by staff regarding this project. As noted earlier, frontage works are to be completed by Translink under their rezoning considerations agreement. The timing for these works will need to be coordinated and completed prior to occupancy of the daycare site. Staff are working with Translink to ensure this is done.

The utility capacity analysis indicates that the development will not require storm, sanitary or water upgrades. Fire flow analysis will be required at building permit stage.

# Analysis

# Response Status To Council's Resolution

The text below provides the status responses to each of the six parts of the Council resolution of June 28, 2010.

1. Vehicular access to the Community Amenity Lands be situated at the north-east corner of the site on Westminster Highway;

Status: As indicated on the site plan in Attachment 2, the vehicle access has been located adjacent to the property line at the northeast edge of the site. Transportation staff have indicated that this location provides acceptable sight lines to traffic in both directions.

2. An asphalt walkway with extruded curb be provided on the north side of Westminster Highway, from the western edge of the Community Amenity Lands to Smith Crescent, at the estimated cost of \$45,000;

Status: This is a Capital Project that is scheduled to be completed later in 2013.

- A special crosswalk with advanced warning signage be installed on Westminster Highway at Smith Crescent, at the estimated cost of \$40,000;
   Status: The special crosswalk with advanced warning signal was installed in 2011 and was operational in March, 2012.
- 4. An extruded curb be installed between the existing eastbound travel lane and shoulder on the east side of Westminster Highway, from Smith Crescent to Gilley Road, to create a delineated walkway and cycling path at the estimated cost of \$70,000; Status: The segment between Fraser Gate to Gilley Road is a Capital Project that will be completed later in 2012. The segment between Fraser Gate to Smith Crescent is a Capital
- 5. A new bus stop for the westbound bus be located in close proximity to the Community Amenity Lands on Westminster Highway; and

Status: The new bus stop will be implemented in consultation with the Coast Mountain Bus Company. This is anticipated to be completed in late 2013.

6. Staff comment on the issues surrounding the pedestrian improvements on the north side of Westminster Highway.

Status: Included with the Rezoning Considerations for the Hamilton Translink Operations and Maintenance Facility (RZ 09-484669) was a requirement for frontage improvements on the north side of Westminster Highway to be undertaken as part of the Servicing Agreement. The frontage improvements are to include a 1.8m westbound bike lane and 2.0m paved and delineated walkway with extruded curb on the north side from Boundary Road to the western edge of the proposed daycare centre. Staff are currently working with Translink to ensure these elements are incorporated in their Servicing Agreement (SA 10-532629).

## Flood Covenant / Flood Event Release

Project that will be completed later in 2013.

As the subject site will remain under City ownership a rezoning requirement for registration of a flood covenant was determined not to be required.

The submitted plans indicate that the proposed buildings will fully meet the City's current Flood Plain Designation and Protection Bylaw No. 8204 and the prescribed minimum 3.5m GSC Flood Construction Elevation.

## Geotechnical Review

A geotechnical review was undertaken for the subject site. Based upon the findings from the geotechnical drilling, the site will required approximately 8 to 9 months of preloading to accommodate the facility.

# Site Contamination

A site investigation report was undertaken by Golder Associates on September 2, 2010. Based upon their historical review of the site they concluded that the site is not an area of environmental concern with regard to the Environmental Management Act. No further investigation was warranted.

# Tree Survey

The tree survey was undertaken as part of the overall site survey. A single tree of bylaw size was identified on the site under the survey. A review by the City's Tree Protection Officer indicated that the species was actually a multi-branching shrub species in very poor condition. A tree removal permit was not required for its removal and retention would affect site preloading activity. The landscaping plan for the site indicates approximately 16 trees will be added to the property.

# Frontage Improvements and the Provision of Utility Services

Frontage improvements on Westminster Highway in front of the subject property are the responsibility of Translink as one of the conditions attached to the rezoning of the Hamilton Translink Operations and Maintenance Facility at 4111 Boundary Road (RZ 09-484669 adopted November 8, 2010). Translink representatives have been working closely with City staff on their Servicing Agreement (SA10-532629) submissions and are aware of their obligations regarding the daycare frontage works.

Per Translink's rezoning requirements, the frontage improvements along the daycare site on Westminster Hwy. will include a 1.8m westbound bike lane and 2.0m paved and delineated walkway with extruded curb on the road to the western edge of the daycare property. Utility connections will also be required as part of the Translink Servicing Agreement.

Based upon the submitted capacity analysis undertaken for the daycare project, storm, sanitary and water analyses were determined not to be required. A 75mm sanitary sewer forcemain is at the property line and can be connected to via a private pump station by the future contractors completing the site servicing. Connections for both water and storm sewer will come from the south side of Westminster Hwy. This design is to be included in the offsite works being done by Translink.

Staff have worked with Translink to coordinate the timing of the offsite works with the opening of the proposed child care facility.

Additional fire flow analysis is to be undertaken at the Building Permit stage once the building design has been confirmed.

# Financial Impact or Economic Impact

None.

## Conclusion

Staff are recommending support for the proposed daycare facility at 23591 Westminster Hwy. The proposed layout meets and exceeds the BC Child Care Licensing requirements and will help address a need for child care resources in the infant-toddler and pre-school age groups in Hamilton. The site has been will designed given the constraints of the site shape and the need to meet the flood construction elevation requirements and has been given general support by the Advisory Design Panel members.

David Brownlee Planner 2

DCB:cas

Attachment 1: Location Map Attachment 2: Conceptual Development Plans

Attachment 3: Development Application Data Sheet

Attachment 4: Draft Minutes Advisory Design Panel April 18, 2012

Attachment 5: GHMA Response to ADP Comments April 27, 2012

Attachment 6: Rezoning Considerations Concurrence







PH - 194



PH - 195









3482714







# **Development Application Data Sheet**

**Development Applications Division** 

Attachment 3

# RZ 12-601319

Address: 23591 Westminster Hwy.

Applicant: City of Richmond

Planning Area(s): Hamilton

	Existing		Prop	osed	
Owner:	City of Richmond		Same		
Site Size (m²):	2,287.5 m <sup>2</sup>	2,287.5 m <sup>2</sup>		same	
Land Uses:	vacant	vacant		Child Daycare Facility	
OCP Designation:	Neighbourhood Residential		same		
Area Plan Designation:	Residential (Mixed Multiple and Family)	Residential (Mixed Multiple and Single- Family)		Community Facilities Use	
Zoning:	Single Detached (RS1/F)		School & Institution	School & Institutional Use (SI)	
On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement		Proposed	Variance	
Floor Area Ratio:	No maximum		0.14	none permitted	
Lot Coverage – Building:	No maximum	15%		none	
Lot Size (min. dimensions):	No minimum	2,287.5 m²		none	
Setback – Front Yard (m):	Min. 6.0 m	Greater than 6.0 m Min.		none	
Selback - Side & Rear Yards (m):	Min. 3.0 m	Greater than 3.0 m Min. no		none	
Height (m):	12 m	A	pprox. 6.0 m	none	
Off-street Parking Spaces – Total:	0.75 space per employee plus 1 space for each 10 children in care 0.75 x 8 employees = 6 33 children = 3.3 Total stalls required: 10	11 including 1 handicapped none		none	
Loading Bay	1 medium	1 medium none		none	
Tandem Parking Spaces:	permitted	5 stalls for dropoff none			
Bicycle Spaces	Class 1: 1 spaces     Class 1: 1 spaces       Class 2: 2 spaces     Class 2: 2 spaces		none		

Other:



# DRAFT – Advisory Design Panel

# Wednesday, April 18, 2012

# **Excerpt of Minutes**

# 2. RZ 12-601319 – HAMILTON CHILD DAYCARE FACILITY

APPLICANT: City of Richmond

PROPERTY LOCATION: 23591 Westminster Highway

## Applicant's Presentation

Mark Mathiasen, GHM Architects, Janet Whitehead and Martin Younis, City of Richmond Project Development and Facility Services, presented the project on behalf of the applicant.

## Panel Discussion

Comments from the Panel were as follows:

- appreciate the accommodation for toilet requirements for daycare staff and children in wheelchairs or with mobility impairment;
- due to grade issues, give attention to ramping as it is necessary to provide continuous surfaces within the site;
- no problem with Britco-style building; understand the budget constraints of the project;
- landscaping seems active and interesting; lots of activities in different areas are appropriate for small children;
- information provided on the edge details of the building could use more resolution; concrete crawlspace kind of finish below the hardie panel is not visually interesting; consider adding a different material, e.g. corrugated metal; no space for berm or planter;
- overall, a reasonably planned project given the limitations of the site;
- question the location of the play area which is adjacent to Westminster Highway; why not locate it adjacent to the park to the north of the site?; may have shadow issues but would be more more removed from the road;
- retaining wall at the west property line should be treated nicely in consideration of the neighbouring residential property to the immediate west;
- very interesting scheme from a daycare perspective; fairly well-resolved project notwithstanding the challenges in grading;
- a hill is a great play surface; look at opportunities to create a sloped surface from the covered deck edge down to grade to integrate the areas, e.g. through on-grade landscaping instead of lattice barrier;

- large verge at the edge of Westminster Highway could be treated to soften the street and provide buffering from the street; consider a reforestation plan (i.e., planting of small trees that eventually grow into big ones) to integrate cost-effective planting into boulevard to assist in screeping noise and traffic coming from the highway to the play area;
- sidewalk location needs to be separated from the street/curb to set better precedent for the neighbourhood;
- would appreciate if proposals from the Panel could be integrated into the project's terms of reference;
- consider providing temporary cover or tent-like structure for outdoor play areas to provide opportunities for outdoor play during rain;
- consider more playfulness in window pattern, e.g. lower windows for toddlers;
- consider using roof fence/vents or stronger changes in roof lines and forms to break up the massing of the roof and add playfulness to it;
- consider adding another colour to add more playfulness to the project considering that it is a daycare facility;
- understand the budget constraints of the project; however, consider improving texture of the paving coming out into the parking area;
- notwithstanding the budget constraints, the terms of reference should encourage innovation by the proponents in terms of landscaping, building massing, articulation, window elements and roof form;
- comments of Panel members may provide interesting solutions to challenges faced by the project;
- ensure that there is sufficient tree planting in the northern edge of the site to provide sun shade for children during sunny days;
- modular structure has successful precedents; ensure that wooden members are sized to be visually proportional and chunky; should tie-in with landscape elements;
- ensure that there is sufficient buffering if the primary play area is on the highway side;
- in view of the location of the play area, look at some serious buffering along the edge of Westminster Highway to address the noise issue; and
- building is raised and there is a fair amount of space underneath; consider the possibility of a storage area in the crawlspace; could be incorporated under the building at minimal cost.



April 27, 2012

City of Richmond Development Applications 6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, British Columbia V6Y 2C1 Canada

Attn: David Brownlee Special Projects Planner

Deor Sk:

Re:	RZ 12-601319 - Hamilton Child Daycare Facility
	Response to ADP Minutes of April 18 2012

Project No.: 11285

Suile 203

V3R 1J7

10190 152A Street Surrey, B.C.

Tel: (604) 581-8128 Fox: (604) 581-8148

As requested, here is our response to recommendations made by the Design Advisory Panel meeting held on April 18, 2012. The thoughtful comments are acknowledged, and oppreclated for their intent in helping to improve the Hamilton Daycare project.

The following response is intended to provide context and background to comments suggesting changes, and to indicate a proposed course of action for the Design-Builder, Responses are indicated by *Italics*.

 due to grade issues, give attention to ramping as it is necessary to provide continuous surfaces within the site.

This issue has been addressed. The site is gently graded to the front doors so as not to require ramps for primary access to the building. In addition, the intant/Toddier access to the exterior is provided with a ramp to facilitate moving infants and toddiers in strollers from both front and rear access points.

 information provided on the edge details of the building could use more resolution; concrete crowlspace kind of finish below the hardle panel is not visually interesting; consider adding a different material, e.g. corrugated metal; no space for berm or planter;

The building finishes will be changed to conceal the concrete crawispace foundation walls.

question the location of the play area which is adjacent to Westminster Highway; why not locate it
adjacent to the park to the north of the site?; may have shadow issues but would be more more
removed from the road;

The building siting was reviewed in detail in consultation with City of, Richmond Planning, Engineering, Project Development, and Social Services Department staff. A number of factors led to the placement of the building fowards the rear of the site:

1) There is a large grade change required to meet flood plain elevations - the floor elevation is 3.8m compared to a current average site elevation of 1.1 - 1.2m. Distance is necessary to help mitigate the visual and logistical effects of site grading transitions, including planning considerations around the visual impact to the public of high retaining walls along the front of the property, as well as traffic engineering concerns around traffic sight lines along the curve of the adjacent roadway.

Ron Hoffort Architect Inc., 8. Arch., MAIBC Mork Mashlasen Architect Inc., 8. Arch., MAIBC

Page 1 of 4

April 27, 2012 RZ 12-601319 - Hamilton Child Daycare Facility Response to ADP Minutes of April 18 2012



- 2) Placement towards the rear of the site mitigates impacts to the adjacent neighbour due to lower retaining wall heights and better views towards the front of the property where the adjacent house is located.
- 3) Ilcensing requirements, for safety and operational reasons, stipulate a physical separation between the infant/toddler and 3-5 age group play areas.
- 4) set back requirements combined with access to the sunny south side, grading issues, sight lines, public presence, and the requirement for separate play areas all helped lead to the decision to place the largest play area, designed for 25 3-5 year olds, on the sunny south side. The smaller play area, designed for 8 infants and toddiers, was determined to be best located on the shadler and quieter north side.
- retaining wall at the west property line should be treated nicely in consideration of the neighbouring
  residential property to the immediate west;

Comment/requirement will be passed along to the Design-Builder. Product such as "Alian Block", a smaller scale architectural concrete product, is proposed.

 a hill is a great play surface; look at opportunities to create a sloped surface from the covered deck edge down to grade to integrate the areas, e.g. through on-grade landscaping instead of lattice barrier;

The suggested hill is likely not possible, as City staff provided instructions through earlier reviews to reduce slopes in the play area for safety reasons. Other landscape opportunities, such as plant screening, would mitigate the visual issue that is mentioned.

Iarge verge at the edge of Westminster Highway could be treated to soften the street and provide buffering from the street; consider a reforestation plan (i.e., planting of small trees that eventually grow into big ones) to integrate cost-effective planting into boulevord to assist in screening noise and traffic coming from the highway to the play orea;

Off-site work is determined by the prior re-zoning process carried out for this site by B.C. Transit, and is outside the scope of this application. For information purposes, it is noted that input from traffic engineering and planning during the site planning phase suggests that this is not an option for traffic safety reasons due to required sight lines around the curve.

 sldewalk location needs to be separated from the street/curb to set better precedent for the neighbourhood;

Off-site work is determined by the prior re-zoning process carried out for this site by B.C. Transit, and is outside the scope of this application.

would appreciate if proposals from the Panel could be integrated into the project's terms of reference;

Design Panel proposals will be addressed in consultation with City staff for inclusion in the Design-Build Request for Proposals terms of reference.

Page 2 of 4

April 27, 2012 RZ 12-601319 - Hamilton Child Daycare Facility Response to ADP Minutes of April 18 2012



 consider providing temporary cover or tent-like structure for outdoor play areas to provide opportunities for outdoor play during rain;

Covered play space is already provided for both play areas at the front and back of the property. A small tent-like structure in addition to these could be beneficial and playful on the street site, and may be considered if budget and City of Richmond planning considerations allow for it.

consider more playfulness in window pattern, e.g. lower windows for toddiers;

All windows for children's activity areas are placed at the child appropriate still height of 1°-10", Windows for adult areas are placed at appropriate heights to coordinate with miliwork, furniture, and function.

 consider using roof fence/vents or stronger changes in roof lines and forms to break up the massing of the roof and add playfulness to it;

Comment will be passed along to the Design-Builder.

 consider adding another colour lo add more playfulness to the project considering that it is a daycare facility;

Comment will be passed along to the Design-Builder.

 understand the budget constraints of the project; however, consider improving texture of the paving coming out into the parking area;

Comment will be passed along to the Design-Builder.

 notwithstanding the budget constraints, the terms of reference should encourage innovation by the proponents in terms of landscaping, building massing, orticulation, window elements and roof form;

Comment will be passed along to the Design-Builder.

 ensure that there is sufficient tree planting in the northern edge of the site to provide sun shade for children during sunny days;

Comment will be passed along to the Design-Builder.

modular structure hos successful precedents; ensure that wooden members are sized to be visually
proportional and chunky; should tie-in with landscape elements;

Comment will be passed along to the Design-Builder.

ensure that there is sufficient buffering if the primary play area is on the highway side;

Comment will be passed along to the Design-Builder. Note that transparency in the fencing on the street side was a requirement of Planning, and will require review with City staff.

Page 3 of 4

April 27, 2012 RZ 12-601319 - Hamilton Child Daycare Facility Response to ADP Minutes of April 18 2012



 In view of the location of the play area, look at some serious buffering along the edge of Westminster Highway to address the noise issue;

See previous comment,

 building is raised and there is a fair amount of space underneath; consider the possibility of a storage area in the crawlspace; could be incorporated under the building at minimal cost.

Comment will be passed along to the Design-Builder. Storage under the building will require the addition of a fire sprinkler protection system which may not be supported by the budget.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this project to the City of Richmond Design Panel. I trust the preceding comments are helpful. Please do not hesitate to call the undersigned should you have further queries or comments arising out of the above noted comments.

Sincerely,

Graham Hoffarl Mathlasen Architects

Mark Mothlasen, MAIBC, LEED<sup>©</sup>AP

cc: Jonet Whitehead, Project Manager, City of Richmond Project Development & Facilities Services Martin Younis, Project Coordinator, City of Richmond Project Development & Facilities Services

F:(11285 Hamilton Dayaate(1.0 Pre-Construction(1), 4 Cthy (Schedules, Code Ancysis, B.P., D.P., ADP-Brawnzee response 01-04-27, wpd

Page 4 of 4



**Rezoning Considerations** 

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

Address: 23591 Westminster Hwy.

File No.: RZ 12-601319

# Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8881, the developer is required to complete the following:

- 1. Final Adoption of OCP Amendment Bylaw 8880.
- 2. Provincial Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure Approval.
- 3. Submission of a Landscape Plan, prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development.

## 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 Division. 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.

(For more information refer to : <u>http://www.richmond.ca/services/ttp/special.htm</u>).

- 2. Additional fire flow analysis are to be undertaken at the Building Permit stage once the building design has been confirmed.
- 3. 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.

[Signed original on file]

Signed

Date

# Bylaw 8880



# Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 Amendment Bylaw 8880 (RZ 12-601319) 23591 Westminster Highway

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

1. Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 is amended by repealing the existing land use designation in Schedule 2.14 (Hamilton Area Plan) thereof of the following area and by designating it "COMMUNITY FACILITIES".

P.I.D. 028-376-650 Lot B Section 36 Block 5 North Range 4 West New Westminster District Plan BCP46528.

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 8880".

FIRST READING

PUBLIC HEARING

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

ADOPTED

MAY 2 8 2012

·



MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



# Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 8881 (RZ 12-601319) 23591 WESTMINSTER HIGHWAY

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

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following area and by designating it SCHOOL AND INSTITUTIONAL USE (SI)

P.I.D. 028-376-650 Lot B Section 36 Block 5 North Range 4 West New Westminster District Plan BCP46528.

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 8881".

FIRST READING	MAY 2 8 2012	CITY OF RICHMOND
PUBLIC HEARING		APPROVED by
SECOND READING		APPROVED by Director
THIRD READING		
MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION APPROVAL		
OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED		
ADOPTED		

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



To:	Planning Committee	Date:	April 24, 2012
From:	Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Acting General Manager, Planning and Development	File:	08-4045-20- 10/2012-Vol 01
Re:	City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) Text Amendments: Density Calculation		

#### Re: City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) Text Amendments: Density Calculation Clarification for Minor Streets, Lanes, Mews, Parks, and Open Spaces Not Identified in Richmond's Development Cost Charge (DCC) Program

## Staff Recommendation

- 1. That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 8888, which amends Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100 by making text amendments to Schedule 2.10 (City Centre Area Plan) to clarify the intent of the Plan in respect to lands voluntarily dedicated or otherwise transferred to the City by developers for use as "minor streets" (i.e., as designated under the Plan), lanes, mcws, parks, and open spaces not identified in the Development Cost Charge (DCC) program for land acquisition purposes, and make clear that the City may, in its discretion on a project-byproject basis, include such lands in the calculation of "net development site" for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted floor area, be introduced and given first reading.
- 2. That Bylaw No. 8888, having been considered in conjunction with:
  - the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program;
  - the Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;

is hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3)(a) of the Local Government Act.

3. That Bylaw No. 8888, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is hereby deemed not to require further consultation.

Brian / Jackson, MCIP Acting General Manager, Planning and Development

BJ:spc Att.

FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY		
ROUTED TO: Law Parks Transportation		CONCURRENCE OF ACTING GENERAL MANAGER
REVIEWED BY TAG	YES NO	REVIEWED BY CAO YES NO

#### Staff Report

#### Origin

The purpose of this staff report and bylaw is to propose text amendments to the City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) for the purpose of:

- Clarifying the intent of the Plan in respect to lands that are voluntarily dedicated or otherwise transferred to the City (i.e., fee simple lot) by developers for use as "minor streets" (i.e., as designated under the Plan), lanes, mews, parks, and open spaces, but are not identified in the Development Cost Charge (DCC) program for land acquisition purposes; and
- Making clear that the City may, in its discretion on a project-by-project basis, include such lands in the calculation of "net development site" for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted floor area.

#### Findings of Fact

The CCAP identifies new parks and roads to be secured as voluntary developer contributions via Richmond's development approval processes. In cases where the contributors of these features are not eligible for financial compensation via the DCC program (i.e., most "minor streets", lanes, mews, and some parks are not identified for land acquisition purposes on the DCC program), the CCAP permits such features to be secured via means that do not reduce the contributing developer's buildable floor area. Typically, a statutory right-of-way is used for this purpose, but there is increasing concern among City staff that this may result in unclear ownership responsibilities (e.g., maintenance standards, liability), hardship for private owners (i.e., long-term maintenance of statutory right-of-way areas), and related development and administrative challenges. The CCAP permits non-DCC features (i.e., features not identified on the DCC program) to be dedicated or otherwise transferred to the City (i.e., fee simple lot) without any loss of buildable floor area (i.e., no reduction in "net development site" area upon which density is calculated), and such means are easier to administer than statutory right-of-ways. Unfortunately, however, to date the effective use of the relevant CCAP provisions for this purpose has been hampered by the Plan's lack of clarity and transparency.

#### Related Policies & Studies

#### CCAP Policy Review

Key CCAP directions requiring consideration include the following:

- a) Density is calculated on "net development site" area, which is defined as site area "net of street and park dedications required to satisfy the <u>intent</u> of Area Plan and other City policies"; and
- b) Dedication is not required to satisfy the intent of the Plan in respect to:
  - Non-DCC park and open space (policy 4.1.m); and
  - Non-DCC "minor streets", lanes, and mews, provided that securing such features via an
    alternate means results in an outcome equal to or better than what could otherwise have
    been reasonably achieved under the Plan (policies 4.1.j and 4.1.k).

Based on the above, it is understood that the CCAP does not require the exclusion of non-DCC parks, open spaces, "minor streets", lanes, or mews from "net development site" area for the purpose of calculating buildable floor area, regardless of how such features are secured (i.e., statutory right-of-way, dedication, or fee simple lot). Furthermore, given that the current Plan allows for density to

be calculated on non-DCC features, how those features are secured (i.e., statutory right-of-way versus dedication or fee simple lot) is of no consequence to the City Centre's projected total buildable floor area, population, anticipated demand for services/amenities, or related considerations.

#### Consultation

OCP Bylaw preparation Consultation Policy No. 5043 provides direction with regard to consultation requirements for an OCP amendment. As the proposed OCP amendment is limited to text changes clarifying existing CCAP policy and will not increase development nor change existing land use policy, no consultation is required with the Vancouver International Airport Authority (VIAA) or School District No. 38 (Richmond). Notice published in Richmond newspapers and the statutory Public Hearing will provide Richmond residents and interested parties with an opportunity to comment.

#### Analysis

#### Proposed CCAP Text Amendments

To make it clear that the City may, in its discretion on a project-by-project basis, include lands dedicated or otherwise transferred to the City for use as non-DCC features in the calculation of "net development site" for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted floor area within the City Centre, text amendments are proposed to the definition of "net development site" and implementation strategies in respect to transportation features (policies 4.1.j and 4.1.k) and park and open space features (4.1.1 and 4.1.m), as shown in Attachment 1 and summarized below:

- 1. Net Development Site (Definition) The existing definition is expanded to make clear that "net development site" can include parks, open spaces, "minor streets", lanes, or mews provided that the feature is not identified on the DCC program for land acquisition purposes and the outcome would be equal to or better than what could otherwise have been reasonably achieved under the Plan, as determined to the satisfaction of the City and in accordance with criteria set out in Section 4.0 Implementation and Phasing Strategies of the Plan (as per items 2 and 3 below).
- Transportation Features (Implementation Policies 4.1.j & 4.1.k) Two existing
  implementation policies are replaced with one new policy that makes clear, among other
  things, that "minor streets", lanes, and mews may be secured via means that do not reduce "net
  development site" area for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted floor area,
  provided that this contributes towards:
  - Equal or better results in respect to built form and character, level of public amenity, adjacency considerations, and City goals, objectives, costs, risks, liability, and related considerations; and
  - Enhanced transportation function, specifically including, but not limited to, expanded network continuity (e.g., the introduction or completion of a "minor street" connecting two or more existing public streets and constructed to its full functional width as determined to the satisfaction of the City).
- 3. Park & Open Space Features (Implementation Policies 4.1.1 & 4.1.m) Information regarding the DCC program is redundant and is, thus, repealed. In addition, as with the transportation policies (above), two existing park policies are replaced with one new policy that makes clear, among other things, that park and open space may be secured via means that

do not reduce "net development site" area for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted floor area, provided that this contributes towards:

- Equal or better results in respect to built form and character, level of public amenity, adjacency considerations, and City goals, objectives, costs, risks, liability, and related considerations; and
- Enhanced park and open space function and amenity (e.g., equitable distribution and improved access).

## Zoning Considerations

Unlike the CCAP, the Zoning Bylaw determines maximum buildable floor area based on "net site area" (i.e., excluding <u>all</u> road and park secured as dedications and fee simple lots), even in the case of non-DCC features. The implementation of the CCAP policies clarified via the subject text amendments, therefore, requires that the zoning of affected properties are drafted/amended on a project-by-project basis to permit "gross floor area" (based on site area <u>including</u> non-DCC features) to be constructed on "net site" area (excluding non-DCC features). The resulting zones will indicate, on a site-specific basis, that increased density is permitted, provided that the owner dedicates or otherwise transfers to the City a specified amount of land for (non-DCC) park and/or road purposes, as determined to the satisfaction of the City. An example of such a Zoning Bylaw amendment, in respect to the pending rezoning of 7731 and 7771 Alderbridge Way (Onni, RZ 11-585209, first reading of Council, April 23, 2012) is provided for reference as Attachment 2.

#### Financial Impact

None.

#### Conclusion

The CCAP identifies new non-DCC parks and roads that may be secured without reducing "net development site" area for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted floor area. Statutory right-of-ways are typically used for this purpose, but dedication and fee simple lots are preferable. To facilitate this alternate approach, text amendments are proposed to clarify existing CCAP policies, and guidance is provided in respect to related project-by-project Zoning Bylaw requirements.

Soprame Costor Huffman.

Suzanne Carter-Huffman Senior Planner/Urban Design

SPC:cas

Attachment 1: Comparison of Existing & Proposed CCAP Policy Attachment 2: Example of a Draft Zoning Bylaw (Standard Zone) Amendment (RZ 11-585209)
POLICY	EXISTING CCAP	PROPOSED CCAP TEXT AMENDMENTS
		Net Development Site
Definition	Net Development Site Net Development Site means the area of a Development Site, net of street and park dedications required to satisfy the intent of Area Plan and other City policies.	<ul> <li>Net Development Site means the area of a Development Site net of land dedicated or otherwise transferred to the City for_street and park purposes, except the City may, in its discretion on a project-by-project basis, include land dedicated or otherwise transferred to the City for a park, open space, Minor Street, lane, or mews in the calculation of Net Development Site (for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted floor area) if the following criteria are satisfied:</li> <li>the feature is not identified for land acquisition purposes on Richmond's Development Cost Charge (DCC) program; and</li> <li>the development outcome would be equal or better than what could otherwise have been reasonably achieved under the Plan, as determined to the satisfaction of the City and in accordance with Section 4.0, Implementation and Phasing Strategies, of the Plan.</li> </ul>
	Major Thoroughfares, Major Streets & Minor Streets	Major Thoroughfares, Major Streets, Minor Streets, Lanes & Mews
4. 1,j)	<ul> <li>These streets are to be dedicated and their alignment should be considered fixed as per the Plan, except that in the case of Minor Streets, the City may determine that this can be varied, provided that the alternative alignment and/or means of securing a designated Minor Street for public use results in a specific benefit to the community and a situation that the City considers to be equal or superior to what would otherwise have been achievable under the Plan with regard to:</li> <li>the intended transportation functions of the street and related mobility and access networks;</li> <li>costs, risks, and liability incurred by the City;</li> <li>the form of development on the affected development site and its neighbours.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>These features are to be dedicated and their alignment should be considered fixed as per the Plan, except that, at the discretion of the City on a project-by-project basis, Minor Street, lanes, and mews may be:</li> <li>realigned, closed, or added to enhance network continuity, functionality, and related characteristics of the feature for vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles, loading, and other uses; and</li> <li>secured such that the area of the feature may be included in Net Development Site (for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted floor area) provided that the feature is not identified for land acquisition purposes in Richmond's Development Cost Charge (DCC) program and the development outcome would be equal or better than what could otherwise have been reasonably achieved under the Plan, Including:</li> <li>equal or better results in respect to built form and character, level of public amenity, adjacency considerations, and City goals, objectives, costs, risks, liability, and related considerations; and</li> <li>enhanced transportation function, specifically including, but not limited to, axpanded network continuity (e.g., the introduction or completion of a Minor Street connecting two or more existing public streets and constructed to its full functional width as determined to the salisfaction of the City).</li> </ul>
4.1.k)	Lanes & Mews The alignment, the means by which these routes will be secured for public use, and the nature of that use (e.g., vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles, loading, other public uses) will be determined, to the satisfaction of the City, through Richmond's development review process.	INTENTIONALLY BLANK

POLICY	EXISTING CCAP	PROPOSED CCAP TEXT AMENDMENTS
10		Park & Open Space
4.1.1)	Park & Open Space on the DCC Program Where specific parkland acquisition and parkland development are in the City-Wide DCC Program, developers will be eligible for DCC credits or rebates if they have given land for park or constructed the park improvements, but only to the maximum extent of the park costs in the City-Wide DCC Program and the maximum extent of their parkland acquisition and development DCC payments to the City-Wide DCC Program.	<ul> <li>These features are to be dedicated or otherwise transferred to the City (i.e., fee simple lot) and their size and location should be considered fixed as per the Plan, except that, at the discretion of the City on a project-by-project basis, features may be:</li> <li>reconfigured to enhance network continuity, functionality, public amenity, site-specific considerations, and related characteristics of the feature; and</li> <li>secured such that the area of the feature may be included in Net Development Site (for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted floor area) provided that the feature is not identified for land acquisition purposes in Richmond's Development Cost Charge (DCC) program and the development outcome would be equal or better than what could otherwise have been reasonably achieved under the Plan, including: <ul> <li>equal or better results in respect to built form and character, level of public amenity, adjacency considerations, and City goals, objectives, costs, risks, liability, and related considerations; and</li> <li>enhanced park and open space function and amenity (e.g., equilable distribution and improved access).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
4.1.m)	<ul> <li>Park &amp; Open Space Not on the DCC Program</li> <li>Where specific park and open space are not on the City-Wide DCC Program, developers will be required to:</li> <li>provide a right-of-way to secure the park and open space as privately owned publicly accessible areas (POPAs) as part of the development approval process; or</li> <li>acquire the parkland and develop the parkland, or contribute to the acquisition and development of all or a portion of the parkland, in order to advance their development and that particular park and open space ahead of the City's DCC Program.</li> </ul>	INTENTIONALLY BLANK



Bylaw 8884

# Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw No. 8884 (RZ 11-585209) 7731 and 7771 Alderbridge Way

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 adding a new sub-section 3 to Section 8.12.4 Permitted Density as follows:
  - "3. Notwithstanding Section 8.12.4.2, for the RAH2 zone the maximum floor area ratio for the net site area of the site located within the City Centre shown on Figure 1 below shall be 2.28, provided that:
    - (a) the conditions in either paragraph 8.12.4.2(a) or 8.12.4.2(b) are complied with; and
    - (b) not less than  $3,538 \text{ m}^2$  of the site is dedicated to the City as road.

Figure 1



2. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following lots and designating them High Density Low Rise Apartments (RAH2)

P.I.D. 000-859-958 Lot 89 Section 5 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 38045

P.I.D. 000-806-943 Lot 96 Section 5 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 39888

3. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 8884".

	AICHMOND
FIRST READING	 APPROVED for content by
A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON	originating dopz
SECOND READING	
THIRD READING	 APPROVED for legality
OTHER REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED	 by Solicitor
ADOPTED	

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER

CITY OF

# Bylaw 8888



# Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 Amendment Bylaw No. 8888 CITY CENTRE AREA PLAN

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

- 1. Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Schedule 2.10 (City Centre Area Plan) is amended by:
  - 1.1. On page A-1, repealing the definition of "Development Site Net" and replacing it with the following:

"Net Development Site means the area of a Development Site net of land dedicated or otherwise transferred to the City for street and park purposes, except that the City may, in its discretion on a project-by-project basis, include land dedicated or otherwise transferred to the City for a park, open space, Minor Street, lane, or mews in the calculation of Net Development Site (for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted floor area) if the following criteria are satisfied:

- the feature is not identified for land acquisition purposes in Richmond's Development Cost Charge (DCC) program; and
- the development outcome would be equal to or better than what could otherwise have been reasonably achieved under the Plan, as determined to the satisfaction of the City and in accordance with Section 4.0 Implementation and Phasing Strategies of the Plan."
- 1.2. On page 4-3, repealing policy 4.1.j) and replacing it with the following:

"Major Thoroughfares, Major Streets, Minor Streets, Lanes & Mews

These features are to be dedicated and their alignment should be considered fixed as per the Plan, except that, at the discretion of the City on a project-byproject basis, Minor Streets, lanes, and mews may be:

- realigned, closed, or added to enhance network continuity, functionality, and related characteristics of the feature for vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles, loading, and other uses; and
- secured such that the area of the feature may be included in Net Development Site (for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted floor area) provided that the feature is not identified for land acquisition

purposes in Richmond's Development Cost Charge (DCC) program and the development outcome would be equal to or better than what could otherwise have been reasonably achieved under the Plan, including:

- equal or better results in respect to built form and character, level of public amenity, adjacency considerations, and City goals, objectives, costs, risks, liability, and related considerations; and
- enhanced transportation function, specifically including, but not limited to, expanded network continuity (e.g., the introduction or completion of a Minor Street connecting two or more existing public streets and constructed to its full functional width as determined to the satisfaction of the City)."
- 1.3. On page 4-3, repealing policy 4.1.k) and leaving it intentionally blank.
- 1.4. On page 4-3, repealing policy 4.1.1) and replacing it with the following:

#### "Park & Open Space

These features are to be dedicated or otherwise transferred to the City (i.e., fee simple lot) and their size and location should be considered fixed as per the Plan, except that, at the discretion of the City on a project-by-project basis, features may be:

- reconfigured to enhance network continuity, functionality, public amenity, site-specific considerations, and related characteristics of the feature; and
- secured such that the area of the feature may be included in Net Development Site (for the purpose of determining the maximum permitted floor area) provided that the feature is not identified for land acquisition purposes in Richmond's Development Cost Charge (DCC) program and the development outcome would be equal to or better than what could otherwise have been reasonably achieved under the Plan, including:
  - equal or better results in respect to built form and character, level of public amenity, adjacency considerations, and City goals, objectives, costs, risks, liability, and related considerations; and
  - enhanced park and open space function and amenity (e.g., equitable distribution and improved access)."
- 1.5. On page 4-3, repealing policy 4.1.m) and leaving it intentionally blank.

Bylaw 8888

ADOPTED

\_

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 8888".

FIRST READING MAY 2 8 2012
PUBLIC HEARING
SECOND READING
THIRD READING



MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



Re:	Application by Matthew Cheng Architect Inc. 6511 No. 2 Road from Single Detached (RS1/		
From:	Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development	File:	RZ 11-586782
To:	Planning Committee	Date:	March 27, 2012

# Staff Recommendation

(RTL4)

That Bylaw No. 8890, for the rezoning of 6471, 6491 and 6511 No. 2 Road from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)", be introduced and given first reading.

han

Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development

EL:blg Att.

ENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Jarkan.

### Staff Report

# Origin

Matthew Cheng Architect Inc. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 6471, 6491 and 6511 No. 2 Road (Attachment 1) from Single Detached (RS1/E) to Low Density Townhouses (RTL4) in order to permit the development of 15 townhouse units. A preliminary site plan and building elevations are contained in Attachment 2.

# Findings of Fact

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

## Surrounding Development

To the North: A large, newer, single-family home on a lot zoned Single Detached (RS1/E);

- To the East: Across No. 2 Road, existing single-family dwellings on lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/E), fronting Christina Road and Camsell Crescent;
- To the South: Older single-family homes on lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/E); and
- To the West: Existing single-family dwellings on lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/B) fronting Garrison Court.

# Related Policies & Studies

# Arterial Road Redevelopment and Lane Establishment Policies

The Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy is supportive of multiple-family residential developments along major arterial roads. While the subject block (east side of the 6400 Block of No. 2 Road) is not identified for Multiple-Family Residential Development on the map contained in the Policy, the subject application is being brought forward for consideration based on its own merits. A discussion is being provided under the "Analysis" section of this report.

#### Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

The applicant is required to comply with the Flood Plain Designation and Protection Bylaw (No. 8204). In accordance with the Flood Management Strategy, a Flood Indemnity Restrictive Covenant specifying the minimum flood construction level is required prior to rezoning bylaw adoption.

# OCP Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development (ANSD) Policy

The site is located within Area 4 of the ANSD map, which allows consideration of all new aircraft noise sensitive uses, including townhouses. An Aircraft Noise Sensitive Use Restrictive Covenant must be registered on title prior to final adoption of this application. As well, the applicant is to submit a report for indoor noise mitigation measures as part of the Development Permit process.

# Affordable Housing Strategy

The applicant proposes to make a cash contribution to the affordable housing reserve fund in accordance to the City's Affordable Housing Strategy. As the proposal is for townhouses, the applicant is making a cash contribution of \$2.00 per buildable square foot as per the Strategy; making the payable contribution amount of \$37,010.00.

# Public Art

The applicant has agreed to provide a voluntary contribution in the amount of \$0.75 per square foot of developable area for the development to the City's Public Art fund. The amount of the contribution would be \$13,879.00.

# Public Input

The applicant has forwarded confirmation that a development sign has been posted on the site. The owners/residents of the neighbouring property to the north at 6451 No. 2 Road expressed their concerns over the proposed access to the townhouse development being located adjacent to their south property line. The applicant has subsequently revised the site design to propose a driveway access away from the common property line. Transportation staff have no concerns with the proposed location of the entry driveway; the existing boulevard median will limit access and egress to right in/right out turns only.

# Staff Comments

# Trees Retention and Replacement

A Tree Survey and a Certified Arborist's report were submitted in support of the application. A site inspection conducted by the City's Tree Preservation Coordinator revealed that five (5) bylaw-sized trees located on-site are in good condition and are good candidates for retention. However, to successfully retain a 78 cm calliper Pine tree and a 37 cm calliper Colorado Blue Spruce tree in the proposed outdoor amenity area, two (2) townhouse units would need to be deleted from the proposal. Therefore, staff recommend retention of only three (3) of the five (5) bylaw-sized trees on-site which are in good condition (see Tree Protection Plan in **Attachment 4**).

To compensate for the loss of two (2) large conifers on-site, the City's Tree Preservation Coordinator recommends that two (2) new larger calliper conifer replacement trees be provided along the No. 2 Road frontage. These "specimen" replacement trees should be specified at a minimum of 6 m high. Staff will work with the landscape architect to ensure the provision of the larger specimen trees on-site at the Development Permit stage.

In order to ensure that the protected trees will not be damaged during construction, tree protection fencing must be installed to City standards prior to any construction activities occurring on-site. In addition, a contract with a Certified Arborist to monitor all works to be done near or within the tree protection zone must be submitted prior to Development Permit issuance. Furthermore, the applicant is required to submit a \$7,500.00 Tree Survival Security for the three (3) protected trees on-site prior to Development Permit issuance. The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has also concurred with the Arborist's recommendations to remove an additional 11 bylaw-sized trees on-site that are in poor condition due to significant structural defects (previously topped, cavities and significant inclusions). Based on the 2:1 tree replacement ratio goal stated in the Official Community Plan (OCP), 26 replacement trees are required for the removal of 13 bylaw-sized trees on-site. According to the Preliminary Landscape Plan (Attachment 2), the developer is proposing to plant 31 trees on-site.

# Site Servicing

An independent review of servicing requirements (sanitary) has concluded no upgrades are required to support the proposed development.

Prior to final adoption, the developer is required to consolidate the three (3) lots into one (1) development parcel.

# Frontage Improvements

Prior to issuance of Building Permit, the developer is to enter into a standard Servicing Agreement to provide the required beautification treatment to the road frontage. Beautification works include relocating the sidewalk to the new property line (a 1.5 m concrete sidewalk) and installing a 1.38 m grassed and treed boulevard behind the existing curb. All works at developers sole cost.

# Vehicle Access

One (1) driveway off No. 2 Road is proposed. The long-term objective is for the driveway access established on No. 2 Road to be utilized by adjacent properties if they ultimately apply to redevelop. A Public Right of Passage (PROP) will be secured as a condition of rezoning to facilitate this.

# Indoor Amenity Space

The applicant is proposing a contribution in-lieu of on-site indoor amenity space in the amount of \$18,000 as per the Official Community Plan (OCP) and Council Policy.

# Outdoor Amenity Space

Outdoor amenity space will be provided on-site and is adequately sized based on Official Community Plan (OCP) guidelines. The design of the children's play area and landscape details will be refined as part of the Development Permit application.

# Analysis

# Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy

The City's Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy guides residential infill development for properties located along arterial roads and also establishes a set of location criteria and development guidelines to which multiple-family residential development proposals must comply. The subject development site generally complies with all of the location criteria except that it is not on a bus route. Response to the location criteria is provided below in *italics*:

i. Along a major arterial road and those portions of a local arterial road identified in the OCP.

The subject site is along a major arterial road, which is No. 2 Road.

- On a land assembly with at least 50 m frontage.
   The site frontage is 61.9 m, which is greater than 50 m.
- iii. Where the application is not the first one in the block to introduce a new form of development.

This application is the first one in the block, between Walton Road and Garrison Road, to introduce townhouse development. However, considering the entire block between Westminster Highway and Granville Avenue, this application is not the first townhouse development; there are several townhouse developments at the corner of No. 2 Road and Granville Avenue.

Staff recommended consultation with the adjacent property owners to the north, south, and west on the proposed land use and density. The applicant confirmed that they have talked to the owners of 6451 and 6531 No. 2 Road (which are the immediate neighbouring properties to the north and south) in October, 2011 and that these two (2) property owners seemed not to have comments regarding the proposal. The applicant advised staff that they did not approach the property owners to the west.

iv. At least 50% of the lots along that section of the major arterial road have redevelopment potential (i.e. a frontage of over 18 m and/or a house over 10 years old).
 Out of the eight (8) lots along No. 2 Road on this block saves (7) of them have a frontage.

Out of the eight (8) lots along No. 2 Road on this block, seven (7) of them have a frontage over 18 m (except 6397 No. 2 Road with a frontage of 13.72 m). Therefore, more than 50% of the lots along No. 2 Road on this block have redevelopment potential.

v. Public transit is available.

Currently, there is no public transit servicing this block of No. 2 Road. However, the #410 bus on Granville Avenue is approximately 300 m away and #401 and C94 buses on Westminster Highway are approximately 500 m away, which all are within walking distance.

vi. The development is within walking distance of commercial services or City community centre.

The development is within walking distance of city community centre. The Thompson Community Centre is about 660 m away from the development.

The proposal is also generally in compliance with the development guidelines for multiple-family residential developments under the Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy. The proposed height, siting and orientation of the buildings respect the massing of the existing single-family homes. All rear units immediately adjacent to the neighbouring single-family dwellings to the west have been reduced in height to two (2) storeys. The front buildings along No. 2 Road have been stepped down from three (3) storeys to 2½ storeys along the side yards and the entry driveway. The building height and massing will be controlled through the Development Permit process.

Although the proposed development does not comply with all of the location criteria, staff support the proposed rezoning application based on the following:

- The proposal is generally in compliance with five (5) of the six (6) location criteria; while the site is not on a bus route, public transit is available within walking distance (under 300 m);
- The proposal is generally in compliance with all of the development guidelines under the Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy;
- Preservation of three (3) of the five (5) healthy bylaw-sized trees on-site which are in good condition;
- Proposing a tree replacement ratio over and above the 2:1 tree replacement ratio goal stated in the Official Community Plan (OCP) (i.e. 31 replacement trees for 13 trees to be removed);
- Providing a voluntary contribution to the Affordable Housing Strategy reserve fund; and
- Providing a voluntary contribution to the City's Public Art fund.

## Requested Variances

The proposed development is generally consistent with the Development Permit Guidelines for multiple-family projects contained in the Official Community Plan (OCP). Based on the review of current site plan for the project, a variance to allow for a total of 18 tandem parking spaces in nine (9) townhouse units (all fronting No. 2 Road) is being requested. Transportation Division staff have reviewed the proposal and have no concerns. The proposed number of on-site visitor parking is in compliance with the bylaw requirement. A restrictive covenant to prohibit the conversion of the tandem garage area into habitable space is required prior to final adoption.

# Design Review and Future Development Permit Considerations

A Development Permit will be required to ensure that the development at 6471, 6491 and 6511 No. 2 Road is sensitively integrated with adjacent developments. The rezoning conditions will not be considered satisfied until a Development Permit application is processed to a satisfactory level. In association with the Development Permit, the following issues are to be further examined:

- Detailed review of building form and architectural character; opportunities to reduce the massing of the end units;
- Review of the location and design of the convertible unit and other accessibility/aging-in-place features;
- Review of site grade to ensure the survival of protected trees and to enhance the relationship between the first habitable level and the private outdoor space;
- Landscaping design and enhancement of the outdoor amenity area to maximize use;
- Ensure there is adequate private outdoor space in each unit; and
- Opportunities to maximize permeable surface areas and articulate hard surface treatment.

Additional issues may be identified as part of the Development Permit application review process.

# Financial Impact or Economic Impact

None.

# Conclusion

The proposed 15-unit townhouse development is generally consistent with the Official Community Plan (OCP) regarding developments along major arterial roads and meets the zoning requirements set out in the Low Density Townhouses (RTL4) zone. Overall, the proposed land use, site plan, and building massing relates to the surrounding neighbourhood context. Further review of the project design is required to ensure a high quality project and design consistency with the existing neighbourhood context, and this will be completed as part of the Development Permit application review process.

The list of rezoning considerations is included as Attachment 5, which has been agreed to by the applicants (signed concurrence on file).

On this basis, staff recommends support for the rezoning application.

Edwin Lee Planner 1 (604-276-4121)

EL:blg Attachment 1: Location Map Attachment 2: Conceptual Development Plans Attachment 3: Development Application Data Sheet Attachment 4: Tree Preservation Plan Attachment 5: Rezoning Considerations Concurrence





	EXISTING:	PROPOSED:
SITE AREA:	30B41.80SF (2865.30SM)	30841.80SF (2865.30SM)
LAND USES:	SINGLE DETACHED	TOWNHOUSE
OCP DESIGNATION:	LOW-DENSITY RESI	LOW-DENSITY RESI
ZONING:	RS1/E	RTLJ
NUMBER OF UNITS:	3	15
	REQUIRED/ALLOWED:	PROPOSED:
FLOOR AREA RATO:	0.500 (18505.08SF)	0.600 (18505.08SF)
LOT COVERACE:	0.400 (12336.72SF)	0.395 (12260.11SF)
SETBACK-FRONT YARD:	MIN. Bm	19.73' (6.001m)
SETBACK-SIDE YARD: (NORTH)	MIN. 3m	11.60' (3.536m)
SETBACK-SIDE YARD: (SOUTH)	MIN, 3m	9.91' (3.021m)
SETBACK-REAR YARD: (WEST)	MIN. 3m	14.83' (4.520m)
HEIGHT: (m)	12.0m	39.47' (12.00m)
LOT SIZE:	30841.80SF (2865.30SM)	
OFF-STREET PARKING RESIDENTIAL/COMMERCIAL:	30 AND 3	30 AND 3
OFF-STREET PARKING ACCESSIBLE:	1	1
OFF-STREET PARKING TOTAL:	33	33
TANDEM PARKING SPACES:	NOT PERMITTED	18
INDOOR AMENITY SPACE:	MIN. 60SM	CASH-IN-LIEU
DUTDOOR AMENITY SPACE:	MIN. 90SM (968,755F)	9715F (90.25M)

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT: 6451/6397 NO.2 ROAD

FLOOR AREA RATIC:

SETBACK-FRONT YARD:

SETBACK-REAR YARD: HEIGHT: (m)

SETBACK-SIDE YARD: (NORTH)

SETBACK-SIDE YARD: (SOUTH)

LOT COVERAGE:

LOT SIZE:

REQUIRED/ALLOWED;

0.600 (8965.28SF)

0.400 (5975.86SF)

MIN. 6m

MIN, 3m

MIN. 3m

MIN. 3m 12.0m 14942.14SF (1388.17SM) PROPOSED:

0.58 (8635.67SF

0.37 (\$457.03\$F)

19.73' (6.001m)

12.00° (3.66m)

10.14' (3.09m) 14.83' (4.520m) 39.47' (12.00m)





TTACHMENT

2

⊳





BUILDING 2 ELEVATION (FRONTING NO.2 ROAD)



BUILDING 2 SOUTH ELEVATION SIDE ELEVATIONS



BUILDING 1 NORTH ELEVATION

,

MATTHEW CHENG ARCHITECT INC.



No Cole General Solidate Ar Barley Solidate Ar Barly Solidate Ar Barly Solidate Ar Barly Solidate

0 m to to to

Aujust 55-15-UNIT TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT 6471/6491/6511 NO.2 ROAD RICHMOND, BC

ELEVATIONS

HC/00	
Overhalt:	
VC	
Suster	_
1/8" = 1-0"	







LANDSCAPE ENLARGEMENT

With Marthew Cheng ArdUlerts Inc. Countro HTLL LANDSCAPE DETAILS DITE Imaging 2(1) LIGHTMO MARTIN

L2

12-025

Copyright manyor, The during and dropp is the property of 2MG (under spe Antilanth and may tech reproduced or used for other property without help

ONCE: FOM OF 3

DRAMM DO

DESIGN: DO

LISSALD PHO -ROACT NAMES.



City of Richmond 69)1 No. 3 Road Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1 www.richmond.ca 604-276-4000

# Development Application Data Sheet

# RZ 11-577561

**Attachment 3** 

Address: 6471, 6491 and 6511 No. 2 Road

Applicant: Matthew Cheng Architect Inc.

Planning Area(s): Thompson

	Existing	Proposed
Owner:	Jagroop S. Bhullar, Nirinder K. Bhullar, and Salindran K. Bhullar	To be determined
Site Size (m <sup>2</sup> ):	2,865.3 m <sup>2</sup> (30,841.8 ft <sup>2</sup> )	2,865.3 m <sup>2</sup> (30,841.8 ft <sup>2</sup> )
Land Uses:	Single-Family Residential	Multiple-Family Residential
OCP Designation:	Low-Density Residential	No Change
Area Plan Designation:	N/A	No Change
702 Policy Designation:	N/A	No Change
Zoning:	Single Detached (RS1/E)	Low-Density Townhouses (RTL4)
Number of Units:	3	15
Other Designations:	N/A	No Change

On Future Development	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.60	0.60 max.	none permitted
Lot Coverage – Building:	Max. 40%	40% max.	попе
Lot Coverage – Non-porous Surfaces	Max. 65%	65% max.	none
Lot Coverage – Landscaping:	Min. 25%	25% min.	none
Setback – Front Yard (m):	Min. 6 m	6.0 m	none
Setback – Side Yard (North) (m):	Min. 3 m	3.0 m min.	none
Setback – Side Yard (South) (m):	Min. 3 m	3.0 m min.	none
Setback – Rear Yard (m):	Min. 3 m	4.5 m	none
Height (m):	Max. 12.0 m (3 storeys)	12.0 m (3 storeys) max.	none

On Future Development	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Lot Size (min. dimensions):	Min. 50 m wide x 35 m deep	Approx. 61.9 m wide x 46.3 m deep	none
Off-street Parking Spaces – Resident (R) / Visitor (V):	2 (R) and 0.2 (V) per unit	2 (R) and 0.2 (V) per unit	none
Off-street Parking Spaces - Total:	33	33	none
Tandem Parking Spaces:	not permitted	18	variance requested
Handicap Parking Spaces:	1	1	none
Bicycle Parking Spaces – Class 1 / Class 2:	1.25 (Class 1) and 0.2 (Class 2) per unit	19 (Class 1) and 3 (Class 2) min.	none
Amenity Space – Indoor:	Min. 70 m <sup>2</sup> or Cash-in-lieu	\$15,000 cash-in-lieu	none
Amenity Space – Outdoor:	Min. 6 m <sup>2</sup> x 15 units = 90 m <sup>2</sup>	90 m <sup>2</sup> min.	none

Other: Tree replacement compensation required for removal of bylaw-sized trees.

.

.



ATTACHMENT 4



# **Rezoning Considerations**

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

# Address: 6471, 6491, and 6511 No. 2 Road

File No.: RZ 11-586782

# Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8890, the developer is required to complete the following:

- 1. Consolidation of all the lots into one development parcel (which will require the demolition of the existing dwellings).
- 2. Registration of an aircraft noise sensitive use covenant on title.
- 3. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
- 4. Registration of a Public Rights-of-Passage (PROP) statutory rights-of-way (ROW), and/or other legal agreements or measures, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, over the internal drive-aisle in favour of future townhouse developments to the north and south.
- 5. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$0.75 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$13,879.00) to the City's public art fund.
- 6. Contribution of \$1,000 per dwelling unit (e.g. \$15,000) in-lieu of on-site indoor amenity space.
- 8. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$2.00 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$37,010.00) to the City's affordable housing fund.
- 9. Registration of a legal agreement on title prohibiting the conversion of the tandem parking area into habitable space.
- The submission and processing of a Development Pennit\* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.

# Prior to a Development Permit<sup>\*</sup> being forwarded to the Development Permit Panel for consideration, the developer is required to:

Submit a report and recommendations prepared by an appropriate registered professional, which demonstrates that the
interior noise levels and thermal conditions comply with the City's Official Community Plan requirements for
Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development. The standard required for air conditioning systems and their alternatives
(e.g. ground source heat pumps, heat exchangers and acoustic ducting) is the ASHRAE 55-2004 "Thermal
Environmental Conditions for Human Occupancy" standard and subsequent updates as they may occur. Maximum
interior noise levels (decibels) within the dwelling units must achieve CMHC standards follows:

Portions of Dwelling Units	Noise Levels (decibels)
Bedrooms	35 decibels
Living, dining, recreation rooms	40 decibels
Kitchen, bathrooms, hallways, and utility rooms	45 decibels

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

- 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, and a provision for the Arborist to submit a post-construction assessment report to the City for review.
- Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of \$7,500.00 for the three (3) trees to be retained.
   50% of the security will be released at Final Inspection of the Building Permits of the affected site and the remaining
   50% of the security will be released two (2) years after final inspection of the Building Permits in order to ensure that the trees have survived.

- 1. Installation of appropriate tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained as part of the development prior to any construction activities, including building demolition, occurring on-site.
  - Note: Should the applicant wish to begin site preparation work after third reading of the rezoning bylaw, but prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant will be required to obtain a Tree Permit and submit a landscape security (i.e. \$13,000) to ensure the replacement planting will be provided.

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

- 1. Enter into a Servicing Agreement\* for the design and construction of a new 1.5m concrete sidewalk installed along the entire frontage, on the west property line of No 2 Road, including a 1.38m wide grass and treed boulevard (existing sidewalk to be removed). Design to include water, storm & sanitary connections as required.
- Submission of a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to the Transportation Division. 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.
- 3. Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
- 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.

#### 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.

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

[Signed original on file]

Signed

Date

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.



# Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 8890 (RZ 11-586782) 6471, 6491, AND 6511 NO. 2 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 LOW DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTL4).

P.I.D. 003-301-222 Lot 775 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 65414 Section 12 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 63264

P.I.D. 004-248-287 North half of the south 133.5 feet Lot 5 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 65414 Section 12 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 1506

P.I.D. 002-684-535

South half of the south 133.5 feet Lot 5 Except: Firstly: Part Subdivided by Plan 63005 and Secondly: Part Subdivided by Plan 70767; Section 12 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 1506

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 8890".

FIRST READING	APR 2 3 2012	CITY OF RICHMOND
A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON		APPROVED
SECOND READING		APPROVED by Director
THIRD READING		or Sovietor
DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED		<u> </u>
ADOPTED		

MAYOR

# CORPORATE OFFICER

		To Public Hearing Date: June 18, Zoiz
Mayora	ndCouncillors	Item # 6 Re:- 34 42 - 2890
From:	City of Richmond Website [webgraphics@richmond.ca]	No: 129 00 00-10-
Sent:	May 21, 2012 1:35 PM	
To:	MayorandCouncillors	, ,

Subject: Send a Submission Online (response #649)

Categories: 08-4105-20-2011586782 - 6471/6491/6511 No 2 Rd

# Send a Submission Online (response #649)

# Survey Information

Site:	City Website
Page Title:	Send a Submission Online
URL:	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx
Submission Time/Date:	5/21/2012 1:38:32 PM

# Survey Response

Your Name:	Wendy Leung	
Your Address:	5791 Garrison Rd, Richmond	
Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number:	6471,6491,6511 No 2 Rd (RZ 11-586782)	
Comments:	All the residents of 5791 Garrison Rd OPPOSE the proposed rezoning application to change from single detached houses to 15 townhouse units. This is due to the following reasons: 1) Increase traffic flow of No 2 Rd. At the moment, traffic jam occurs from Granville Ave up to Walton at No 2 Rd during rush hours. 2) Allow more residents in the concerned area will affect the qualify of life of our neighbourhood due to noises. We no longer be able to enjoy the quietness, which is very important to us. 3) Our Community Resources, such as Thompson Community centre and elementary and high school are designed for a neighbourhood of mostly single homes. Resources distributed is based on a designed density of people. If, more residents are coming to share the same resources. This will create problem of scarcity, and more competition on resources. Again, the deserved quality of life that the residents will be devastated. 4) Rezoning will drive down the property value of the neighbourhood, especially to the single house owners on	



**PH - 243** 

Garrison Court, whose backyard is facing the rezoning area. Instead of having a quiet and nice view of seeing neighbours' garden/backyard. Their view will soon be buildings without a view. This is not fair to all home owners in the neighbourhood. Based on the above reasons, we hope the City of Richmond can re-evaluate this rezoning application and make a DECLINE decision on this application. Thank you.

MayorandCouncillors		To Public Hearing Date: June 18, 2012
From:	City of Richmond Website [webgraphics@richmond.ca]	Re: hylaw 8890
Sent:	May 14, 2012 10:58 PM	
To:	MayorandCouncillors	L
Subject:	Send a Submission Online (response #645)	

Categories: 12-8060-20-8890 - RZ 11-586782 - 6511 No 2 Rd

# Send a Submission Online (response #645)

# Survey Information

Site:	City Website
Page Title:	Send a Submission Online
URL:	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx
Submission Time/Date:	5/14/2012 11:01:32 PM

# Survey Response

Your Name:	
Your Address:	
Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number:	8890 (RZ 11-586782)
Comments:	Dear Mr. Weber, We would like to thank you for giving us an opportunity to raise our concerns about the upcoming development that will be happening next to our house. We live on 6531 which is right next to 6511 on No 2 Road. My wife and I have two small kids and my elderly parents are living with us as well. We are quite concern about the loss of privacy and the amount of commotion and the level of noise that will be created during the constructions and also after that. As a result, we are seriously considering selling our property to escape all that. We feel like we are, somehow, being forced to sell out because we were, initially, planning to live in this neighbourhood for a few more years until our kids are done with their primary schooling. In light of the recent developments, we were hoping that maybe City Hall has some kind of provisions in place for times like this for home owners who see themselves trapped and helpless. As I mentioned, at this point, we are quite open to the idea of selling. If City Hall can arrange a sell or buy our property at



market price from us, it would be a big relief. Another idea is that maybe the developer would be interested in purchasing our house and adding the lot to the other three. Is it possible for City Hall to discuss that idea with the developer, perhaps?! We really would appreciate your help and advice on this issue that has become increasingly quite stressful to us and our family. Thank you,



То:	Planning Committee	Date:	April 11, 2012
From:	Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Acting General Manager, Planning and Development	File:	RZ 12-600991
Re:	Application by Xi Chen (Chen Design Studio) Road from Single Detached (RS1/E) to Coach		•

#### Staff Recommendation

That Bylaw No. 8893, for the rezoning of 6471 Blundell Road from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Coach Houses (RCH)", be introduced and given first reading.

ANDADA

Brian J. Yackson, MCIP Acting General Manager, Planning and Development

BJ:el Att.		1.P
		ENT USE ONLY ACTING
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Affordable Housing	тана	- Mappulerin

#### Staff Report

Item	Details		
Applicant	Xi Chen (Chen Design Studio)		
Location	6471 Blundell Road See Attachment 1		
Development Data Sheet	See Attachment 2		
Zoping	Existing: Single Detached (RS1/E)		
Zoning	Proposed: Coach Houses (RCH) See Attachi	ment 3	
OCP Designation	Generalized Land Use Map – Neighbourhood Residential	Complies V I N	
Area Plan Designation	N/A	Complies I Y D N	
Lot Size Policy	Polícy 5408 – permits Compact Single Detached or Coach House lots See Attachment 4	Complies 🗹 Y 🗆 N	
Other Designations	Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy – permits Compact Single Detached or Coach House lots with lane access	Complies I Y I N	
Affordable Housing Strategy Response	Two (2) coach house units	Complies ☑ Y □ N	
	North: Single Detached (RS1/E)		
Surrounding	South: Across Blundell Road, Blundell Elementary School		
Development	East: Non-conforming Single Detached (RS1/E) – 13.5m wide		
	West: Six (6) recently created Coach House (RCH) Lots		
Rezoning Considerations	See Attachment 5		

#### Staff Comments

# Tree Preservation

A Tree Survey and a Certified Arborist's report were submitted in support of the application; six (6) on-site trees and seven (7) off-site trees were identified and assessed. The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator reviewed the Arborist's Report and concurs with the Arborist's recommendations to remove six (6) bylaw-sized trees on site due to poor condition and conflict with lane construction (Attachment 6). Based on the 2:1 tree replacement ratio goal stated in the Official Community Plan (OCP), 12 replacement trees are required.

Due to the configurations of the future lots and building footprints, it is expected that only eight (8) replacement trees can be planted on site. The applicant has agreed to provide a voluntary contribution of \$2,000 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund in-lieu of planting the remaining four (4) replacement trees.

In order to ensure that the proposed replacement trees will be planted and that the front yards of the future lots will be enhanced, a Landscape Plan, prepared by a registered landscape architect, and a landscaping security, based on 100% of the cost estimates provided by the landscape architect, must be submitted prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

Seven (7) trees located on the neighbouring property to the north and east are identified to be retained and protected. Tree protection fencing is proposed on site (see Tree Retention Plan in **Attachment 7**). As a condition to rezoning, the applicant is required to submit a proof of contract with a Certified Arborist to monitor all works to be done near or within all tree protection zones.

## Site Servicing/Subdivision

No servicing concerns. As a condition of rezoning, the developer is required to dedicate a 6 m lane along the entire north property line of the site for proposed lane extension.

Prior to Approval of the Subdivision, the developer is required to enter into a standard Servicing Agreement for the design & construction of a lane along the entire north property line of the site (see Attachment 5 for details).

The developer will also be required to pay DCC's (City & GVS&DD), School Site Acquisition Charge, and Address assignment Fee at future Subdivision stage.

## Vehicle Access

Direct vehicular access from the subject site to Blundell Road will not be permitted in accordance with Residential Lot (Vehicular) Access Regulation (Bylaw No. 7222). Vehicle access is to be from the proposed rear lane only. Removal of the existing driveway letdowns to the site along Blundell Road and reinstatement of the sidewalk will be addressed as part of the Servicing Agreement application.

#### Conclusion

This rezoning application is to permit subdivision of an existing large lot into two (2) smaller lots. This rezoning application complies with all applicable land use designations and policies contained within the Official Community Plan (OCP). The applicant has agreed to the list of rezoning conditions included in **Attachment 5**. On this basis, staff recommends support of the application

and the second se

Edwin Lee Planner 1 (4121)

EL:rg

Attachment 1: Location Map Attachment 2: Development Application Data Sheet Attachment 3: Proposed Subdivision Plan Attachment 4: Lot Size Policy No. 5408 Attachment 5: Rezoning Considerations Attachment 6: Arborist Report Review Attachment 7: Tree Retention Plan



ATTACHMENT 1



Amended Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



# Development Application Data Sheet Fast Track Application

Development Applications Division

Attachment 2

# RZ 12-600991

Address: 6471 Blundell Road

Applicant: Xi Chen (Chen Design Studio)

Date Received: February 14, 2012 Fast Track Compliance: March 20, 2012

	Existing	Proposed
Owner	John-Wayne Yao, Wen Su, Pat Yun Erwing Yao	To be determined
Site Size (m <sup>2</sup> )	941 m <sup>2</sup> (10,129 ft <sup>2</sup> )	409.5 m <sup>2</sup> (4408 ft <sup>2</sup> ) each
Land Uses	One (1) single-family residential	two (2) single-family residential dwellings with one (1) coach house per lot
Zoning	Single Detached (RS1/E)	Coach Houses (RCH)
Number of Units	One (1)	Four (4)

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.60	0.60 Max.	none permitted
Lot Coverage – Building:	Max. 45%	45% Max.	none
Lot Coverage – Buildings, structures, and non-porous	Max. 70%	70% Max.	none
Lot Coverage - Landscaping	Min. 20%	20% Min.	none
Setback – Front & Rear Yards (m):	6 m Min.	6 m Min.	none
Setback - Side Yards (m):	Min. 1.2 m	Min. 1 <i>.</i> 2 m	none
Height (m):	2.5 storeys	2.5 storeys	none
Lot Size (min. dimensions):	270 m <sup>2</sup>	409.5 m <sup>2</sup>	поле
Lot Width	Min. 9 m	10.31 m	none

Other: Tree replacement compensation required for loss of significant trees.
### BC LAND SURVEYORS PROPOSED SUBDIVISION AND TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY PLAN OF THE EAST HALF LOT 2 EXCEPT: PART SUBDIVIDED BY PLAN 43029, SECTION 18 BLOCK 4 NORTH RANGE 6 WEST NWD PLAN 13379

PID : 003-491-226

#### CIVIC ADDRESS :

6471 - BLUNDELL ROAD RICHMOND. B.C.

#### ELEVATION DERIVATION

ELEVATIONS ARE GEODETIC DERIVED FROM THE CITY OF RICHMOND CONTROL MONUMENT No. 77H4623 (HPN# 202) ELEVATION=1.452m DATUM NADB3 (CSRS) 2005

Lot dimensions and clearances according to Fleld Survey.

This plan does not show non-plan chorgos, liens or interests.

This plan was proposed for inspection purposes and is for the exclusive use of our client. The signatory accepts no responsibility or liability for any domages that may be suffered by a third party as a result of any decisions mode or octions taken based on this document. This documents shows the relative location of the surveyed structures and featuros with respect to the boundaries of the parcel described above. This document shall not be used to define property lines ar property corners. All rights resorved. Na person may copy, repraduce, transmit or alter this document in whole or in part without the consent of the signatory.

THIS TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY HAS BEEN PREPARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MANUAL OF STANDARD PRACTICE AND IS CERTIFIED CORRECT THIS 11th DAY OF JANUARY, 2012.

B.C.L.S. LAKHJOT S. GREWAL





#### NOTE

Preliminary Layout, subject to oppraval. Areas and Dimensions are subject to detailed Lead Survey and colculations, and may vary



Attachment 3

### ATTACHMENT 4



### City of Richmond

### **Policy Manual**

Page 1 of 2	Adopted by Council: April 10, 1989	Policy 5408	7
	Amended by Council: January 15, 2001*		
· .	Amended by Council: May 15, 2006 *	·	
File Ref: 4045-00	SINGLE-FAMILY LOT SIZE POLICY IN Section 18-4-6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

### Policy 5408:

The following policy establishes lot sizes in Section 18-4-6 located in the area generally bounded by Comstock Road, Blundell Road, Gilbert Road and No. 2 Road as shown on the attached map:

- 1. All properties shall meet the requirements of Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E) as per the Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300, with the following exceptions:
  - (a) properties with frontage on Gilbert Road and Blundell Road may be allowed to be subdivided as per Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6) or Coach House District (R/9), provided accesses are to be a constructed lane and not to these arterial roads.
- 2. This policy is to be used in determining the disposition of future rezoning applications in this area for a period of not less than five years, except as per the amending procedures in the Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300.
- 3. Multiple-family residential development shall <u>not</u> be permitted.

\* Original Adoption Date in Effect





## **Rezoning Considerations**

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

### Address: 6471 Blundell Road

### File No.: RZ 12-600991

# Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8893, the developer is required to complete the following:

- 1. 6m lane dedication along the entire north property line.
- 2. Submission of a Landscape Plan, prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, and deposit of a Landscaping Security based on 100% of the cost estimate provided by the Landscape Architect, including installation costs. The Landscape Plan should:
  - comply with the guidelines of the OCP's Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies and should not include hedges along the front property line;
  - include a mix of coniferous and deciduous trees;
  - include the dimensions of tree protection fencing as illustrated on the Tree Retention Plan attached to this report; and
  - include the eight (8) required replacement trees with the following minimum sizes:

No. of Replacement Trees	Minimum Caliper of Deciduous Tree	or	Minimum Helght of Conlferous Tree
8	9 cm		5 m

If required replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site, a cash-in-lieu contribution in the amount of \$500/tree to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for off-site planting is required.

- 3. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$2,000 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of four (4) replacement trees within the City.
- 4. 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 on the neighbouring properties to the north and east. 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.
- 5. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.

### Prior to Approval of Subdivision, the developer is required to:

- 1. Enter into a Servicing Agreement\* for the design and construction of a lane along the entire north property line. Works include, but may not be limited to, storm sewer, sand/gravel base, roll curb & gutter (both sides), asphalt pavement, and lane lighting. Design to include water, storm & sanitary connections for both lots, and the removal of the existing driveway crossing on Blundell Road.
- 2. Pay Dcc's (City & GVS&DD), School site acquisition charge, and Address assignment fee.

#### 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.

[Signed original on file]

Signed

Date

### Arborist Report review – G. Jaggs

### 6471 Blundell Rd RZ 12-600991 Mar 29, 2012

### Att: Edwin Lee cc: Conor Sheridan

I have reviewed the Arborist report dated February 22, 2012 and provide the following commentary:

### Tree Inventory Summary

4 trees located on site2 trees located in the lane ROW7 trees located on neighbouring property

### Staff commentary

4 trees (tag# 258, 259, 260 and 263) located on site are all in poor condition - either dead, dying (sparse canopy foliage) or have been previously topped or exhibit structural defects such as cavities at the main branch union. As a result, these trees are not good candidates for retention and should be replaced.

2 trees (tag# 261 and 262) located in the lane ROW have been previously topped, exhibit codominant stems with inclusions and sparse canopy foliage indicative of decline. These two trees will also be in conflict with new lane construction. As a result, these trees are not good candidates for retention and should be replaced.

7 trees located on neighbouring property are to be protected as per the Arborist report recommendations and as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.

Replacement trees should be specified at 2:1 ratio as per the O.C.P.

#### Summary

4 trees (tag# 258, 259, 260 and 263) located on site to be removed and replaced. 2 trees (tag# 261 and 262) located in the lane ROW to be removed and replaced. 7 trees located on neighbouring property are to be protected. Replacement trees should be specified at 2:1 ratio as per the O.C.P.







### Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 8893 (RZ 12-600991) 6471 BLUNDELL 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 COACH HOUSES (RCH).

P.I.D. 003-491-226 East half Lot 2 Except: Part subdivided by Plan 43029, Section 18 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 13379

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 8893".

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

MAYOR

MAY 1 4 2012



CORPORATE OFFICER

١



То:	Planning Committee	Date:	April 11, 2012
From:	Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Acting General Manager of Development	File:	RZ 10-522194
Re:	Application by Khalid Hasan for Rezoning at Detached (RS1/E) to Compact Single Detache		lliams Road from Single

### Staff Recommendation

That Bylaw No. 8895, for the rezoning of 11340 Williams Road from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Compact Single Detached (RC2)", be introduced and given first reading.

Jackson)

Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Acting General Manager of Development

BJJ:el

Atl.		
	FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTME	ENT USE ONLY AGINO
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Affordable Housing	YMND	manpackion

### Staff Report

### Origin

Khalid Hasan has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 11340 Williams Road (Attachment 1) from Single Detached (RS1/E) to Compact Single Detached (RC2) in order to permit the property to be subdivided into two (2) single family lots with vehicle access from an existing rear lane (Attachment 2).

### Findings of Fact

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

### Surrounding Development

The subject property is located on the south side of Williams Road, between Shell Road and Seacote Road, in an established residential neighbourhood consisting of a mix of older single detached dwellings on larger lots and new single detached dwellings on compact lots.

### **Related Policies & Studies**

### Lot Size Policy 5434

The subject property is located within the Single-Family Lot Size Policy No. 5434 (adopted by Council February 19, 1990/amended October 16, 2006) (Attachment 4). This Policy permits development of compact lots (minimum 9 m or 29.5 ft. wide) along Williams Road, providing no direct accesses are created to the arterial roads. The current proposal would create two (2) lots; each approximately 10.06 m wide, with vehicle access from an existing rear lane, which is in conformance with the policy.

### Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy

The subject application is consistent with the City's Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy, which encourages compact single-family development with lane access along arterial roads.

### Affordable Housing

The Richmond Affordable Housing Strategy requires a suite on at least 50% of new lots, or a cash-in-lieu contribution of \$1.00 per square foot of total building area toward the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund for single-family rezoning applications.

The applicant is proposing to provide a legal secondary suite on at least one (1) of the two (2) future lots at the subject site. To ensure that the secondary suites are built to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the Strategy, the applicant is required to enter into a legal agreement registered on Title, stating that no final Building Permit inspection is to be granted until the secondary suites are constructed to the satisfaction of the City, in accordance with the BC Building Code and the City's Zoning Bylaw. This legal agreement is a condition of rezoning. This agreement will be discharged from Title on the one (1) lot where a secondary

suite is not required by the Affordable Housing Strategy after the requirements are satisfied, at the initiation of the applicant.

Should the applicants change their mind about the affordable housing option selected, a voluntary contribution to the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund in-lieu of providing the secondary suite will be accepted. In this case, the voluntary contribution would be required to be submitted prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, and would be based on \$1.00 per square foot of total building area of the single detached developments (i.e. \$4,353).

### Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

The applicant is required to comply with the Flood Plain Designation and Protection Bylaw (No. 8204). In accordance with the Flood Management Strategy, a Flood Indemnity Restrictive Covenant specifying the minimum flood construction level is required prior to rezoning bylaw adoption.

### Public Input

There have been no concerns expressed by the public about the development proposal in response to the placement of the rezoning sign on the property.

### Staff Comments

### Tree Preservation

A Tree Survey and a Certified Arborist's report were submitted in support of the application; six (6) trees were identified and assessed:

- two (2) bylaw-sized trees on the subject property;
- one (1) bylaw-sized tree on the adjacent property to the west (11320 Williams Road); and
- three (3) street trees on city's property along the site frontage.

The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator reviewed the Arborist's Report and concurs with the Arborist's recommendations to remove all bylaw-sized trees on the subject site:

- a 20 cm caliper Cherry tree on-site is recommended for removal due to its existing poor condition (as a result of previous topping); and
- a 28 cm caliper Cherry tree on-site is recommended for removal due to its existing poor condition (as a result of previous topping) and the conflict with new construction. Since this tree is located on the west property line, a written permission from the adjacent property owner to the west (at 11320 Williams Road) to remove the tree has been obtained.

Based on the 2:1 tree replacement ratio goal stated in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the size requirements for replacement tree in the Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057, four (4) replacement trees each at 6 cm calliper or 3.5 m in height are required.

In order to ensure that the proposed replacement trees will be planted and that the front yards of the future lots will be enhanced, a Landscape Plan, prepared by a registered landscape architect, and a landscaping security, based on 100% of the cost estimates provided by the landscape architect, must be submitted prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. The landscape plan

should comply with the guidelines of the Official Community Plan's Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy and include four (4) replacement trees (a mix of coniferous and deciduous). If replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site, cash-in-lieu (\$500/tree) for off-site planting would be required.

The applicant is also proposing to remove a bylaw-sized Babylon Willow tree located on the neighbouring property to the west (at 11320 Williams Road) due to its conflict with new construction. The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator agrees with the Arborist that this tree is in very poor condition (old topping wounds have formed large decay pockets that are prone to branch failure) and recommends removal. A consent letter from the property owners of 11320 Williams Road is on file. A separate Tree Cutting Permit is required prior to Building Permit issuance.

Three (3) street trees located on City property are all in good condition and should be retained. Since all three (3) trees are located in a concrete sidewalk, tree protection barriers are not required.

### Site Servicing and Vehicle Access

No Servicing concerns. Vehicular access to the site at future development stage is not permitted to or from Williams Road as per Bylaw No. 7222.

### Subdivision

At future subdivision stage, the developer will be required to pay Development Cost Charges (City and GVS&DD), School Site Acquisition Charge, Address Assignment Fee, Servicing costs and cash-in-lieu for future lane improvements.

### Analysis

The rezoning application complies with Lot Size Policy 5434 and the Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies. This is a single-family residential development on an arterial road where an existing municipal lane is fully operational. The future lots will have vehicle access to the laneway with no access being permitted onto Williams Road.

### Financial Impact or Economic Impact

None.

### Conclusion

This rezoning application to permit subdivision of an existing large lot into two (2) compact lots complies with all policies and land use designations and is consistent with the direction of redevelopment currently on-going in the surrounding area. On this basis, staff support the application.

Edwin Lee Planner 1

EL:rg

Attachment 1: Location Map Attachment 2: Proposed Subdivision Plan Attachment 3: Development Application Data Sheet Attachment 4: Lot Size Policy 5434 Attachment 5: Rezoning Considerations Concurrence



ATTACHMENT

ATTACHMENT I



PH - 267

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



ATTACHMENT 2



# Development Application Data Sheet Development Applications Division

RZ 10-522194	Attachment 3
Address: 11340 Williams Road	
Applicant: Khalid Hasan	
Planning Area(s): Shellmont	

	Existing	Proposed
Owner:	Urban Era Builders & Developers Limited.	No Change
Site Size (m <sup>2</sup> ):	674 m <sup>2</sup> (7,255 ft <sup>2</sup> )	Two (2) lots – each approximately $337 \text{ m}^2 (3,627.5 \text{ ft}^2)$
Land Uses:	One (1) single-family dwelling	Two (2) single-family dwellings
OCP Designation:	Generalized Land Use Map – Neighbourhood Residential	No change
Area Plan Designation:	N/A	No change
702 Policy Designation:	Lot Size Policy 5434 permits rezoning and subdivision to Compact Single Detached (RC2) or Coach Houses (RCH).	No change
Zoning:	Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)	Compact Single Detached (RC2)
Number of Units:	1	2
Other Designations:	Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies permit residential redevelopment along this arterial road due to the existing operational rear lane.	No change

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.60	0.60 Max.	none permitted
Lot Coverage – Building:	Max. 50%	50% Max.	none
Lot Coverage – Buildings, structures, and non-porous	Max. 70%	70% Max.	none
Lot Coverage – Landscaping	Min. 20%	20% Min.	none
Selback - Front Yard (m):	6 m Min.	6 m Min.	none
Setback - Rear Yard (m):	Min. 1.2 m	1.2 m Min.	
Setback – Side Yards (m):	Min. 1.2 m	1.2 m Mìn.	none

On FutureSubdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Height (m):	2.5 storeys	2.5 storeys	none
Lot Size (min. dimensions):	270 m <sup>2</sup>	337 m²	none
Lot Width	Min. 9 m	10.06 m	none

Other: Tree replacement compensation required for removal of Bylaw-sized trees.

.

-

	City of Richmond	Policy Manual
Page 1 of 2	Adopted by Council: February 19, 1990 Amended by Council: November 18, 1991 Amended by Council: October 16, 2006	POLICY 5434
File Ref:	SINGLE-FAMILY LOT SIZE POLICY IN QUAR	TER-SECTION 36-4-6
POLICY	5434:	
	owing policy establishes lot sizes in a portion of Section eston Highway, Shell Road, No. 5 Road, and William	
	<ol> <li>That properties within the area bounded by S Road, and Steveston Highway, in a portion of subdivide in accordance with the provisions of (R1/E), with the exception that:</li> </ol>	f Section 36-4-6, be permitted to
	<ul> <li>a) Properties fronting on Williams Road from properties fronting on Steveston Highway from and properties fronting on No. 5 Road from 135 m south of Seacliff Road to rezone and provisions of Single-Family Housing District (R/9) provided that vehicle accesses are to Multiple-family residential development shall</li> </ul>	om Seaward Gate to Shell Road, Williams Road to approximately subdivide in accordance with the (R1-0.6) or Coach House District the existing rear laneway only.
	b) Properties fronting on No. 5 Road from Stev 135 m south of Seacliff Road be permitted to	veston Highway to approximately
	provisions of Single-Family Housing Distr provided that vehicle accesses are to the exis	subdivide in accordance with the rict, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)





## **Rezoning Considerations**

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

### Address: 11340 Williams Road

File No.: RZ 10-522194

# Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8895, the developer is required to complete the following:

- 1. Submission of a Landscape Plan, prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, and deposit of a Landscaping Security based on 100% of the cost estimate provided by the Landscape Architect, including installation costs. The Landscape Plan should:
  - comply with the guidelines of the OCP's Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies and should not include hedges along the front property line;
  - include a mix of coniferous and deciduous trees;
  - include the dimensions of tree protection fencing as illustrated on the Tree Retention Plan attached to this report; and
  - include the four (4) required replacement trees with the following minimum sizes:

No. of Replacement Trees	Minlmum Caliper of Deciduous Tree	or	Minimum Height of Coniferous Tree
4	6 cm		3.5 m

If required replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site, a cash-in-lieu contribution in the amount of \$500/tree to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for off-site planting is required.

- 2. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
- 3. Registration of a legal agreement on Title to ensure that no final Building Permit inspection is granted until a secondary suite is constructed on one (1) 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.

Note: Should the applicant change their mind about the Affordable Housing option selected prior to final adoption of the Rezoning Bylaw, the City will accept a voluntary contribution of \$1.00 per buildable square foot of the single-family developments (i.e. \$4,353) to the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund in-lieu of registering the legal agreement on Title to secure a secondary suite.

### Prior to Approval of Subdivision, the developer is required to:

1. Pay Development Cost Charges (City & GVS&DD), School site acquisition charge, Address assignment fee, Servicing costs, and cash-in-lieu for future lane improvements.

#### 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.

[Signed original on file]

Signed

Date

PH - 273



### Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 8895 (RZ 10-522194) 11340 WILLIAMS 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 COMPACT SINGLE DETACHED (RC2).

P.I.D. 004-255-275 Lot 39 Section 36 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 25908

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 8895".

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

MAY 1 4 2012

CITY OF RICHMOND APPROVED ĥч APPROVED by Director or Solicito

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



Planning and Development Department

То:	Planning Committee	Date:	April 24, 2012
From:	Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development	File:	RZ 11-596457
Re:	Application by Avion Homes Ltd. for Rezonin Assembly (ASY) to Single Detached (RS2/E)	ig at 7431	Francis Road from

### Staff Recommendation

- 1. That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 8900, to redesignate 7431 Francis Road:
  - a. from "Community Institutional" to "Neighbourhood Residential" in Attachment 1 to Schedule 1 of Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100 (Generalized Land Use Map); and
  - b. from "Community Institutional" to "Low-Density Residential" in Attachment 2 to Schedule 1 of Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100 (Specific Land Use Map);
     be introduced and given first reading;
- 2. That Bylaw No. 8900, having been considered in conjunction with:
  - the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program; and
  - the Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;

is hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3)(a) of the Local Government Act;

- 3. That Bylaw No. 8900, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is hereby deemed not to require further consultation; and
- 4. That Bylaw No. 8901, for the rezoning of 7431 Francis Road from "Assembly (ASY)" to "Single Detached (RS2/E)", be introduced and given first reading.

Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development

EL:blg

.

,

FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY			
ROUTED TO: Affordable Housing Policy Planning		CONCURRENCE OF ACTING GENERAL MANAGER	

### Staff Report

### Origin

Avion Homes Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 7431 Francis Road (Attachment 1) from Assembly (ASY) to Single Detached (RS2/E) in order to construct a single-family dwelling.

### Findings of Fact

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

### Surrounding Development

The subject site contained a small house with parking area at the back of the site, and was used by a church group. The site is located within an established residential neighbourhood consisting predominantly of single-family dwellings. Other land uses also exist further east in the neighbourhood (i.e. townhouses, apartments).

- To the north: Existing single-family dwellings on lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/E);
- To the east: Existing single-family dwellings on lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/E) with rezoning and subdivision potential (to RS2/C) under Lot Size Policy 5449;
- To the south: Across Francis Road, single-family dwellings on lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/B) fronting Francis Road and single-family dwellings on lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/A) fronting Danyluk Court; and
- To the west: A vacant lot and an existing single-family dwelling on lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/E); and then newer single-family dwellings on lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/C).

### **Related Policies & Studies**

### Official Community Plan (OCP)

Both the Generalized Land Use Map and the Specific Land Use Map contained in the OCP designates 7431 Francis Road as *Community Institutional*. An OCP amendment is proposed for 7431 Francis Road in order to redesignate this site as *Neighbourhood Residential* in the Generalized Land Use Map and as *Low-Density Residential* in the Specific Land Use Map.

### Lot Size Policy 5449

The subject site is located within the area covered by Lot Size Policy 5449 (adopted by Council February 17, 1992) (Attachment 3). This Policy permits rezoning and subdivision of lots on the north side of Francis Road in accordance with Single Detached (RS2/C) (minimum 13.5 m wide and 360 m<sup>2</sup> in lot area).

This redevelopment proposal is seeking to rezone the subject site to another sub-category ("E" instead of "C") under the Single Detached (RS) zone in which a wider lot width (18.0 m) and **PH - 279** 

larger lot area  $(550 \text{ m}^2)$  are required. The subject application is being brought forward for consideration based on its own merits; a discussion is being provided under the "Analysis" section of this report.

### Affordable Housing

The Richmond Affordable Housing Strategy requires a secondary suite to be contained in the future dwelling on-site or a cash-in-lieu contribution of \$1.00 per square foot of total building area toward the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund for this single-family rezoning application.

The applicant is proposing to provide a legal secondary suite on the subject site. To ensure that the secondary suite is built to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the Strategy, the applicant is required to enter into a legal agreement registered on Title, stating that no final Building Permit inspection is to be granted until the secondary suite is constructed to the satisfaction of the City, in accordance with the BC Building Code and the City's Zoning Bylaw. This legal agreement is a condition of rezoning.

Should the applicants change their mind about the affordable housing option selected, a voluntary contribution to the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund in-lieu of providing the secondary suite will be accepted prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. In this case, the voluntary contribution would be based on \$1.00 per square foot of total building area of the single detached development (i.e. \$3,950).

### Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

The applicant is required to comply with the Flood Plain Designation and Protection Bylaw (No. 8204). In accordance with the Flood Management Strategy, a Flood Indemnity Restrictive Covenant specifying the minimum flood construction level is required prior to rezoning bylaw adoption.

### Consultation

### School District

This application was not referred to School District No. 38 (Richmond) because it does not have the potential to generate 50 or more school aged children. According to OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, which was adopted by Council and agreed to by the School District, residential developments which generate less than 50 school aged children do not need to be referred to the School District (e.g., typically around 295 multiple-family housing units). This application only involves one (1) single-family dwelling unit.

### Public Input

There have been no concerns expressed by the public about the development proposal in response to the placement of the rezoning sign on the property.

### Staff Comments

### Tree Retention and Replacement

A Tree Survey and a Certified Arborist's Report were submitted in support of the application. Four (4) bylaw-sized trees on site were identified and assessed:

- A 28 cm cal Douglas Fir tree and a 38 cm cal Douglas Fir tree at the back of the site are both in good condition and should be retained as per Arborist Report recommendations. Tree protection for the 28 cm cal Douglas Fir tree should be specified 4 m from the base of the tree, whereas tree protection for 38 cm cal Douglas Fir tree should be specified at 5 m out from the base of the tree.
- A multi-branched Cedar tree has been previously topped at 5 m; as a result, this tree is not a candidate for long-term retention and should be removed and replaced. This tree also falls within the proposed building envelope.
- A dead Douglas Fir tree located at the northwest corner of the site should be removed and replaced.

Based on the 2:1 tree replacement ratio goal stated in the Official Community Plan (OCP), four (4) replacement trees are required for the removal of two (2) bylaw-sized trees on site. Based on the size requirements for replacement trees in the Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057, replacement trees with the following minimum calliper sizes are required:

# Trees	Dbh	# trees to be	Min. calliper of		Min. height of
Removed		replaced	deciduous tree	or	coniferous tree
1 .	20-30 cm	2	6 cm		3.5 m
1	60 cm +	2	11 cm		6.0 m

In order to ensure that the proposed replacement trees will be planted and that the front yard of the lot will be enhanced, a Landscape Plan, prepared by a registered landscape architect, and a landscaping security, based on 100% of the cost estimates provided by the landscape architect, must be submitted prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. The landscape plan should comply with the guidelines of the Official Community Plan's Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy and include a landscape area in the front yard as well as four (4) replacement trees (a mix of coniferous and deciduous). If replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site, cash-in-lieu (\$500/tree) for off-site planting would be required.

### Site Servicing and Vehicle Access

No servicing concerns.

A Covenant is required to ensure that the driveway is designed and constructed to permit a vehicle to turn around on site, in order to avoid backing in or out of the property.

### Analysis

### OCP Amendments

On May 24, 2011, Council passed a resolution to consider redesignation of assembly lands from *Community Institutional* to other OCP designations based on the merits of the application, without the need to retain assembly uses. Staff are to ensure that the proposals are in compliance with other City's Policies and Strategies (i.e. Lot Size Policy, Affordable Housing, Flood Management, etc.), and that typical development elements (i.e., access, parking, layout, tree protection, etc.) are reviewed and evaluated.

The subject site is located within a predominantly single-family neighbourhood. While the site is larger than the typical single-family family lots in Richmond, it is considered small for assembly use. Church groups have considered redeveloping the site for assembly use but they have encountered serious challenges in site design. Significant reductions in building setbacks and parking spaces are required to facilitate any institutional development on this site.

Surrounded by existing large lot single-family developments, the proposed low-density residential land use is appropriate. Redesignation of the subject site to residential use would also contribute to the affordable housing stock in the City as the future home will contain a secondary suite.

### Single Detached (RS2/E)

While Lot Size Policy 5449 permits the subject site to be rezoned and subdivided as per Single Detached (RS2/C), the applicant is seeking to rezone the subject site to Single Detached (RS2/E), a sub-zone of Single Detached (RS) which requires a wider lot width, as well as a larger minimum lot area, than what is required under the RS2/C zone. Under both RS2/C and RS2/E zones, there is no subdivision potential for the subject site. The maximum density permitted under the two (2) sub-zones is also identical. The only differences between the RS2/C and RS2/E zones are the provisions related to *Lot Coverage of Landscaping with Live Plant Material* and the *Front Yard Setbacks*:

	Minimum	Minimum	Lot Coverage of Landscaping	Front Yard
	Lot Width	Lot Area	with Live Plant Material	Setback
RS2/C	13.5m	360m <sup>2</sup>	25%	9 m
RS2/E	18.0m	550m <sup>2</sup>	30%	6 m

The applicant proposes a 6 m front yard setback to accommodate a three (3) car garage at the front and a larger private yard at the back. An auto court is proposed at the front of the property to provide on-site turn around capability. A landscape area within the entire 6 m front yard setback (except for the driveway connecting Francis Road to the auto court on-site) will also be provided to enhance the front yard and streetscape.

The provision of a 9 m front yard setback in the RS2/C zone, where the driveway access is on an arterial road, is to ensure there is adequate space to accommodate a driveway with turn around capability. Staff have no concerns with the proposed RS2/E zone since the applicant has agreed to register a restrictive convent to ensure that the driveway will be designed and constructed to permit a vehicle to turn around on site, in order to avoid backing in or out of the property. The **PH - 282** 

proposed RS2/E zone with a 6 m front yard setback is consistent with the zoning and existing adjacent single-family developments on the adjacent property to the east and west.

### Financial Impact or Economic Impact

None.

### Conclusion

The proposed development to construct a single-family dwelling with a secondary suite contributes to the affordable housing stock in the City. While the proposal is not in compliance with Lot Size Policy 5449, the proposed RS2/E zone is consistent with the existing zoning of the surrounding properties and would allow a more coherent streetscape to be developed along Francis Road. All technical concerns related to the land use rezoning application and OCP amendment have been addressed. On this basis, staff support the rezoning application and associated OCP amendment as proposed.

Edwin Lee Planner 1 (604-276-4121)

EL:blg

Attachment 1: Location Map Attachment 2: Development Application Data Sheet Attachment 3: Lot Size Policy 5449 Attachment 4: Rezoning Considerations Concurrence



### ATTACHMENT 1





Note: Dimensions are in METRES

RZ 11-596457



## **Development Application Data Sheet**

**Development Applications Division** 

Attachment 2

RZ 11-596	157
NZ 11-330	

Address: 7431 Francis Road

Applicant: <u>Avion Homes Ltd.</u>

Planning Area(s): \_\_\_\_\_Blundell\_\_\_

	Existing	Proposed
Owner:	Avion Homes Ltd.	No Change
Site Size (m <sup>2</sup> ):	836 m² (8,999 ft²)	No Change
Land Uses:	Assembly	One (1) siлgle-family dwelling
OCP Designation:	Generalized/Specific Land Use Map: Community Institutional	Generalized Land Use Map: Neighbourhood Residential Specific Land Use Map: Low-Density Residential
Area Plan Designation:	N/A	No change
702 Policy Designation;	Policy 5449 permits subdivision to "Single Detached (RS2/C)"	No change
Zoning:	Assembly (ASY)	Single Detached (RS2/E)
Number of Units:	1	1
Other Designations:	N/A	No Change

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.55	Max. 0.55	none permitted
Lot Coverage – Building:	Max. 45%	Max. 45%	none
Lot Coverage – Non-porous:	Max. 70%	Max. 70%	none
Lot Coverage – Landscaping:	Min. 30%	Min, 30%	none
Setback – Front & Rear Yards (m):	Min. 6 m	Min. 6 m	none
Setback –Side Yard (m):	Min. 1.8 m	Min. 1.8 m	none
Height (m):	Max. 2 ½ storeys	Max. 2 ½ storeys	none
Lot Size (min. dimensions):	550 m²	836 m²	none

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

See The second second second second second second



## **City of Richmond**

## **Policy Manual**

File Ref: 4045-00       SINGLE_FAMILY LOT SIZE POLICY IN QUARTER-SECTION 20-4-6         POLICY 5449:       The following policy establishes lot sizes in the area bounded by the north side of Fra Road located between Gilbert Road and Foster Road (Section 20-4-6):	
The following policy establishes lot sizes in the area bounded by the north side of Fra	
Road Tocated between onbert Road and Poster Road (Section 20-4-0).	ncis
<ol> <li>That properties be permitted to subdivide in accordance with the provisions of Sir Family Housing District (R1/C) along Francis Road and as per Single-Family Hou District (R1/B) along Schaefer Gate in Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300; and</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>This policy (as shown on the accompanying plan) is to be used in determining disposition of future single-family rezoning applications in this area, for a period of less than five years, unless changed by the amending procedures contained in Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300.</li> </ol>	f not
•	



ATTACHMENT 4



## **Rezoning Considerations**

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

### Address: 7431 Francis Road

File No.: RZ 11-596457

# Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8901, the developer is required to complete the following:

- 1. Final Adoption of OCP Amendment Bylaw 8900.
- 2. Submission of a Landscape Plan, prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, and deposit of a Landscaping Security based on 100% of the cost estimate provided by the Landscape Architect, including installation costs. The Landscape Plan should:
  - comply with the guidelines of the OCP's Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies and should not include hedges along the front property line;
  - include a landscape area in the 6 m front yard setback (except for the 5 m wide driveway).
  - include a mix of coniferous and deciduous trees;
  - include the dimensions of tree protection fencing as illustrated on the Tree Retention Plan attached to this report; and
  - include the four (4) required replacement trees with the following minimum sizes:

No. of Replacement Trees	Minimum Caliper of Deciduous Tree	or	Minimum Height of Coniferous Tree
2	6 cm	]	3.5 m
2	11 cm	]	6.0 m

If required replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site, a cash-in-lieu contribution in the amount of \$500/tree to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for off-site planting is required.

- 3. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on Title.
- 4. Registration of a legal agreement on title ensuring that the driveway is designed and constructed to permit a vehicle to turn around on site. The legal agreement shall include language to ensure the driveway and/or auto court design will accommodate a typical passenger car to turn around on-site using a maximum of a 3-point turn, in order to avoid backing in or out of the property.
- 5. Registration of a legal agreement on Title to ensure that no final Building Permit inspection is granted until a secondary suite is constructed on site, to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the BC Building Code and the City's Zoning Byław.

**Note:** Should the applicant change their mind about the Affordable Housing option selected prior to final adoption of the Rezoning Bylaw, the City will accept a voluntary contribution of \$1.00 per buildable square foot of the single-family developments (i.e. \$3,950.00) to the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund in-lieu of registering the legal agreement on Title to secure a secondary suite.

Note:

• 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.

[Signed original on file]

Signed

## Bylaw 8900



### Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 Amendment Bylaw 8900 (RZ 11-596457) 7431 Francis Road

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

- 1. Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 is amended by
  - a. Repealing the existing land use designation in Attachment 1 to Schedule 1 thereof of the following area and by designating it "Neighbourhood Residential".

P.I.D. 004-081-897 Lot 55 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 44033, Section 20 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 26105

b. Repealing the existing land use designation in Attachment 2 to Schedule 1 thereof of the following area and by designating it "Low-Density Residential".

P.I.D. 004-081-897

Lot 55 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 44033, Section 20 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 26105

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 8900".

FIRST READING	MAY 2 8 2012	CITY OF RICHMOND
PUBLIC HEARING		APPROVED
SECOND READING		APPROVED by Manager
THIRD READING		or Soficitor
ADOPTED		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

MAYOR

### CORPORATE OFFICER
# Bylaw 8901



# Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 8901 (RZ 11-596457) 7431 FRANCIS 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/E).

P.I.D. 004-081-897 Lot 55 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 44033, Section 20 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 26105

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 8901".

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

MAYOR

CITY OF RICHMOND APPROVED by H B APPROVED by Director or Solicitor

MAY 2 8 2012

CORPORATE OFFICER

To Public Hearing Date: June 18, 2012

nus

8900 + 8901

Item

Re:

# MayorandCouncillors

From: City of Richmond Website (webgraphics@richmond.ca)

Sent: June 12, 2012 10:58 AM

To: MayorandCouncillors

Subject: Send a Submission Online (response #685)

# Send a Submission Online (response #685)

# Survey Information

Site:	City Website
Page Title:	Send a Submission Online
URL:	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx
Submission Time/Date:	6/12/2012 11:01:15 AM

# Survey Response

Your Name:	Roy Budai
Your Address:	7451 Francis Road
Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number:	7431 Francis Road
Comments:	Re: Hearing for rezoning 7431 Francis Road to be held June 18, 2012. I am in favor of rezoning subject property to RS2E designation. Please ensure proper perimiter drainage is installed with any new construction. At present the back yard of 7451 Francis becomes flooded due to drainage from paved parking lot at 7431 Francis. Please ensure that noise, dust and congestion is kept to minimum during any new construction. Thank You, Roy & Machiko Budai





Planning and Development Department

Re:	Application by Timothy Tse for Rezoning at 7840 Bennett Road from Sing Detached (RS1/E) to Infill Residential (RI2)			
From:	Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development	File:	RZ 09-496145	
То:	Planning Committee	Date:	April 27, 2012	

#### Staff Recommendation

That Bylaw No. 8902, for the rezoning of 7840 Bennett Road from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Infill Residential (RI2)", be introduced and given first reading.

Alson

Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development

EL:rg Att.

FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY NOTING		
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Affordable Housing	YOND	fainfacturen

# Staff Report

# Origin

Timothy Tse has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 7840 Bennett Road (Attachment 1) from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Infill Residential (RI2)" in order to create two (2) new lots and develop two (2) front-to-back duplexes with vehicular access from the rear lane (Attachment 2). A Development Permit application is required and has been received to address the form and character of the proposed duplexes.

# Findings of Fact

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

# Surrounding Development

- To the North: Across Bennett Road, single-family dwellings on lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/E);
- To the East/West: Front-to-back duplexes with vehicle access from the rear lane on lots zoned Infill Residential (RII); and
- To the South: A mix of compact single-family dwellings and front-to-back duplexes on lots zoned Single Detached (RS1/A) and Infill Residential (RII), fronting Acheson Road with vehicle access from the rear laneway.

# **Related Policies & Studies**

# Official Community Plan - Acheson Bennett Sub-Area Plan

The subject site is in the Acheson Bennett Sub-Area Plan (Schedule 2.10B) of the Official Community Plan (OCP). This area is designated as "Residential (Mixed Single-Family and Small Scale Multi-Family)"(Attachment 4). The proposal for two (2) front-to-back duplexes fits well within the established development pattern within the Sub-Area.

# Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

The applicant is required to comply with the Flood Plain Designation and Protection Bylaw (No. 8204). The site is located within an area where the minimum habitable elevation is 2.9 m geodetic; however, there are provisions to permit habitable space, provided it is located a minimum of 0.3 m above the highest level of the crown of any road that is adjacent to the parcel.

# Affordable Housing Strategy

The applicant proposes to make a cash contribution to the affordable housing reserve fund in accordance to the City's Affordable Housing Strategy. For Infill Residential (RI2) townhouse developments, the Richmond Zoning Bylaw (Section 5.15) specifies a voluntary cash contribution of \$2.00 per buildable square foot directed to the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund to achieve an increase in density from 0.4 to 0.55 FAR. A cash contribution of \$8,504 towards the City's Affordable Housing Reserve will be made. PH - 294

# Public Input

The applicant has forwarded confirmation that a development sign has been posted on the site. Staff received an enquiry from the property owner of 7800 Bennett Road, Mr. Bodnar, regarding frontage and lane improvements. Staff have provided the relevant information by email.

Mr. Bodnar has also expressed his concerns related to parking on the block. Based on comments from Engineering Works and Transportation, vehicle access is to be from the back lane only. The existing driveway on Bennett Road will be removed as part of the proposed development, providing additional street parking on Bennett Road. Three (3) parking stalls will be provided on each lot, which complies with the zoning requirement.

Staff have not received any telephone calls or written correspondence in opposition to the subject application.

# Staff Comments

# Tree Retention and Replacement

A Tree Survey and a Certified Arborist's report were submitted by the applicant in support of the application. Four (4) bylaw-sized trees are located on site and all of them are identified as "moderate" to "good" condition. However, they are all located well within the allowable building envelope such that successful retention cannot be achieved.

Four (4) bylaw-sized trees are located within the lane dedication area. The Scotch Pine has been previously topped and exhibits an asymmetrical crown due to excessive pruning. Two (2) Norway Maple are in very poor condition due to excessive branch die-back and branch removal. One (1) Norway Maple tree is in good condition but would not survive the required lane extension and service upgrades through the lane dedication area. All of these four (4) trees are proposed for removal.

Based on the 2:1 tree replacement ratio goal stated in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the size requirements for replacement trees in the Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057, 16 replacement trees are required. The developer is proposing to plant eight (8) new trees on-site (Attachment 2) and to provide a voluntary contribution of \$4,000 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund in-lieu of planting the remaining eight (8) replacement trees.

The applicant has also agreed to protect a 15 cm caliper Honey Locust tree located on the adjacent property to the west at 7800/7808 Bennett Road. A Tree Retention Plan is attached (Attachment 5). Tree protection fencing must be installed to City standards prior to demolition of the existing dwelling on the subject site, and must remain in place until construction and landscaping on the future lots is completed. As a condition to rezoning, the applicant is required to submit a proof of contract with a Certified Arborist to monitor all works to be done near or within the tree protection zone.

# Site Servicing

An independent review of servicing requirements (sanitary and storm) has been conducted by the applicant's engineering consultant and reviewed by the City's Engineering Department. The Capacity Analysis concludes that storm upgrades to the existing system are required to support the proposed development. Prior to approval of Subdivision, the developer is required to enter into a standard Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of the storm upgrades as identified in the capacity analysis (see Attachment 6 for details).

# Frontage and Lane Improvements

Prior to final adoption, the developer is required to dedicate a strip of property along the entire south property line for proposed lane extension (6.0 m wide at the west property line, tapering to 4.5 m wide at the east property line of the site).

As part of the Servicing Agreement for the servicing upgrades, the design and construction of frontage and lane improvements are also required (see Attachment 6 for details).

# Vehicle Access

No direct access is permitted to Bennett Street. As a condition to rezoning, a restrictive covenant is required to ensure that vehicular access to the future lots will be from the proposed lane extension only.

### **Subdivision**

At future Subdivision stage, the developer will be required to pay DCC's (City & GVS&DD), School Site Acquisition Charge, and Address Assignment Fee. Servicing connections are to be determined at Servicing Agreement stage.

### Indoor/Outdoor Amenity

No common shared Indoor/Outdoor Amenity Space is required for this development, but each unit will have access to private outdoor space.

# Analysis

3496755

The proposal to develop two (2) front-to-back duplexes (4 units total) is consistent with the objectives of the OCP-City Centre Acheson Bennett Sub-Area Plan in terms of land use, character, and density. The form of development is similar to other duplexes previously approved on the south side of Bennett Road and north side of Acheson Road. The proposed site layout provides for an attractive pedestrian-oriented streetscape along Bennett Road, which is consistent with the guidelines for the Acheson Bennett Sub-Area.

# Accessibility/Aging In Place

The applicant has proposed units that include substantial living areas at the ground floor. Accessible features will be provided to all units (e.g., inclusion of blocking to bathrooms for installation of grab-bars, and provision of lever door handles.) In addition, the rear units of each duplex will be convertible and have the base level of accessible features described above, and also, widened doors, stairs and corridors throughout, and blocking/ electrical installed for a future stair lift. Accessible features will be fully detailed on Development Permit and Building Permit Drawings.

The Development Permit application will provide more information and detail regarding the form and character of the proposal in addition to the landscaping and design of the private outdoor amenity area of each unit.

# Requested Variances

The proposed development is generally in compliance with the Infill Residential (RJ2) Zone except for a small projection beyond the vertical lot depth envelope. A variance will be required at the Development Permit stage to accommodate a gable ridge projection to maintain the desired form and character encouraged by the Sub-Area Plan.

# Design Review and Future Development Permit Considerations

The rezoning conditions will not be considered satisfied until a Development Permit application is processed to a satisfactory level. In association with the Development Permit, the following issues are to be further examined:

- Building form and architectural character;
- Unit entry design with respect to CPTED principles;
- Location and design of the convertible unit and other accessibility features;
- Landscaping design and enhancement of the private outdoor area to maximize use; and
- Opportunities to maximize permeable surface areas and articulate hard surface treatment.

# Financial Impact or Economic Impact

None.

# Conclusion

The proposal to develop two (2) front-to-back duplexes (4 units total) is consistent with the objectives of the City Centre Acheson Bennett Sub-Area Plan in terms of land use, character, and density. Overall, the project is attractive and a good fit with the neighbourhood. Further review of the project design will be required to ensure a high quality project, and will be completed as part of the future Development Permit process. On this basis, staff recommend that the proposed rezoning be approved.

Edwin Lee Planner 1 (604-276-4121)

EL:rg

Attachment 1: Location Map

Attachment 2: Conceptual Development Plans

Attachment 3: Development Application Data Sheet

Attachment 4: Acheson Bennett Sub-Area Plan

Attachment 5: Tree Retention Plan

Attachment 6: Rezoning Considerations Concurrence



ATTACHMENT 1





# ATTACHMENT 2











CADLAB

anathoritan zan may na kati at 122-018025



×D



PLAN #8 - SECOND FLOOR PLAN

Contract and a contract of a c



HALF STADSONAL Ma power alle Kenn Nel alla Grad Dann Vel acett

ł



# **Development Application Data Sheet**

**Development Applications Division** 

Attachment 3

Address: 7840 Bennett Road

Applicant: Timothy Tse

Planning Area(s): <u>City Centre - Acheson Bennett (Schedule 2.10B)</u>

	Existing	Proposed
Owner:	0866631 BC Ltd.	To be determined
Site Size (m <sup>2</sup> ):	824 m <sup>2</sup>	355 m <sup>2</sup> to 363 m <sup>2</sup>
Land Uses:	One (1) single-family residential dwelling	Two (2) duplexes
OCP Designation:	Generalized Land Use Map – Neighbourhood Residential	No change
Area Plan Designation:	Residential (Mixed Single-Family and Small Scale Mulli-Family)	No change
702 Policy Designation:	N/A	No change
Zoning:	Single Detached (RS1/E)	Infill Residential (RI2)
Number of Units:	One (1)	Four (4)
Other Designations:	N/A	No change

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.55	0.55 Max.	none permitted
Lot Coverage – Building:	Max. 45%	45% Max.	none
Lot Coverage – Buildings, structures, and non-porous	Max. 70%	70% Max.	none
Lot Coverage – Landscaping	Min. 30%	30% Min.	none
Setback – Front Yards (m):	Min. 4.5 m	4.5 m Mín.	none
Setback - Side Yards (m):	Min, 1.2 m	1.2 m Min.	none
Setback – Rear Yards (m):	Min. 1.2 m	1.2 m Min.	none
Height (m):	Max. 9.0 m, but not exceed the residential vertical lot width and the residential vertical lot depth envelope	9.0 m Max.	Variance Requested – projection beyond residential vertical lot depth envelope
Lot Size (min./max.):	312 m²/1,560 m²	355 m <sup>2</sup> to 363 m <sup>2</sup>	none

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
On-Site Parking (Residential):	1 stall per unit or 0.5 stalls per bedroom, whichever is greater	(0.5 stall per bedroom x 3 bedrooms) x 2 units = 3 stalls per lot	none
On-Site Parking (Visitor):	0.2 stalls per unit on lots containing 4 or more units	0	none

Other: \_\_\_\_\_Tree replacement compensation required for loss of significant trees.

.







# **Rezoning Considerations**

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

# Address: 7840 Bennett Road

File No.: RZ 09-496145

# Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8902, the developer is required to complete the following:

- 1. A lane dedication along the entire south property line (6.0 m wide at the west property line, tapering to 4.5 m wide at the east property line of the site).
- 2. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$4,000.00 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of eight (8) replacement trees within the City.
- 3. Submission of a Contract entered into between the applicant and a Certified Arborist for supervision of any on-site works conducted within the tree protection zone of the trees to be retained on the neighbouring property to the west (at 7800/7808 Bennett Road). The Contract should include the scope of work to be undertaken, including: the proposed number of site monitoring inspections, and a provision for the Arborist to submit a post-construction assessment report to the City for review.
- 4. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
- 5. Registration of a legal agreement on title ensuring that the only means of vehicle access is to the proposed back lane and that there be no access to Bennett Road.
- 6. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$2.00 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$8,504.00) to the City's affordable housing fund.
- 7. The submission and processing of a Development Permit\* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.

# Prior to a Subdivision Approval, the developer must complete the following requirements:

- 1. Enter into a Servicing Agreement\* for the design and construction of Frontage Improvements and Lane Extension. Works include, but may not be limited to:
  - a) Frontage improvements Storm Sewer, curb & gutter, pavement widening, 1.5m concrete sidewalk, grass & treed boulevard (to match existing to the west). Note: Design to include Water, Storm & Sanitary service connections for both lots; and
  - b) Lane Extension Lane drainage, roll over curb and gutter, asphalt paving complete with sand/gravel base, and lane lighting.
- 2. Pay Development Cost Charges (City & GVS&DD), School site acquisition charge, and Address assignment fee.
- 3. Provide underground Hydro, Tel. & Cable to both lots. (Note: Existing underground Hydro, Tel. & Cable are capped off at the west property line of the site).

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

- Submission of a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to the Transportation Division. Management
  Plan shall include location for parking for services, deliveries, workers, loading, application for any lane closures, and
  proper construction traffic controls as per Traffic Control Manual for works on Roadways (by Ministry of
  Transportation) and MMCD Traffic Regulation Section 01570.
- 2. Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
- 3. 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.

#### 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.

[Signed original on file]

Signed

Date

# Bylaw 8902

CITY OF RICHMOND

APPROVED by

APPROVED by Director or Solicitor



# Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 8902 (RZ 09-496145) 7840 BENNETT 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 **INFILL RESIDENTIAL (RI2)**.

P.I.D. 003-666-590 Lot 29 Section 17 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 14504

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 8902".

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER

MAY 2 8 2012

3521255

Send a Submission Online (response #688)

To Public Hearing Date: June 18, 2012

لمدہ

1902

# MayorandCouncillors

From:	City of Richmond Website [webgraphics@richmond.ca]	Re: bran
FIOIII.		He: Byan
Sent:	June 13, 2012 9:19 PM	alaste anno 1997.
То:	MayorandCouncillors	in the second
Subject:	Send a Submission Online (response #688)	
Categories:	12-8060-20-8902 - 7840 Bennett Rd (RZ 09-496145), 08-4105-20	-2009496145

# Send a Submission Online (response #688)

# Survey Information

Site:	City Website
Page Title:	Send a Submission Online
URL:	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx
Submission Time/Date:	6/13/2012 9:21:54 PM

# Survey Response

Your Name:	Wen Jun Mo
Your Address:	7808 Bennett RD
Subject Property Address OR Bylaw Number:	8902 (RX 09-496145)
Comments:	I do not agree the construction. Recently, it has been very difficult to find a parking space along the road in our area for visit parking. As a result, turning one house into four duplexes will make the situation worse as more people will be strolling around working for spaces. What is more is that in order for the house to be reconstructed into four duplexes, some trees will need to be cut down. It will bring the negative affect to our environment.

RICHM DATE JUN 1 4 2012



# **Report to Committee**

Planning and Development Department

To:	Planning Committee	Date:	May 9, 2012
From:	Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development	File:	08-4040-01/2012- Vol 01
Re:	Telecommunication Antennas: Amendments to Zoning Bylaw 8500 and Development Application Fees Bylaw 7984		

### Staff Recommendation

- 1. That the proposed "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 8904," concerning maximum beights for telecommunications antennas, be introduced and given first reading; and
- 2. That the proposed "Development Applications Fees Bylaw 7984, Amendment Bylaw 8905," concerning fees for Telecommunications Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol applications, be introduced and given first, second and third readings.

ria Jackson

Brian<sup>4</sup>. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development

MM:blg

FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY						
			CONCURRENCE OF ACTI GENERAL MANAGER			
REVIEWED BY TAG	YES	NO	REVIEWED BY CAO	YES	NO	

### Staff Report

#### Origin

On February 13, 2012, Council passed the following resolution in regards to the *Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol:* 

That:

- (1) The proposed Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol be adopted as a Council Policy to guide the City's review of telecommunication antenna proposals and to facilitate commenting to telecommunication antenna proponents and Industry Canada under the Federal Radiocommunication Act as set out in the staff report entitled "Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol" dated January 18, 2012;
- (2) Staff be directed to prepare the proposed amendments to Zoning Bylaw 8500 as set out in the above staff report for future consideration by Council; and
- (3) Staff be directed to prepare an amendment to Development Application Fee Bylaw 7984 to include an application fee to cover the cost of processing applications under the proposed Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol as set out in the above staff report for future consideration by Council.

Item 1 adopted the *Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol* (Protocol) as City Policy 5045. The purpose of this Report is to address Items 2 and 3 of the above resolution.

### **Findings of Fact**

Richmond's *Zoning Bylaw 8500* allows for "telecommunications antennas" in all zones as local governments are not empowered to prohibit telecommunication installations that are permitted and regulated under Federal jurisdictional powers. However, Section 5.13.7 of Bylaw 8500 does limit the height of "telecommunication antennas" to that of the maximum height for accessory structures and setbacks in each given zone.

The Zoning Bylaw's Agricultural and Industrial zones set a 20 m (66 ft.) maximum height for non-residential accessory structures. The Residential, Mixed-Use, Commercial and Institutional zones have a range of 9.0 m (33 ft.) to 12 m (39 ft.) for maximum heights for accessory structures with the exception of the Entertainment and Athletics (CEA) and School & Institutional Use (SI) zones that have no maximum heights for accessory structures. The Zoning Bylaw's Site Specific zones also set various maximum heights for accessory structures.

#### Analysis

### Proposed Zoning Bylaw Changes

Following the above-noted February 13, 2012 Council referral, *Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 8904* is proposed to amend the maximum height provisions within the Zoning Bylaw in two ways:

*Freestanding Antennas and Towers:* Following the Council referral, a maximum height for freestanding telecommunication antennas and towers is set at 15 m (48 ft.) <u>or</u> the current maximum height for an accessory structure in a zone, whichever is greater. This is consistent with the 15 m (48 ft.) Industry Canada consultation exemptions for freestanding towers that are contained within the adopted City Protocol. This would allow for applicants to build small towers up to 15 m (48 ft.) throughout the City without Development Variance Permits (DVPs). Currently, some zones would require a DVP and other similar zones would not require a DVP for such antennas and towers up to 15 m (48 ft.).

Building-Mounted Antennas: An allowance for building-mounted antennas to extend 3.0 m (9.8 ft.) above the maximum building height for a zone is also being proposed. This would apply when the roof on which the antenna is attached at or within 3.0 m (9.8 ft.) of the current maximum permitted building height. This is consistent with the adopted City Protocol consultation exemption for antennas extending 3.0 m (9.8 ft.) above a building rooftop. Thus, it would allow for some small antennas to be located on buildings without DVPs being required. This provision is also provided on the basis that it does not contravene Transport Canada's YVR maximum height zoning.

It should be noted that existing legally-installed antennas and towers that exceed the above-noted proposed height provisions would be considered as legal non-conforming (grandfathered) under the Zoning Bylaw.

#### **Proposed Application Fee**

An application fee of \$2,040 for processing applications under the Protocol is proposed under *Development Application Fee Bylaw 7984, Amendment Bylaw 8905.* This fee is the same as the City's \$2,040 fee set for Temporary Use Permit (TUP) applications, but more than the \$1,530 DVP application fee. A higher fee is chosen given the level of review and public consultation requirements of the adopted City Protocol would often be closer to those undertaken for a TUP. It should be noted that the expanded Protocol consultation area (6 times tower height) for taller towers would usually involve a greater City cost than the 50 m (164 ft.) consultation radius required for DVP notification areas.

# **Financial Impact**

While some telecommunication antenna proposals reviewed by City staff and Council may involve DVPs with their own application fees, the amendment to the *Development Application Fee Bylaw 7984* would also allow for the City to recoup the additional cost of processing Protocol applications where there is no DVP application.

Opportunities for revenue and amenities resulting from telecommunication installations in public places will be part of a negotiation process consistent with existing Municipal Access Agreements and subject to Council approval.

### Conclusion

Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8904 includes a maximum height for freestanding towers and antennas of 15 m (48 ft.) or the maximum accessory structure height in a given zone, whichever is greater. Also, it is proposed that building-mounted telecommunication antennas may be allowed to extend 3.0 m (9.8 ft.) above the maximum building height permitted in the zone.

Development Application Fee Bylaw 8905 sets an application fee of \$2,040 for antennas and towers being considered under the adopted City Protocol which is in-line with other City development application fees.

In summary, these proposed amendments address the February 13, 2012 Council referral to fully implement the adopted Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol.

Man Mer All

Mark McMullen, Senior Coordinator - Major Projects (604-276-4173)

MM:blg

Terry Crowe, MCIP Manager, Policy Planning (604-276-4139)



# Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 8904 (Telecommunications Antenna Heights)

The Council of the City of Richmond enacts amendments to "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500", as follows:

- 1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended:
  - a) by deleting section 5.13.7 and replacing it with the following text:
    - "5.13.7 Wind turbines shall be allowed in all zones subject to:
      - a) the maximum height for accessory structures in that zone;
      - b) the accessory structure and/or principal building yards and setbacks in that zone;
      - c) landscaping or other specific provisions in the zone; and
      - d) appropriate safety and noise attenuation measures.
    - 5.13.8. Telecommunications antennas shall be allowed in all zones subject to:
      - a) freestanding towers or antennas not exceeding the specified maximum height for accessory structures in that zone or 15.0 m, whichever is greater;
      - b) building-mounted antennas may extend not more than 3.0 m above the maximum building height for that zone provided that the roof of the building is at or within 3.0 m of the maximum building height for that zone;
      - c) all antennas and towers meeting the accessory structure and/or principal building yards and setbacks in that zone;
      - d) landscaping or other specific provisions in the zone; and
      - e) compliance with any covenants or caveats registered on the title of the land which could restrict the installation of telecommunications antennas, including airport maximum height covenants (Property owners and tenants are advised to check their current certificate of title for any covenants or caveats which may be registered and affect the use of the site.)."

This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 8904".

FIRST READING

PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

ι

.

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

ADOPTED

MAYOR

MAY 2 8 2012	CITY OF RICHMOND
	APPROVED by
·	APPROVED by Director
	- ar Solickor

# CORPORATE OFFICER



# Development Application Fees Bylaw No. 7984, Amendment Bylaw No. 8905

The Council of the City of Richmond enacts amendments to "Development Application Fees Bylaw No. 7984", as follows:

- 1. By renumbering subsection 1.15 as subsection 1.16.
- 2. By inserting the following new subsection after subsection 1.14:
  - "1.15 Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol Fees

1.5.1 Every applicant under the Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol must pay an application fee of \$2,040."

3. By inserting the following new definition within section 2.1 immediately following the definition of **Public Hearing**:

"Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol" means the current policy adopted by City Council that identifies the City process for managing consultation and providing siting guidelines for telecommunications antenna proposals under a protocol pursuant to the Federal *Radiocommunications Act*.

This Bylaw is cited as "Development Application Fees Bylaw No. 7984, Amendment Bylaw No. 8905".

FIRST READING	MAY 2 8 2012	CITY OF RICHMOND
SECOND READING	MAY 2 8 2012	ARGIVED
THIRD READING	MAY 2 8 2012	APPROVED by Diroctor
ADOPTED		argonicitor

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER

Mayoranc	lCouncillors	To Public Hearing Date: June 18: 10(2)
From:	Jerry Flynn [jerryjgf@shaw.ca]	Item # 11
Sent:	May 27, 2012 10:55 PM	Re: Bylaw 8904
To:	MayorandCouncillors	A Print State of the State of t
Subject:	Cell Phone Towers	

Categories: 10-6600-07-07-01 - Telecommunication - General, 01-0150-20-BCHY1 - BC Hydro - Includes Smart Meters

Attachments: Smart Meters - Hydro Says vs FACT.docx

Even though the attached deals with Smart Meters, the message is the same, i.e., "industry" is lying to you, taking advantage of your (our) ignorance on such an esoteric subject. Lookat what independent scientists say in the "BioInitiative Report": they say NO to any antennas on the roofs of schools, hospitals, homes for seniors or the ill, etc.

Industry will tell you anything if they think it will get you to allow them to erect their towers where they want. Please show some leadership. Have them (industry) prove that their towers are safe - - - because they can't. May you do the 'right' thing.

Sincerely,

Jerry Flynn



<u>Hydro Says</u>: "Smart Meters are safe, as confirmed by health and science authorities including B.C.'s Provincial Health Officer."

<u>FACT</u>: The World Health Organization classifies EMR (electromagnetic radiation) a Class 2B carcinogen, meaning "Possibly cancer causing." (applies to all wireless radio and microwave frequency-emitting devices.)

FACT: Dr. Annie Sasco MD, MPH, MS, Dr. Ph. D (Harvard U.) epidemiology for cancer prevention; previous Head of IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer, an agency of the World Health Organization: WHO) programs on cancer prevention (<u>www.youtube.com</u>) "Exceedingly urgent that valid, independent, publicly-funded research be done into EMR re cell phone use. Despite the voices of industry-funded scientists saying otherwise there is concrete evidence that mobiles/cell phones and wi-fi cause cancer in humans."

FACT: The American Academy of Environmental Medicine asks (in part) for:

- a) An immediate caution on Smart Meter installation due to potentially harmful RF exposure;
- b) Accommodation for health considerations regarding EMF and RF exposure, including exposure to wireless Smart Meter technology;
- c) Independent studies to further understand the health effects from EMF and RF exposure. http://aaemonline.org/emf\_rf\_position.html

**FACT**: Independent scientists are urging governments everywhere to immediately observe the "precautionary principle" i.e., set exposure guidelines 1000 to 10,000 times lower than they are now: put the onus on industry to prove their products are safe; and prevent cell phone towers from being installed on roofs of schools, hospitals, homes for the elderly, etc.

<u>FACT</u>: Safety Code 6 was based on <u>industry-funded</u> studies, which consider only the <u>thermal</u> effects of EMR, while ignoring the low-intensity, long-term <u>non-thermal</u> biological effects which independent scientists say are harmful to - not just humans - but to all life forms. These scientists say Canada's Safety Code 6 is obsolete, outdated and urgently in need of revision to reflect the non-thermal effects. Until that happens, our "guidelines" are among the lowest in the world.

**FACT**: EMR is accumulative (additive) from all such devices a person is exposed to. Damaged DNA is never repaired and can be passed on to subsequent generations.

<u>FACT</u>: Scientists say that the world is witnessing the largest technological experiment in human history - without the consent or knowledge of the subjects.

**FACT**: Now that they've had 30 years to study EMR, Scientists say they know that the latency period for cancers to develop is 10 years or more.

FACT: Scientists say brain cancers increased 50% from 1999 to 2009

FACT: Scientists say pregnant women have a 1-in-50 chance of giving birth to an autistic child.

**FACT**: Scientists say that the exponential growth of cancers and other illnesses corresponds to the spread of EMR-emitting devices in our society.

<u>FACT</u>: Insurance companies hired Independent Laboratory Scientists and these scientists also observed Cell Damage and DNA Chain Breaks and now the Insurance Companies will NOT insure Liability damage from Wireless Smart meers and other wireless devices. TV Video (3 minutes) (<u>http://eon3emfblog.net/?=382</u>

<u>Hydro says</u>: "Smart meters will not be a security or privacy risk because they will have encryption just like the banks use."

FACT: Banks are now refusing to use wireless in their systems. Known victims of hacking include: the International Monetary Fund (IMF), Lockheed Martin Wireless, the Pentagon, Toronto Hydro (179,000 customer accounts). The recent Director of the CIA calls wireless "stupid, stupid." And Ontario's Privacy Commissioner says a Smart Grid system is a: "Treasure trove for hackers, thieves or marketers."

<u>FACT</u>: Any would-be criminal can easily determine when a home is occupied or empty by using readily-available EMR meters that read/measure radiation levels.

Hydro says: "The smart meter program ensures privacy and is protected."

FACT: Every electrical appliance in a home has its own unique "signature" and, by using currently available software, utilities can tell when each and every appliance was turned On, when it was turned Off and for how long it was in use. In California, it is known that Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) sells customers' data to 3<sup>rd</sup> parties (mass merchandisers, appliance manufacturers, marketers, insurance companies, lawyers, law enforcement agencies, etc.).

<u>FACT</u>: A wireless grid system is extremely vulnerable to both a cyber attack (insertion of "worms") as well as to having the wireless signals disrupted/blocked/jammed. Each and every link in a grid would be vulnerable, i.e., individual homes, neighborhoods, communities, substations, regions, whole provinces and even entire countries! The consequences to those affected would be catastrophic.

FACT: An Internet report states: "Insurance companies (e.g., Lloyds of London) won't insure smart meters due to biological damage seen by scientists they hired."
<u>Hydro says</u>: "Standing next to a Smart Meter for 20 years you'll receive the same amount of radiation as is emitted in a 30 minute cell phone conversation.

FACT: Dr. Daniel Hirsch, Ph.D., Nuclear Physics, U of C (Santa Cruz) says that a Smart Meter radiates 100 or more times whole body radiation than does a cell phone.

<u>FACT</u>: Santa Cruz, California, Department of Public Health Services conducted its own comparative studies and found that a Smart Meter emits from 50 to 450 times whole body radiation than does a cell phone, depending on a person's distance from the meter.

FACT: This statement is most misleading in that it speaks of a single meter, purposely ignoring what an actual, realistic meshed-grid installation would look like, with hundreds if not thousands of homes, each with its own Smart Meter, each home having up to 15 "Smart" appliances, each appliance being fitted with its own wireless microwave radio. Hydro makes no attempt to address, let alone quantify, the aggregate amount of radiation a community would experience in a realistic situation.

<u>Hydro Says</u>: "On average, a residential meter transmits customer data 4 to 6 times a day – for a total average of one minute per day."

FACT: In a California court of law, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG & E) admitted to the judge that, on average, Smart Meters emit 14,000 pulses per day (every 6 seconds) with the most active meter peaking at 190,000 pulses per day (every 0.45 seconds). Hydro does not mention the EMR that would be emitted within the home when the ZigBee radio is active with up to 15 "smart" appliances. Nor does it mention anywhere what level of EMR would bathe an entire community having a smart-grid installed.

<u>Hydro Says</u>: "The Smart Metering Program will help keep rates low by creating a more efficient power system and reducing power loss. They will save customers about \$70 million over the next three years through lower rates."

FACT: CBC TV did a survey of Toronto residents having smart meters and found that 80% had experienced higher bills. Virtually every jurisdiction in North America that we've read about on the internet has complained that electric bills have doubled, tripled even guadrupled - and more.

FACT: Dalton McGuinty, Premier of Ontario said that, on reflection, it was a mistake for Ontario to allow Smart Meters. The efficiencies and cost-savings he'd expected haven't materialized.



Contraction of the second s
To Public Hearing
Date: June 18, 2012
ltem #
Ro: Byland 8904

**Rogers Communications** 

1600 ~ 4710 Kingsway Burnaby, British Columbia V5H 4W4 rogers.com

June 13, 2012

Mayor Malcolm Brodie Councillor Chak Au Councillor Linda Barnes Councillor Derek Dang Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt Councillor Ken Johnston Councillor Ken Johnston Councillor Bill McNulty Councillor Linda McPhail Councillor Harold Steves City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Dear Mayor Brodie and Council:

Re: Telecommunication Antennas; Amendments to Zoning Bylaw 8500 and Development Application Fees Bylaw 7984

Rogers Communications is pleased to support the amendments being considered to Zoning Bylaw 8500 and the Development Application Fees Bylaw 7984 recently passed by the Planning Committee and that will soon be considered by Richmond Council. Adopting this change to the bylaws will facilitate a more streamlined and certain process for our company as we continue to make investments in our network to ensure the citizens of Richmond have access to the most advanced wireless services.

Rogers also wishes to express appreciation to the City of Richmond and their staff for their efficient and effective management and development of the recently adopted Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siling Protocol and related bylaw changes. Richmond has been a pleasure to work with and we look forward to continuing this constructive working relationship.

Rogers will have a member of its staff at the Council meeting and will be pleased to speak in support if it would be helpful. We will follow up directly with the Planning Department to discuss.

Sincerely,

Leon Leroux Director, Network Implementation West

RICA DATE JUN 1 2 2012

CC: Mr. Brian Jackson, Director of Development Ms. Gail Johnson, Manager of Legislative Services Mr. David Weber, City Clerk Mr. Mark McMullen, Senior Coordinator – Major Projects

WIRELESS · DIGITAL CABLE · INTERNET · HOME PHONE · VIDEO · PUBLISHING · BROADCASTING PH - 328



Planning and Development Department

To: Planning Committee From: Brian J. Jackson, MCIP

**Director of Development** 

 Date:
 April 10, 2012

 File:
 RZ 11-585209

Re: Application by Onni 7731 Alderbridge Holding Corp. and Onni 7771 Alderbridge Holding Corp. for the Rezoning of 7731 and 7771 Alderbridge Way from Industrial Retail (IR1) to High Density Low Rise Apartments (RAH2)

#### Staff Recommendation

That Bylaw No. 8884, which makes minor amendments to the RAH2 zone specific to 7731 and 7771 Alderbridge Way and rezones these subject properties from "Industrial Retail (IR1)" to the amended "High Density Low Rise Apartments (RAH2)", be introduced and given first reading.

ingelican

Brian J. Jackson, MCIP Director of Development

BJJ:mm Att.

	FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTME	ENT USE ONLY ACTING
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Transportation Engineering Parks Planning Affordable Housing Law	Y M N N Y M N N Y M N N Y M N N Y M N Y M N Y M N	puappacleson

#### Staff Report

#### Origin

Onni 7731 Alderbridge Holding Corp. and Onni 7771 Alderbridge Holding Corp. have applied to rezone 7731 and 7771 Alderbridge Way (see Attachment 1) from "Industrial Retail (IR1)" to "High Density Low Rise Apartments (RAH2)" in order to develop a 660-unit project in four (4), six-storey wood frame buildings over two (2) concrete parking structures. A minor text amendment to the RAH2 zone is also required to facilitate the proposed development.

#### Findings of Fact

#### Background

The subject site is situated in the City Centre's Lansdowne Village, an emerging high density, mixed-use community located between Gilbert Road, Alderbridge Way and Westminster Highway (Attachment 3). The two (2) subject lots, comprising 2.87 ha. (7.09 acres) were created in 1969 as part of the Brighouse Industrial Estate subdivision along Alderbridge Way (see Attachment 1). Of note, the western lot was the site of the long-standing Stacey's Furniture World and the eastern lot now includes a Tim Hortons amongst numerous other smaller commercial and light industrial tenants.

Existing surrounding development includes:

*North:* Immediately to the north of the site is the former CPR line property which is now owned by the City and will form part of New River Road. Further to the north, one large light industrial building is located on a site zoned as "Industrial Business (IB1)." This site is designated within the CCAP as part of a large future Riverfront Park.

South: Immediately to south of the subject site is Alderbridge Way with the former Grimm's sausage factory site on the south side of the street. This site is now zoned "Industrial Retail (IR1)" and is the subject of a current rezoning application to rezone the site to a "Residential Limited Commercial (RCL)" zone allow for a higher density, mixed-use development.

*East:* A site zoned "Industrial Retail (IR1)" lies to the east of an adjacent lane. The site includes two light industrial/retail buildings.

*West:* The Gilbert Road approach to the Dinsmore Bridge forms the north-west boundary of the subject site. The remainder of the site is bounded by the former "V-Tech" building site and is now zoned "Industrial Retail (IR1)."

#### Related Policies and Studies

The proposed development site is designated as "Mixed Use" within the City's Official Community Plan (OCP). The site is also within the City Centre Area Plan's (CCAP) "Urban Centre T5 (25 m) Specific Land Use" Map designation which provides for residential land use with a floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.2, which can be increased to a maximum 2.0 FAR with the provision an affordable housing density bonus (see Attachment 3 for context). Other major policy documents of note include:

Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development Policy (ANSD) Area 2: All aircraft noise sensitive land uses (except new single family) may be considered subject to the necessary reports to be submitted and covenants being registered on title as required by the policy.

Affordable Housing Policy: The proposed development is subject to the policy which requires that five (5) percent of the total residential building floor area be devoted to affordable housing units following the policy's requirements regarding unit type and target income.

These above policies and other policies, as applied to the proposed development, are discussed below in the staff report.

#### Applicant's Proposal

In early 2011, the Onni Group of Companies purchased the two (2) lots comprising the site. The proposal involves these lots being re-subdivided with Cedarbridge Way being extended from Alderbridge Way to the New River Road to create two (2) new, slightly smaller lots. A total of four (4) buildings will be constructed. Two (2) buildings will be located on top of one (1) large single storey parkade on each lot on either side of the new Cedarbridge Way.

Of the 660 units proposed, Building 1 contains 140 units, Building 2 contains 200 units, and Buildings 3 and 4 both contain 160 units. The Development Application Data Sheet (Attachment 4) includes a full summary of the development statistics and the cover sheet of the preliminary architectural plans (Attachment 7) include a breakdown of the number of units in each building as well as the number different unit types.

#### Public Consultation

As the proposed development is consistent with the City's OCP and CCAP, no formal agency consultation associated with OCP amendment bylaws is required.

Signage is posted on-site to notify the public of the subject application. At the time of writing this Report, no public comment had been received.

The statutory Public Hearing concerning the zoning amendment bylaw will provide neighbours and other interested parties with an opportunity to provide comment.

The proposed development was also forwarded to the City's Advisory Design Panel (ADP) on January 4, 2012 which generally provided favourable comments with suggestions to be investigated and incorporated into the more detailed building design for review by the ADP and Development Permit Panel during the Development Permit process (excerpt of ADP minutes in Attachment 2).

#### Staff Comments

#### Transportation

The proposed project involves widening of Alderbridge Way and Gilbert Road, and constructing New River Road fronting the development (with removal of the old CPR tracks). These are all major roads on the DCC Road Program. The project will also include construction of two (2) major pedestrian/bicycle routes, a north-south Pedestrian Link that will connect to the major Gilbert Road Greenway and be the start of major east-west Green Link that commences from the PH - 331

north-south pedestrian link and continues eastward for several blocks. (refer to Attachment 5 for the Functional Transportation Plan and Attachment 10 for the Rezoning Considerations Letter for a detailed description of transportation-related improvements).

#### Public Roads & Frontage Improvements:

To secure the road widening and greenways/pedestrian linkages adjacent and through the site in a sufficient manner, the following dedications and SROWs are required of the developer as considerations of rezoning.

*Cedarbridge Way:* The development will involve re-subdivision of the site into a proposed Lot 1 (Western Lot) and a Lot 2 (Eastern Lot) and the dedication of Cedarbridge Way through the development site from Alderbridge Way to New River Road. Works will include full traffic light signalization at the intersection of Cedarbridge Way at Alderbridge Way. This applicant will also include the pre-ducting and bases for the signal standard and controllers boxes for a future pedestrian crosswalk signal to be constructed at Cedarbridge Way and New River Road by the City in the future.

*River Road:* Generally, the developer will construct the entire road cross-section which includes two (2) east and two (2) west bound travel lanes with grass and tree lined boulevards on either side of an eastbound bike path located between the eastbound vehicle lanes and 3.0 m (9.8 ft.) wide sidewalk. There will also be registration of a 3.0 m (9.8 ft.) wide SROW for public rights of passage for the sidewalk adjacent to River Road.

Alderbridge Way: There will also be widening of the Alderbridge Way vehicle lanes and construction of a 2.0 m (6.6 ft.) sidewalk with a treed boulevard required of the applicant. There will be registration of a 2.0 m (6.6 ft.) wide SROW for the sidewalk inside of the south property lines of the proposed Lots 1 and 2.

*Gilbert Road:* Generally, the applicant is required to construct the full curb to curb widening of Gilbert Road for approximately 50 m (164 ft.). The road cross-section generally consists of two northbound traffic lanes, two southbound traffic lanes, a northbound left turn lane (at the New River Road intersection), northbound and southbound bike lanes and a raised median with landscaping.

At the southeast corner of the New River Road/Gilbert Road intersection, other frontage improvements (such as a greenway, plaza and public art discussed further below in the report) are required as this is a prominent location for traffic entering Richmond via the Gilbert Road gateway corridor.

The signalization of the New River Road/Gilbert Road intersection will be constructed by a separate development in the vicinity, but the applicant will also need to make some modifications to the signal.

*East Lane:* There will be reconstruction of the southern part of the current lane along with registration of SROW for public rights of passage for a 2.0 m (6.6 ft.) sidewalk being constructed inside of the east property line as generally shown on Attachment 5.

### Green Links

*East-West Green Link:* The CCAP's envisioned east-west Green Link connects the Oval Village local commercial and major recreational destinations to the Aberdeen Village Commercial and Arts District. The applicant has addressed these components to the satisfaction of planning, transportation and parks staff (see Attachments 3, 8).

There will be a 10.0 m (33 ft.) wide SROW for pedestrian, bicycle and related uses and features, providing all necessary access by public and emergency services, City and other public utility service providers. The SROW is located above the below grade parking structures.

The separation between the buildings is approximately 20m (66 ft.) along the Green Link, leaving sufficient area for ground floor patios and common strata property on each side. The greenway will include a 3.0 m (9.8 ft.) wide hard surfaced public path that extends from the east to the west boundaries of the development (not including the crossing of Cedarbridge Way. The Green Link also includes landscaping and community garden plots.

North-South Green Link: There will be a 5.0 m (16.5 ft.) wide SROW along the west boundary for pedestrian, bicycle and related uses and features, providing all necessary access by public and emergency services, City and other public utility service providers. This Green Link will include a 3.0 m (9.8 ft.) hard surfaced public path extending from north to south on the west side of the proposed Lot 1.

An interim retaining wall that responds to the higher elevation of the development site is required along the west boundary and may be located within the SROW, provided that it does not compromise the intended public use and enjoyment of the spaces as determined by the City.

Design, security for construction, owner maintenance, liability and other terms of the Green Link and sidewalk SROWs are to be determined to the satisfaction of the City as a condition of bylaw adoption.

#### Gilbert Road Boulevard and Greenway

The development of the Greenway on the east side of the very wide unused Gilbert Road allowance, a prominent gateway location into the City Centre, remains to be finalized. Given that there will be up to 20 m (66 ft.) of open space between the project property line and the road edge in this high visibility area, a plaza, pedestrian and cycling paths, lighting, significant tree planting and a major \$350,000 Landmark Public Art piece, (shown in concept on Attachment 9) is envisioned (Also, see Public Art section below).

The landscape plan needs to be finalized for this section of the Gilbert Road Greenway and will be designed and constructed by the City in the future.

## Parking and Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

On-Site Vehicle Parking: The proposed project includes a total of 849 parking spaces with 450 spaces in the parkade on Lot 1 for Buildings 1 and 2, and 399 spaces within the parkade on Lot 2 for Buildings 3 and 4 (See Attachments 4 and 7 for full parking statistics). The applicant requests an overall parking reduction of 7.5% below the parking requirements set out in Bylaw 8500. In lieu of this reduction, the City accepts the Developer's offer to voluntarily:

Contribute \$100,000 to the City for the construction of a 3.0 m (9.8 ft.)
 bike/pedestrian pathway along the east side of Gilbert Road from the southern end of
 PH - 333

the applicant's required frontage improvements to Lansdowne Road. (Not eligible for DCC credits.)

- Contribute \$25,000 to the City for a City Centre-type bus shelter. (Not eligible for DCC credits.)
- Enter into an agreement with the City to ensure that the electrical vehicle and bicycle plug-ins be provided as a condition of issuance of the City building permits for each building with confirmation that such have been provided as a condition of issuance of an occupancy permit for each building:
  - Provision of 20% of the total resident parking spaces in each parkade with 120 or 240 volt (voltage as determined by Onni) electric service for vehicle plug-ins with conduits, circuits breakers and wiring in a form acceptable to the Director of Transportation (actual outlets to be provided later by strata owners).
  - Provision of one (1) standard 120 volt electric plug-in for every forty (40) resident bicycle parking spaces in a form acceptable to the Director of Transportation.

There are no variances required to the automobile and bicycle parking provisions of Zoning Bylaw 8500. It should be noted that staff and the applicant will work together at the Development Permit stage to maximize the achievable parking stalls.

It should be noted that there will be also on-street parking provided on Cedarbridge Way throughout the day and off-peak on-street parking on Alderbridge Way and River Road over the short to intermediate term.

*Bicycle Parking:* The proposed project includes a total of 860 resident bicycle parking spaces with 434 resident spaces in the parkade and sixty-eight (68) surface visitor spaces for Buildings 1 and 2; and 426 resident spaces within the parkade and sixty-four (64) surface visitor spaces for Buildings 3 and 4. The resident bicycle parking provided is above the minimum requirements of Zoning Bylaw 8500 (See cover page of Attachments 4 and 7 for full parking statistics).

#### Loading Space Requirements:

Section 7.13 of Zoning Bylaw 8500 requires that one (1) SU9 (medium 9 m trucks) off-street loading space be provided for each building and one (1) off-street WB 17 (large 17 m trucks) loading space be provided for every two (2) buildings. The applicant has accommodated the four (4) required SU9 loading spaces on either side of the greenway junction with Cedarbridge Way. However, the turning movements for potential 17 m (55 ft.) length of WB 17 trucks preclude placement of such spaces on-site or on Cedarbridge Way. Given the low frequency of use of such large trucks in a purely residential project, staff agrees to support a relaxation of this requirement at time of Development Permit consideration.

If, after occupancy of the project, the absence of WB17 loading spaces proves to be a problem on occasion, Transportation staff may consider temporary closures of several parking spaces to allow for large truck parking on a fee per-request-basis for the future residents within the development.

#### Servicing Capacity Analysis

City Engineering staff have reviewed the application at a preliminary level and require the following:

#### Storm Sewer Upgrade Requirements:

From CP Railway frontage (i.e. New River Road) to the outfall of the Hollybridge Canal (at corner of Hollybridge Way and existing River Road).

- Upgrade the existing ditch to a 1200mm diameter storm main from manhole D8 to 185 meters northeast along the former CPR line frontage (i.e. New River Road).
- Upgrade the existing ditch to a 1200mm diameter storm main from manhole D5 to 222 meters northeast along proposed New River Road (manhole D8 at junction of Gilbert Road).
- Upgrade the existing ditch to 1500mm diameter storm main from junction of Hollybridge Way and former CPR line property (manhole D4) to 80 meters northeast along proposed New River Road (manhole D5).
- Upgrade the existing 375 and 450mm diameter to a 1500mm diameter storm main from junction of existing River Road and Hollybridge Way (manhole D1 in the analysis) to 205 meters southeast along Hollybridge Way (manhole D4).
- Upgrade the existing 750mm diameter to a 1500mm diameter storm main from manhole D1 (in the analysis) to its outfall with an approximate length of 8m.

*Gilbert Road Frontage:* Upgrade the existing ditch to a 600 mm diameter storm sewer from the proposed site's entire Gilbert Road frontage up to the existing box culvert at Lansdowne Road. The proposed storm sewer at Gilbert Road must be interconnected to the proposed storm sewers at the CPR frontage.

*Future Cedarbridge Way Frontage:* Provide the greater of a) 600 mm or b) OCP size by the developer, as per City requirements. The proposed storm sewer in future Cedarbridge must be interconnected to the proposed storm sewers at the CPR and Alderbridge Way frontages.

Alderbridge Way Frontage: Works include:

- Upgrade the existing 250mm and 300mm diameter storm sewers from east to west property line of the proposed site to a 600 mm diameter sewer.
- Upgrade the existing 300mm to 750mm and existing 375mm to 900mm diameter storm sewers from the west property line of the proposed site to the existing box culvert at Lansdowne Road.

#### Sanitary Sewer Upgrade Requirements: Works include:

• Upgrade the existing 200 mm diameter to 450 mm diameter from SMH 4738 (manhole S70) to 90 meters northeast along old CPR right of way to SMH 4737 (manhole S60).

- Upgrade the existing 200 mm diameter to 375 mm diameter from SMH 4699 (manhole S50) to 80 meters southwest along old CPR right of way to SMH 4737 (manhole S60).
- Provide a 525mm diameter sanitary main in the future Cedarbridge Way from SMH 4737 (manhole S60) to a new manhole located 220 meters south going to Alderbridge Way.
- Upgrade the existing 150 mm diameter to 525mm diameter from the new manhole at the corner of future Cedarbridge Way and Alderbridge Way to 80 meters east to SMH 4690 (manhole S20).
- Upgrade the existing 200 mm diameter to 525mm diameter from SMH 4690 (manhole S20) to 94 meters southeast to existing lane between 7740 Alderbridge Way to 5003 Minoru Boulevard at SMH 4688 (manhole S10).
- Upgrade the existing 300 mm diameter to 600 mm diameter from SMH 4688 (manhole S10) to 69 meters southwest to existing Minoru Pump station.
- Through the Servicing Agreement, the sanitary sewer alignments will need to be coordinated to suit the future Minoru Sanitary Pump Station upgrade.
- Both current sanitary mains located within the Subject Lands will need to be removed by the Developer and the SROWs in which they are located are to be discharged from title.

#### Water Works Review:

Review and works include:

- Water System: Using the OCP 2021 maximum day model, there is 346 L/s available at 20 psi residual. Based on the proposed application, the development requires a minimum fire flow of 275 L/s. Water analysis is not required. However, once the applicant has confirmed the building design at the building permit stage, the developer will need to submit fire flow calculations signed and sealed by a professional engineer based on the Fire Underwriter Survey to confirm that there is adequate available flow.
- Provide watermains (minimum 200mm diameter, per City's requirements) at the proposed site's CPR and future Cedarbridge Way frontages.

The applicant is also responsible for undergrounding the existing private utility line located within the New River Road alignment.

Latecomer Agreements will be available for sanitary and storm upgrades that are not frontage improvements as only provided by the Local Government Act. Development Cost Charge (DCC) credits will be applicable to eligible storm and sanitary works detailed in the Rezoning Considerations Letter (Attachment 10).

#### Analysis

#### Proposed Zoning Amendment:

Bylaw No. 8884 proposes to rezone the subject site from "Industrial Retail (IR1)" to "High Density Low Rise Apartments (RAH2)" and make a minor amendment to the zone concerning the calculation of density under the CCAP.

With regard to the calculation of density for a site, the CCAP identifies certain new parks and roads to be secured as voluntary developer contributions via the City's development processes. In cases where the contributors of new parks or road are not eligible for financial compensation via the DCC program (e.g. "minor streets"), the CCAP allows for them to be secured by means that do not reduce the contributing development's buildable floor area. This approach of allowing "gross floor area" (i.e. calculated on site area including road/park) on the "net site" (i.e. site area excluding road) lessens the cost to the contributing developer and helps ensure that developments which include non-DCC road and park features is not discouraged. Statutory right-of-ways have typically been used for securing such features.

Dedication can be also used provided that site-specific provisions are included within the zoning bylaw to facilitate "gross floor area" calculated on the "net site". Dedication is preferable to statutory right-of-ways (SROW) for roads such as the Cedarbridge Way on the subject site (Attachment 5). In light of this, staff recommend that the RAH2 be amended so that the maximum permitted density (FAR) on the subject site be calculated based on the "gross site" (i.e. calculated on site area including the dedicated road) and be applied to the "net site" (i.e. new Lots 1 and 2 outside of the dedicated road).

Based on the above approach, the proposed development will include a maximum "gross density" of 2.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) over the entire development site. If same physical area of Cedarbridge Way is dedicated instead of being secured by a SROW, there will be a FAR of 2.28 for the net site area excluding the road dedication. Thus, the proposed Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8884 includes on overall FAR of 2.28 for the net site area (comprised of the proposed Lots 1 and 2) to allow for the preferred method of dedication instead of obtaining a SROW to secure Cedarbridge Way.

#### Other Zoning Requirements Including Basic Universal Housing Requirements:

The preliminary plans indicate that the proposed development meets the minimum setback, maximum height and lot coverage requirements within the RAH2 zone. Of note, the applicant has elected to provide 502 of the total 660 units meeting twenty-two (22) of twenty-three (23) of the Basic Universal Accessible Housing provisions of Section 4.16 of Zoning Bylaw 8500. Meeting these accessibility provisions is optional, but when all of the provisions are met, a 1.86 m<sup>2</sup> (20 ft.<sup>2</sup>) floor area exemption per each accessible unit is provided. As the applicant is proposing to provide entry doors to be prewired to allow future owners to install accessible strike pads for opening the entry door in lieu of providing 600 mm (2.0 ft.) of manoeuvring space beside the suite entry doors as per section 4.16.11, a variance would be required for relaxation of this one provision through a Development Variance Permit. This alternative wiring approach may be included within the Development Permit and Building Permit plans if a Development Variance Permit (DVP) is issued by Council to vary section 4.16.11. **PH - 337** 

#### Form & Character of Development:

The Development Permit application plans will be brought forward to Development Permit Panel for consideration with the above-noted DVP application. The following provides a general overview of building and site design considerations based on the plans included in Attachments 6 to 8.

#### Development Site Plan:

The project involves construction of two (2) large parkades (with two (2) buildings on each parkade) on either side of the extension of Cedarbridge Way. The current Alderbridge Way elevation is lower at 1.5 m (4.9ft.) compared to the New River Road which is located at 2.6 m (8.6 ft.). This elevation difference results in a 2.5 m (8.2 ft.) grade difference between Alderbridge Way and the first floor of the adjoining units. The grade difference of approximately 1.5 m (4.9 ft.) on New River Road presents far less of a challenge. The "Design Approach Perspective Drawings" in Attachment 6 illustrate this elevation difference as well as the road layout, change of elevation, building massing and typical elevation treatments for two (2) of the buildings.

#### Key Street Wall Feature Views:

It is critical that this development contribute to consistent, urban street walls on Alderbridge Way and New River Road which are two (2) of the major curvilinear streets in the City Centre.

To address the above situation, the applicant has responded to staff's request to orientate the units facing streets with stairs and entrance doors and the use of building design techniques to have the units look like townhouses from the street. As well, the use of stepped patio and landscaped terraces reduce the appearance of the grade difference.

Building Height and Rooflines: Each of the four (4) buildings rises to six (6) storeys in height. Each building includes terraces downward to as low as four (4) storeys to provide for a variety of building form and more useable patio space for some of the units on the top two (2) floors of each building. The use of inverse gable or butterfly roofs and higher ceilings for the sixth floor in each building provides continuity within the family of buildings in the proposed development.

To provide variation within this family of buildings, tower elements are included on the southeast corner of Building 1 and northwest corner of Building 2. Furthermore, the northwest wing of Building 1 facing towards Gilbert Road has significant broad terraces stepping downwards to the west (See page 4 of Attachment 6).

*View Corridors:* View corridors are particularly important due to the proposed riverfront park being developed immediately to the north, and the distant mountain views to the north and east. The spacing between the buildings on Cedarbridge Way allows for good view corridors north-south and sunlight penetration. The low-rise form of the proposed development will allow for the adjacent in-stream development to the east and south to be afforded views of the Fraser River and North Shore Mountains.

Building Orientations: The four (4) buildings have a similar U-shaped building form with each building rising between four (4) to six (6) storeys above street grade. Differentiation amongst the buildings has been achieved by mainly varying the orientation of the buildings and differentiating the materials and small-scale articulation between Buildings 1 and 4 facing Alderbridge Way and Buildings 2 and 3 facing the New River Road. 3498893 PH - 338 Building Materials and Articulation: While the buildings have a similar typology, varied materials and small-scale articulation have been applied to provide for differentiation. In particular, Buildings 1 and 4 facing Alderbridge Way have darker colours, more detailing and metal panelling evoking an early 20<sup>th</sup> Century industrial building. Conversely, Buildings 2 and 3 are designed in a mid-20<sup>th</sup> modernist building style with bolder articulation and use of lighter coloured metal panelling.

Further development of the architectural and landscape plans will be undertaken in lead up to review of the Development Permit by the Development Permit Panel and for its consideration of approval by Council.

#### On-Site Landscape:

As noted above, the "U" shape buildings provide for large semi-private courtyards while maintaining highly visible smaller water features as shown on Attachment 9. The typical width of the courtyards from building face to building face is approximately 35 m (115 ft.) which provides ample room for on-site outdoor amenities and patios for each ground floor unit.

The applicant has responded to staff's concern about having enlarged play areas included within the courtyards of Buildings 1, 2 and 4 on either side of Cedarbridge Way. Multi-purpose amenity / BBQ areas are provided for the Buildings 1 and 2 courtyards while community garden plots are provided adjacent to Building 2, 3 and 4.

The OCP includes on-site open space guidelines for active uses including socializing, children's play and related use. The development includes  $3,430 \text{ m}^2 (36,812 \text{ ft.}^2)$  of such on-site socializing areas. The additional CCAP guidelines provide for on-site walkways, planting, garden plots, etc. The development also includes  $742 \text{ m}^2 (7,987 \text{ ft.}^2)$  of on-site walks and garden plots are provided in the landscape plans.

Of note, while there are no trees on the subject site, staff have requested and reviewed an arborist's report confirming that the proposed buildings and north-south Green Link with retaining wall (discussed earlier in the report) will not adversely affect several significant trees on the adjacent property to the west.

#### Summary of Building and Landscape Design:

In summary, staff feels that the applicant has gone a long way to developing a wood-frame project that has the modern, urban character desired for the City Centre and which responds to the CCAP's design guidelines. Particularly, staff and the ADP have identified the need for the applicant to apply high quality, durable materials and undertake minor modifications to the detailed design of the buildings.

#### Other Major Planning Aspects of Development to Address at Rezoning:

Aside from the servicing, transportation, zoning and design elements of the development, the following planning elements are of note.

#### Affordable Housing Agreement:

Following the City's Affordable Housing Policy, the applicant will be providing 38 affordable housing (low-end market rental) to the satisfaction of the City with combined habitable floor area 3498893

comprising at least 5% of the subject development's total residential building area (including common areas, such as hallways and lobbics). The terms of a Housing Agreement entered into between the applicant and City will apply in perpetuity. The terms specify the following regarding types and sizes of units, rent levels, and tenant household incomes:

Unit Type	Number of Units	Minimum Unit Area	Maximum Monthly Unit Rent*	Total Annual Household Income*
1-Bedroom	8**	50 m2 (535 ft2)	\$925	\$37,000 or less
2-Bedroom	30**	80 m2 (860 ft2)	\$1,137	\$45,500 or less

May be increased periodically as provided for under adopted City policy.

\*\* All affordable housing units must satisfy Richmond Zoning Bylaw requirements for Basic Universal Housing.

The affordable housing units are located on first three (3) floors of Buildings 1, 3 and 4. The location and size of these units within the development is included within the preliminary architectural plans included on page A1.1 of Attachment 7 is to the satisfaction City Housing staff.

There will also be registration of a legal agreement requiring each of the four (4) buildings to be constructed as set out in Attachment 7 and preventing issuance of a final Building Permit inspection granting occupancy for each of the four (4) buildings until confirmation is provided that the required number of affordable housing units have been provided to the satisfaction of the City.

The agreement will also ensure that occupants of the affordable housing units subject to the Housing Agreements shall enjoy full and unlimited access to and use of all on-site indoor and outdoor amenity spaces.

#### Indoor Shared Amenity Space:

The applicant proposes to include 951 m<sup>2</sup> (10,235 ft<sup>2</sup>) of shared indoor amonity within Building 1 as shown in Attachment 9 which includes an indoor swimming pool. They will also have a small amonity space of approximately  $21m^2$  (230 ft<sup>2</sup>) in each of Buildings 3 and 4.

There will be registration of a reciprocal access easement and other legal agreements required on the proposed Lots 1 and 2 to ensure that the proposed indoor recreation space is constructed within Building 1 prior to construction of the other buildings. The agreements will also ensure there are appropriate mechanisms to allow for shared access, use and management and require sharing costs for operations and maintenance for such shared amenity space that is provided to all units within all of the buildings.

*Public Art:* The City has accepted the applicant's offer to voluntarily provide \$440,411 to Richmond's public program with a cash contribution of \$139,700 provided to the public art reserve fund for a Landmark Art piece, providing a security in a form acceptable to the City for \$300,711 for other Public Art (as shown on Figure 9) and a detailed Public Art Program prior to adoption of rezoning. The calculations are based on \$0.75/ft<sup>2</sup> of eligible building floor area of 618,120 ft<sup>2</sup> (excluding basic universal accessible housing and affordable housing).

It should be noted in addition to \$139,700, the previous Onni contribution of \$210,300 for the ORA development on Hollybridge Way will be used for the Landmark Art piece at Gilbert and New River Road to reach the City's budgetary goal for larger sculptural works of \$350,000 as outlined in the City's *City Centre Public Art Plan*.

#### Other Elements to be provided at Development Permit:

The submission of the Development Permit (DP) to Development Permit Panel is anticipated to be undertaken prior to adoption of the rezoning. Aside from building and landscape design elements, the following are being addressed as part of consideration of the DP.

#### Basic Universal Accessible Housing.

The applicant's proposal to construct 502 Basic Universal Accessible Housing units will be ensured during the Development Permit and Building Permits processes. The architect of record will provide a letter of assurance confirming adherence to the Zoning Bylaw 8500 requirements (except as may be varied by Council as noted in the discussion above in this report). A notation on the architectural plans will also be required as a condition of Development Permit and Building Permit.

#### Airport and Industrial Noise:

The City's OCP aircraft noise and industrial noise policies apply. Submission of a report that addresses aircraft noise following the provisions will be required to recommend that buildings are designed in a manner that mitigates potential aircraft and industrial noise within the proposed dwelling units. Dwelling units must be designed and constructed to achieve:

- CMHC guidelines for interior noise levels as indicated in the chart below: Portions of Dwelling Units Noise Levels (decibels) Bedrooms 35 decibels 40 decibels Living, dining, recreation rooms Kitchen, bathrooms, hallways, and utility rooms 45 decibels
- The ASHRAE 55-2004 "Thermal Environmental Conditions for Human Occupancy" standard for interior living spaces or most recent ASHRAE standards.

The developer will be required to enter into and register the City's standard noise-related covenant(s) on title for Aircraft Noise Sensitive Use Development (ANSUD) and industrial noise.

LEED Silver: The applicant has committed to meet the Canadian Green Building Council LEED Silver 2009 criteria and submission of follow-up letter confirming that building has been constructed to meet such LEED criteria. The "architect of record" or LEED consultant is also to provide a letter of assurance confirming how each building meets LEED Silver criteria prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for each building. The LEED criteria to be met must include Heat Island Effect: Roof Credit and Storm Water Management Credit.

#### Other Development Considerations:

The applicant has also agreed to undertake the following as required by the City:

- District Energy Utility (DEU): The applicant has agreed to commit to connecting to the proposed City Centre DEU. The DEU terms will be finalized prior to issuance of the Development Permit and will include:
  - o Design and construction of the development's buildings to facilitate hook-up to a DEU system (e.g., hydronic water-based heating system); and
  - o Entering into a Service Provision Agreement(s) and statutory right-of-way(s) and/or alternative legal agreements, to the satisfaction of the City. **PH - 341**

- *Flood Construction Level:* Registration of the City's standard flood indemnity covenant on title.
- Community Planning Program: The City has accepted the Developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$149,543 towards Richmond's community planning program fund (based on \$0.25/ft<sup>2</sup> of total building area, excluding affordable housing units) with \$37,386 (25% of the total) provided to the City prior to rezoning adoption. A legal agreement will be registered that requires contribution of \$112,157 (75% of the total) to the City prior to issuance of a building permit for the second of four (4) buildings within the development.

#### Future Development Permit Review:

The applicant will continue working with staff on the Development Permit application being completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development for review by the ADP and Development Permit Panel before being brought to Council for consideration of issuance. This will include finalizing of the architectural and landscape plans in more detail.

Also, at that time, the two proposed variances discussed above in this report concerning relaxing the requirement for two (2) WB 17 (large) loading spaces and Universal Basic Accessible Housing front entrance door clearance provisions will be formally considered.

#### Financial Impact

None.

#### Conclusion

The proposed application is consistent with the OCP and CCAP land-use and density policies for the site and other major City policies that apply to this 660-unit development. Staff recommends that the proposed development should proceed through the rezoning process and development permit review processes where the project's design will be completed. In addition to the sitespecific land-use and design aspects, the proposed development will:

- Form a distinctive, high-quality, high-density yet low-rise part of to the Lansdowne Village neighbourhood;
- Complete important sections of the major road network in the CCAP including New River Road east of Gilbert Road and the extension of Cedarbridge Way to New River Road;
- Provide 38 affordable housing units;
- Provide significant contributions to the City's Public Art Program; and
- Include the start of major east-west and north-south Green Links and Greenways that will connect Lansdowne Village to the rest of the City Centre.

Based on the forgoing, it is recommended that Bylaw No. 8884 be forwarded to Council for consideration of first reading.

Mal Mr. Mul

Mark McMullen Senior Coordinator – Major Projects MM:rg

Attachment 1: Location Map and Aerial Photograph

Attachment 2: Excerpt of Minutes from January 4, 2012 Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel

Attachment 3: CCAP Lansdowne Village Specific Land Use Map

Attachment 4: Development Application Data Sheet

Attachment 5: Functional Road Layout Plan

Attachment 6: Design Approach Perspective Drawings

Attachment 7: Preliminary Architectural Plans

Attachment 8: Preliminary Landscape and Greenway Plans

Attachment 9: Public Art and On-Site Amenity Space Plan

Attachment 10: Rezoning Considerations Letter

## ATTACHMENT 1





## Advisory Design Panel

## Wednesday, January 4, 2012

Time:	4:00 p.m.
-------	-----------

- Place: Rm. M.1.003 City of Richmond
- Present:Kush Panatch, ChairSimon Ho, Vice-ChairSteve Jedreicich, Acting ChairJoseph Fry (arrived at 4:39 p.m.)Tom ParkerThomas LeungCst. Greg ReimerSherri HanHarold OwensShira StandfieldAlso Present:Sara Badyal, PlannerMark McMullen, Senior Coordinator, Major ProjectsRustico Agawin, Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m.

# 1. ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL ORIENTATION AND ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

Sara Badyal, Staff Liaison for the Advisory Design Panel, welcomed the new and returning members of the Panel for 2012. Thereafter, she briefed the Panel members regarding the Panel's Terms of Reference and the role of the Panel within the City's review process for development permit application.

The Panel members proceeded to elect the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Panel. Kush Panatch was elected Chair and Simon Ho was elected Vice-Chair. In view of the manifestation of the Chair to leave the meeting at 6 p.m. and the declaration of the Vice-Chair of conflict of interest regarding Item 3 of the agenda, the Panel agreed to designate Steve Jedreicich as Acting Chair for the consideration of Item 3.

#### 2. RZ 11-585209 - SIX-STOREY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITH 660 APARTMENTS IN FOUR BUILDINGS

ARCHITECT: Yamamoto Architecture Inc.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 7731/7771 Alderbridge Way

#### Panel Discussion

Comments from the Panel were as follows:

- wood frame construction for six-storey buildings is a fairly new development and has some constraints; existing building design has issues which need to be addressed with regard to compliance with certain provisions of the BC Building Code and the BC Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists (APEG) Guidelines;
- per BC Building Code, maximum allowable height for shear wall construction is 20 meters; the height from the first floor to the roof in the proposed buildings appears to be 22 meters;
- the Code likewise provides that the maximum height from the ground level to the 6<sup>th</sup> floor is 18 meters; applicant needs to check whether the height limitation is measured from grade or first floor; needs to be addressed as it has firefighting implications;
- APEG guidelines for 5-6 storey wood frame residential buildings permit only a 10 percent setback of the uppermost floor; the project's engineers will need to look into the recess of the buildings' top floor;
- recommend that all wood-framed shear walls be continuous from the ground to the top level;
- recommend to isolate balconies from the main structure of the buildings by using column supports instead of being cantilevered; could avoid maintenance issues in the long-term;
- firewalls should be straight;
- interesting site; appreciate slideshow graphics showing evolution of design;
- create a plaza space that is larger and less fragmented in view of the larger context of future development of adjacent properties; applicant needs to work with Planning regarding how the future development to the north-west of the site is envisioned;
- courtyard developments and emphasis on urban agriculture are interesting; character of terraces are well-defined except the interface on the Cedarbridge Way dedication; consider pathways that allow access or egress from the courtyards up to the deck; will add vitality to the street edges;
- streetscape treatment on Alderbridge Way is critical; use high quality materials at the front face; consider lowering wall height;

- plaza space does not look like and will not function as a plaza; it is a roadway in the center of the development; consider further treatments to emphasize pedestrian movements across it;
- concern on appearance of community gardens along the greenway and public access of users; community gardens should have a more urban character suitable to their intended users;
- appreciate the overall lay-out of the buildings and the courtyard orientations;
- missed opportunity in the plaza; does not appear like a plaza; the proposed development is a self-contained community; big size of the development and number of residential units necessitate a "town center"; celebration at intersection is important; appreciate transparent lobbies flowing out into the plaza but ground plane articulation is missing;
- buildings are handsome; however, further design development is needed to make them have a more Richmond character;
- differentiate each building in terms of colour and texture;
- decide to have corner elements or not; right now have the same colour with the rest of the buildings; further development is needed if they are to be emphasized;
- 2-meter patio is too high; consider lowering it to 3.5 feet;
- applicant needs to check accuracy of shadow diagram;
- like the feeling of the courtyards; however, courtyard elevations need softening as they look like university buildings; detailed design of facades needed appropriate for a high-end condominium; courtyards need further articulation;
- concern on the barrier-free accessibility of community gardens to residential units; functionality has to be resolved;
- consider incorporating the water feature adjacent to the play are in Building 4 as part of play area; eliminate or address the hazard potential;
- consider purpose of the courtyards; should be a gathering space; play area should be usable; enhance functionality of community garden space to encourage its use as a community gathering place;
- north face of the greenway, i.e. facades of the two buildings are uniform; need further articulation on Building 2;
- agree with comments on the towers; add architectural features to "punch out" towers, e.g. colour and texture;
- appreciate the inclusion of 75 percent of the units as convertible; applicant is encouraged to provide convertible units for each type of unit;
- applicant is likewise encouraged to increase the number of affordable units;

- consider egress of people from the courtyard to the street level sidewalk using wheelchairs, strollers and other wheeled conveyances in the design of the courtyard; consider as alternate to route through internal corridors;
- like the idea of the community gardens; will bring residents outside; will discourage unwanted visitors and enhance surveillance;
- good natural surveillance from various points in the development; good street access from lower units is a positive factor from a crime prevention perspective;
- area of the proposed development is in transition; first of its of kind of development in the area to create part of the fabric of the area; towers are subtle and will rely on the type of materials suggested in the renderings actually being used in the manner indicated;
- concern on the orientation of some of the courtyards resulting in dark/shaded areas; mold growth on hard surfaces may be an issue;
- courtyard scheme is appropriate to achieve desired density for a low-rise type of development; however, not convinced on the grade transition at street;
- street edge needs to be carefully looked at; appears high as shown in the renderings; does not work well at this stage of the development from a pedestrian street point of view;
- nicely designed project; like the articulation of the buildings; character of the buildings is appropriate to the site; courtyard design is nice;
- proposed development seems to lack a focal point; consider creating a public gathering place at the intersection of Cedarway Bridge and River Road, a likely gathering area for people as it is adjacent to a future park and near the river;
- like the alternating use of brick and other materials in the exterior finishes of the buildings; consistency in overall massing is achieved in similar treatments using different materials;
- relationship to the street is fairly well done;
- community gardens are not aesthetically pleasing and takes a lot of space; tends to over program smaller courtyards like in Buildings 3 and 4;
- consider public art opportunities along the Gilbert Road greenway; applicant is also encouraged to consider incorporating public art into buildings, e.g. creating lighting design or glass/steel design within the towers; City and Public Art Commission have been supportive of such schemes;
- good job on the massing of the six-storey buildings; encourage the village feel with variation;
- agree with comments on the plaza; applicant could dead-end the two streets and create a plaza as continuous pedestrian link across it; will create a true pedestrian plaza in the centre area;

- congratulate the applicant for keeping the setbacks between the buildings at the proper distance of 60 feet for six-storey buildings;
- great design for a wood frame building; does not look like a wood frame building; urge the applicant to keep the design elements as shown and emphasized as design progresses;
- lost opportunity for Building 3 to address more the river and future park as it is not oriented towards them as done in Building 2;
- consider a bigger context for the walkway terminus; consult with adjacent property owner on possible interface in the future; consider better use of oddball configuration at the corner;
- Alderbridge Way is a busy street; emphasize the corners of the two buildings (using design elements, e.g. colours and different materials) at the Cedarbridge entrance off of Alderbridge Way; and
- Onni has developed high quality high-rise developments to the west of the site; applicant is encouraged to maintain the same level of quality in the subject development as those projects west of the site.

(At this juncture, Mr. Panatch and Mr. Ho left the meeting and Mr. Jedreicich assumed the Chair)

#### 3. DP 11-593925 - SIX-STOREY MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT WITH 55 APARTMENTS OVER GROUND LEVEL COMMERCIAL AND AMENITY SPACE

ARCHITECT: Cotter Architects

PROPERTY LOCATION: 14000 Riverport Way

#### Panel Discussion

Comments from the Panel were as follows:

- like the shape of the building which is suitable for a 5-storey wood frame building;
- concern on the off-site loading; Riverport Way is fairly narrow and loading vehicles are close to Riverport Way and Steveston Highway intersection;
- concern on firefighting access to units facing the Fraser River (i.e., back of the building); should be addressed by BC Building Code consultant and may include Code equivalences;
- is there an easement in the rear for exit stair egress to neighbouring property?
- suggest increasing the floor-to-floor height of the CRUs to allow for beam depth;



Specific Land Use Map: Lansdowne Village (2031) Bylaws 8427 & 8516 2010/09/13

ATTACHMENT 4



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

## **Development Application Data Sheet**

## **Development Applications Division**

.

RZ 11-585209	
Address:	7731 & 7771 Alderbridge Way
Applicant/Owner:	Onni 7731 Alderbridge Way Holding Corp. & 7771 Alderbridge Way Holding Corp.
Owner:	Onni 7731 Alderbridge Way Holding Corp. & 7771 Alderbridge Way Holding Corp.
Planning Area(s):	City Centre Area (Lansdowne Village)
Floor Area	No change is proposed in maximum permitted floor area or density

	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed Development	Variance	
Zoning Lot Size (Min.)	• 2400sm (25,833sf)	<ul> <li>Lot 1: 13,288.37sm (143,036 sf)</li> <li>Lot 2: 11,886.75 sm (127,949 sf)</li> </ul>	None	
CCAP/Zoning Lot Coverage (Max.)	<ul> <li>60% for buildings</li> <li>80% for building and non porous surfaces</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Lot 1: building footprint: 45% non-porus surfaces: 69.5%</li> <li>Lot 2: building footprint: 45% non-porus surface: 70.3%</li> </ul>	None	
CCAP/Zoning FAR	<ul> <li>1.2, up to 2.0 FAR with provision of 5% of total floor area for affordable housing units.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2.0 FAR with 20m Cedarbridge dedication as per Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 8884 text not deducted.</li> </ul>	• None	
Zoning Habitable Floor Elevation (Min.)	Residential: 2.9 m geodetic	<ul> <li>Residential: 4.064 m</li> <li>Local exception permitted for 1 lobby per building.</li> </ul>	None	
CCAP/Zoning Height (Max.)	<ul> <li>25 m, but with specific areas allowing up to 35m as outlined in CCAP.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Varies, but less than 25m above finished grade in all cases.</li> </ul>	• None	
CCAP/Zoning Selbacks @ (Min.)	a) 3m@ Alderbridge b) 3m@ East Lane c) 1.5m@ New River Road d) 1.5m@ West Side	<ul> <li>a) 4.5m for Building 1 and 5.0m Building 2 @ Alderbridge from PROP</li> <li>b) 3m@ East Lane from PROP</li> <li>c) 3m@ New River Road from PROP</li> <li>d) 3m@ West Side from PROP</li> <li>Based on setback to back face of PROP/SROW; setbacks from the actual property lines are greater.</li> </ul>	• None	

	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed Development	Variance
Zoning Off-Street Parking	Lot 1: Parkade (Bldqs1 /2): 427 Min Residents: 1.2/unit: 359 Min Affordable: 0.90/unit: 7 (max small car: 50%) Min Visitors: 0.2/unit: 61 Lot 2 Parkade: (Bldqs 3 / 4): 398 Min Residents: 1.2/unit: 313 Min Affordable: 0.90/unit: 27 (max small car 50%: ) Min Visitors: 0.2/unit: 58 (With maximum 10% TDM Reduction possible)	Preliminary for Rezoning: Lot 1: Parkade (Bldgs1 /2): 450 Residents/Affordable: 399 (small car: 41%) (tandem: 15%) Visitors: 51 Lot 2: Parkade (Bldgs3/4): 399 Residents/Affordable: 351 (small car: 50%) (tandem: 11%) Visitors: 48 (With 7.5% TDM overall parking reduction provided)	None
Zoning Bicycle Parking	Lot 1: Parkade (Bldgs1 /2) Resident (1.25/unit): 425 Visilor (0.2/unit): 68 Lot 2: Parkade (Bldgs1 /2) Resident (1.25/unit): 400 Visitor (0.2/unit): 64	Lot 1: Parkade (Bldqs1 /2) • Resident (1.25/unit): 434 • Visitor (0.2/unit): 68 Lot 2: Parkade (Bldqs1 /2) • Resident (1.25/unit): 426 Visitor (0.2/unit): 64	• None
Zoning Loading	• 2 medium; 2 large with one being provided for each building with sizes as per Section 7.10.2. To be on- site.	<ul> <li>Required one SU9 loading space provided for each of the four buildings in locations acceptable to City.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>DVP to relax the requirement for 2 WB 17 spaces required.</li> </ul>
Zoning Accessible Housing	<ul> <li>Basic Universal Housing: City standards for wheelchair accessible dwellings</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Notation to be shown that design will meet the Basic Universal Hosuing standards as per Section 4.16 for 502 units, except for 4.16.11.</li> </ul>	• DVP for to relax Section 4.16.11 only as stated in staff report.
CCAP Guidelines for <u>Shared</u> Residential Amenity Space: Indoor (Min.)	<ul> <li>For projects exceeding 200 units (CCAP):</li> <li>2 sqm/unit: 1320sm, but may be reduced if significant indoor recreation features provided</li> </ul>	993 sm provided and accepted as it includes large indoor swimming pool as significant recreation feature as provided for in CCAP.	• N/A

9	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed Development	Variance
CCAP/OCP <u>Shared</u> Residential Amenity Space: Outdoor (Min.) guidelines	<ul> <li>As per CCAP Sections 2.6.1</li> <li>(e), 3.1.8A and OCP:</li> <li>OCP: 6 sqm/unit for socializing, children's play &amp; related uses: 3960sm</li> <li>CCAP: 10% of net site area for on-site walkways, planting, garden plots, etc.: 2518 sm</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3430 sm of on-site socializing areas provided.</li> <li>1742 sm of on-site walks and garden plots are provided.</li> <li>The areas provide are less than absolute amount in the CCAP guidelines, but given the large uninterrupted areas and amenities provided, they are accepted subject to refinement at DP stage.</li> </ul>	• N/A
CCAP Private Outdoor Amenity Space: (Min.) guidelines	<ul> <li>20sqm for grade-oriented and 6sqm for upper floor apartments. See Section 3.1.8B of the CCAP for dimensions.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The total area of patios and balconies meet CCAP guidelines, but each balcony/patio needs to be confirmed at DP review.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>T8D at DP review</li> </ul>



ATTACHMENT 5





#### Orientation

With the Cedarbridge Way dedication and east-west Greenway, the site is effectively split into four quadrants.

The development proposes four buildings with the courtyard spaces of the southwest, northeast, and southeast buildings each oriented facing southwest.

The northwest building, at the comer of Gilbert and the new River Road, has its countyard space facing north, towards the future park and view.

This will maximize the number of units with a view of the river and park, and will create a visual connection between the public park space and the internal courtyard.



1

1



#### Articulation

The orientation and articulation of the massing achieve several objectivest

- · Maximize views to the river per the General Guidelines of the CCAP 3.1.1 A
- · Maximize alternoon sun into the counyard areas and public green links per 3.1.2.A.
- · Provide a strong, urban street wall as a backdrop to the new river-front park.
- · Provide a strong, urban street wall along Alderbridge Way.
- · Provide lower-scale massing adjacent to the more intimately scaled greenways.
- · Provide opportunity for tower elements and iconic gateway elements at key locations especially at the Northwest comer of the site at the intersection of River Road and Gilbert Road per 3.1.6. E. Mid-rise b).
- · Provide strong horizontal articulation through rool forms (3.1.5.A) while aniculating the facade with narrow bays and setbacks at upper levels (3.1.5.P)



onni

Alderbridge Staff Repart Richmond, BC 8th February 2012



ŷ

1

b a ſ

i

r a đ



GROSS SITE AREA:

309,059 SO.FT. (28.712 SO.M.)

#### NET SITE AREA: AFTER 20M CEDARBRIDGE AND LANE STUB DEDICATIONS

LOT 1: 143,038 SQ.FT. (13,258 SO.M.)

LOT 2: 126,944 SQ.FT. (11,793 SQ.M.)

TOTAL BOTH LOTS: 269,982 SQ.FT. (25,081 SQ M.)

#### PROPOSED FLOOR AREA:

630,000 SC.FT. (2.04 F.A.R.) 309,059 SC.FT. x 2.0 FSR = 618,118 SO.FT.

502 ADAPTABILITY ENHANCED UNITS # 2 SO.M. = 11,882 SO.FT

660,000 SCI FT.

onn

#### FLOOR AREA AND UNIT BREAKDOWN SUMMARY:

LA	NIT	1	BUILDING			TOTAL
TYPE		1 NO. 1	NO.2	NO.3	NO.4	TO LAS
1 BH		30	23	27	28	105 (15%)
2 BR		\$7	158	122	323	509 (TP:4)
3 84		10	\$2.	11	10	43 (?%e)
TOTAL U	UNITS	137	2303	160	160	
		346		23	65	980
TOTAL	NET SF	130,600 SF	193,500 SP	154,200 SF	151,800 SF	
EVER SYLA	643	324,000 85		346,000 SF		630,000 85
TOTAL C	BRUSS SF	145,050 3F	197,520 SF	157,700 SF	155,300 SF	
(NCLUDING AMBINITIC EXCLUSIONS)	342,070 SP		313,000 SP		865,070 SF	



Alderbridge Richmond, BC



building 2- tower element Staff Report 8<sup>th</sup> February 2012 d e s i g n approach Alderbridge Richmond, BC שמ 0 mil



ပပ ကဆ Afderbridg Richmond, E 

building 2- south west Staff Report 8<sup>th</sup> February 2012 сĿ υ a 0 e s b p r a a














-Building 4- south east Staff Report 8th February 2012 ၿပ сч Alderbridg Richmond, B ψ σ ā 0 () 7 a b a p b

• 

#### 7731, 7771 ALDERBRIDGE WAY RICHMOND, B.C.

# APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT



100	FSR	Units	SQM	รฉศ
Site area			28,712.50	309,060.00

### Proposed Floor Area

FSA	j	2.00		57,425.01	618,120.00
Bonus for Universal units	Í		T		
(1.85 SQM/ger Universal	- {				
Unit)	ļ	0.03	502	933.72	10,050.52
Total		100		58,358.73	628,170.52

#### Net site area after cedarbridgeway dedication

West Lot (1)		13,288.80	113,040.00
East Lot (2)		11,885.80	127,937.00
Total	2.28 *	25,174.60	270,977.00

\* FSR based on the Net site area and FSA

(excluding the bonus for the Universal bousing)

### Ground coverage/net area/lot

	%	SQM	SOFT
West Lot (1)	45%	13,288.80	143,040.00
Building 1-Ground coverage		Z,828.05	30,441.00
Building 2 -Ground coverage		3,130.45	33.696.00
East lot (2)	45%	11,885.80	127,937.00
Building 3 -Ground coverage		85.003.5	28,958.00
Building 4 -Ground coverage		2,604.34	28,033.00

	5	350	1.5	BURDIN	01	molecter.	<b>F</b>	1.12.4	22	BUILDIN	52	10/2022	2.800	1.1	100	TOTAL	THE R.	200
ROOM	-	-01,	-	10000	144	1344-3	-	6234	-	iów.	-	( Without			408		-	punit
	-	-	3410	TOTAL.	Alta	1	140	+	7.4.6	town		-	10.1	100	100	Total.		with
	77	R	1 5	1 18 1	17,500	27	1	19		28	27.101	14	1	17	7	41	44.901	м
3	-	13	-	11	12.463	14	1	11	1	36	30.150	21		10	- 61	32	\$2.225	6
	0	14		15	\$6.121	1.8	1	10		16	33,308	25	11			-03 1	\$4,527	- 46
3	tt	14	-	3	25.77L	14	-	10	-	16	.11.25#	25	40	1		45	54,753	-
2	1	14		0	29,817	14		11		35	32,010	D	47	41		54.	SOIR	
1	1	jø	-	1.5	11,647	JA .	1	. 16	-	18	13.118	25	11	AŬ		- 54	HAIS	- 41
112301.50	(I)	392	1.0	10	10.116	72	in	14	1 .	200	191,913	150	78	197	20	343	521.214	246
	246	CAN	25	100%	415		1 Acres	Tik	n	100%	574		24%	754	100	1000	100%	

	sint .	Zaci	iera J	1.40
Voltors	340	A20.	4.90	60
Attordable		1.05	230	1
Mealdents.	392	1.20	2,30	259
lotal	-			407
Car Parks provided	1			454
accessible.		-	1	
Valence		18.	16	51
amati car		41	*	1.53
Tordem Pashing		-		
from allowed?	1		1	107
(senided)	-	1396	-	

Ricycle paralace n	gsintmont.		
Visitore	340	0.2	54
Residents	540	1.25	425
Total			493
stighte partites p	conde a		502
Visitors (af tradie	N.2		61
Residents	-		614
Ventical	-	NA .	1 120

### LOADING SPACE REQUIREMENTS:

1 SPACE FOR 1ST 240 UNITS, 1 SPACE FOR EACH ADD'L 160 UNITS = 4 spaces (medium size)

(+) 1 SPACE FOR EVERY 2 BUILDINGS = 2 spaces (large size)

TOTAL REQUIRED = 6 spaces (2 large, 4 medium)

TOTAL PROVIDED = 4 spaces (4 medium)

# 

	a.	348	212	\$LILD-IN	6P	and the	ner'i	1.00		BUILDON	24	The Color	2.50	122	65.9	TOTAL	121 10 100	2 120-
1000	-	-979	-	Tilmed	ALLE	Simona .		10%	_	TEAL	the i	interes .			105		63.*A	Bearing and
	- 211	1000	1.70	- Service	Cart I	1 areas	1.74	150	and.	1000		lune -	144	1.6.7	141	10.04	1.64	140
6 3		21		1 25	17.131	17	1	1	1 .	43.1	17,136	221		11		38.4	54,247	24
3		35	•	22	24,639	17		11	1	22	14215	ti e		11	11	42	89,564	_ 15
	1			- 95	17,511	26	1		-	- 31	277.62	25	10	31	1	6	\$3,753	1.
3	- 5	.30		61	27,911	26	1	11	-	85	27,842	26.1	10	37		- 61	JKJ13	1.14
*		11		. 11	27,911	25	1.1		1	- 84	27,555	25	12	. 50		3	35.867	62
1		24		14	26,191	22	1	*	1	30	27,256	- 22 -	17	0		61	33,457	1 12
32.83	11		12	100	Ann Da	118	15	10	10	164	157-67	1 125	50	148	30	120	204,661	25
	1674	299.	104	1075	SOX		114	14.4	62	20097	\$07X		2.84	m	10.1	207%	100%	

_	Um	200	ters .	# Gard
Vallers	120	6.20	8.90	51
Adordable	30	2.00	9,90	10
Realizents	300	1.40	0.90	313
Total				304
Les Paries Print	*4			37
Les Parits 27501d	*1		-	
<u>Ces Punto 275nia</u> Acteosible Visitori	*1	6	15	
<u>Ces P<sub>an</sub>to 20581d</u> Acteolitie Violitări Violitări Violitări	ed	C.	15 N	377 41 199
Ces 2 <sub>40</sub> (3 255a) Acteolitie Visitary Visitary Visitary Tendem Parking	*1	<u>c</u> . 9	15 N	377 5 49 199
Cos Partie Zmini Actoristic Videan Videa Videa Videan Videan Videan Videan Videan Vide	e4	G. Se	15	377 44 199

HOLD COM IN THE T	And and a state of the		
alsors.	320	42	1 64
instente	1 200	_18	400
ital	-		
Rycle parking pr	wided		490
faitors (int grade)	M.)		. P
eskierts			426.
Werdstall	1	24%	1 401

# Yamamoto Architecture Inc.

ATTACHMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT FEBRUARY 8, 2012







,











10111-003

ADACINENT DEVELOPVENT

1920, 709 AND MINISTER MAY MANAGANA ING

nen w

A2.6

Then is for

19 044

































.







FRISLIN'HARY PLANT LOT BOTARCAL NAME

> or Distance in the other contract or other

Arrestell , promote

dation standing

Not sympto Publics

Silver Spider Grass Daffodil



Gionachas maca Golden Japanese Forest Grass

**Bleeding Heart** 

Carek tumuloota Berkeley Sedge

Sand Dune Sodge

GRASSES, PERENNIALS, BULDS, AND ANNUALS

Yarrow

	Balan heimgara		Taxa and	
	division personal	14 13 m	Sec.26	10.000
	Derechters?	- Martin	Divisi, Ma	
ntrat IX	HUTCHNEEL NORE	CTHE WOM ADMIT	A-24	and the
	Supercentrative place family Consectioners	Harry Roward Rev Carlos B	NP parts ND gast	18.42
	Concess for alleftings.	Otternor	The	21.04
	Coloradores Million	244	64.049	27.44
	sectored granteries	Chaptering any particulars	April	SF 44
	land the latter latter in the second se	Barten angelen	ALC: Y	2010
	Part is a biret	Factoria	Acres	Sec.1
	in our internet and Thinkson'	Intellinia Theilph Lovel		
	Reputicion multiple	Martine Scientifiers	12.00	25.04
	Dr. committe S. 24.847 Encontraction (Lafford er	while developments of	45,000	14-1 16 14 1
	ricecci endori Arti Jacob	The designation of	#1.720	N 84
	Apar, and in	wallin General	A 19.00	1000
	Assaultantion being the state of the state o	resignmentar	1.944	Fred .
	(kings) particle Scoreines' Journes to mAin October	Approximation and a	12.000	15-11
	Taxes areada. Hiterd	Perio ten i districi	17.00	15 mil
-	In contrast also years			
1	INCOMPANY WANT	COMPONENTE	101	AMORE
	Daterstagener	See lige	41.20	0° 18
	Bulghore Librick Epidedical progenity Robert	Hard ACTION AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AN		
	rystant minerals	Balante Manager	the mobile to	15.44
	Protection and any	Calumnia.	1.64	15
	Confed alloyed and	ALS You W SHIE!		
	Failed atomic sectorization interest consumer sectorization	Gand mits Spirities	distant or .	5.
	to Perspice adjunction to the contraction of the co	Weighters, Singer, Pass	a sheet	a te
	distriction and an	Nord of the	- LAMINE	10.04
Y.	III. FENDROLL DUN AND A	CORDATIN KARE	92N	UPICN,
	And the second sec	Construction (Construction)	Algebringeri Delle	24° -
	Stola a story from Blaum"	Phile Statistics in the state	1.200	
	Barrissee average	Parent Data Print	V Sharing a	dian.
	15-04 Streetspeel	Page -	Co. No.	
	Name a Solid Adams	Star Labor Cross	12,00	Print.
	Photo in the little	Care-desta Printer	20 with	EP-AL
	FLEMO PARAMET	D-mark	1.4	
	Dist Partieus	Mexical Fighter Grove	Sec.	5100
Al.	alar in dealegance however advances innerses and lower according to which for the particular of the dealers of the	Culminika Lindon Jonnia	APRIL 1	

-34 43.41

ide the issue

142.042 James

SUTLEAS Autom

And the Party lines

Intellige Subsects

Same Services

Salages

NOTES

A 10 WHITE OF

in the

HANP & DIAHOND

No. Marriel and The Works

Yamamoto

-Series. PLANT MATERIALS

> ----L2.1

Simila

-

Architecture Inc.

the set start sectors in the set (20-mar

1731, 7771 ALDERBRIDGE WAY

**PH - 396** 

Hosta



.




PH - 399







## **Rezoning Considerations**

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

Address: ERIC HUGHES, Development Manager	
ONNI 7731 Alderbridge Holding Corp. ONNI 7771	Alderbridge Holding Corp. RZ2011-585209
#300-550 Robson St.	
Vancouver, BC	
V6B 2B7	
	File No.: RZ2011-585209

Prior to final adoption of Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8884 to rezone the two existing parcels of land at 7731 and 7771 Alderbridge Way (the Subject Lands) from IL to RAH2, the Onni Group of Companies (the Developer) is required to complete the following:

- 1. **Dedicated Public Roads:** The following roads as described below and generally shown on Figure 1 and otherwise determined based on the City's approval of the functional design are to be dedicated and secured with interim Statutory Rights of Way secured as outlined below.
  - a. Cedarbridge Way: Provision of a 20.0 m wide Statutory Right of Way (SROW) on the Subject Lands from Alderbridge Way to the current dedicated north lane (New River Road) for road, utility and Public Rights of Passage purposes in a form satisfactory to the City.
  - b. River Road: That part of the City-owned former CPR rail line (free hold parcel: Lot 12, Sec 5/6-4-6, Plan 24195) from Gilbert Road to the east side of the current dedicated lane bounding the east side of the Subject Lands will be dedicated as Road.
  - c. Cedarbridge Way Dedication and Subdivision: Registration of a legal agreement on the Subject Lands prohibiting issuance of any building permit until such lands are subdivided into Lot 1 (West Lot) and Lot 2 (East Lot) with a 20m wide road dedication in the same location of the above-noted SROW as generally shown on Figure 1. The agreement will also require that prior to approval of such subdivision of the Subject Lands, the existing building on the proposed Lot 1 will be demolished as the building will encroach into the proposed road dedication. A further agreement will be registered that prohibits issuance of a building permit for a building on the proposed Lot 1 until such time there is confirmation to the satisfaction of the City that the existing building on the proposed Lot 2 is not being utilized in any manner that requires vehicle access onto Cedarbridge Way without a traffic and parking management plan, that includes analysis and measures to address traffic operations and safety, and encroachment agreement that are to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation.
  - 2. Statutory Rights of Way (SROW) for Sidewalks: The following areas are required for sidewalks as described below and as generally shown on Figure 1 are to be secured by SROW for 24-hour-a-day public pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation and related uses and features, with maintenance provided by the City, providing all necessary access by City and other public utility service providers and for bylaw enforcement activities. Unless as otherwise determined under the approved functional design for the transportation works and the Servicing Agreement, the following SROWs are required:
    - a. River Road: Registration of a 3.0 m wide SROW for a 3.0 m sidewalk inside of the entire north property line of the proposed Lots 1 and 2, together with two 4.0 m-by-4.0 m corner cuts at the intersection of River Road and Cedarbridge Way. (Not eligible for DCC credits.)
    - b. Alderbridge Way: Registration of a 2.0 m wide SROW for a 2.0 m sidewalk inside of the entire south property line of the proposed Lots **PHd** 2,402 ther with two 4.0 m-by-4.0 m corner cuts at the

intersection of Alderbridge Way and Cedarbridge Way. (Sidewalk within SROW not eligible for DCC credits.)

- c. East Lane: Registration of a 2.0 m wide SROW for a 2.0 m sidewalk inside of the east property line of the proposed Lot 2 adjacent to the southern part of the adjacent current dedicated lane for a minimum of 20 m. past the driveway letdown for Building 4 and as generally shown adjacent to future paved portion of the lane shaded in grey on Figure 1, whichever is greater. (Not eligible for DCC credits.)
- 3. Statutory Rights of Way (SROW) for Greenway & Pedestrian L ink: The following areas described below and as generally shown on Figure 2 are to be secured by SROW for 24-hour-a-day public pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation and related uses and features, providing all necessary access by City and other public utility service providers and bylaw enforcement activities. Unless as otherwise determined under the approved Development Permit plans and the City Servicing Agreement to be approved as a condition of rezoning, the following SROWs are required:
  - a. East-West Greenway: Registration of a 10.0m wide SROW for 24-hour-a-day public access and use for pedestrian, bicycle and related uses and features, providing all necessary access by emergency services, City and other public utility service providers, including bylaw enforcement activities. The SROW will extend from the east to west boundaries of the Subject Lands except for the Cedarbridge Road dedication and North-South Pedestrian Link as shown on Figure 2. The below-grade parking structures and community garden plots may be located within the SROW, provided that such elements do not compromise the City's intended public use and enjoyment of the spaces as determined to the satisfaction of the City. Design, security for construction, and owner maintenance, liability and other terms of the area under the SROW are to be to the satisfaction of the City as a condition of bylaw adoption.
  - b. North-South Pedestrian Link: Registration of a 5.0m wide SROW for 24-hour-a-day public access and use for pedestrian, bicycle and related uses and features, providing all necessary access by emergency services, City and other public utility service providers, including bylaw enforcement activities. The SROW will extend from the north to south boundaries of the Subject Lands as shown on Figure 2. A required retaining wall along west boundary of may be located within the SROW, provided that element does not compromise the intended public use and enjoyment of the spaces as determined, to the satisfaction of the City. The SROW will include a process for removal of the retaining wall in the future by either the City or adjacent property owner to the west. Design, security for construction, and owner maintenance, liability and other terms of the area under the SROW are to be to the satisfaction of the City as a condition of bylaw adoption.
- 4. Flood Covenant: Registration of the City's standard flood indemnity covenant on title ensuring that there is no construction of habitable area below the Flood Construction Level of 2.9 m (Area A).
- 5. Tandem Parking Covenant: Registration of the City's standard covenant on title ensuring that tandem parking spaces in each building are occupied by the owners of the same strata lot is required.
- 6. Noise Covenant(s): Registration of covenants below on title is required for:
  - a. Aircraft Noise Sensitive Use Development (Residential) covenant based on the City's standard covenant; and
  - b. Industrial Noise covenant to require that the buildings be constructed to address the maximum noise levels set-out in item 15(b) below.
- 7. District Energy Utility (DEU): Registration of a restrictive covenant and/or alternative legal agreement(s), to the satisfaction of the City, securing that "no development" will be permitted on the subject site and restricting Development Permit\* issuance until, the Developer enters into legal agreement(s) in respect to the Developer's commitment to connecting to the proposed City Centre DEU, including operation of and use of the DEU and all associated obligations and agreements as determined by the Director of Engineering, including, but not limited to:
  - a. Design and construction of the development's buildings to facilitate hook-up to a DEU system (e.g., hydronic water-based heating system); and

- b. Entering into a Service Provision Agreement(s) and statutory right-of-way(s) and/or alternative legal agreements, to the satisfaction of the City, that establish DEU for the subject site.
- 8. Affordable Housing Agreement: Registration of the City's standard Housing Agreements to secure 38 affordable housing (low-end market rental) to the satisfaction of the City that the combined habitable floor area of which units shall comprise at least 5% of the subject development's total residential building area (including common areas, such as hallways and lobbies). The terms of the Housing Agreements shall indicate that they apply in perpetuity. The terms specify the types and sizes of units (or as adjusted to the satisfaction of the City and Developer) in Tables 1 and 2, and rent levels and tenant household incomes as set out in Table 2.

		BU	BUILDING 1				LDING	3		BU	ILDING	4	TOTAL				
FLOORS	NC	<b>X</b> .	AREA	TOTA:		NOS.		TOTAL	N	Ds.	AREA	TOTAL	NO5			AREA	
	1 160	2880	AREA	- TOTAL	1850	2800	AREA	TOTAL	1860	2600	ANCA		1357	2810	TOTAL	MALA	
		2	864	1,728	· ·	4	864	3,456	· ]	4	864	3,456	-	10	10	8,640	
3									-	3	888	2,664	-	3	3	2,664	
								1	1	-	635	635	1	•	1	635	
	-	2	864	1.728	-	4	864	3,456	· 1	4	864	3,456	-	10	10	8,640	
	Z	-	600	1,200					· ·	3	888	2,664	2	3	5	3,864	
2									•	2	866	1,732	•	2	2	1,732	
							100		2	-	600	1,200	2	-	2	1,200	
									1	-	645	645	1		1	645	
		2	883	1,776					1		564	564	1	2	3	2,340	
1							200	$   < \epsilon$	1	-	570	570	1	·	1	570	
TOTAL	2	6		6,432	-	8		6,912	6	16		17,586	8	30	38	30,930	

#### Table 1: Affordable Housing Unit Locations

### Table 2: Affordable Housing Target Groups

Unit Type	Number of Units	Mínimum Unit Area	Maximum Monthly Unit Rent*	Total Аплиal Household Income*
l-Bedroom	8**	50 m2 (535 ft2)	\$925	\$37,000 or less
2-Bedroom	30**	80 m2 (860 ft2)	\$1,137	\$45,500 or less

\* May be increased periodically as provided for under adopted City policy.

\*\* All affordable housing units must satisfy Richmond Zoning Bylaw requirements for Basic Universal Housing.

- 9. Ensuring Affordable Housing: Registration of a legal agreement requiring each of the four buildings be constructed as set out in the above section and preventing issuance of a final Building Permit inspection granting occupancy for each of the four buildings until confirmation is provided by City Housing staff confirming that the required number of Affordable Housing units as shown in the above tables have been constructed to the satisfaction of the City. The agreement will specify that the issuance of a final Building Permit inspection granting occupancy for Building 2 or 3 is prohibited until the affordable housing units in Building 1 are completed and issued a final Building Permit inspection granting occupants of the affordable housing units set-out in Table 1. The agreement will also ensure that occupants of the affordable housing units subject to the Housing Agreements shall enjoy full and unlimited access to and use of all on-site indoor and outdoor amenity spaces.
- 10. Indoor Shared Amenity Space: Registration of reciprocal access easement and other legal agreements as required on the proposed Lots 1 and 2 will be required to ensure that not less than 10,235 ft<sup>2</sup> shared indoor amenity, with an included indoor swimming pool, is provided within the first building to be constructed on the Subject Lands, being Building 1, as shown on Figure 1 and that appropriate mechanisms to allow for shared access, use and management and usped reavise sharing costs for operations and maintenance for such

shared amenity space is provided to all units within all of the buildings. The reciprocal access easement / other legal agreement will be between the owners of Lots 1 and 2, but with the City identified as a grantee to ensure that the agreements which not be discharged and or changed without City approval. The reciprocal access easement / other legal agreement will also specify that the issuance of a final Building Permit inspection granting occupancy for Building 2, 3 or 4 is prohibited until Building 1 is completed and has been issued a final Building Permit inspection granting occupancy.

- 11. Public Art: City acceptance of the Developer's offer voluntarily provide \$440,411 to Richmond's public program with a cash contribution of \$139,700 provided to the public art reserve fund for a Landmark Art piece, providing a security in a form acceptable to the City for \$300,711 for other Public Art (as shown on Figure 2) and a detailed Public Art Program prior to adoption of rezoning. The calculations are based on \$0.75/ft<sup>2</sup> of eligible building floor area of 587,214 ft<sup>2</sup> (excluding basic universal accessible housing and affordable housing). The Developer will be invited (but not required) to participate in the selection process for the Landmark Art piece. It should be noted in addition to \$139,700, the previous Onni contribution of \$210,300 for the ORA development on Hollybridge Way will be used for the Landmark Art piece at Gilbert and New River Road to reach the City's budgetary goal for larger sculptural works of \$350,000 as outlined in the City's *City Centre Public Art Plan*.
- 12. Community Planning Program: City acceptance of the Developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$149,543 towards Richmond's community planning program fund (based on \$0.25/ft<sup>2</sup> of total building area, excluding affordable housing units) with \$37,386 (25% of the total) provided to the City prior to rezoning adoption. A legal agreement will be registered that requires contribution of \$112,157 (75% of the total) to the City prior to issuance of a building permit for the second of four buildings on the Subject Lands.
- 13. Transportation Demand Management: As also set in "Schedule 1" to this letter, The Developer requests an overall parking reduction of 7.5% below the parking requirements set out in Bylaw 8500 with a reduction of the visitor parking from 0.20 to 0.15 spaces/unit which results in required visitor parking of 99 stalls (25% reduction), residential parking of 750 stalls (4% reduction) for a total visitor and residential parking of 849 stalls. Within the overall maximum 7.5% reduction, there may be adjustment as to the breakdown of the reduction by the Developer for visitor and resident parking spaces, but only to the satisfaction of the City. In lieu of this reduction, the City accepts the Developer's offer to voluntarily:
  - a. Contribute \$100,000 to the City for the construction of a 3.0m bike/pedestrian pathway along the east side of Gilbert Road from the southern end of the Developer's required frontage improvements to Lansdowne Road. (Not eligible for DCC credits.)
  - b. Contribute \$25,000 to the City for a City Centre-type bus shelter. (Not eligible for DCC credits.)
  - c. Enter into an agreement with the City to ensure that the electrical vehicle and bicycle plug-ins be provided as a condition of issuance of the City building permits for each building with confirmation that such have been provided as a condition of issuance of an occupancy permit for each building:
    - i. Provision of 20% of the total resident parking spaces in each parkade with 120 or 240 volt (voltage as determined by Onni) electric service for vehicle plug-ins with conduits, circuits breakers, wiring in form acceptable to the Director of Transportation (actual outlets to be provided later by strata owners).
    - ii. Provision of one standard 120 volt electric plug-in for every 40 resident bicycle parking spaces in a form acceptable to the Director of Transportation.
- 14. Transportation, Parks and Engineering Works under Servicing Agreement(s) (SA): Enter into a Servicing Agreement (SA)\* for the design and construction, at the Developer's sole cost, of full upgrades across and adjacent to the Subject Lands for road works, transportation infrastructure, street frontages, water, sanitary and storm sewer system upgrades, and related works as generally set out below. Prior to rezoning adoption, all works identified via the SA must be secured via a Letter(s) of Credit, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, Director of Engineering, Director of Transportation and Manager, Parks Planning and Design. All works shall be completed with regards to timing as set out in the SA and above-noted covenant and legal agreements in the Rezoning Requirements. Refinements to the Engineering Works requirements may occur through the SA process. Furthermore, other neighbouring **GH**lop**404** ay be constructing some of the engineering services

listed below. These factors, together with project phasing, will be taken into consideration in the phasing of securities for engineering services.

### a. Transportation Works

SA works will include, but may not be limited to, the following as works included within "Schedule 1" attached to and forming part of this letter.

### b. Engineering Works:

SA works will include, but may not be limited to, as set out in the following table:

Storm sewer upgrade requirements:

1) General

From CP Railway frontage (i.e., new River Road) to outfall of Hollybridge Canal (at corner of Hollybridge Way and existing River Road).

a. Upgrade the existing ditch to 1200mm diameter storm main from manhole D8 to 185 meters northeast along the proposed site's CPR frontage (i.e., new River Road).

b. Upgrade the existing ditch to 1200mm diameter storm main from manhole D5 to 222 meters northeast along proposed new River Road (manhole D8 at junction of Gilbert Road).

c. Upgrade the existing ditch to 1500mm diameter storm main from junction of Hollybridge Way and CP Rail ROW (manhole D4) to 80 meters northeast along proposed new River Road (manhole D5).

d. Upgrade the existing 375 and 450mm diameter to a 1500mm diameter storm main from junction of existing River Road and Hollybridge Way (manhole D1 in the analysis) to 205 meters southeast along Hollybridge Way (manhole D4).

e. Upgrade the existing 750mm diameter to a 1500mm diameter storm main from manhole D1 (in the analysis) to outfall with an approximate length of 8m.

## 2) Gilbert Road frontage

a. Upgrade the existing ditch to 600 mm diameter storm sewer from the proposed site's entire Gilbert Road frontage up to the existing box culvert at Lansdowne Road. The proposed storm sewer at Gilbert Road must be interconnected to the proposed storm sewers at the CPR frontage.

3) Future Cedarbridge Way frontage

a. Provide the greater of a) 600 mm and b) OCP size by the Developer, as per City requirements. The proposed storm sewer in future Cedarbridge must be interconnected to the proposed storm sewers at the CPR and Alderbridge Way frontages.

- 4) Alderbridge Way frontage
- a. Upgrade the existing 250mm and 300mm diameter storm sewers from east

to west property line of the proposed site to 600 mm diameter. Upgrade the existing 300mm to 750mm and existing 375mm to 900mm Ь. diameter storm sewers from the west property line of the proposed site to the existing box culvert at Lansdowne Road. Manhole locations to be determined in the Servicing Agreement design. C. d. As an alternative to 4) a. and b. provide a single storm sewer system, sized to OCP conditions, from the site's east property line (i.e., east property line of 7771 Alderbridge Way) to the existing box culvert at Lansdowne Road. Sanitary sewer upgrade requirements: Upgrade the existing 200 mm diameter to 450 mm diameter from SMH a. 4738 (manhole S70) to 90 meters northeast along old CPR right of way to SMH 4737 (manhole S60). Upgrade the existing 200 mm diameter to 375 mm diameter from SMH Ъ. 4699 (manhole S50) to 80 meters southwest along old CPR right of way to SMH 4737 (manhole S60). C. Provide a 525mm diameter sanitary main in the future Cedarbridge Way from SMH 4737 (manhole S60) to a new manhole located 220 meters south going to Alderbridge Way. Upgrade the existing 150 mm diameter to 525mm diameter from the new d, manhole at the corner of future Cedarbridge Way and Alderbridge Way to 80 meters east to SMH 4690 (manhole S20). Upgrade the existing 200 mm diameter to 525mm diameter from SMH d, 4690 (manhole S20) to 94 meters southeast to existing lane between 7740 Alderbridge Way to 5003 Minoru Boulevard at SMII 4688 (manhole S10). Upgrade the existing 300 mm diameter to 600 mm diameter from SMH e. 4688 (manhole S10) to 69 meters southwest to existing Minoru Pump station. f. Through the Servicing Agreement, the sanitary sewer alignments will need to be coordinated to suit the future Minoru Sanitary Pump Station upgrade. g. Both current sanitary mains located within the Subject Lands will need to be removed by the Developer and the SROWs in which they are located are to be discharged from title.

#### Water Works and Review:

a. Water System: Using the OCP 2021 maximum day model, there is 346 L/s available at 20 psi residual. Based on the proposed application, the development requires a minimum fire flow of 275 L/s. Water analysis is not required. However, once the applicant has confirmed the building design at the building permit stage, the Developer will need to submit fire flow calculations signed and sealed by a professional engineer based on the Fire Underwriter Survey to confirm that there is adequate available flow.

. . .

b. Provide watermains (minimum 200mm diameter, per City's requirements) at the proposed site's CPR and future Cedarbridge Way frontages.

### General:

Undergrounding of Overhead Utilities:

As per City Centre policy, the developer is responsible for facilitating the undergrounding of the existing private utility pole line located within the "new" River Road right-of-way. As such, the developer is required, at the developer's sole cost, to install conduit within "new" River Road to accommodate the undergrounding of private utilities, to the satisfaction of the City. (No DCC credits are applicable.)

## DCC Credits:

DCC credits are available for the following:

- 1. Sanitary Sewer
  - a. gravity sanitary sewer along the development frontage on New River Road;
  - b. gravity sanitary sewer along the Cedarbridge Way or the lane between New River Road the lane south of Alderbridge Way; and
  - c. gravity sanitary sewer from the Minoru sanitary pump station to approx 70m northeast.

### 2. Storm Sewer

Storm sewer along on New River Road intended to replace storm sewer on old River Road.

### Lalecomer Agreements:

Latecomer Agreements will be available for sanitary and storm upgrades that are not frontage improvements as only provided by the Local Government Act.

## c. Greenway and Boulevard Landscape Works (Parks)

SA works will include, but may not be limited to, the following:

- i. All works within the East-West Green Link and North-South Pedestrian Link described above and boulevard grass and tree plantings on public roads including, but not limited to, the works shown on the preliminary plans dated February 8, 2012 prepared by Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture Inc. entitled "7731, 7771 Alderbridge Way" (which are attached to the staff report for this development to the Planning Committee of April 17, 2012) to the satisfaction of City Parks staff; and
- ii. Acknowledging that the City will construct the Gilbert Greenway works (located at the back of the approximate 50 m of the Gilbert Road widening and frontage improvements constructed by the

Developer within the Gilbert Road allowance detailed under Schedule 1) at an appropriate date in the future.

- 15. **Development Permit:** The submission and processing of a Development Permit\* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development with the following elements being addressed:
  - a. Basic Universal Accessible Housing: A notation on the architectural plans requiring and describing how the 502 Basic Universal Housing units meet all of the requirements of Zoning Bylaw 8500, except where Section 4.16.11 (front entry door clearance provision) may be varied by Council.

	BUILDING 1						BUILDING 2							TOTAL					
FLOORS		NOS.		TOTAL	AREA	Universa		NOs.		TOTAL	AREA	Universal		6	ICX.		AREA	Universal	
	1 010	2760	3 3200	IOIAL	Апса	1 units	4 63P	2 810	3800	TOME	Adea	units	t EID	2515	1 (đ. đ.	TOTAL	PRICA	units	
6	7	23	5	18	17,500	12	3	23	٥	28	27,101	22	s	.32	3	46	44,601	34	
5	3	75	8	22	21,469	16	3	22	5	30	30,754	23	1	37	ti.	52	52,223	39	
4	11	13	·	29	25,321	18	8	28	-	36	33,206	28	29	46	1	65	58,527	46	
3	11	18		29	25.321	18	-8	28	2	.36	33,398	28	<u>)</u> 9	45		65	58,719	46	
2	.)	14	-	23	20,937	14	۲	27	-	35	33,398	27	17	ц	1.5	58	54,335	41	
1	5	<u>کې</u>		. 19	19,667	14	9	25		35-	33,158	26	14	40	Ψ.	54	52,825	40	
-	39	90	Ц	140	130,216	92	39	152	9	200	191,015	154	78	242	20	340	321,230	Z46	
and the second	28%	64%	8%	100%	41%		20%	76%	5%	100%	59%		23%	71%	6%	100%	1.00%		

#### **Basic Universal Housing Unit Locations**

## West Lot

## East Lot

	BUILDING 3						BUILDING 4						TOTAL					
FLOORS	0.000	NOL		TOTAL	AATA	Universa		NO5.		TOTAL	AREA	Universal		1	IQ18		AREA	Universal
	L DID	2,000	3 5 2 0	TOTAL	AREA	1 units	1810	> 910	3.000	IOTAL	AREA	unita	1,920	2813	3650	TOTAL	ARLA	write
5	•	11	ব	15	17,131	12	·	11	4	15	17,136	12	-	22	8	30	34,267	24
5	· ·	25	5	21	24,639	17	- ·	16	6	22	24,925	18	-	31	12	43	49,564	35
4	5	20		31	27,911	26	5	7.6		31	27,842	26	10	52	•	62	55,753	52
3	5	26	-	31	27,911	26	5	26	•	31	27,842	26	10	52	-	62	55,753	52
2	6	52	•	31	27,911	25	6	25	-	31	27,956	25	12	50	•	62	55,867	50
1	2	22		31	28,191	22	9	21	-	30	27,266	21	18	43	·	61	55,457	43
	25	**	10	160	153,694	128	25	125	10	160	152,967	128	50	250	20	320	306,661	256
arry car	16%	78%	6%	100%	50%		16%	78%	6%	100%	50%		16%	78%	Sín	100%	100%	

- b. Airport and Industrial Noise Report: A notation on the architectural plans requiring and describing the required submission of a report that addresses aircraft noise following the provisions of the City's Official Community Plan for aircraft noise and industrial noise generally. The report's recommendations for the proposed development will require that the buildings are designed in a manner that mitigates potential aircraft and industrial noise within the proposed dwelling units with the architect of record providing a letter of assurance conformance adherence to the report and his/her plans prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for each building. Dwelling units must be designed and constructed to achieve:
  - CMHC guidelines for interior noise levels as indicated in the chart below:

Portions of Dwelling Units	Noise Levels (decibels)
Bedrooms	35 decibels
Living, dining, recreation rooms	40 decibels
Kitchen, bathrooms, hallways, and utility rooms	45 decibels

- the ASHRAE 55-2004 "Thermal Environmental Conditions for Human Occupancy" standard for interior living spaces or most recent applicable ASHRAE standard.
- 16. LEED Silver: Submission of letter with from the Architect of Record as a requirement of issuance of building permit confirming that the building phase (building and landscape design) has a sufficient score to meet the Canadian Green Building Council LEED Silver 2009 criteria and submission of follow-up letter confirming that building has been constructed to be the such LEED criteria. The architect of record or

LEED consultant is also to provide a letter of assurance confirming how each building meets LEED Silver criteria prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for each building. The LEED criteria to met must include:

- a. Heat Island Effect: Roof Credit
- b. Storm Water Management Credit
- 17. Landscape Plan: Submission of a Landscape Plan, prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, and deposit of a Landscaping Security based on 100% of the cost estimate provided by the Landscape Architect, including installation costs. The final Landscape Plan will include the elements shown on the preliminary plan dated February 8, 2012 prepared by Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture Inc. entitled "7731, 7771 Alderbridge Way" with final DP-level detail to be completed by the Developer the satisfaction of the City which is attached to the staff report to Planning Committee for the development.

### Notes:

- \* Item requiring 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. The form and content of all agreements shall be to the satisfactory to the Director of Development.

The subject Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8884 will include a provision that effectively enables calculation of density on that part of Cedarbridge Way dedicated as road as consideration for adoption of Bylaw 8884.



Figure 1: Overview of Road and Streetscape



Figure 2: Public Art & On-Site Open Space

#### Schedule 1: Rezoning Considerations

#### 7731/7771 Alderbridge Way Rezoning Application

### **Transportation Servicing Agreement Requirements**

<u>Transportation SA Requirements</u>: All transportation improvements identified in the City-approved Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) and over the course of the rezoning application process are to be addressed via the servicing agreement process for this development. A City-approved "Preliminary Functional Roads Plan" is attached (Figure 1). Complete and detailed road and traffic management design is subject to final functional design approved by the Director of Transportation. The transportation-related Servicing Agreement works will include, but are not limited to the following:

(i) <u>Construction of New River Road (Only between Gilbert Road and East Lane)</u> – The scope of work includes the construction of a full new roadway (the length of which is equivalent to the length of the north development frontage) between Gilbert Road and East Lane (the north-south lane along the east development frontage). The Developer is responsible for building the full road cross-section from the site frontage to the north curb inclusive (with a minimum 1.0 m wide hard surface clearance area and retaining wall at the back of the north curb). The Developer will conduct a contaminated site study and possible minor remediation of the land to the satisfaction of the City within this road with the costs being paid by the Developer (the costs of which are eligible for Road Works DCC credit at building permit). This roadway is to be completed as part of Phase 2 of the development (Building 2 –northwest quadrant of site) and prior to "Final Building Permit Inspection" granting occupancy for Phase 2. DCC credits are available for road works completed within the dedicated road right-of-way as defined in the City DCC program. This new road project shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation and the Director of Development, and shall include, but not limited to the following elements:

- All road elements and frontage improvements are to be placed within the 26.21 m City dedicated road allowance (includes current City lane allowance and former CPR line parcel dedicated as road) with the exception of the 3.0 m, wide sidewalk (to be placed within the building setback and secured via a Public Right of Passage Statutory Right of Way (SROW), with two 4 m x 4 m corner cuts (at both sides of the intersection with Cedarbridge Way), are to be provided at rezoning subject to the Public Rights of Passage being able to be converted to dedication by the Developer as part of. The alignment of this roadway is to be centered within the city road right-of-way, i.e. consistent with the New River Road alignment established west of Gilbert Road. This road is to be built to an elevation of 2.6 m geodetic with a maximum 5% slope transitioning to the centerline of Gilbert Road at the New River Road intersection.
- The ultimate lane configuration, upon completion of construction, shall consist of two westbound traffic lanes, two eastbound traffic lanes and a left turn lane at the Gilbert Road/New River Road intersection. Elsewhere along this roadway, a level grade median is to be provided to separate eastbound and westbound traffic. The median shall have decorative paving treatment with features/finishings to be determined by the city. The lane widths are 3.25 m (curb lanes) and 3.2 m (other lanes and median).
- The frontage improvements of this road project shall consist of curb and gutter on both sides of the road, a 1.71m wide landscaped boulevard (with a single row of street trees at 6.0 m on center), 1.8 m wide off-road bike lane (inclusive of two 0.15 m level grade concrete bands along the edges of the bike lane), 1.55 m wide buffer (with bollards and street furniture, street trees, and/or other features designed to separate pedestrian and cyclist traffic), 3.0 m sidewalk, banner poles, hard landscape features, street furnishings, and street lights. At the bus stop (location to be determined by the city in consultation with Coast Mountain Bus Co.), the boulevard shall be widened to 2.7 m to accommodate bus shelter/transit accessibility requirements and the 1.55 m buffer width shall be reduced to 0.55 m to respect the width of the existing city right-of-way. The design of the plaza area at the southeast corner of the Gilbert Road/New River Road intersection is to be coordinated in conjunction with City Parks and Planning with the overall layout of the intersection to ensure that safe and effi**Phi**t-**p412ria** and cyclist movements are accommodated.

- In the interim time period (before the ultimate New River Road is extended to the northeast), the traffic operations along this section of New River Road shall be as follows: two-way traffic between Gilbert Road and interim River Road junction, one-way eastbound between interim River Road junction and Cedarbridge Way, and two-way traffic between Cedarbridge Way and East Lane. Concrete barriers shall be placed to direct traffic to respect the interim traffic operations. When New River Road is extended to the north, two-way traffic will be permitted between Gilbert Road and East Lane. At the New River Road/Cedarbridge Way intersection, traffic movements will be limited to right-in/right-out (enforced by channelization and signage) and a special crosswalk is required to provide a pedestrian connection to the future waterfront park on the north side of New River Road. The East Lane shall be closed to vehicular traffic at New River Road.
- In the interim conditions, vehicle access to the development along New River Road shall be limited to the Cedarbridge Way intersection. No driveway or other vehicle access will be permitted along this new roadway.

(ii) <u>Widening of Alderbridge Way (along development frontage)</u> - The scope of work includes: 2.0 m road widening over the length of the development south frontage to allow for the construction of future left turn lanes; 20:1 taper sections to tie the road widening section to the existing pavement east and west of the development; frontage improvements; and the signalization of the Alderbridge Way/Cedarbridge Way intersection. This roadway is to be completed as part of Phase 1 of the development (Building 1 - southwest quadrant of site) and prior to "Final Building Permit Inspection" granting occupancy for Phase 1. Road Works DCC credits are applicable, but not for the sidewalks completed within the Public Rights of Passage SROW. This road widening project shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation and the Director of Development, and shall include, but not limited to the following elements:

- The lane configuration, upon completion of the 2.0 m road widening, shall consist of two eastbound traffic lanes and two westbound traffic lanes. (with left turns allowed in the center lanes at the Cedarbridge Way and East Lane intersections). The widened portion of the road shall be tied back to existing pavement east and west of the development with a 20:1 taper. Frontage improvements are to include curb and gutter along the development side of the road, a 2.0 m sidewalk and a minimum 1.65 m treed boulevard.
- At the Alderbridge Way/Cedarbridge Way intersection, a full signalized intersection shall be constructed.
- Vehicle access to the development along Alderbridge Way shall be limited to the Cedarbridge Way and East Lane intersections. No other driveway or vehicle access will be permitted along the development frontage of Alderbridge Way once the development is complete.

(iii) <u>Construction of Cedarbridge Way (between New River Road and Alderbridge Way)</u> - The scope of work includes the construction of a new roadway that extends Cedarbridge Way from Alderbridge Way to New River Road. The Developer is to build the full cross-section including two traffic lanes, two parking lanes, frontage improvements, and traffic calming measures. This roadway is to be completed as part of Phase 1 of the development (Building 1 - southwest quadrant of site) and prior to "Final Building Permit Inspection" granting occupancy for Phase 1. Road Works DCC credits are not available for this road construction projects. This project shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation and the Director of Development, and shall include, but not limited to the following elements:

• The lane configuration of this roadway, upon completion of construction, shall consist of two traffic lanes and two parking lanes (total 12 m wide pavement). At the Alderbridge Way intersection, the parking lanes are to be removed to accommodate two departure lanes and one receiving lane. At the New River Road intersection, the two parking lanes are removed to make provision for right-in/right-out channelization. This section of Cedarbridge Way is to be raised at the north end (maximum 5% grade) to meet the elevation of New River Road). The frontage improvements shall include, on both sides of the road, curb and gutter, a 2.35 m sidewalk and a minimum 1.65 m treed boulevard.

- At the Cedarbridge Way/east-west greenway intersection, curb extensions (maximum 2.5 m measured from curb face) and a marked level grade crosswalk are required.
- At the Alderbridge Way/Cedarbridge Way intersection, a fully signalized intersection shall be constructed. At the Cedarbridge/New River Road Intersection, channelization is required to restrict access to right-in/right-out movements only.
- Vehicle access to the development along Cedarbridge Way shall be limited to one parkade entrance driveway each for Buildings 1/2/3. Access to Building 4 shall be via the East Lane. Access to the loading area for each building is to be accommodated along the roll curb section of the curb extensions at midblock on Cedarbridge Way. No other driveway or vehicle access to the development will be permitted on Cedarbridge Way.

(iv) <u>Widening of Gilbert Road</u> - The scope of work includes the full curb to curb widening of Gilbert Road for a distance that is equivalent to the length of the development Gilbert Road frontage (approximately 50 m). This project is to start from a distance of approximately 30 m south of the New River Road/Gilbert intersection towards the south and is to end with 30:) tapers to tie to the existing pavement. Full frontage improvements (including curb and gutter, sidewalk, boulevard and greenway requirements) along the development frontage are required. This road widening project is to be completed as part of Phase 2 of the development (Building 2 - northwest quadrant of site) and prior to "Final Building Permit Inspection" granting occupancy for Phase 2. Road Works DCC credits are available for road works completed within the dedicated road right-of-way as defined in the City DCC program. This road widening project shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation and the Director of Development, and shall include, but not limited to the following elements:

- The lane configuration shall consist of two northbound traffic lanes, two southbound traffic lanes, northbound and northbound left turn lane (at the New River Road intersection), northbound and southbound bike lanes and a raised median with landscaping. The construction of the median is to include banner poles and/or other hard landscape features. The lane widths are 3.25 m (all traffic lanes) and 1.8 m (bike lanes).
- The signalization of the New River Road/Gilbert Road intersection will be constructed by a separate development in the vicinity. The subject development is responsible for any modifications to the installed traffic signals that are required as a result of the construction of the section of New River Road (between Gilbert Road and East Lane) and frontage works carried out at the southeast corner of New River Road/Gilbert Road. The details of the required signal modifications are described under a separate section in the Transportation SA requirements.

(v) <u>Widening of East Lane</u> - The scope of work includes the widening of the existing 6.0 m wide lane along the development east frontage by 2.0 m to provide a sidewalk and lighting strip (lighting is to be provided) by the Developer. The lane widening project is to be completed as part of Phase 4 of the development (Building 4 -southeast quadrant of site) and prior to "Final Building Permit Inspection" granting occupancy for Phase 4. DCC credits are not available for this project. The widening of East Lane shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation and the Director of Development, and shall include, but not limited to the following elements:

- The interim cross-section of the lane shall consist of a 2.0 m wide sidewalk/lighting strip and 6.0 m wide pavement. The extent of widening is from Alderbridge Way to at least 20 m past the parkade entrance to Building 4 or as shown on Figure 2 whichever is greater subject to review of the plan for greenway north of this section of Jane. The existing pavement of the lane over the length of the widening is to be resurfaced. As part of the redevelopment of the site to the east, the lane will be widened to 7.5 m and a 1.5 m wide sidewalk will be provided.
- The section of the existing lane north of the lane widening to be carried out by this development will be converted to a pedestrian pathway with the current right of way dedication or as part of SROW over the closed lane that may be included as part of the future development to the east). A preliminary ultimate design for the pathway (subject to amendment by the future development to the east with consultation with the Developer), incorporating these design criteria, is to be prepared by this development: connection of the lane at the north end to meet the grade of New River Road; providing a pedestrian crossing at the greenway; and making provisions for any utility requirements (e.g. storm

main). An interim design (i.e. before the site east of the lane is redeveloped) is also to be prepared. The interim design is expected to meet all access, vehicular/pcdestrian circulation, loading and utility requirements, but will not compromise the execution of the ultimate design. If any temporary works, including stairs, to be located within the road dedication will need to be secured by a City encroachment agreement that ensures their ultimate removal at the cost of the Developer.

• Vehicle access to the development from East Lane is limited to the parkade entrance to Building 4. Vehicle access to the site from New River Road via East Lane will be closed upon the completion of the pathway and redevelopment of the adjacent site to the east.

(vi) <u>Timing of Road and Traffic Improvements</u> - The timing of the various road and traffic improvements is tied to the development phases as described elsewhere in this document and as follows. These improvements are to be completed prior to "Final Building Permit Inspection" granting occupancy for the respective development phases as described on **Figure 1** and including, but not limited to:

- Phase 1 (Building 1 southwest quadrant of site) Alderbridge Way widening for its entire length; construction of entire length of Cedarbridge Way, entire length of New River Road, modification of the future traffic signal at the Gilbert/New River Road intersection and construction of all frontage works facing Building 1.
- Phase 2 (Building 2 -northwest quadrant of site) Construction of all frontage works facing Building 2 including the Cedarbridge Way frontages and New River Road frontages, and the Gilbert Road widening with its frontage works being constructed only at the direction of the Director of Transportation in consultation with the Manager of Parks.
- Phase 3 (Building 3 northeast quadrant of site) Construction of all frontages works facing Building 3 including those on the Cedarbridge Way and New River Road frontages.
- Phase 4 (Building 4 southeast quadrant of site) All remaining frontage works are to be finished, including the Cedarbridge Way and Alderbridge Way frontages and all East Lane works to the extent as shown on Figure 1 or 20m past the driveway entrance to Building 4, whichever is greater.

NOTE: All frontage works (including curb & gutter, bike paths, boulevards, boulevard landscaping, sidewalks and pedestrian and vehicle letdowns and bus shelters as specified for each building in Figure 1) are to be constructed fronting each building site prior to "Final Building Permit Inspection" granting issuance for each of the subject building. The Developer may elect to undertake more works than outlined in phases above or change the order of the phasing only with explicit written permission of the City's Director of Transportation and submission of a revised Functional Road Plan and TIA.

(vii) <u>Traffic Signals and Special Crosswalk</u> - The following traffic control devices are to be provided at the full cost of the Developer. Property dedication or Public Rights of Passage right-of-ways (exact dimensions to be confirmed through the SA process) for the placement of traffic controller cabinet and other traffic signal equipment is required. The timing of the construction of these traffic control devices will be determined by the city.

- The Alderbridge Way/Cedarbridge Way intersection is to be signalized. The traffic signal requirements include: concrete bases, poles, conduit, junction boxes, cable, signal displays, vehicle detection devices, accessible pedestrian signals, illuminated street name signs, and installation of new communications conduit and cable.
- Modifications to the future traffic signals at the Gilbert Road/New River Road intersection will need to be made. The
  traffic signal modifications may include but are not limited to the following: repair, modification and/or installation of
  vehicle detection; relocation and/or replacement of traffic signal poles, bases, junction boxes, signal heads and
  conduit; relocation of traffic signal controller cabinet and base; modification and/or installation of accessible
  pedestrian signals and illuminated street name signs; repair, modification and/or installation of communications cable
  (both fibre optics and copper); and property acquisition (or utility ROW) to house traffic signal equipment.

#### Rezoning Considerations: ONNI 7731 Alderbridge Holding Corp. ONNI 7771 Alderbridge Holding Corp. RZ2011-585209; Page 16 of 16

• A future special crosswalk signal will be constructed by the City at the Cedarbridge Way/New River Road intersection. The Developer will provide the necessary drawings for the full crosswalk signal for approval of the Director of Transportation. All necessary conduit pre-ducting, signal standard bases, and other necessary junction and equipment boxes will be installed by the Developer within the area of the scope of their works in a manner so that the Developer's transportation works will not need to be dug-up or removed to allow for the City's future installation of the special crosswalk signal. The Developer shall install temporary street light poles/fixtures on the installed bases. These temporary poles/fixtures are to be tied into the street lighting circuit and should be designed/built in such a fashion that allows them to be disconnected in the future.

(viii) <u>Development Vehicle Access</u> - Vehicle access to this development will be provided via Cedarbridge Way and East Lane. Direct vehicle access from New River Road, Gilbert Road or Alderbridge Way will not be permitted.

(ix) <u>Emergency Vehicle Access</u> - As part of the rezoning and Servicing Agreement processes, the Developer is to consult the Fire-Rescue Department to ensure that the site layout and access are adequate to accommodate emergency vehicles. City Transportation will need to be advised of the outcome of this consultation to ensure that emergency vehicle access requirements are incorporated in the design of road and traffic improvements for this development. In particular, the consultants are to seek input from Fire-Rescue on whether the overall road and traffic improvements and the timing of these improvements relative to the development phases (including the interim/ultimate traffic operations in the vicinity of this development) are adequate for emergency response purposes during construction and post-occupancy.

(x) <u>Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan</u> - Prior to Building Permit approval, the applicant is to submit a detailed Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to the satisfaction of the City. The preliminary plan is to identify (for each development phase): construction vehicle access, emergency vehicle access, parking facilities for construction workers, and staging areas for construction vehicles and materials (facilities for staging activities are not available on any of the peripheral public roadways). The plan will require the use of proper construction traffic control procedures and certified personnel as per Traffic Control Manual for works on roadways (Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure) and MMCD Traffic Regulation Section 01570.

Signed

April 5, 2012



## Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw No. 8884 (RZ 11-585209) 7731 and 7771 Alderbridge Way

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 adding a new sub-section 3 to Section 8.12.4 Permitted Density as follows:
  - "3. Notwithstanding Section 8.12.4.2, for the RAH2 zone the maximum floor area ratio for the net site area of the site located within the City Centre shown on Figure 1 below shall be 2.28, provided that:
    - (a) the conditions in either paragraph 8.12.4.2(a) or 8.12.4.2(b) are complied with; and
    - (b) not less than  $3,538 \text{ m}^2$  of the site is dedicated to the City as road.



Figure 1

2. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following lots and designating them High Density Low Rise Apartments (RAH2)

P.I.D. 000-859-958 Lot 89 Section 5 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 38045

## P.I.D. 000-806-943

Lot 96 Section 5 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 39888 PH - 417 3. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoving Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 8884".

FIRST READING	APR 2 3 2012	CITY OF RICHMOND
A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	APPROVED for content by originating dect/7
SECOND READING		APPROVED
THIRD READING		for legality by Solicitor
OTHER REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED		M
ADOPTED		·

MAYOR

## CORPORATE OFFICER

**Minutes** 



## Extract From:

## **Regular Council Meeting for Public Hearings**

## Tuesday, May 22, 2012

## 1. Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8884 (RZ 11-585209)

(Location: 7731 & 7771 Alderbridge Way; Applicant: Onni 7731 Alderbridge Holding Corp. and Onni 7771 Alderbridge Holding Corp.)

## Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was available to answer questions.

Written Submissions:

Mike Rasberry, Tim Hortons Restaurant, #125-7771 Alderbridge Way (Schedule 3)

Helmot Eppich, Chairman of the Board, Richard Eppich, CEO and President, Ebco Industries Ltd., 7851 Alderbridge Way (Schedule 4)

William Dao, Legal Counsel, Tim Hortons, The TDL Group Corp., (Schedule 5)

Submissions from the floor:

Mike Rasberry, Tim Hortons Restaurant, #125-7771 Alderbridge Way, expressed concern that the proposed residential development by Onni would have a negative impact on the Tim Hortons Restaurant he owns and operates. He explained that the lease for his restaurant extends through 2032. The lease has no termination or demolition clause so there are no legal grounds available to Onni for the termination of his lease.

Mr. Rasberry noted that the developer had not communicated with him, nor engaged in any discussion regarding the proposed development.

Mr. Rasberry stated that if the requested rezoning took place, it would make bis restaurant business non-conforming, and that by rezoning the property, the City would encourage the termination of his lease.

In closing, Mr. Rasberry requested that Council add the following conditions: (i) the City require the inclusion of retail/commercial space; and (ii) the satisfactory resolution of the lease tenure matter.

## **Minutes**



David McKeegan, a representative from the TDL Group Corp. that operates Tim Hortons Restaurants, spoke in support of Mr. Rasberry's comments, and reiterated concerns regarding Onni's failure to indicate its development intentions to the businesses operating at the subject site.

Mr. McKeegan also requested that as a condition of the rezoning, Onni include some commercial or retail space in the development that could accommodate a Tim Hortons Restaurant, and settle any lease issue with Tim Hortons, and the other businesses, at the subject site.

Chris Evans, Onni representative, advised that the developer has spoken to Tim Hortons corporate office throughout the past two years. He noted that Onni understands the need to resolve the lease issue before the rezoning bylaw is adopted by Council. He added that Onni has spoken with landowners, and tenants, affected by the proposed development, but he agreed that better communication could have been undertaken.

PH12/5-6 It was moved and seconded That, in relation to this rezoning, as a further condition of fourth reading of the Bylaw, that any leases registered on title, including the lease in favour of Tim Hortons Canada, would be discharged.

### CARRIED

PH12/5-7 It was moved and seconded That Zoning Amendment Bylaw 8884 be given second and third readings. CARRIED

 To Public Hearing

 Date:
 May 22, 2012

 Item #\_3

 Re:
 Support 8884

May 10, 2012

City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, British Columbia V6Y 2C1 Delivered by hand

### Attention: Richmond City Council

Schedule 3 to the Minutes of the Council Meeting for Public Hearings held on Tuesday, May 22, 2012.

MAY 1 4 2002

RECEINED

## Re: Objection to Re-Zoning Application RZ11 585209 Onni 7731 Alderbridge Holding Corp. and Onni 7771 Alderbridge Holding Corp. Affecting: 7731 Alderbridge Way and 7771 Alderbridge Way, Richmond, BC

This submission is in response to the proposed Onni condo development and the negative impact it will have on the community and businesses located at 7731 Alderbridge Way and 7771 Alderbridge Way.

As noted in the "Report to Committee" by Brian Jackson, dated April 10<sup>th</sup> 2012, a Tim Hortons Restaurant is currently located at 125-7771 Alderbridge Way.

As the Owner and Operator of this Tiru Hortous franchised restaurant, I strongly object to the rezoning and redevelopment of this site as it is currently proposed. My objection is based on the fact that there appears to be numerous issues that were not considered in the Report to Committee. I believe these issues are important to the sustainable growth and prosperity of our community. It is my sincere hope that Council will take sufficient time to adequately consider these issues before approving this development.

- 1. Within the Official Community Plan (OCP), Section 2.4, Objective 3, Policy (a) identifies the need to reinforce the regional town centre role of the City Centre by continuing to support uses which meet the daily shopping and personal service needs of the significant resident and worker populations. This Policy also refers to the desire for the integration into mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly character of the downtown. Policy (d) also encourages small, pedestrianfriendly streetfront convenience and personal service facilities on major roads to complement neighbourhood service centres and meet the needs of the surrounding residents. The City of Richmond would not be achieving the objectives of the mixed-use policies of the OCP if it were to allow Onni to develop only residential condos at this site. The attached Appendix B outlines the cited sections of the OCP.
- 2. While the Report to Committee may feel that the proposed development is consistent with the OCP, it appears to not consider items 9.4.4D a) and b), which reinforce the need to incorporate mixed-use areas, specifically commercial uses at grade into raw Feyerer many. I think it is established policy that promoting pedestrian related activity hops foster a safet 1 environment by creating a public environment.

PH - 421

- 3. We urge Council to consider the addition of a retail component to this residential development because it appears there are no retail plans by Onni. As Council may know, a retail component would provide readily accessible services to the community by making it more walkable and less dependent on the automobile and therefore better for the environment.
- 4. Furthermore, adding ground level retail businesses to a residential development would provide additional security by adding "eyes on the street" in conformance with CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) principles. This principle is particularly true at this location because this Tim Hortons operates 24 hours a day.
- 5. In addition, 7731 & 7771 Alderbridge Way are located within the T5 zone, in the Lansdowne Village section of the City Center (as detailed on Specific Land Use Maps: Lansdowne Village 2031 in the City Center Area Plan). The attached Appendix A outlines the permitted uses for T5 zoned land.
- 6. T5 zoning is described by the City of Richmond in its Land Use and Developing Framework as "a mixed-use development designed to help reinforce the downtown core". The Onni development as proposed is not consistent with the City's desire for mixed-use, as no accommodation has been made for retail or commercial use.
- Further to the T5 zoning issue, there is an application currently under review to the South of the Onni site which respects the importance of mixed-use within that proposed development. I think there should be a discussion on why Onni's current proposal does not do the same.

The above are my policy issues against the proposed Onni development as it currently stands. Having been a long time resident, business owner, and employer in the City of Richmond I feel strongly that there other community issues that are equally important factors, which I hope Council will consider.

- 8. The Tim Hortons Restaurant mentioned has been at this location and serving this community since September 2002, and in this time has become part of the community. We serve as a community meeting place for residents and workers. We are a place where family and friends gather together to share their thoughts and greet their neighbors. If the development were to go forward as proposed, this would be lost to the community as relocating within the immediate area is highly unlikely.
- 9. Onni has had little or no engagement with myself or the other affected businesses at this site. Despite our long standing in the community, and almost ten-year history at this location, this is my first opportunity for consultation.

PH - 422

- 10. As a member of the community, this Tim Hortons has supported and been involved with countless community events, and has contributed charitable donations and sponsorships focused in the local area surrounding this location. These involvements and contributions enrich the community, and this enrichment would be lost if Onni's development were to continue as proposed.
- 11. Over the years, we have employed hundreds of Richmond residents. Our employment often provides an opportunity for new residents to develop better language skills, meet their neighbors, and become comfortable in the community. The absence of commercial/retail space in this development would result in a loss of these jobs, and the associated benefits for the community.

Taking these factors into consideration, the development as proposed would result in a community that offers considerably less of what makes an area a desirable place to live.

The many benefits provided by maintaining businesses in the community, such as Tim Hortons, relate directly to the mixed-use benefits of improving the downtown core that the T5 zoning and the OCP policies aim to achieve.

The businesses in the area would benefit the growing community and the new development, by providing conveniently located services, employment, as well as charitable contributions, while maintaining the sense of community that has been established through the longstanding presence of these businesses.

I believe that further consultation with local businesses and residents would allow for the interest of the community to be served, while also meeting the needs of the developers.

As a concerned Richmond resident and business owner, and on behalf of the forty employees at our restaurant, I respectfully urge Council to direct Onni to rework their proposal to include opportunities for commercial/retail space in keeping with the T5 zoning and OCP policies, as well as for the betterment of the community as a whole.

Sincerely, Mike Rasberry

Owner/Operator Tim Hortons #2324

## Appendix A: T5 Zoning Details

T5 Zoning allows for the following uses:

Mixed Multiple-Family Residential/Commercial Use and Multiple-Family Residential, <u>provided that ground floor dwelling units are:</u>

a) for Pedestrian Oriented Retail Precincts – "High Streets & Linkages". Not permitted;

b) for Pedestrian-Oriented Retail Precincts – "Secondary Retail Streets & Linkages": Live/Work Dwellings.

Hotel

Office

Retail Trade & Services

Restaurant

Neighbourhood Pub

Institutional Use

 Recreation Studio (Studio spaces that provide for a high degree of transparency and public access along fronting streets and open spaces shall be considered to satisfy requirements for retail continuity in Pedestrian-Oriented Retail Precincts.)

Community Use

Accessory Uses

Appendix B: City of Richmond Official City Plan (OCP) cited sections:

#### Section 2.4, Objective 3:

Maintain a hierarchy of retail and personal service locations to meet community-wide and neighbourhood needs.

#### POLICIES:

a) Reinforce the Regional Town Centre role of the City Centre by continuing to support:

- The regional shopping centres and their integration into the mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly character of the downtown;
- The specialty retail and personal service districts which cater to Richmond's diverse population and contribute to the City Centre's tourist appeal;
- Uses which meet the daily shopping and personal service needs of the significant resident and worker populations;

d) Encourage the development of small, pedestrian-friendly, streetfront convenience and personal service facilities on major roads to complement neighbourhood service centres and meet the needs of surrounding residents;

#### Section 9.4.4.D Retail Development on Major Streets

- a) New development on major streets, particularly at intersections, should reinforce the establishment of mixed-use areas that provide special retail focal points and promote pedestrian activity in the City;
- b) Mixed-use developments on major streets should accommodate commercial uses at grade and residential uses above;

May 16, 2012

VIA HAND DELIVERED

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

Dear Sirs & Mesdames:



OPERATED BY THE TDL GROUP Corp. 7460 - 51" STREET S.E., CALGARY, ALBERTA T2C 484 TELEPHONE (403) 203-7400 • FACSIMILE (403) 203-7430

Schedule 5 to the Minutes of the Council Meeting for Public Hearings held on Tuesday, May 22, 2012.

1

#### Re: \_\_\_\_\_Tim Hortons Restaurant located at 125-7771 Alderbridge Way, Richmond, BC

- 1. This letter is a submission from the TDL Group Corp. which operates as the franchisor for the Tim Hortons restaurant #2324 located at 125-7771 Alderbridge Way, in Richmond, BC.
- 2. We wish to voice our objection to the proposed re-zoning application by Onni. If the rezoning is approved in the current form, it will cause irreparable harm to all of the businesses in and around 7731 Alderbridge Way and 7771 Alderbridge Way.
- 3. Tim Hortons has been operating at this location since 2002 and our lease of the premises continues through to 2032. Onni recently purchased this property from the previous landlord and our understanding is that Onni plans to re-develop all of the property located in the vicinity of the Tim Hortons into residential condominiums.
- 4. Our concern is that Onni has not formally indicated to us, or to any of the other businesses in the area, their Intentions for this development. We think it is only fair that Onni should inform the tenants of their re-development plans, as they plans will ultimately have a major impact on all of the stakeholders, including the community at large.
- 5. As a condition of their re-zoning approval, Onni should be required to either settle any disagreements with the tenants regarding their existing leases or permit the tenants to continue operating until the end of their term as agreed to in the leases.
- 6. We wish to inform City Council that the Tim Hortons lease has no early termination clause or demolition clause, so it is abundantly clear that there are no legal grounds for termination available to Onni.
- 7. We feel that if City Council were to approve Onni's application as it stands, Onni would be encouraged to breach the terms of their leases and effectively close down the Tim Hortons, as well as the other businesses, causing many employees to lose their lobs.
- Further, we are concerned that Onni's development plans will affect the access and parking for all of the businesses at this location. We would like to know if Onni's construction plans will impede access to our property and effectively kill our business.
- 9. Finally, the proposed re-zoning would force all of the businesses into a legal limbo because they would be non-conforming with the proposed zoning, a status that no business owner would want. Non-conforming status could impact our ability to refurbish, renovate and alter our operations at this location, which would most certainly occur over the remaining 20 year term of our lease.

- Tim Hortons and our Franchisee are positive contributors to the Richmond community. We
  operate several locations in Richmond that have employed hundreds of local residents over
  the years.
- 11. We have been, and continue to be, a strong supporter of numerous local charities and organizations thru the Timbits Minor Sports Program, the Tim Hortons Community Cruiser, and the Tim Horton Children's Foundation. This could all be lost if Onni re-zoning application were to proceed as planned.
- 12. We would respectfully request that if the City wishes to proceed with the re-zoning, that the City require as a condition of the re-zoning that Onnl:
  - (a) include some commercial or retail space in the development that could accommodate our operations; and
  - (b) settle any lease issue with Tim Hortons and the other businesses at this location.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours very truly,

THE TOL GROUP CORP.

William Cao

Legal Counsel

From: 604-278-7230



CELEBRATING 5D YEARS IN BUSINESS

DATE

Schedule 4 to the Minutes of Council the Meeting for Public Hearings held on Tuesday, May 22, 2012.

May 18, 2012

The Mayor and Council, City of Richmond, 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC, V6Y 2C1 Via Fax: 604-278-5139



To Public Hearing Date: MAY 22, 2012 ltem # よち Re:

Dear Mayor and Council:

#### RE: Development Application by Onni at 7731 and 7771 Alderbridge Way, Richmond

We are the owners of the property at 7851 Alderbridge Way and the property at 7280 River Road in Richmond. We have owned these properties since 1968 and 1972 respectively. As the Mayor and Council is aware, we established and have been operating two family owned manufacturing Companies, namely Ebco Industries and Advanced Cyclotron Systems Inc. at these premises since 1969. Currently, there are about 300 employees between the two Companies ranging from Engineers and Scientists to uniquely qualified technicians and licensed tradesmen.

We are well aware that with the availability of the Canada line, ours and other adjacent lands in the area have become suitable for redevelopment to "higher land uses" including commercial and high density residential. To this end; we, as the owners of these lands for over 44 years, wish to ensure that re-development of any properties in our immediate vicinity do not in any way interfere with the current and future "highest and best" land use of our lands. May we respectfully submit that the highest land values and the equity in our lands are critical to the operation & success of our current Companies. Furthermore, protecting the "highest and best" land values is even more critical for the future relocation of the current Companies.

For all of the above reasons, we must respectfully inform the Mayor and Council of our objections related to "View Corridor" considerations included on Page 10 in the Report (File\_RZ 11-585209) from Director of Development to Planning Committee dated April 10, 2012 in support of application by Onni for properties at 7731 and 7771 Alderbridge Way from Industrial Retail to High Density Low Rise Apartments. We firmly believe that any view corridor considerations, implied or express by the City of Richmond, for this application will adversely affect the market value of our property at 7280 River Road.

Your Worship Mayor Brodle and esteemed Councilors, we have owned the property at 7280 River Road since 1972 and we do not now want the future market value or the redevelopment. potential of this property diminished or limited or constrained in any way by virtue of the expectations for a view corridor directly opposite our property mentioned in a City of Richmond Planning Report, Furthermore, we believe any consideration of a view corridor by the City of Richmond in favor of a private property owner is equivalent to Council conferring a significant benefit for that developer while at the same time negatively impacting our lands as the view PH - 428



Ebco Industries Ltd. 7651 Alderbridge Way, Hichmund, British Columbis, Canada' V6X 244 MAY-17-2012 19:06

From: 604-278-7238



corridor is being given or implied over our lands thus limiting or diminishing or causing additional constraints on our lands.

Given that any view corridor considerations, however minimal, still negatively affect our property at 7280 River Road and 7851 Alderbridge (in way of future redevelopment), we must respectfully request the Mayor and Council to NOT grant any view corridor considerations to the above development and that the current view corridor language be removed entirely from here on prior to any further approvals.

We are hopeful that the Mayor and Council would grant our request given that:

- our request only seeks to protect our lands and does not in any way limits the scope of the above development.
- that we have owned these lands for over 44 years.
- that the success of our two Companies, Ebco Industries and Advanced Cyclotron Systems Inc, with 300 highly paid jobs and growing heavily depends on the continuing "highest and Best" land values for financing of the two Companies.
- we have been a strong Corporate stakeholder for the City of Richmond providing significant support to the city of Richmond 's cultural goals including Museums, etc.

We will be pleased to meet the Mayor and Council in person should it be so required.

Yours truly.

Herrot Eppich Chairman of the Board

Richard Eppich CEO and President

CC :

George Duncan, CAO, City of Richmond (Via email: <u>gduncan@richmond.ca</u>) Brian Jackson, Director of Development (Via email: <u>bjackson@richmond.ca</u>)



PH - 429

Encul Industries Ltd = 7851 Alderbridge Way, Richmond, British Collymbia, Canada - V6X 244

**Minutes** 



**Extract From:** 

## Special (Closed) Council Meeting Monday, June 4, 2012

RES NO. ITEM

## AGENDA ADDITIONS (AND DELETIONS) AND COMMUNITY CHARTER CLOSED MEETING COMPLIANCE FOR ADDITIONAL ITEMS

SIC12/4-1 It was moved and seconded

- (1) That the RCMP Contract, be added to the agenda as Item No. 2, and the previous Item No. 2 now be Item No. 3; and
- (2) Council hereby declares that the meeting held at 4:00 p.m. on Monday, June 4, 2012, is to be closed to the public and that the basis of this closure is that the following items on the agenda of this meeting comply with the following closed meeting criteria specified in Section 90 of the Community Charter:
  - Item 1 90(1)(i) the receipt of advice that is subject to solicitorclient privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose; and
  - Item 2 90(1)(c) labour relations or other employee relations; and
  - Item 3 90(1)(k) negotiations and related discussions respecting the proposed provision of a municipal service that are at their preliminary stages and that, in the view of the council, could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality if they were held in public.

## CARRIED

\*\*\*\*\*

The Closed Meeting was opened to the public to consider the following:

\*\*\*\*\*

SIC12/4-3 It was moved and seconded That the following resolution (Resolution No. PH12/5-6), adopted at the Regular Council Meeting for Public Hearings held on Tuesday, May 22, 2012, be rescinded:



Extract From:

## Special (Closed) Council Meeting Monday, June 4, 2012

RES NO. ITEM

That, in relation to this rezoning, as a further condition of fourth reading of the Bylaw, that any leases registered on title, including the lease in favour of Tim Hortons Canada, would be discharged.

CARRIED

**Minutes** 

SIC12/4-4 It was moved and seconded That third reading of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 8884 be rescinded.

CARRIED

SIC12/4-5 It was moved and seconded That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 8884 be referred to the Public Hearing scheduled for June 18, 2012 at 7:00 pm in the Council Chambers at Richmond City Hall.

CARRIED

## RESOLUTION TO CLOSE THE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC

SIC12/4-6

It was moved and seconded That the Special Council Meeting be closed to the public (5:21 p.m.) (in

accordance with the resolution on closure and compliance adopted earlier in this meeting).

CARRIED

\*\*\*\*\*

To	Public I	learing
Date:	June	8,2012
ltem	12	
Re:	Bulan	8884
-	ľ	



June 11, 2012

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

Attn: Brian Jackson, Director of Planning

Re: Onnl Rezoning Application RZ 11 585209 – Objections by Tim Hortons (TDL Group Corp.) and Mike Rasberry, Owner/Operator Tim Hortons #2324

Mr. Jackson,

Pursuant to your request, I write in an effort to provide some background and clarification surrounding the above noted subject matter. I am in receipt of three documents; a letter from Mike Rasberry, Owner/Operator Tim Hortons #2324 dated May 10, 2013, a letter from William Cao, Legal Counsel TDL Group Corp., and the meeting minutes of the Regular Council Meeting for Public Hearings, May 22, 2012.

It is important to convey that Onni acquired this property with a lease to Tim Hortons in place. For clarity the tenant is The TDL Group Ltd. ("TDL") (Franchisor) and not Mike Rasberry Owner/operator of Tim Hortons Store # 2324 (Franchisee). In becoming the successor in interest to the lease, we began communicating directly with the tenant, TDL, as is appropriate. However, through correspondence in relation to the relocation of the store operated by Mr. Rasberry, we were led to believe Mr. Rasberry was being informed of what was being discussed surrounding his business. Mr. Rasberry informed us he has visited several potential alternative locations for his business as proposed by Onni. These locations were proposed directly to TDL who we can only conclude passed this information on to Mr. Rasberry.

With respect to TDL, we have been communicating with them since July, 2011. Our discussions have included our intentions regarding the future redevelopment of the property, the financial feasibility of an early lease termination, and relocation of the operation of Mr. Rasberry's store upon satisfactory terms. There has been a significant amount of formal communication in the form of emails, letters, phone calls and meetings commencing October, 2011 through to May, 2012. I point this out because in Section 4 of Mr. Cao's letter, he states Onni has not formally indicated to TDL Group its intensions for this development. This statement is factually false at best. For Council's interest I have outlined a timeline of our discussions below:

- July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2011 – formal written notice from Onni to TDL Group with notification of new ownership of the property.

Suite 300 – 550 Robson St. PHON Vancouver, British Columbia FAX Canada V6B 287 Ormi

рноле 604 682 7711 Fax 604 688 7907 Opni.com

PH - 432

REAL ESTATE DEVELOPM

IIIN 1 1 2012

- October 31<sup>31</sup>, 2011 formal written communication from TDL to Onni acknowledging that Onni has advised TDL of new ownership and its Intent to redevelop the property into four condominium buildings. TDL notes Onni's rezoning application submitted to the City.
- November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2012 Email from Onni to TDL acknowledging receipt of TDL's October 31<sup>π</sup> letter and suggesting to TDL that both groups have some dialogue regarding TDL and Franchisee's concerns
- November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Video Conference call between Onni and Tim Hortons corporate officers: Jim Preston, Sr. Regional V.P. Western Canada, Greg Vogell, Sr. Regional V.P. Development Western Canada, and David MacKelgan, Manager of Real Estate Development BC, William Cao, TDL Group Legal Counsel. Note: Onni participated in this video conference at Tim Horton's regional office in Langley, BC.
- December 6, 2012 TDL issues meeting minutes of the November 17<sup>th</sup> conference call which include points on relocation of Franchisee's store and losses in consideration of early termination of the lease.
- December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012 formal written notice from Onni to TDL acknowledging receipt of the meeting minutes and requesting a breakdown of losses due to early termination.
- February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012 Correspondence between Onnl and TDL regarding the sharing of more detailed information regarding Mr. Rasberry's business.
- February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012 Onni and Dave Mackeigan, Manager of Real Estate and Development BC drive around to visit potential locations for the relocation of the Mr. Rasberry's store. Mr. MacKeigan met Onni representatives at Mr. Rasberry's store and drove around with them to potential locations.
- March 1, 2012 email correspondence from TDL to Onni thanking Onni for continuing to work with TDL to find a relocation site and asking if we have received a Development Permit and if we have started pre-sales.
- March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Conference call between Onni and TDL to discuss matters further in particular related to relocation options for Mr. Rasberry's store.
- April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Email correspondence between Onni and TDL Group regarding relocation options for Mr. Rasberry's store including three specific locations.

In summary, based on the outline of correspondence to date, it is abundantly clear Onni and TDL have been engaged in detailed and formal communications for some time. What's more, we believe Mr. Rasberry who is the Franchisee has been kept up to speed by TDL with regards to the communication that has taken place to date.

In closing, it is unfortunate Council was not provided all of the relevant information with respect to the ongoing discussions surrounding the relocation of the Tim Horton's store prior to the May 22<sup>nd</sup> Public Hearing. I trust the information above provides a clearer picture of our efforts to engage Tim Hortons on matters related to the redevelopment of our property. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me

Sincer

B<del>eau Jaf</del>vis V.P. Development

Suite 300 – 550 Robson St. Vancouver, British Columbia Canada V6B 2B7 PHONE 604 602 7711 FAX 604 688 7907 Onni.com

PH - 433

To Public Hearing Date: June (8, 2012

item #

Re:

## MayorandCouncillors

From:	City of Richmond Website (webgraphics@richmond.ca)
	exty er Menkhond Meberie (mebgraphileo@nonmend.ed)

Sent: June 7, 2012 8:05 PM

To: MayorandCouncillors

Subject: Send a Submission Online (response #681)

Categories: 08-4100-02-01 - Development - Inquiries and Complaints - General

# Send a Submission Online (response #681)

## Survey Information

Site:	City Website
Page Title:	Send a Submission Online
URL:	http://cms.richmond.ca/Page1793.aspx
Submission Time/Date:	6/7/2012 8:08:02 PM

## Survey Response

Your Name:	Sally Mercer
Your Address:	303-8880 No. One Road
Subject Property Address OR Byław Number:	8884
Comments:	With all the High Density Apartments being Built on River Road and NO plans for New Bridges. Council has to Stop development of More Apartments until the Roadways are Given a Good Look. Industrial Retail used to be a priority.

