



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

**Public Hearing Agenda
Electronic Meeting**

Monday, July 17, 2023 – 7 p.m.

**Council Chambers, 1st Floor
Richmond City Hall
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1**

OPENING STATEMENT

Page

1. **RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 10075 (RZ 18-817742)**
(File Ref. No. RZ 18-817742) (REDMS No. 7236314)

PH-5

See Page PH-5 for full report

Location: 3560 Moncton Street

Applicant: Inter Luck Trading Corp.

Purpose: To create a new “Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village” zone and to rezone the subject property from the “Steveston Commercial (CS2)” zone to the “Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village” zone to permit development of a mixed-use building containing commercial units at grade and five residential units above, with vehicular access from the lane (west).

First Reading: June 12, 2023

Order of Business:

1. Presentation from the applicant.

Page

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

Council Consideration:

1. Action on second and third readings of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10075.



2. **RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 10464 (RZ 20-919113)**
(File Ref. No. RZ 20-919113) (REDMS No. 7207145)

PH-104

See Page **PH-104** for full report

Location: 8911, 8931, 8951, 8991 Patterson Road

Applicant: Dava Developments Ltd.

Purpose: To rezone the subject property from “Residential Single Family (RS1/F)” zone to the new “Residential/Limited Commercial (ZMU54)” zone and “School and Institutional Use (SI)” zone, to permit development of a mixed-use mid-rise and high-rise development.

First Reading: June 12, 2023

Order of Business:

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

Council Consideration:

1. Action on second and third readings of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10464.



Page

3. **RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 10470 (RZ 21-922202)**
(File Ref. No. RZ 21-922202) (REDMS No. 7216004)

PH-173

[See Page PH-173 for full report](#)

Location: 5800, 5840, 5860 Granville Avenue

Applicant: Interface Architecture Inc.

Purpose: To rezone the subject property from “Single Detached (RS1/E)” to “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)”, to permit development of 18 townhouse units with vehicle access from Granville Avenue.

First Reading: June 12, 2023

Order of Business:

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

Council Consideration:

1. Action on second and third readings of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10470.



4. **RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 10472 (RZ 21-945951)**
(File Ref. No. RZ 21-945951) (REDMS No. 7227004)

PH-214

[See Page PH-214 for full report](#)

Location: 7520 Ash Street

Applicant: Benito Kho and Verney Kho

Purpose: To rezone the subject property from the “Single Family (RS1/F)” zone to the Single Family (RS2/E)” zone, to subdivide the property into two lots with one lot fronting Ash Street and one lot fronting Armstrong Street.

First Reading: June 26, 2023

Page

Order of Business:

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

Council Consideration:

1. Action on second and third readings of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10472.

☐

ADJOURNMENT

☐



City of Richmond

Report to Committee

To: Planning Committee
From: Wayne Craig
Director, Development

Date: May 24, 2023
File: RZ 18-817742

Re: Application by Inter Luck Trading Corp for Rezoning at 3560 Moncton Street from "Steveston Commercial (CS2)" Zone to "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – (Steveston Village)" Zone

Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10075, to create the "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village" zone, and to rezone 3560 Moncton Street from "Steveston Commercial (CS2)" zone to "Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village" zone, be introduced and given first reading.

Wayne Craig
Director, Development
(604-247-4625)

WC:ke
Att. 9

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Affordable Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Staff Report

Origin

Inter Luck Trading Corp. (Nuong Truong – President) has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 3560 Moncton Street from “Steveston Commercial (CS2)” to a new “Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village” zone in order to develop a two-storey, mixed use building containing approximately 419 m² (4,513 ft²) of commercial space at grade and five residential units above, with vehicular access from the lane to the west. A location map and aerial photo are contained in Attachment 1. Conceptual development plans are provided in Attachment 2.

The subject site is located in the Steveston Village Heritage Conservation Area. It does not contain an identified heritage resource.

Background Information

The following provides background information about the previous proposal under this rezoning application and consideration of the proposal at Planning Committee; and the submission of a revised proposal in accordance with the Enhanced Development Review Process for new projects in Steveston:

- On October 22, 2019, Planning Committee made the following referral:
That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10075 to create the “Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village” zone, and to rezone 3560 Moncton Street from “Steveston Commercial (CS2)” to “Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village”, be referred back to staff to review proposed building design and building materials.
- A revised proposal that responded to the October 22, 2019 Planning Committee referral was presented to the March 2, 2021 Planning Committee meeting, who made the following referral:
That the application by Inter Luck Trading Corp. for Rezoning at 3560 Moncton Street from “Steveston Commercial (CS2) to Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village” be tabled until the Steveston Design Committee is established.
- Related to Planning Committee’s referrals on the rezoning application at 3560 Moncton Street, on June 28, 2021, Council endorsed the following:
 - Amend the terms of reference and membership composition of the Richmond Heritage Commission to strengthen the review of development applications city-wide and in Steveston Village; and
 - Endorsed an Enhanced Development Review Process for development proposals in the Steveston Village Heritage Conservation Area.
- Zaher Verjee Architect was the architect of record for the rezoning application submission up until a formal notification was received by the City on May 30, 2021 indicating they no longer represented the applicant/owner for this project.

- In February 2022, the rezoning application at 3560 Moncton Street was amended to indicate Ken Chow (Interface Architecture) as the architect of record for the subject proposal and a new development proposal was submitted and processed in accordance with the Enhanced Development Review Process.
- In compliance with the Enhanced Development Review Process applicable for new development projects in the Steveston Village Conservation Area, the following has been undertaken as part of the new development proposal submitted for this rezoning:
 - A heritage professional consultant has been engaged to research the historical and heritage context applicable to the site and to aide and inform the expanded design rationale for the rezoning submission.
 - Development of an expanded design rationale and submission of new architectural drawings based on the principles of this rationale and recommendations from the heritage consultant.
 - Richmond Heritage Commission review of the new rezoning proposal and accompanying materials.
 - Separate sections of this report provide additional information about the Enhanced Development Review Process that the rezoning application is subject to.

Findings of Fact

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

Subject Site Existing Housing Profile

There are no residential dwelling units on the subject site.

Subject Site Existing Uses

The subject site contains a vacant one-storey building that was used as a commercial and hardware/marine business until 2018.

Surrounding Development

The subject site is an L-shaped property located at the southwest corner of Moncton Street and 2nd Avenue. The site currently contains a one-storey commercial building (currently vacant) on the north side and an open gravel surfaced area on the south side.

To the North: Across Moncton Street is a two-storey commercial building zoned “Steveston Commercial (CS2)”. A rezoning application has been submitted for the site on the north side at 3551 Moncton Street (RZ 21-934507) for a two-storey mixed use redevelopment.

To the South: The rear parking lot of the property fronting onto Bayview Street zoned “Steveston Commercial (CS2)” at 3711 Bayview Street.

To the East: Across 2nd Avenue is a two storey commercial building (Hepworth Block) zoned “Steveston Commercial (CS2)” at 3580 Moncton Street, which is one of the identified heritage resources in Steveston Village.

To the West: One storey commercial buildings at 3500 Moncton Street and 3480 Moncton Street. The building at 3480 Moncton Street is one of the identified heritage resources in Steveston Village, known as “Watsida Building/Riverside Art Gallery”. Both sites are zoned “Steveston Commercial (CS2)”.

Related Policies & Studies

Official Community Plan/Steveston Area Plan

The subject site is located in the Steveston Village Core Area, and is designated “Neighbourhood Service Centre” in the Official Community Plan and “Heritage Mixed-Use” in the Steveston Area Plan. The proposed mixed-use development is consistent with these land use designations.

The Steveston Village Land Use Density and Building Height Map in the Steveston Area Plan allows for maximum Floor Area Ratio of 1.2 and maximum building height of 9 m (29.5 ft.) and two storeys along Moncton Street (Attachment 4). The proposed height and density for this project is consistent with the Steveston Area Plan.

The subject property is also located in the Steveston Village Heritage Conservation Area (SVHCA); it is not one of the identified heritage resource properties (i.e., protected heritage properties). When the development proposal was originally submitted, both a rezoning and Heritage Alteration Permit application was submitted. However, with recent changes approved by Council on May 15, 2023, new development proposals in the SVCHA will only require a rezoning application and Development Permit application. As a result, the previously submitted Heritage Alteration Permit application for this site will be cancelled.

Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

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

Affordable Housing Strategy

The City’s Affordable Housing Strategy requires that all rezoning applications that propose 60 or less apartment units provide a cash-in-lieu contribution to the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund. Consistent with the Strategy, the applicant proposes to submit a cash-in-lieu contribution to the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund in the amount of \$15.00 per buildable square foot (excluding the proposed commercial floor area) for a total contribution of \$149,655.00 prior to the final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

Market Rental Housing Policy

The rezoning application was received prior to the current Market Rental Housing Policy adopted by Council on June 20, 2022. In keeping with Council policy, instream rezoning applications are exempted from the Market Rental Housing Policy if the project reaches first reading no later than June 20, 2023.

Public Consultation

A rezoning sign has been installed on the subject property. Public correspondence received on the rezoning application prior to the implementation of the Enhanced Design Review Process and 2022 change in architect is contained in Attachment 5 and provides comments on a prior proposal. Since receipt of this correspondence, a new development proposal has been submitted by a different architect working with the required heritage consultant under the new Enhanced Design Review Process. A summary of the comments in the correspondence is provided with a staff response in bold italics where appropriate.

- Comments about too many condominiums in Steveston and expressing concerns about the loss of existing character in Steveston Village and concerns about the size and overall mass of the proposed project.

The proposed mixed-use development is consistent with the “Heritage-Mixed Use (Commercial-Industrial with Residential & Office above)” designation for Steveston Village in the Steveston Area Plan that allows for at-grade commercial along the street frontage and residential uses above.

Along Moncton Street, the height of buildings is limited to two storeys and 9 m (29.5 ft.) height to ensure the building size and overall massing is consistent with historic structures and existing development. The proposed density and height is consistent with the Steveston Area Plan.

- Comment about the rooftop spaces for residential units being made accessible.
The current proposal provides for individual rooftop decks with access provided by a set of external stairs to the rooftop area to each residential unit. The architect has confirmed that the stair access can be outfitted with a chair lift system to improve accessibility and that the proposed stair access is the best option to comply with applicable BC Building Code requirements and ensure the rooftop access design does not negatively impact the building envelope. Rooftop deck areas have also been setback from the edge of the building to reduce visibility from the street
- Redirecting customer traffic and commercial activities away from Moncton Street with the additional commercial frontage proposed along 2nd Avenue.
Due to the location of the site at a corner and current geometry of the site, two public road frontages exists for the subject site along Moncton Street and 2nd Avenue. Although Moncton Street is the shorter of the two road frontages, the proposed development provides for a strong presence along Moncton Street and to the corner intersection placing the building in line with other commercial buildings and ensuring additional commercial units and entrances are oriented to Moncton Street.

- Concerns about vehicle access from the lane and using the lane as a loading area.
The lane is designed to service existing and future traffic and accommodating vehicle access from the lane is supported in the Steveston Area Plan. This proposal is not required to provide for dedicated on-site loading facilities in accordance with Zoning Bylaw provisions. Any loading functions can be accommodated for in the existing lane to the west of the subject site. Garbage and recycling service pick-up will also occur in the lane and the subject redevelopment is providing dedicated on-site garbage and recycling rooms where bins/carts will be stored and located to allow them to be transported into the lane during pick-up. Lane upgrades will also be undertaken along the subject site's lane frontage.

Since the change in architect in 2022, additional outreach has been undertaken by the applicant by contacting the neighbouring property owners to the west (3500 Moncton Street) and east (3580 Moncton Street on the other side of 2nd Avenue) with information about their development proposal. During this outreach the applicant indicated no concerns about the proposed development from these adjacent property owners. The site further to the west at 3480 Moncton Street recently changed ownership and the applicant has recently connected with the new owners to share information about their proposed development. Additional consultation with the new property owners will be undertaken by the applicant to obtain any applicable comments and feedback on the development proposal.

Through the previous processing and review of the rezoning application with the prior architect, initial geotechnical investigation and accompanying report was provided to assess soil and groundwater conditions and potential impacts of the proposed development on neighbouring buildings.

The applicant also consulted with the Steveston 20/20 Group (consisting of non-profit and historical groups in Steveston) and presented the concept of their development proposal for information purposes and for members to ask questions and provide feedback at their April 28, 2022 meeting. Based on the consultation with the Steveston 20/20 Group, no outstanding concerns were identified at the time. A copy of the Steveston 20/20 meeting minutes is provide in Attachment 6.

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant first reading to the rezoning bylaw, the bylaw will be forwarded to a Public Hearing, where any area resident or interested party will have an opportunity to comment. Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the Local Government Act and the City's Zoning Bylaw 8500.

Richmond Heritage Commission

The rezoning proposal was also presented and reviewed by the Richmond Heritage Commission on May 10, 2023. The Richmond Heritage Commission received a presentation from the project architect and heritage consultant on the heritage context, design rationale and overall project and provided comments and feedback on the proposal.

Based on the consideration of the rezoning application by the Richmond Heritage Commission, the following motion was passed (Attachment 7 provides an excerpt of the drafted Richmond Heritage Commission meeting minutes):

That the rezoning application for 3560 Moncton Street (RZ18-817742) be supported subject to the applicant giving consideration to the comments of the Commission.

Comments made by the Richmond Heritage Commission on the proposal will be addressed through the Development Permit application process.

Analysis

Heritage Consultant Report

McLean Heritage Planning & Consulting has been engaged by the applicant to assist with the historical research and context of the subject site and surrounding area and inform the project's design rationale related to the heritage site planning and design components integrated into the proposal. The heritage consultant report is provided in Attachment 8.

The following provides a summary of the heritage consultant report recommendations that inform the design rationale for the project. The report:

- Recognizes the historical building and development pattern for the subject site prior to construction of the current building on the subject site in 1963.
- References that the prior building and land (owned by a Japanese Canadian – Matsu Tanaka until 1942) was used as a commercial/hardware store that included living quarters that were likely attached to the side and rear of the principal commercial building.
- Includes archival photographs show a building with a strong corner presence that included an entry door at the corner with orientation to both Moncton Street and 2nd Avenue.
- Highlights the development pattern that occurred in the area over time that was often the result of historical lot configuration, multiple uses on a site and phasing of development, a historic lot expression is a design component included in the proposal that is reflected by providing for distinct and broken up commercial frontages along Moncton Street and 2nd Avenue that is reflective of the historical development pattern in Steveston and is a heritage element that helps to integrate the proposal into the surrounding area.
- Supports land use policies and Development Permit guidelines applicable to the Steveston Area Plan for the subject site with a building proposal that maintains a strong presence along Moncton Street and recognizes the significance of the 2nd Avenue commercial frontage and the importance of including design and architectural elements to break up and create separate distinctive façade treatments.
- In addition, the heritage consultant report recommends the incorporation of a historical commemorative element into the development proposal to recognize the historical and/or cultural significance of prior development on the site.

The details of which will require further design development and review to determine if this component should be included in the proposed redevelopment. This will occur as part of the processing of the Development Permit application. If a commemorative element is included in this project, this component of the project will be presented to the Richmond Heritage Commission for review and comment as part of the processing of the Development Permit application. Final details of a commemorative element will be provided as part of the Development Permit, which will be forwarded to Council for consideration.

Built Form and Architectural Character

The proposed development is a two-storey mixed-use building with at grade commercial fronting Moncton Street and 2nd Avenue and five residential units on the second level. Access to the parkade is from the existing lane. A pedestrian breezeway located along 2nd Avenue connects the parking area to the street. In accordance with the Steveston Area Plan Development Permit Guidelines, the building is generally sited at zero lot line to both road frontages and the lane.

The proposed massing is two-storeys and with an 8.9 m (29 ft.) building height, which is consistent with Steveston Area Plan provisions for development along Moncton Street. This massing approach also is compatible with the Hepworth Block building to the east and existing one-storey buildings to the west. The proposed flat roof form and parapet treatment with differing architectural treatment, provide distinctive frontages along Moncton Street and 2nd Avenue in accordance with recommendations in the heritage consultant report. Along Moncton Street, a slight difference in building setback, parapet height and differences in architectural façade treatment maintains a continuous street wall approach while also breaking up the building form. A combination of building recesses, and building entrances (residential lobby and pedestrian breezeway into the parkade) combined with three distinctive architectural facades breaks up the massing along the longer 2nd Avenue frontage.

The five residential units can be accessed and entrance lobby on 2nd Avenue. Elevator and/or stairs access an exterior corridor and courtyard on the 2nd level. Private rooftop decks are proposed for each of the five residential units with access being provided by a set of stairs from the corridor/courtyard up to the rooftop decks. These access stairs are located away from the edges of the building and screened by the proposed building parapet and will not be visible from the street. This approach does not result in any additional building massing for access structures to the rooftop and can also accommodate the installation of chair stair lift to improve accessibility if needed. No communal outdoor amenity is provided for this small-scale mixed use development.

Additional design development of the built form and refinement of the architectural elements and building materials, including consideration of comments from the Richmond Heritage Commission and received through the processing of the rezoning will be addressed through the Development Permit application.

Proposed Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village Zone

The proposed new zone allows for similar uses as other mixed use zones in Steveston Village that include general commercial and residential (apartment) uses.

The new proposed zone includes the following specific provisions:

- General base density of 1.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR).
- Additional density related to affordable housing up to 1.1 FAR.
- Parking reductions in accordance with Steveston Area Plan policies.

Registration of a covenant identifying that the building is a mixed use building and indicating that the building is designed to avoid unwanted noise generated by internal use from penetrating into residential areas will be secured as a rezoning consideration for this project.

Existing Legal Encumbrances

There is an existing 3 m (9.8 ft.) wide Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) immediately south of the adjacent properties to the west for sanitary sewer infrastructure. This area is part of the site's driveway access. No buildings, structures or landscaping is permitted or proposed over this SRW area.

Housing Type and Tenure

Five residential apartment units are proposed and are all sized to be family friendly units (two three-bedroom units; two four-bedroom units; one five-bedroom unit). Consistent with OCP policy respecting multiple-family housing development projects, and in order to maximize potential rental and housing opportunities throughout the City, the applicant has agreed to register a restrictive covenant on Title, prohibiting (a) the imposition of any strata bylaw that would prohibit any residential dwelling unit from being rented; and (b) the imposition of any strata bylaw that would place age-based restrictions on occupants of any residential dwelling unit. This will be secured as a rezoning consideration item (see Attachment 9 for the proposed rezoning considerations for this project).

Transportation and Site Access

Vehicle access will be through the existing lane to the west, and the existing driveway crossing located on 2nd Avenue will be closed.

The development contains a total of 15 parking stalls: nine commercial parking stalls and six residential parking stalls. One residential visitor parking will be shared with the commercial spaces. This approach to on-site parking is consistent with applying a 33 per cent parking reduction for non-residential (commercial uses) and sharing of residential visitor parking with commercial parking in accordance with policy provisions contained in the Steveston Area Plan. For residential use, a 20 per cent parking reduction in conjunction with a package of transportation demand management measures (TDM) will be secured in accordance with the regulations contained in the City's Zoning Bylaw.

Based on the above on-site parking provisions, the following TDM's will be secured through rezoning consideration legal agreement(s):

- Transit pass program available for the residential units (two transit passes per unit; 10 total transit passes) to provide monthly transit passes (2 zone) for a specified period (one year).
- Bicycle amenities – increase the number of Class 1 on-site bicycle spaces provided from one to two per dwelling unit and increase the size of half of the Class 1 bicycle spaces to accommodate bikes with trailers and provide for on-site bicycle maintenance facilities and equipment. Additionally, all Class 1 bicycle parking stalls for residential use are to be provided with electric battery charging infrastructure.
- The forthcoming Development Permit application will confirm the provisions for bicycle parking provisions on the subject site, including the additional bicycle amenities being secured through the TDM.

The proposed development includes provisions for six small car parking stalls (four commercial; two residential). The inclusion of small car parking stalls into the project will require a variance. Any specific changes or requirements identified as part of the proposed variance will be identified and secured through the Development Permit application.

BC Energy Step Code

As a Part 3 building under the BC Building Code, the proposed development is subject to the City's Step Code requirements. The project architect has submitted a letter confirming that the proposed development has been designed to meet Energy Step Code 3 with inclusion of a Low Carbon Building Energy Systems (i.e., air sourced heat pump systems). Additional details on Energy Step Code compliance and the integration of applicable building mechanical systems into the development will be provided through the Development Permit application.

Amenity Space

For each residential unit, private outdoor decks on the rooftop are provided. The sizes of these rooftop decks exceed the minimum required (6 m²; 65 ft²) for apartment units. A common outdoor amenity area is not provided for this small-scale mixed use development.

Indoor amenity space or cash-in-lieu contribution is not provided based on the Official Community Plan guidelines, which provides an exemption where the average unit size is greater than 148 m² (1,593 ft²). The average residential unit size in the proposed development is 164 m² (1,769 ft²).

Geotechnical Considerations

As a new proposal has been submitted for the rezoning application by a different architect, submission of a new or updated geotechnical report will be required as a rezoning consideration item. In addition, the applicant will also be required to engage a qualified consultant to inspect the current condition of neighbouring/adjacent buildings prior to any works on the subject site and monitor exterior of the buildings and settlement.

Also, registration of a subsidence covenant on Title will be required prior to issuance of a Building Permit. A signed and sealed letter/report from a geotechnical engineer must be provided to confirm that the proposed development will not impact the serviceability of neighbouring buildings, including the properties at 3480, 3500 and 3580 Moncton Street, and they may continue to be safely used for their intended purposes. All buildings must be built only in strict compliance with the recommendations set forth in the geotechnical report.

Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

Completion of a Servicing Agreement is a rezoning consideration item for the proposed development to undertake the following servicing and frontage related works and improvements:

- Along the north property line, construct a concrete sidewalk with appropriate hardscape boulevard and concrete curb and gutter to City specifications. Along the west property line, construct a concrete sidewalk and curb and gutter to City specifications. Any existing driveways are to be removed and replaced with the applicable frontage works.
- Upgrade the existing accessible ramp with tactile warning strips for the visually impaired at the south west corner of the intersection of Moncton Street and 2nd Avenue.
- Along 2nd Avenue, adjust pavement markings and signage to add angled parking where the existing driveway crossing is to be removed and replaced with concrete sidewalk and curb and gutter.
- Upgrade the entire lane width of the lane along the subject site's entire frontage along the west property line to City specifications.
- Grant a 2 m x 2 m corner cut (SRW) at the north east corner of the subject site and undertake works to match the proposed sidewalk improvements.
- Install fire hydrants along the Moncton Street and 2nd Avenue frontages at the appropriate spacing.

Development Permit Application

A Development Permit application is required to be processed to a satisfactory level prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. Further design development and refinements to the architecture, urban design, landscape design and integration of elements recommended by the heritage consultant will be undertaken as part of the Development Permit application review process, including, but not limited to:

- Compliance with Development Permit Guidelines in the 2041 Official Community Plan and the Steveston Area Plan, including the Sakamoto Guidelines.
- On-site landscape design development, including design approach to the outdoor courtyard/corridor and rooftop deck areas.
- Review and refinement of the proposed cladding materials, window and door treatments, awnings and signage elements.

- Further design development in response to recommendations of the heritage consultant and comments received from the Richmond Heritage Commission, including applicable information on the integration of a historical commemorative element into this project.
- Review the requested variance proposing small car stalls (6 total – 4 commercial; 2 residential) in the proposed development.
- Review of the aging-in-place features and accessibility measures.
- Review of the sustainability measures and components.

Financial Impact or Economic Impact

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

Conclusion

The purpose of this rezoning application is to create a new “Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village” zoning district and to rezone 3560 Moncton Street to this new zone to permit development of a 2 storey mixed use development with at-grade commercial space and five residential units on the second level.

The proposal was also subject to the Enhanced Development Review Process applicable for redevelopment in the Steveston Village Heritage Conservation Area, implemented by Council in June 2021.

Staff support the rezoning application as it is consistent with the land use, density and height policies within the Steveston Area Plan.

It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10075 be introduced and given first reading.



Kevin Eng
Planner 3

KE:cas

- Att.
- 1: Location Map
 - 2: Conceptual Development Plans
 - 3: Development Application Data Sheet
 - 4: Steveston Area Plan (excerpt)
 - 5: Public Correspondence Received
 - 6: April 28 2022 Steveston 20/20 meeting minutes (excerpt)
 - 7: May 10 2023 Richmond Heritage Commission Meeting Minutes (excerpt)
 - 8: Heritage Consultant Report (McLean Heritage Planning & Consulting)
 - 9: Rezoning Considerations



City of Richmond



RZ 18-817742

Original Date: 04/13/18

Revision Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES

DRAWING LIST

Architectural

Architect

INTERFACE ARCHITECTURE IN
#230 - 11500 CAMBIE ROAD
RICHMOND, B.C. V6X 3Z5
Tel: 604-821-1162
Email: kenn@interfacearchitecture.com

Figure 1

MATSON PECK & TOPLISS
#320 - 11120 HORSESHOE WAY
RICHMOND, BC V7A 5H7
Tel: 604-270-9331
Fax: 604-270-4137
Email: trout@mttbc.ca

HERITAGE

MCM CLEAN HERITAGE PLANNING
 857 - 3536 TERRA VITA PLACE
 VANCOUVER, BC V5K 5H6
 Tel: 778-3084357
 Email: mcleanheritage@gmail.com

CEOTECHNICAL

DAVIES GEOTECHNICAL INC.
UNIT 2-1520 CLIVEDEN AVENUE
DELTA, B.C. V3M 6J8
Tel: 604-395-2300
Fax: 604-395-2301
Email: Paul.Davies@daviesgeotechnical.com

FLOOR AREA SUMMARY (SF)

	GROSS	EXEMPT	NET FAF	NET FAS
LEVEL 1 (OVERALL)	1,640 SF	(6,400 SF)	5,240 SF	494.3 MC
* RESIDENTIAL	705 SF	--	705 SF	
* RETAIL	6,000 SF	(6,000 SF)	4,538 SF	
* PARKING	1,500 SF	(9,000 SF)	0 SF	
* MECH/GAR/BLEC	700 SF	(700 SF)	0 SF	
* LEVEL 2 (RESID)	9,400 SF	(304 SF)	9,041 SF	840.0 MC
TOTALS	21,001 SF	(6,707 SF)	14,244 SF	1,327.1 MC

AVERAGE GRADE CALCULATION

	SITE	BUILDING	TOTAL AVG.
	NW CORNER 1	1.24	1.24
	NW CORNER 2 (INNER CORNER CORNERS NOT COUNTED)	(1.05)	(1.25)
	NW CORNER 3	1.20	1.27
	SW CORNER	1.54	1.54
	SE CORNER	1.24	1.24
	NE CORNER	1.24	1.24
	AVG GRD	1.26m	1.31m
			1.30m

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

THIS REZONING SUBMISSION REVISES THE A SITE PLAN TO DEVELOP A NEW 2-STOREY, MIXED-USE PROJECT TO BE LOCATED ON THE CORNER OF STEVENSON AVENUE AND CONSERVATION AVE. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONSERVATION AVE. WILL ALSO REQUIRE AN APPLICATION FOR A CONSERVATION VARIATION. PREVIOUSLY OCCUPIED BY STEVENSON COMMERCIAL BUILDING, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT HERETOFORE


THE SUBJECT SITE IS LOCATED IN THE CORE AREA OF THE ORIGINAL STEVENSON VILLAGE. HISTORICALLY THE STEVENSON VILLAGE WAS A MIXED-USE COMMERCIAL CENTRE OF THE OVERALL VILLAGE. THE STEVENSON AVENUE, FORMERLY NAMED 625 STEVENSON AVENUE, WAS THE MAIN STREET OF THE STEVENSON COMMERCIAL DISTRICT. THE STEVENSON VILLAGE CONSERVATION STRATEGY (JUNE 2006) OUTLINES A DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN THAT CONSIDERS

AN INCREASE IN DENSITY FROM 1.0 TO 12 FAR UP TO 33% REDUCTION IN REQUIRED PARKING THE SACRIFICED DESIGN GUIDELINES THE POTENTIAL FINANCIAL INCENTIVES STEVENSON AVE. PLAN # 1490.

[RZ 18-817742]

DESIGN THAT IS CURRENTLY IN PROGRESS FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE EXISTING ZAMAKS OF THE 1250 AND SITE (3, 105) WITH A DENSITY OF 115/FAR. THE SITE IS NOT A DESIGNATED VILLAGE HERITAGE AREA AND IS NOT A HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT AREA AND HARDWARE. THE EXISTING 1-STORY

LOCATION PLAN



ZONING SUMMARY


ADDRESS	CIVIC ADDRESS	LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS	LOT AREA	HERITAGE/RES/ANEF	YES / NO / NO	AREA PLAN / OCP	24 STEVENSON AREA PLAN
3569 MONKTON STREET, RICHMOND BC	001-007-915	LOT 26 SECTION 08 BLOCK 3 NORTH RANGE 7 WEST NMD PLAN 23758	1225.9 M2 (13.165 SF = 0.303 ACRES)				

[illegible]

OUTDOOR AMENITY AREA	N/A	TBD
NOTES: 1. TO BE REVIEWED AS PART OF THE PROCESSING OF THE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION 2. CLASS 1 AND CLASS 2 BICYCLE PARKING FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE TO BE DETERMINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPROVED TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MEASURES AND OTHER CITY REQUIREMENTS WITH PLANS TO BE FINALIZED AS PART OF THE PROCESSING OF THE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION		



SITE PLAN




INTERFACE:

Suite 230
1590 Cambie Road
Richmond BC
Canada V6X 3Z5
604 821 1162
604 821 1146

PROJECT	MIXED-USE BUILDING
	6500 MONTEMIN STREET
	RICHMOND, BC
SUBJECT NO.	THIRLICK
DATE	AS NOTED
TE	DEC 23, 2021
BY	JAWN BY
BY	YCHOWAL
CHECKED BY	YC
SHEET TITLE	PROJECT DATA, SITE PLAN

CHURCH

A101





RZ 18-817742

Attachment 3

Address: 3560 Moncton Street

Applicant: Inter Luck Trading Corp.

Planning Area(s): Steveston Area Plan


	Existing	Proposed
Owner:	Inter Luck Trading Corp.	TBD
Site Size (m²):	1,225.9m ² (13,195.48 ft ²)	No change
Land Uses:	Commercial	Mixed-Use commercial and residential
OCP Designation:	Neighbourhood Service Centre (NSC)	No Change – complies
Area Plan Designation:	Heritage Mixed Use (Commercial-Industrial with Residential and Office above)	No Change – complies
Zoning:	Steveston Commercial (CS2)	Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village
Number of Units:	One commercial unit	At grade commercial units and five 2 nd level residential units

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max 1.1	1.1	none permitted
Lot Coverage (% of lot area):	Max. 100 %	100% (approx.)	none
Setbacks (m):	No front, rear or side yard setback	No front, rear or side yard setback	none
Height (m):	9 m	8.9 m	none
Off-street Parking Spaces – Total:	Commercial - 9 Residential - 6 Visitor - 1 (shared with commercial)	Commercial – 9* Residential – 6* Visitor - 1 (shared with commercial)	None *Variance requested for small car stalls
Off-street Parking Space – Accessible	1	1	none
Class 1 Bicycle Parking Spaces	Commercial - 2 Residential - 7	TBD as part of the Development Permit and Approved TDM	none
Class 2 Bicycle Parking Spaces	Commercial - 2 Residential - 1	TBD as part of the Development Permit	none

* **Proposed small car stalls (6 total – 4 commercial; 2 residential) to be reviewed as part of the Development Permit application**

Steveston Village Land Use Density and Building Height Map

Bylaw 10392
2022/12/22



		Maximum FAR	Maximum Storeys	Maximum Building Height
	Core Area, generally	1.6	3	12 m *
	Core Area, Bayview Street (North)	1.2	3**	Varies due to grade elevation difference north of Bayview Street
	Moncton Street **	1.2	2	9 m *
	Riverfront Area	1.2	2	9 m***

Bylaw 10392
2022/12/19

* Maximum building height may increase where needed to improve the interface with adjacent existing buildings and streetscape, but may not exceed the maximum storeys.

** Three storey building height for buildings along the north side of Bayview Street shall include two storeys over a parkade structure.

Bylaw 10392
2022/12/19

*** Maximum building height along the south side of Bayview Street shall not exceed two storeys above finished site grade.

Park,Minhee

From: MayorandCouncillors
Sent: Friday, 27 July 2018 08:24
To: 'June Stevens'
Subject: RE: Steveston Marine

Good morning Ms. Stevens,

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your email. Please be advised that copies of your email have been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor.

Thank you again for taking the time to make your views known.

Hanieh Berg | Acting Manager, Legislative Services City Clerk's Office | City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

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

From: June Stevens [<mailto:jstevens0613@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, 26 July 2018 18:37
To: MayorandCouncillors
Subject: Steveston Marine

This is the first time I have ever made the move to voice my concerns about the way that Richmond seems to be "selling out" and changing the reason for my living here. I am usually a part of the silent majority but reading the latest issue of the Richmond News, has prompted me to protest vehemently.

I live in Steveston because of the character and pace of living but I have been watching this succumb to developers. Firstly it was Rod's Lumber being replaced with expensive condos. It is now going to be Steveston Marine being replaced with condos. We DO NOT need more condos, we need the character of our village to be maintained. May be you could take a leaf out of Fort Langley's book, the council seem to care more about keeping their character village than money. Development permits seem to be handed out like bus tickets without any consideration of the infrastructure. We still only have the same bridges and tunnel for as long as I have lived here, yet thousands of condos and mega houses bring more vehicles onto the island.

I could go on about the irresponsibility of allowing the gigantic houses in our agricultural land but I'll spare you my ire on this subject.

When I moved here in 1988 It was a great place to live. The last thing I want is to move from Richmond but the decisions of your staff, councillors and mayor push me closer to making this change.

June Stevens

Sent from my iPad

Park,Minhee

From: Linda Barnes <loulindy50@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 31 July 2019 09:26
To: Park,Minhee
Cc: Zaher Verjee
Subject: Re: 3560 Moncton Street (RZ18- 817742) Rezoning Plans

Thanks Michele! I did forward to them and asked them to reply to you directly. With holidays and summer in Steveston many are quite busy so am sorry if no one got back. I'm an example! My comments are as follows;
I feel its an acceptable design although nothing of notable excitement
The rooftop access should be accessible for people with disabilities. I understand the issue of the individual "dog houses" visible from street level but there must be a much better way of making the rooftop usable, green and accessible for all residents and their visitors. With so little green garden space in developments (understandable), especially in Steveston, the use of rooftops is really important and should be maximized.

Cheers
Linda Barnes
4551 Garry St
Richmond
604 787 3118

On Jul 30, 2019, at 4:00 PM, Park,Minhee <MPark@richmond.ca> wrote:

Hi Linda,

Just following up to see if you have received comments from Steveston 20/20 members and if you have any comments on the proposed development.

I am finalizing the rezoning staff report this week. If you want your comments to be attached to the staff report, please send me your written comments by the end of tomorrow.

Thanks.

Minhee Park, Planner 2
Policy Planning Department
City of Richmond
Tel. (604) 276-4188
Fax. (604) 276-4052

From: Park,Minhee
Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 09:35
To: 'Linda Barnes'
Cc: Zaher Verjee
Subject: 3560 Moncton Street (RZ18- 817742) Rezoning Plans

Hi Linda,

Further to our meeting on June 20, 2019, please find attached a copy of the plans submitted for the rezoning application for 3560 Moncton Street. Please note that these plans are preliminary and more detailed plans will be provided and reviewed at the Development Permit stage.

The rezoning application is tentatively placed on the September 4 Planning Committee agenda for consideration. This means I need to finalize my report before the end of July. If you want your comments to be included in the staff report, please send me your written comments by July 31, 2019.

If the Planning Committee and Council decide to move the application forward, a Public Hearing for the rezoning bylaw will be held on October 21.

Please be advised that a Development Permit (DP) application has not been submitted yet. If the rezoning bylaw receives third reading, the applicant will be required to submit complete Development Permit and Heritage Alteration Permit applications and they must be processed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need further information. Thanks.

Minhee Park, Planner 2
Policy Planning Department
City of Richmond
Tel. (604) 276-4188
Fax. (604) 276-4052

PD Riverside Ventures Inc.

#107-970 Burrard Street
Vancouver, B.C.
V6Z 2R4

August 20, 2019

City of Richmond

6911 No.3 Road
Richmond, BC
V6Y 2C1

Attention: **Ms. Minhee Park,**
Planner 2, Policy Planning Division.

Wayne Craig,
Director of Development

Dear Ms. Park and Mr. Craig,

Thank you for your email correspondence regarding the proposed Mixed Use Development of 3560 Moncton Street, located in the Steveston Village.

As requested, this letter outlines our main concerns of the proposed development as owners of the neighbouring property, 3480 Moncton Street and landlord for a new business tenant operating from that location.

Our primary concerns are as follows:

The proposed development redirects customer traffic away from Moncton Street with the focus being on Second Avenue as the major points of storefront entry and decorative access points are facing Second Avenue. Unlike the existing Marine building this proposed development does not support the historical influence of Moncton Street.

The size and overall mass of the proposed development overshadow the neighbouring buildings and do not support the concept of Steveston as a small heritage community and creates the illusion of engulfment of the existing buildings along Moncton Street. This proposal clearly does not support the current vision of a historical fishing vision and does nothing to preserving the historical aspects of Steveston for future generations.

The proposed parking includes nine commercial spaces and seven residential spaces and all of these parking stalls are accessed through the lane. Currently the lane is already extremely busy with heavy delivery and pedestrian traffic and services a condominium complex and several commercial businesses.

In fact our building is right at the property line to this lane and the entrance and exits to our property face into this lane. This includes emergency evacuation exit points. In addition, as a result of the lack of parking in Steveston this area is used for restaurant patio and takeout service, deliveries and parking for the existing commercial buildings and is always congested with cars, delivery and garbage trucks and pedestrian traffic. The proposed development includes one entrance off the lane which is the ONLY service entrance, delivery access, residential tenants access. The width of the lane and the visibility in the lane do not support the proposed pre and post construction traffic as it is too dangerous for pedestrian traffic.

In addition, we do not see a designated loading area for the building included in the development proposal and therefore will be increased congestion in the lane. Garbage trucks will not be able to turn into their property and will have to block the lane to manually load the containers onto the truck. This garbage and recycling area is proposed for the area behind our building and will be extremely disruptive. The proposed drawings include a deck on the second level overlooking our building at 3480 Moncton these decks are greater than 180 square feet. We are concerned about the impact the closeness of the decks and the second floor of this building will have on our building and future redevelopment of our property.

The sewer right of way shown on the drawings appears to provide a ten foot buffer on the west side of the proposed building and ours building. This buffer is undersized considering the size of the new structure.

At this point we will be engaging construction and heritage professionals to help us further investigate the impact of this development on our property and business tenant in order to preserve and protect our property and business. Please feel free to contact me if you wish to discuss any of these points in more detail and we do look forward to working with you throughout this process.

With regards,

PD Riverside Ventures Inc.



Diana Dallas,
Director

Eng, Kevin

From: Eng, Kevin
Sent: September 16, 2021 11:40 AM
To: 'Don O'Toole'
Subject: RE: Opposition to rezoning application of Steveston Marine Hardware (File No. HA 18-817743)

Hi Christine,

Thanks your email. The following are some applicable updates in response to your question:

- Updates to the membership of the Richmond Heritage Commission, in accordance with the Council direction provided on this back in late June 2021, is currently being undertaken. Referencing my previous email, Council decided not to establish a new "Steveston Design Committee". Instead, it was decided to amend the membership and terms of reference for the Richmond Heritage Commission to assist in the review of development applications in the Steveston Village Conservation Area. Staff hope to have the membership of the Richmond Heritage Commission updated sometime later this year (note: membership appointments to the Richmond Heritage Commission require Council approval).
- For the application at 3560 Moncton Street, a revised overall project is currently being prepared by the applicant.
- Once the Richmond Heritage Commission member appointments has been completed, the revised proposal at 3560 Moncton Street will be required to be submitted to the Richmond Heritage Commission for review and comment.

Please let me know if you have any questions on the above.

Regards,
Kevin Eng
Senior Planner, Policy Planning Department, City of Richmond
604-247-4626; keng@richmond.ca; www.richmond.ca

From: Don O'Toole
Sent: September 13, 2021 7:57 AM
To: Eng, Kevin
Subject: Re: Opposition to rezoning application of Steveston Marine Hardware (File No. HA 18-817743)

Hi Kevin,

Just to be extra clear, does it mean the development application of the old Steveston Marine Hardware building is on hold until the Steveston Design Committee? Or what is the current stats of this application?

thanks
Christine

On Sep 13, 2021, at 7:53 AM, Don O'Toole <thedings@shaw.ca> wrote:

Hi Kevin,

Thanks for this information. Is there update on this topic? (apologies if I somehow missed this. I have looked and can't see any updates)

thanks,
Christine

On Jul 9, 2021, at 10:40 AM, Eng, Kevin <KEng@richmond.ca> wrote:

Good Morning Christine,

Thanks for your email and comments on the rezoning application proposal at 3560 Moncton Street (reference file RZ 18-817742 and related file HA-817743).

This email acknowledges receipt of your correspondence submitted to Council on this rezoning application. It will be included as public correspondence received when the rezoning application is considered by Council.

I would also like to take this opportunity to update you on a few matters related to the establishment of the "Steveston Design Committee" and how development applications are processed and reviewed in the Steveston Heritage Conservation Area. Recently, City Council considered, in general, the process for reviewing development proposals in the Steveston Village Conservation Area at the June Planning Committee meetings and as a result, decided to amend the current Richmond Heritage Commission terms of reference and membership in order to assist with the enhanced review of development proposals in Richmond (including Steveston). Furthermore, Council decided not to establish a separate brand new advisory committee (Steveston Design Committee). Full details are contained in the links to staff reports and minutes below:

- June 23 2021 Planning Committee
 - https://www.richmond.ca/_shared/assets/4_Steveston_Advisory_Design_Committee_PLN_06232158723.pdf (Staff report)
 - https://www.richmond.ca/cityhall/council/agendas/planning/2021/062321s_minutes.htm (Item 4 in the minutes)
- June 28 2021 Council
 - https://www.richmond.ca/_shared/assets/18_-_Steveston_Village_Advisory_Design_Committee_Steveston_Area_Plan_Review_CNCL_06282158757.pdf (Staff Report)
 - https://www.richmond.ca/cityhall/council/agendas/council/2021/062821_minutes.htm (Item 18 in the minutes)

Presently, Council has endorsed amending the Richmond Heritage Commission as per the above report. As the Richmond Heritage Commission is established through a bylaw, the amending bylaw was considered when Council reviewed this in June. I understand that the bylaw to amend the Richmond Heritage Commission will be adopted at the next Council meeting in July. One thing I would like to clarify is that the Richmond Heritage Commission is an advisory body appointed by Council to provide comments/feedback to Council. The Richmond Heritage Commission does not make land use decisions or provide approvals on development proposals. Development application approvals and decisions resides with Richmond City Council. Once Council

adopts the bylaw to revise the terms of reference and membership of the Richmond Heritage Commission, staff will work to recruit the applicable qualified professionals (with demonstrated experience in heritage conservation planning and design) for Council's consideration sometime in the Fall 2021.

In relation to the project at 3560 Moncton Street – as noted in the staff report link, the development proposal will be required to be reviewed and considered by the Richmond Heritage Commission, as well as additional review and processing of the proposal by staff. As noted above, in the coming months the Richmond Heritage Commission membership will need to be updated before they are in a position to review proposals. Staff also anticipate that a revised development proposal for the subject site will be submitted by the applicant sometime later this year.

Thank you for taking the time to review this email and the provided links.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

Regards,
Kevin Eng
Senior Planner, Policy Planning Department, City of Richmond
604-247-4626; keng@richmond.ca; www.richmond.ca

From: Don O'Toole <thedings@shaw.ca>
Sent: July 4, 2021 12:16 PM
To: MayorandCouncillors <MayorandCouncillors@richmond.ca>
Cc: Eng, Kevin <KEng@richmond.ca>
Subject: Opposition to rezoning application of Steveston Marine Hardware (File No. HA 18-817743)

Hello Mayor Brodie and City Councillors,

I would like to formally provide public feedback and opposition to the rezoning application of the building in historic Steveston that was formally the Steveston Marine and Hardware store.

I am a Steveston resident and am opposed to changing commercial one-story buildings in the heart of historic Steveston to two-level buildings. This building is on a block with single story buildings and should continue to match this character and level. I am extremely concerned that approval of this application will result in more one-story buildings on Moncton street in historic Steveston being torn down . This will change the charm of this key street of Moncton. You talk of historic Steveston as being a gem of Richmond. Support this gem and reject this rezoning application.

Thank you,
Christine O'Toole

Begin forwarded message:

From: Don and Christine <thedings@shaw.ca>
Subject: Re: Opposition and request for information for Steveston Marine Hardware (File No. HA 18-817743)
Date: May 8, 2021 at 8:55:18 PM PDT
To: "Eng, Kevin" <KEng@richmond.ca>

Hi Kevin,

Thanks so much for getting back to me. I have reviewed the documents and I would like to add my feedback and concerns. Can you let me know who is on the Steveston Design Committee and how I can voice these concerns:

- opposed to changing one story buildings to two story in historical Steveston. This building is on a block with single story buildings and should continue to match this character and level.
- opposed to adding additional stories that will impact sight lines to the Gulf of Georgia Cannery (from pedestrians on Moncton) and this will further take away the charm and character of the street
- opposed to adding more residential housing to the historical district which will further erode the charm and reason tourists, film industry, and other Richmondites come to Steveston

There is no need to add another level to buildings on Moncton in the heart of Steveston. There is not need to add more residents to this historical center.

Please let me know whom to contact.

Thank you,
Christine

From: "Eng, Kevin" <KEng@richmond.ca>
To: "Don and Christine" <thedings@shaw.ca>
Cc: "communityplanning" <CommunityPlanning@richmond.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 1:28:41 PM
Subject: RE: Opposition and request for information for Steveston Marine Hardware (File No. HA 18-817743)

Hi Christine,

Thank you for contacting the City about the redevelopment proposal at 3560 Moncton Street (former Steveston Marine Hardware site).

My name is Kevin Eng and I work in Planning and Development at the City and am the development planner for the development application (rezoning application) that has been submitted for the site (reference file RZ 18-817742).

In relation to your concerns identified in your email, I wanted to provide you with some project updates and also where you can obtain further information about the development application through the City's website:

- The rezoning application was recently forwarded to the March 2 2021 Planning Committee meeting. Planning

Committee/Council did not make a decision on the application and a referral was passed to table the application. See below for links to the meeting minutes from the March 2 2021 Planning Committee meeting. Also provided are links to the staff report that provide detailed information, including drawings, about the proposed rezoning application for the subject site.

○

https://www.richmond.ca/cityhall/council/agendas/planning/2021/030221_minutes.htm

○

https://www.richmond.ca/_shared/assets/1_Application_3560_MonctonSt_PLN_03022157861.pdf

Once you have had the opportunity to review the information about the proposal, please feel free to contact me by email or phone about providing public input/concerns on the submitted rezoning application proposal.

Regards,
Kevin Eng
Planner 2, Policy Planning Department, City of Richmond
604-247-4626; keng@richmond.ca; www.richmond.ca

From: Don and Christine <thedings@shaw.ca>
Sent: April 11, 2021 8:58 PM
To: Community Planning <CommunityPlanning@richmond.ca>
Subject: Opposition and request for information for Steveston Marine Hardware (File No. HA 18-817743)

City of Richmond Security Warning: This email was sent from an external source outside the City. Please do not click or open attachments unless you recognize the source of this email and the content is safe.

Hello,

RE: File No. HA 18-817743 + RZ 18-817742

I am a Steveston resident and would like to voice my opposition to the Heritage Altercation Permit application for the building that used to be Steveston Hardware. This village is the heart of this area and it's history generates tourism and business.

Can you please send me more information about the proposed application? Can you let me know whom to contact, and what steps I need to take to raise my concerns to those who are reviewing this application?

Thank you,
Christine O'Toole

performances as well as pop-up (activation stages) could also include marching/standing bands; 75th anniversary so a lot of themes over the years are to be weaved into the stages; pop-up booths to share ideas with community stories;

- Things that were in the past that won't be the same include: no fireworks, no BBQ, shorter hours, **may** have walk up for salmon sales (but the night before is a pre-paid for pick-up); no beer garden; no bull head derby
- launch of communication early in May; including application for groups to participate in activation stages or pop-ups
- the kick off will be the kite festival (June 25 - 26)
- Merchants seem to be interested to be a participant and will be further asked
- Input re closing the streets to traffic, majority think streets should be closed for July 1
- No food trucks on the Steveston site
- Grab and go might work for one day with food trucks
- Traditional ones that come
- Between kite festival and salmon festival activities being investigated
- Hub would love to participate just thinking about it and will discuss with festival committee
- (NOTE: Hub is an alternative community space: engagement; wellness; collaboration; 5000 sq feet; co-work space; yoga offered; public not as aware as the space just became available during COVID; not a lot of events because of this stevestonhub.com)
- Other Steveston sites/groups encouraged to offer something

3. Ken Chow and Associates from Interface architects- presented the development plans for old Nikkei Building and the Steveston Hardware Store site

- presentation for community not a public hearing, just an opportunity for organizations to ask questions and to provide feedback
- 20/20 members are invited to take the information presented back to their organization and review for feedback/questions or if more info is needed can be asked
- Ken Chow is at Cambie and #5 for 27 years, done Steveston projects before
- 2 projects: first: old Steveston Hardware building; across street old Nikkei building (owners of these buildings/projects were in attendance to hear feedback from the group)

Review of existing areas:

Marine site (Nora and Richard)

- Ken explained how he reviewed all history and archives on buildings/sites
- not a heritage building/site
- street intersection is an important one
- the building should be interesting but also echo what was in the past so heritage feeling is not lost
- merchants want foot traffic to be strongly maintained along Moncton
- 1950-60 vintage
- retail faces street
- original drawing in 2019 turned back for various reasons
- revised preliminary design: a prominent corner; area plan guidelines to be authentic and to recognize

heritage; Steveston history; now community evolved to be more community based compared to old Steveston (fishing; Japanese heritage/history); reference building photos from the past eg 1939 - 1943)

Proposed

- retail units; parking; five large apartment/condo units; rooftop access; greenway
- will look like four separate buildings but would be one which reflects the look of the current village units
- therefore these units are smaller notion is to break it down to look more like separate buildings not a big one; corner entry; one large tree that is there is featured by creating an open space around the units

Nillos

**Richmond Heritage Commission
Excerpt of DRAFT Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2023**

Rezoning Application for 3560 Moncton Street (RZ18-817742)

Kevin Eng, Planner 3, provided an introduction highlighting the site context and specific issues including the proposed façade reflecting historic lot lines, the commemoration plan, and building façade treatments.

Ken Chow, Interface Architecture Inc., provided a presentation with the aid of a visual presentation, highlighting the following:

- The subject site is a L-shaped site at the intersection of Moncton and 2nd Avenue.
- Although the Steveston Area Plan does not show historic lot lines on the subject site, the proposed design reflects historical lot expression based on archival research.
- Ground-floor retail space is proposed along Moncton Street and 2nd Avenue, and parking access is provided from the lane.
- The existing big tree on the adjacent site to the west is coordinated with the project design.

Hugh McLean, McLean Heritage Planning and Consulting, provided an overview of the site's history, with the aid of a visual presentation, highlighting the following:

- The subject site is surrounded by a number of protected heritage buildings that contribute to the heritage value of the area.
- The Steveston commercial core remains a collection of narrow false-front vernacular historic buildings; almost all of them are small wood buildings.
- The history of the Steveston Marine and Hardware goes further than the 1960s. A small commercial building (the “Tanaka Building”) was built by Matsu Tanaka on the subject site circa 1928, and the Steveston Hardware business was established at that time. The site was conveyed to John Leach in 1944 and the building was expanded in the 1960s.
- The evolution of the earlier buildings (the original corner building and the living quarter to the west) on the site forms for a component of the design rationale of the project.
- The proposed design incorporates the historical elements such as the corner entry orientation, large storefront windows and smaller retail frontage on Moncton Street.

Ken Chow provided additional information regarding the proposed design with the aid of a visual presentation.

- The project draws upon the Tanaka Building as a design precedent. The proposed design incorporates a corner entry with a transom, large storefront windows.
- The proposed units are arranged along the second level courtyard. All five residential units have stairs to the rooftop decks, and there is elevator access to the main doors. Some units have balconies.
- The point of reference for the proposed massing and height of the proposed development is the Hepworth Block. The proposed building height is less than the height of the Hepworth Block.
- Strong horizontal lines relate to the building to the west, and the lower parapet serves as a transition.
- Architectural Elements such as columns, awnings, dentils and brackets are incorporated.
- A commemorative plaque is proposed on the west elevation to recognize the historical and cultural significance of the Tanaka Building.
- A breezeway and an elevator lobby breaks the building massing along the 2nd Ave. frontage.

In response to questions from the Commission, the following additional information was provided.

- The project architect noted that the previous issues were mainly related to the building articulation. To address the issues, the building massing was further broken up with more distinct facades. There were concerns regarding the potential loss of presence and focus on the Moncton Street commercial frontage. As indicated in the heritage report, the 2nd Avenue frontage has significance and provides an important connection to the waterfront and bring the people to the intersection and Moncton Street. Also, the courtyard design has been simplified.
- Staff noted that Development Permit application would not be brought forward to the Commission unless there are specific components that require Commission's review, and the proposed development is exempt from the Public Art contribution requirement.
- The project architect noted that the commercial parking entrance would not have a gate and that the residential parking access would have a gate implemented. Rooftop mechanical unit details and locations are to be determined, and a mix of Hardi-siding and wood will be used and architectural details such as window mullions, and a transom have been incorporated.
- The project architect noted that prominent band boards in different styles were proposed for future signs and a projecting sign with brackets on Moncton Street side was proposed. There will be no sign on the awnings.

The Commission is generally supportive of the design and appreciated the heritage report which helps to understand the history of the site. The elevations are well developed with interesting

design details. It was noted that detailing is very important to give a level of finesse and authenticity. The history of landscaping in the area, pre-development, would have been valuable information to understand the site's landscape history and value. The Commission provided the following comments for consideration and further design development:

- For crime prevention purposes, a second gate to secure the commercial parking area is recommended.
- Fiberglass windows could be an alternative material to be considered for this project.
- The design and locations of rooftop mechanical units should be considered in advance; the units should be grouped and screened.
- Vast improvement has been made from the previous design, particularly on the 2nd Avenue frontage. There are some opportunities to improve the design further by introducing variation in height (e.g., a higher cornice line in the middle).
- A simpler approach rather than applying additional architectural ornamentation using the building massing and recesses would be effective to create an interesting rhythm along the street and respect the historical lot lines.
- It was suggested that a shed roof form be introduced to the grey blocks on 2nd Avenue elevation to further break down the separation between the facades.
- The use of vinyl windows are acceptable for the upper portion of the building but details such as mullions should be treated carefully for a cohesive appearance.
- The projecting sign on Moncton Street would add an interesting character.
- The 2nd Avenue awnings are a bit too consistent. Slightly different treatments would add a visual interest.
- Rather than a plaque, consider some other artful or interpretive options to commemorate the history of the site.

It was moved and seconded:

That the rezoning application for 3560 Moncton Street (RZ18-817742) be supported subject to the applicant giving consideration to the comments of the Commission.

CARRIED



Design Consultation

3560 Moncton Street, Richmond

March 2023 - Final





Courtenay Office:

6091 Ledingham Road, Courtenay, BC V9J 1M5

Vancouver Office:

57-3436 Terra Vita Place, Vancouver, BC V5K 5H6

(778) 308-4357

mcleanheritage@gmail.com

www.mcleanheritage.ca

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. HISTORIC CONTEXT	1
2.1. STEVESTON HISTORIC AREA	3
2.2. MONCTON STREET – THE VILLAGE’S “HIGH STREET”	6
2.3. SUBJECT SITE – 3560 MONCTON STREET	14
2.4. SUMMARY	21
3. MUNICIPAL POLICY, STRATEGY, REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES	22
3.1. STEVESTON AREA PLAN	22
3.1.1. HISTORICAL AREA AND CULTURAL CONTEXT	23
3.1.2. AREA ARCHITECTURAL ASSESSMENT	24
3.2. STEVESTON VILLAGE CONSERVATION STRATEGY AND GUIDELINES	25
3.2.1. HERITAGE CONSERVATION AREA	26
3.2.2. DESIGN GUIDELINES – SAKUMOTO AND STEVESTON AREA DP	26
3.2.3. EXAMPLES OF OTHER HISTORIC COMMERCIAL AREAS – GASTOWN, CHINATOWN	28
3.3. STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR THE CONSERVATION OF HISTORIC PLACES	29
3.3.1. SPATIAL ORGANIZATION	30
3.3.2. VISUAL RELATIONSHIPS	31
3.3.3. BUILT FEATURES	32
3.4. SUMMARY	33
4. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL - 3560 MONCTON STREET	33
4.1. DEVELOPMENT TIED TO LOCAL PLANNING OBJECTIVES	34
4.2. DEVELOPMENT DESIGN PRINCIPLES AND RATIONALE (PRECEDENT)	34
4.3. PLANS AND ELEVATIONS	36
4.4. CONCLUSIONS	40
5. COMMEMORATION PLAN	41
5.1. PURPOSE	41
5.2. DESIGN CONCEPTS (GRAPHIC LAYOUT)	42
6. MAINTENANCE PLAN	43
6.1. MAINTENANCE GUIDELINES	43
6.2. REQUIRED PERMITS	43
6.3. ROUTINE, CYCLICAL AND NON-INVASIVE CLEANING	43
6.4. REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT OF COMPROMISED MATERIALS	44
6.5. INSPECTIONS	44
6.5.1. INSPECTIONS AND SCHEDULE	44
6.5.2. ONGOING MONITORING	45
6.6. INFORMATION FILE	45
6.7. EXTERIOR MAINTENANCE	45

1. INTRODUCTION

Primary Address: 3560 Moncton Street, Richmond

Neighbourhood and Zoning: Steveston; CS2

Legal: Lot 25, Block 3N, Section 10, Plan NWP25758

Type of Resource: Building; Commercial; Single-storey retail

Historic Name: **Steveston Marine and Hardware**

Original Owner: Matsu Tanaka (previous building)

Date of Construction: 1963 (Source: BC Assessment)

Architect: Not known

Builder: Not known

Heritage Status: Not listed on Richmond Heritage Inventory, situated within Steveston Heritage Conservation Area

3560 Moncton Street is situated in the southwest area of the City of Richmond, commonly known as Steveston (Figure 1). While the building is not formally registered as a historic resource, it is located within the Steveston Heritage Conservation Area (HCA), and does contribute to the historic context. The City's requirement is that any development in the HCA requires a Heritage Alteration Permit as part of any Development Permit.



Figure 1: 3560 Moncton Street in context to Steveston

2. HISTORIC CONTEXT

The property on which the proposed development is located, at 3560 Moncton Street, has been a single-unit commercial building since its construction in 1963. It is currently

vacant, located on the westerly portion of Moncton Street, which is the primary commercial street of Steveston (Figure 2). Previous buildings on this site constituted a collection of smaller wood-frame buildings.



Figure 2: Steveston Heritage Conservation Area Map, City of Richmond, Planning Bulletin #3. 3560 Moncton Street outlined.

2.1. STEVESTON HISTORIC AREA

The development of Steveston's historic downtown through the late 1800s began as a result of the abundance of fish that passed into the mouth of the Fraser River, which resulted in construction of canneries to process the fish. It was new fish processing technology developed in the 1880s that allowed for canning, which required the fresh stocks to be as close as possible to the processing. Steveston also served as a service centre for Richmond's agricultural community as the area began to be settled and farmed. Its prosperity, driven in large part by the nearby canneries, was fueled in large part by labour which included First Nations, and those of Chinese and Japanese descent.



The original layout of the village, as illustrated by the 1892 survey plan, had a commercial core focused between Chatham Street and the Fraser River and a large area to the north comprising urban-sized lots, reflecting the optimism of that time, when it was expected to develop into a town to compete with Vancouver (Figure 3). The subject site on Moncton Street is outlined, magnified below.




Figure 3: Original 1892 Survey Plan, subject site outlined
Source: City of Richmond Archives Map 1990 14 6.

As the village gradually began to develop in the mid to late 1890s, the focus of commercial development was along Moncton Street between Third Avenue and No. 1 Road, and to the docks located along the mouth of the Fraser River (Cannery Channel).

Telephone service was provided to the community as early as 1895. Growth in the area was given a further boost beginning around 1904, following the 1902 completion of a rail line to Steveston by the CPR. By 1905 that rail line was leased to the BCER and electrified, which allowed for the Interurban to use the route; this also provided electricity to the community. Known as the “Sockeye Express” (Figure 4), the interurban ran as frequently as every hour, “attaining 90 km/h on the flat lands of Richmond.”¹ It took 45 minutes to get to downtown Vancouver.




Figure 4: An Interurban Tram, 1906

Source: Source: Source: Community Stories - Steveston Recollections, The History of a Village, Steveston Museum

https://www.communitystories.ca/v1/pm_v2.php?id=record_detail&fl=0&lg=English&ex=00000591&hs=0&rd=263624#

By 1906, there were 18 canneries set along the two miles of foreshore making up the Fraser River waterfront. Steveston became the largest centre of commercial

¹ *Historical Atlas of Vancouver*, Derek Hayes, Douglas & McIntyre, 2005, p. 66.

fishing in Canada. The Northern Bank (which later became the Royal Bank) was in place by that time. This economic growth continued into the early years of the second decade. By 1912, however, the growth was beginning to peak, similar to other areas of the Lower Mainland.

The decline in the salmon industry starting in 1913, followed by a depression in world markets that hit by 1914, had profound impacts on all communities on the west coast, including Steveston. The original vision of W.H. Steves, who purchased the land that would become the townsite, was for a town that would rival Vancouver. However, the economic growth tied to the canneries along the river also led to major downturns.

Further devastation occurred with the fire of May 1918. The Star Cannery was the source of the fire, caused by accidental ignition from an oil lamp (Figure 5). This, combined with several bad fishing seasons, resulted in the closure and merging of several canneries.



Figure 5: Charred pilings of the Lighthouse, Steveston and Star Canneries after the fire of 1918.

Source: City of Richmond Archives, 1971 1 242

The fire's impact on the canneries and parts of the village was traumatic. It spread quickly, fueled by strong winds, and destroyed three canneries and three hotels and put roughly 600 workers – predominantly First Nations, Japanese-Canadian and Chinese-Canadian – out of work. It also destroyed many buildings on the south side of Moncton Street, as far east as First Avenue. If the subject site had a building on it

at that time, it was evidently destroyed, while it spared the exterior of the brick-clad Hepworth Block (although the interior had to be gutted and re-built) (Figure 6).



Figure 6: The Hepworth Building after the 1918 fire (circled, red). Subject site, adjacent (outlined, yellow).

Source: Source: Community Stories - Steveston Recollections, The History of a Village, Steveston Museum

https://www.communitystories.ca/v1/pm_v2.php?id=record_detail&fl=0&lg=English&ex=00000591&hs=0&rd=263658#

Over the first several decades of the 20th century, Steveston became a focus of Japanese-Canadian settlement, second only to Powell Street in Vancouver. Similar to Powell Street, by the 1930s the businesses along Moncton Street were predominantly owned by Japanese-Canadians. This reflected the success of that community over time, where business owners who were tenants acquired ownership of many buildings. The prosperity and importance of that community was also evident with a separate Japanese School and Japanese hospital. The community endured until the forced relocation from the west coast and the internment beginning in 1942.

2.2. MONCTON STREET – THE VILLAGE’S “HIGH STREET”

The development of Moncton Street as the commercial focus of Steveston was put in place early as a result of its proximity to both the canneries along the waterfront and the development of the BCER Interurban line that connected downtown Vancouver to Marpole and Steveston (see Section 2.0).

By 1890, Steveston boasted an Opera House, which reflected the prosperity and optimism of the community at that time (Figure 7).



Figure 7: Steveston Opera House, Chatham Street and Second Avenue, 1890
Source: Community Stories - Steveston Recollections, The History of a Village, Steveston Museum

https://www.communitystories.ca/v1/pm_v2.php?id=record_detail&fl=0&lg=English&ex=00000591&hs=0&rd=263559

However, despite W.H. Steve's dream of rivaling Vancouver, the buildings that were developed in the 1890s and through the early 1900s along Moncton Street reflected more of a modest working-class community that was dependent on a cyclical industrial economy, servicing local agricultural areas and the canneries. The commercial buildings, while ornate in some cases, such as the 1894 Sockeye Hotel (Figure 8) and London Hotel built around the same time (Figure 9), were otherwise mostly modest one or two-storey wood frame structures.



Figure 8: Sockeye Hotel, 1894

Source: Community Stories - Steveston Recollections, The History of a Village, Steveston Museum

https://www.communitystories.ca/v1/pm_v2.php?id=record_detail&fl=0&lg=English&ex=00000591&hs=0&rd=263566



Figure 9: London Hotel on Moncton Street, 1908

Source: Community Stories - Steveston Recollections, The History of a Village, Steveston Museum

https://www.communitystories.ca/v1/pm_v2.php?id=record_detail&fl=0&lg=English&ex=00000591&hs=0&rd=263567#

By the early 1900s, Moncton Street was the site of many businesses and services. (Figure 10). While some of the buildings were on consolidated lots, the original lot layout dictated much of the form and design: relatively narrow false-front “boomtown” vernacular buildings, almost all wood-frame and wood-clad (Figure 11).



Figure 10: Moncton Street looking east from Third Avenue, showing Commercial Hotel (left) and London Hotel (right), 1908

Source: City of Richmond Archives, Centennial Collection 1978 5 18



Figure 11: Moncton Street Looking West from Second Avenue, 1920s

Source: City of Richmond Archives 1978 37 12

The commercial core lies between Third Avenue to the west and No. 1 Road to the east, south of Chatham Street. It has a variety of 20th century buildings which

collectively illustrate the evolution of the area. 3560 Moncton Street is one of those that contributes to this story. The Gulf of Georgia Cannery, a National Historic Site, anchors that west end of Moncton Street, although it is not located within the HCA. The remainder of Moncton Street contains buildings of a modest scale and primarily constructed of wood (with some exceptions).

Immediately to the east of 3560 Moncton Street is the landmark Hepworth Block at 3580 Moncton Street (Figure 12) while to the northeast is the Marine Garage at 3611 Moncton Street (Figure 13). At the west end of the block is Watsida Building/Riverside Art Gallery at 3480 Moncton Street (Figure 14).



Figure 12: Hepworth Block, 3580 Moncton Street

The design elements of both historic and newer buildings are elaborated on in Section 3.1.2 of this report.



Figure 13: Marine Garage, 3611 Moncton Street



Figure 14: Watsida Building, 3480 Moncton Street (right)

The listed heritage buildings along Moncton Street are illustrated in Figure 15.




Figure 15: Historic context map outlining listed or protected historic sites along and adjacent to Moncton Street

[Note: no date is given in the walking tour for the Marine Garage but text implies it is the same building as Seppo's Automotive/Walker's Emporium, which is pre-1918. Archival image of Walker's Emporium is clearly not the same building as seen today but a better explanation is that the front of Walker's Emporium was cut back in order to allow for gas pumps as part of the conversion to a gas station.]

The development pattern, particularly as affected by the 1918 fire, is evident in the ages of the listed buildings. Those on the north side of Moncton Street tend to date from the pre-fire era, as this side was saved by being slightly further away from the source of the fire. Those on the south side did not fare as well, with the exception of the Hepworth Block, as it was constructed of brick.

Collectively and individually, these buildings and their sites contribute to the historic character of these blocks of Moncton Street, and are the basis for the creation of the Heritage Conservation Area (see Section 3.2.1).

2.3. SUBJECT SITE – 3560 MONCTON STREET

The historic uses found at 3560 Moncton Street exemplify some of the earliest commercial development in Steveston attributed to the post-fire era.

The early history of the subject site is not entirely clear: whether there was a building situated here prior to the 1918 fire has not been determined. If there were a building, it would have certainly been destroyed in that fire (as evidenced in Figure 6, page 6).

While the existing building has little architectural merit – and is the reason it is not noted as a resource of importance (i.e. listed) in the HCA – it is an expression of the mid-20th century changes of Steveston from a small service community, initially for the farming and fishing industry, and the evolving urban community of Richmond as the surroundings began to be more fully developed. It is also has an unusual modern design (Figure 16).



Figure 16: 3560 Moncton Street, n.d.

However, it is the continuity of a business here, dating back to the 1920s, that expresses the earlier evolution of the site and its associations: these are the intangible heritage values, and they are the most important.

Through the 1920s, Moncton Street gradually recovered from the fire, and the first building constructed on this site in that post-fire era dates from 1928, according to Assessment Roll records. Based on those records, it appears that M. Tanaka acquired the site that year – comprising Lots 5 and the East ½ Lot 6, Block 6, Plan

249. He was initially listed as a fish exporter, but by 1937 the local directory listed this site as Steveston Hardware.

City Directories for 3560 Moncton Street

YEAR	STREET ADDRESS, BUSINESS, INDIVIDUAL
Prior to 1928	No listing at this address
1929-1931, 1935-1936	Tanaka, M Fish exporter
1937	Steveston Hardware (M Tanaka)
1938-1939	44 Moncton Tanaka, M - Hardware
1940-1942	Steveston Hardware (M Tanaka)
1947	352 Apostolic Faith Mission 356 Steveston Hardware J.W. Leach

Tax assessment records similarly indicate that the ownership changed in the early 1940s and that by 1960 an additional parcel, Lot 3 (the most southerly lot of the subject site fronting Second Avenue) was added to the ownership by Steveston Hardware Limited.

Assessment Records

YEAR	LEGAL DESCRIPTION	NAME OF OWNER
1929	Lot 4 & E ½ Lot 5, Block 6, Plan 249	M Tanaka
1937		M Tanaka
1946		John Leach
1949		Steveston Hardware Ltd. (changed from John Leach)
1951		Steveston Hardware Ltd.
1960	Lot 3, 4, & E ½ Lot 5, Block 6, Plan 249	Steveston Hardware Ltd.

The acquisition of property by Matsu Tanaka – not just as a tenant, but as an owner – is an illustration of the commercial success of the Japanese-Canadian community in Steveston in the interwar period. (Similar business success was also evident during that same time period in Powell Street, Vancouver.)

Matsu Tanaka was born March 18, 1885. He was a self-employed fish broker, hardware merchant and the owner of Steveston Hardware. Together with his wife Masaye and son Masao, they lived at 44 Moncton Street (the original address of the subject site). In 1942, as part of the expulsion of Japanese-Canadians from the west coast, they were sent to Grand Forks and subsequently, in 1946, both were exiled to Japan.²

² Landscapes of Injustice, Custodian Case File for Matsu Tanaka and Masaye Tanaka

The context of the earlier commercial building on this site is evident, set at an important corner of Moncton Street (Figure 17). **For the purposes of this report, it is called the “Tanaka Building.”**



Figure 17: Moncton Street as seen from slightly east of Second Avenue, 1939. Tanaka Building, centre left.

Source: City of Richmond Archives 1977 2 13

Although a report from the *Vancouver Province* (February 17, 1990) claimed that the business was established in 1941 by Wilf Leach, this does not provide a complete picture of the history and (either wilfully or accidentally) ignores the earlier work by Matsu Tanaka to establish Steveston Hardware. Records show that the property was conveyed to John Wilfred Leach of Steveston in February 1944.³

The Tanaka Building was a modest one-storey building, framed and clad with wood, with a prominent paired-door entry set at the corner and angled, large multi-glazed picture windows set on either side of the entry with a transom. The earliest close-up photo dates from 1943 (Figure 18). At that time, it comprised the store with orientation to both Second Avenue and Moncton Street, and a 6-room detached living quarters at the rear (Figure 19).⁴

³ Landscapes of Injustice, Custodian Case File for Matsu Tanaka

⁴ Ibid.



Figure 18: Tanaka Building, 3560 Moncton Street, April 1943.
Source: Landscapes of Injustice, Collection of Official Files and Correspondence pertaining to Matsu Tanaka.

AGE OF CHILDREN: 29

STATEMENT OF ALL REAL PROPERTY (Each parcel must be mentioned and particulars given)

Property 1

1. LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION: Chatham & 7th, Steveston, B.C.

Lots 2A & 2B Block 15 of Section 10 Block 3 North Range 7 West Map 249 in the district of New Westminster. (Municipality of Richmond)

Property 2

Title No. 121053 E // // // // // #44 Moncton St., Steveston, B.C.

2. BUILDINGS AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS: Municipality of Richmond.

Lot 4 and the East half of lot 5 of Block 6 of part of Section 10, Block 3, North Range 7 West Map 249 in the District of New Westminster. Title No. 82156 E

Property 1 - None. Property 2 - 1 Storey 6 roomed wooden frame dwelling house and store in front of premises, & 1 wood shed.

Figure 19: Part of Real Estate Summary of Matsu Tanaka, Office of the Custodian.
Source: Landscapes of Injustice, Collection of Official Files and Correspondence pertaining to Matsu Tanaka.

The living quarters was a small flat-roof extension on the west side of the store on what would be the east half of Lot 5 (Figure 20).



Figure 20: 1936 Waterworks Atlas, updated to 1939. Store outlined in red, living quarters outlined in yellow.

Source: City of Richmond Archives 1991 40 133

It is evident from examining the 1936 Waterworks Atlas, the 1943 photo, and the 1952 air photo (Figure 21) that a storefront expansion was undertaken sometime after acquisition by John Leach. The frontage was extended further west from the original Tanaka Building.

By the 1950s the small shed roof extension seen from Second Avenue had been replaced with a larger addition, possibly at the same time as the storefront extension, but the west side section that made up the living quarters was still intact, as seen on the 1952 air photo.




Figure 21: Air Photo of Steveston, magnified to show subject site, 1952. Original building and living quarters outlined in red.

Source: City of Richmond Archives 1997 16 90

Steveston Hardware sold everything from mattresses and appliances, and as the name implied, tools, paint, building and fishing supplies. In 1974, “Marine” was added to the store name, reflecting its role in providing the local industry with fishing supplies.⁵

The extent of the earlier building on the site is illustrated in the Fire Insurance Plan from 1960, although it does not distinguish the various additions at the front, west side and rear (Figure 22).

⁵ “Another Steveston Landmark Bites the Dust,” *Richmond News*, July 23, 2018




Figure 22: 1960 Fire Insurance Plan
Source: City of Richmond Archives 1985 146 19

It is presumed that the post-1943 additions that constituted the larger building are included in the site outline on the 1960 Fire Insurance Plan. (Wood frame buildings were defined on Fire Insurance Plans defined as yellow, which confirms that this is the extent of that earlier wood frame building before it was replaced by the existing cinderblock building.)

On this basis, **historic lot expression** is not necessarily how the lots are shown today, but rather how they appeared in those early years of the subject site.

It is also on that basis that the “historic lot expression” is defined for the purposes of this report, and upon which the proposed development is assessed in Section 4. Despite the lots being consolidated to accommodate the new building that would house Steveston Marine and Hardware, the following historic lot configuration comprised of: 1) the 1928 Tanaka Building, 2) a west-side addition and former living quarters, that forms the Moncton Street frontage, and 3) the then-vacant lot to the south fronting Second Avenue. **This defines how the Moncton Street and Second Avenue sides should be expressed in the new development.**

Evidently that original store was inadequate to serve the expanding business, and its reconstruction in 1963, which included the consolidation of Lots 3, 4 and the east half of Lot 5, was considered a landmark building for that time. It contrasted significantly with the other older surrounding buildings through the use of a full-height and full width window, and other modern material such as concrete block (cinderblock) along the sides and rear and a large projecting canopy (Figure 23).



Figure 23: Steveston Marine and Hardware, 1980

Source: Community Stories - Steveston Recollections, The History of a Village, Steveston Museum

https://www.communitystories.ca/v1/pm_v2.php?id=record_detail&fl=0&lg=English&ex=00000591&rd=263702#

Its original footprint, and a later expansion, is illustrated by a vertical “seam” along the Second Avenue side. While this is not entirely conclusive, it suggests that the building was constructed in two phases: the first covers an area that appears similar to the original footprint of the Tanaka Building.

Until around 2018 the site was occupied by Steveston Marine and Hardware, and it closed in response to changing ownership and the original application (dating back to 2015) to initially rezone the site to allow a microbrewery.

2.4. SUMMARY

The site has historic value primarily due to the early association with an important local retailer, Matsu Tanaka, who was an important member of the Japanese Canadian community who contributed to the development, growth and overall prosperity of Steveston. Matsu Tanaka established Steveston Hardware in 1928, in what appears to be the first building constructed on this site, following the devastating fire of 1918. It has significance through its direct association as a supplier to the marine (predominantly fishing) industry of the area. It also has importance in its continuing association with that business, that was involuntary

acquired from Mr. Tanaka by John Wilfred Leach of Steveston in 1944. However, since that building was demolished in the early 1960s, it is the intangible association rather than the tangible resource itself that is of paramount importance and how the buildings were presented on the site that reflected much of the original lot layout.

As noted in Sections 4 and 5 of this report it will be important to recognize that early and on-going association. The basis upon which the new design is assessed, and how it should be commemorated, is how it relates to the **historic lot expression**, rather than the building as it stands today.

3. MUNICIPAL POLICY, STRATEGY, REGULATION AND GUIDELINES

There are a number of plans, policies, guidelines and a regulatory framework that sets the foundation for evaluating the work on the subject site.

3.1. STEVESTON AREA PLAN

The document titled *“Steveston Village Conservation Program – Conservation Strategy, Managing Change,”* as prepared for the City of Richmond in 2009, formed the starting point for the *Steveston Area Plan*, adopted in June 2009. The Strategy laid out the vision, goals and objectives of future planning, the heritage value and significance of Steveston (historical context statement and an area-wide Statement of Significance) including a thematic framework, along with a wider framework for developing conservation policies and urban design policies including design guidelines. These were accordingly integrated into the *Steveston Area Plan*.

The vision, in part, includes the active conservation of heritage, and the goals include the management of mixed-use urban development to conserve the unique character of the area. Objectives #1, #2 and particularly #3 are relevant to this rezoning proposal, specifically to:

1. Preserve employment opportunities and choices in the village;
2. Retain a compact business centre while limiting the amount of commercial development outside the village;
3. Ensure the character and scale of any new commercial development is compatible with the surrounding land uses.

The policy tied to Objective #3 reads: *“Require the design of new commercial structures in the Steveston Village to be in size and scale with existing buildings.”*

Further policies, as part of Section 3.2.3 – Steveston Village Node, include:

- *Encourage the development of the Village as a vibrant commercial centre;*

- *Encourage residential units as part of mixed commercial/residential developments;*

In addition, the *Steveston Area Plan, Section 4.0 – Heritage*, contains a number of policies under the first objective, to encourage the preservation, rehabilitation and restoration of listed historic resources. While the subject site is not listed as such, there are some provisions that are relevant, including:

- *Along Moncton Street the maximum building height shall be two-storeys and 9 m in height to ensure the size and scale of Moncton Street development is consistent with the village node;*
- *Encourage the retention and re-establishment of the small historic lots in a flexible manner due to fragmented ownership and varied lot development timing (e.g. consider consolidations of two historic lots to accommodate vehicle access from a rear lane or side street, to achieve unique heritage conservation and development opportunities).*

There are further policies under the second objective, namely to encourage new development to retain significant heritage resources and views, and to maintain and enhance the unique heritage character of Steveston, including:

- *Encourage new development to reflect the heritage nature of Steveston and recognize the unique architectural, urban design features and diverse cultures that shaped Steveston.*

Tied to heritage policies is the third objective that allows for a Heritage Conservation Area, a grant program and the requirement that a Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP) be required for any development – which includes most properties within the Steveston Village area, including the subject site. Buildings not identified in the Steveston Village Conservation Strategy (such as the subject site) still require a HAP but defer to the applicable Development Permit Guidelines, which form part of the *Steveston Area Plan* (see Section 3.2 of this report).

3.1.1. HISTORICAL AREA AND CULTURAL CONTEXT

The document titled “*Steveston Village Conservation Program – Conservation Strategy, Managing Change*” explains the historical area and cultural context. The area’s core heritage themes found in the Historical Context Statement that collectively tell the story of the Village are:

- Aboriginal use and settlements
- Agricultural roots - historic role as a service centre
- Cannery legacy
- Fisheries tradition – including the cultural diversity

- Small frontier town
- Transportation hub
- Cultural diversity – First Nations, Chinese, Japanese workforce and residents
- Continuing community

3.1.2. AREA ARCHITECTURAL ASSESSMENT

The area's diversity stems from the historical and cultural components, visually expressed through a collection of buildings that range from the 1890s and well into the 20th century. Some of the buildings, such as the subject site, do not integrate well into the community, while others, particularly some newer developments, achieve a better sense of place through the use of varied massing, simple Vernacular styles, materials, fenestration and signage that complements the surrounding historic resources. Most of the earlier buildings are such a simple expression of commercial development at that time (i.e. Vernacular style) that their tangible value is as much in the collective streetscape as it is in the individual components.

The architectural importance – the tangible heritage values – stem from the historic development (i.e. listed heritage resources) which is reinforced by intangible values that are present. Newer developments draw their inspiration from the older collection and designs that are respectful of the local area are one of the key objectives of the Steveston Area Plan, and associated Guidelines.

The north side of the block is worth noting with its contrast in form and use, with some buildings that illustrate past residential use converted to commercial and others (such as the Northern Bank) that was never residential but was a “kit” house design of the BC Mills Timber and Trading Company that also had a commercial application.

Examples of good local area design are illustrated below – with select points along Moncton Street and the multi-use development along the east side of Third Avenue (Figure 24).

They involve a variation of forms, streetscape retail continuity with inviting storefronts, cladding, fenestration, circulation, viewpoints and signage. Wood is the predominant material and variation in colour provides additional visual interest.

Parapet/cornice, cladding, façade articulation & window pattern



Strong corner presence, low massing



Variable massing, cladding & window pattern



Signage and Storefront Fenestration



Circulation (breezeway)



Figure 24: Examples of good area-wide design to complement the historic character

3.2. STEVESTON VILLAGE CONSERVATION STRATEGY AND GUIDELINES

The City of Richmond *Official Community Plan (OCP)* designates Steveston as a Heritage Conservation Area as part of its long-range strategy. The OCP identifies 17 properties that are to be protected which significantly embody the strong heritage character of the area⁶. While the subject site is not one of those properties, nevertheless it requires a Heritage Alteration Permit in conjunction with a Development Permit to ensure that the development is respectful of the overall heritage character.

⁶ City of Richmond, Planning Bulletin-04, 2009

3.2.1. HERITAGE CONSERVATION AREA

The strategic designation of Steveston as a Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) in 2009 was to recognize and protect its broader heritage character and the intrinsic values found in certain buildings, but equally as important, the cumulative historical significance of this cultural landscape. The rate of change was already evident then, and it was recognized that an HCA was the planning tool that could most effectively counteract the types of changes that were not in keeping with the historic character of the Village.

The HCA By-law protects the properties that are set within the boundaries, whether or not they have heritage value (i.e. they are not required to be formally listed in order to be protected). The subject site is one of those properties and as such any development must include a rigorous evaluation to ensure the design is in keeping with the heritage character. This is also the basis for the Heritage Alteration Permit that is necessary as part of any development permit.

3.2.2. DESIGN GUIDELINES – SAKUMOTO AND STEVESTON AREA DP

The Sakumoto Guidelines were developed 34 years ago and serve as a supplement to the Steveston Area Plan DP Guidelines.

It appears that the primary purpose at that time of the Sakumoto Guidelines was to encourage authentic restoration of heritage storefronts. While this approach was commendable for its era, the concept of restoration and rehabilitation has come a long way since that time and the tangible values found on any site are not necessarily the most important. Often, it is the intangible values, as expressed through select tangible character-defining elements, that are the most important. Their complexity requires careful assessment and expression, often through a Statement of Significance.

The Moncton Street Character Area is intended to have new development that is small-scale and continue the “rhythm” of a series of storefronts. They should be similar in character and scale to existing buildings, and use a fairly simple commercial style using false fronts with the gable facing the street (obscured on the street side by that false front). False fronts are also appropriate but need a decorative parapet or cornice. The simple style referred to in the Guidelines is commonly “boomtown” vernacular.

Storefront windows should be larger than upper storey windows. Entry doors should be recessed. Cornice lines and canopies can serve to bring the scale down to the pedestrian level. Exceptions to the criterion of small retail shopping

buildings would be existing larger buildings. Continuity of commercial frontage is paramount, with minimum street setback.

Section 9.0 of the *Steveston Area Plan* contains guidelines for new development (the “DP Guidelines”). This is intended to preserve and enhance the valued elements of the village, supporting its heritage and special character, and recognizing the qualities and opportunities that exist there. Section 9.3 of the *Steveston Area Plan* contains additional DP Guidelines for the character areas: the subject site is situated in Area “B”, known as the Steveston Village Character Area, with the Village Core Sub-area focused on Moncton Street. In the context of the proposed development, is intended to achieve desired heritage streetscapes and architecture that is visual pleasing and functional, and encourage a scale of development and intensity of use that is respectful of the historic building pattern. The following general principles are important:

- Massing and height that reinforces a continuous streetwall of commercial uses, along with flat roofs, recessed entries and a varied street façade
- Architectural elements need to be complementary yet distinguishable and not mimic existing (recognizing that Steveston continues to evolve)
- Exterior walls and finishes should similarly complement and be of natural materials that display craftsmanship, historically accurate profiles and dimensions
- Weather protection
- Historically appropriate signage

More specific DP Guidelines applicable to the Village Core Sub-area include:

- Development illustrating the pattern of small lots and small blocks – retaining or re-establishing the small historic lots and a varied street façade with select passageways where historically appropriate
- Architectural elements that are high quality and natural (i.e. wood)
- Windows on ground level to be large and consistent with retail, with recessed storefront entries and upper floor windows displaying a historically appropriate pattern, with a coordinated colour scheme

This report will examine further as to why the current commercial building (dating from 1963) does not work here as well as an example of what to follow, and how the principle of the **historic lot expression** (which is different from the actual legal lot lines) is more appropriate to follow, in addition to the components that are more consistent with the *Steveston Area Plan* DP Guidelines than the previous proposal for this site.

3.2.3. EXAMPLES OF OTHER HISTORIC COMMERCIAL AREAS – GASTOWN, CHINATOWN

The expression of a commercial area, particularly one that was established between the late 1800s and early 1900s, is one of mostly small low-scale commercial buildings set on separate parcels, with the occasional larger, more ambitious building developed on a number of tied parcels. An excellent example of this type of area's form and pattern of development, which Steveston shares to some degree, are the historic districts of Gastown and Chinatown in Vancouver.

These areas are expressed through simply designed storefronts and upper floors (although as these areas became more developed and prosperous in the early decades of the 20th century, some later examples were more ornate). Particularly for Gastown, prior to the fire of 1886, the buildings were all constructed of wood and predominantly in the “boomtown” false-front style, quite similar to Steveston. As the area grew, one of the defining streetscape traits was the form – often narrow frontages each with a variable width and height, with the latter creating an authentic heritage “fabric” sometimes referred to as “sawtooth” appearance to the block profile. Its retention has been noted as fundamental to conserving the area's built form.^{7, 8}

The objective in both historic areas is to have new development respect the existing by way of scale, configuration and rhythm, on both the storefront level and the upper floors. Where a new building covers more than one historic-width lot, a division of both storefronts and upper floors into vertical “units” is promoted by the use of architectural features to create texture and visual interest. Examples of such features are pilasters, window placement and rhythm, some variation in cladding (e.g. stone and brick), columns and cornices.

While height is the defining difference between Gastown/Chinatown and Steveston – typically higher in the former compared with the latter – the principles of varied height and texture is a similar objective for such a historic commercial area.

⁷ City of Vancouver, Gastown HA-2 Design Guidelines, amended to July 2022, p.3

⁸ It should be noted that the principle of retaining the “sawtooth” streetscape in Gastown was hindered by the fact that new development or additions are regulated by height – 75 ft. maximum – instead of density (FSR), and as such most new developments or additions went to that maximum height.

3.3. STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR THE CONSERVATION OF HISTORIC PLACES

3560 Moncton Street is situated in the Steveston commercial district, in southwest Richmond, which is formally recognized by the City of Richmond as a Heritage Conservation Area. As elaborated further in Section 4 of this report, the subject site has minimal architectural value, although other values do exist on the site. As such, conservation standards such as Parks Canada's *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (hereafter referred to simply as "Standards and Guidelines"), as applied to the built form, is not relevant here. However, there are principles found in Standards and Guidelines as applied to cultural landscapes that are relevant. These can assist in assessing the approach taken here.

Heritage District

*"A heritage district is a cultural landscape. The Canadian Register of Historic Places defines a heritage district as a place comprising a group of buildings, structures, landscapes and/or archaeological sites and their spatial relationships where built forms are often the major defining features and where the collective identity has heritage value for a community, province, territory or the nation. Heritage districts can be urban or rural. Most heritage districts are governed by municipal by-laws that are complemented by guidelines to protect their heritage value."*⁹

This analysis of relevant guidelines is limited to the relevant **Section 4.1 Guidelines for Cultural Landscapes, Including Heritage Districts** are divided into 11 subsections: for the purpose of this report, only certain ones are highlighted, given that the existing building is not proposed to be retained, but the new construction is expected to be compatible and respect the character and values of the HCA.

Preservation: the action or process of protecting, maintaining, and/or stabilizing the existing materials, form and integrity of a historic place or of an individual component, while protecting its heritage value.

Restoration: the action or process of accurately revealing, recovering or representing the state of a historic place or of an individual component, as it appeared at a particular period in its history, while protecting its heritage value.

Rehabilitation: the action or process of making possible a continuing or compatible contemporary use of a historic place or an individual component, through repair, alterations, and/or additions, while protecting its heritage value.

⁹ *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places*, Parks Canada, Section Ed., 2010, p. 50

Of the 11 subsections, those that apply in this case are: **spatial organization, visual relationships, and built features**. Although much of the guidelines apply to conservation, there are still some principles can still be extracted for a development such as 3560 Moncton Street, where the proposed development is entirely new.

3.3.1. SPATIAL ORGANIZATION

Standards and Guidelines (Section 4.1.4) notes that in urban heritage districts, “land use, buildings, streets and topography often define or influence spatial organization. The buildings’ siting, the open spaces between them and the circulation corridors are often identified as character-defining elements in urban heritage districts.”

General Guidelines

Standard	Description
1	<p>Understanding the spatial organization and how it contributes to the heritage value of the cultural landscape. Location, as one of its character-defining elements, is to be retained.</p> <p><i>Comment: The historic relationship of the subject site to both Moncton Street and Second Avenue reflects the design of the original (1928) building.</i></p>
3	<p>Documenting the spatial organization of the cultural landscape, including the orientation, alignment, size, configuration and interrelationships of its component features, the relationship of features to the overall landscape, and its evolution and condition before beginning project work.</p> <p><i>Comment: The historic lot expression should be the basis for developing individual components that make up the collective single building proposed for this site.</i></p>
4	<p>Assessing the overall condition of the spatial organization early in the planning process so that the scope of work is based on current conditions.</p> <p><i>Comment: This is the fundamental standard expected of this development.</i></p>

Additions or Alterations to a Cultural Landscape

13	<p>Designing a new feature when required by a new use that is compatible with the character-defining spatial organization</p> <p><i>Comment: The “physical record” of the original 1928 building should be expressed without necessarily replicating or imitating.</i></p>
----	---

3.3.2. VISUAL RELATIONSHIPS

Standards and Guidelines (Section 4.1.5) notes that “the visual relationships between elements of heritage districts can influence the user experience. For example, a tall building in a low-rise heritage district may be perceived as out of scale.”

General Guidelines

Standard	Description
1	<p>Understanding the visual relationships and how they contribute to the heritage value of the cultural landscape.</p> <p><i>Comment: The historic visual relationship of the subject site to the modest vernacular buildings along Moncton Street should be reflected in the massing and design elements and material.</i></p> <p>Corner orientation, as one of its character-defining elements, is to be retained.</p> <p><i>Comment: The building should respect the dual orientation.</i></p>
4	<p>Understanding the evolution of visual relationships. This could include using historic photographs or artwork to understand how the visual relationships may have changed or been lost over time.</p> <p><i>Comment: Archival material is critical to integrate into the design process and include in any commemoration piece.</i></p>

Additions or Alterations to a Cultural Landscape

15	<p>Designing a new feature when required by a new use that respects the historic visual relationships in the cultural landscape. This can include matching established proportions and densities, such as maintaining the overall ratio of open space to building mass in an urban heritage district.</p> <p><i>Comment: While the increased height is a reflection of the necessity for vertical expression of mixed use (as opposed to historic mixed uses that almost always were within the horizontal plane), the modest two-storey height expected of new developments along Moncton is respectful of, and sensitive toward, the area's character.</i></p>
----	---

3.3.3. BUILT FEATURES

Standards and Guidelines (Section 4.1.11) notes that built features such as commercial buildings and that “additions to recent cultural landscapes should be undertaken with the utmost respect and care and complement the heritage value of the historic place.”

General Guidelines

Standard	Description
1	<p>Understanding the built features and how they contribute to the heritage value of the cultural landscape.</p> <p><i>Comment: The building will keep its orientation facing Moncton Street.</i></p>
2	<p>Understanding the evolution of built features over time.</p> <p><i>Comment: The site's evolution over time should be documented and recognized as a historic expression.</i></p>
3	<p>Documenting the function, condition, materials and surroundings of built features and the relationship of those features to each other and to the historic place, before beginning project work.</p> <p><i>Comment: Design elements are to recognize those of the surroundings in terms of profile, material and colour.</i></p>

Therefore, as noted above, while this is not a conservation project, it is located in a formally recognized Heritage Conservation Area and the principles of studying, understanding, documenting and respecting the values of that wider area are paramount to this project.

3.4. SUMMARY

The application of principles found in the *Steveston Area Plan*, using the thematic framework of the “*Steveston Village Conservation Program – Conservation Strategy, Managing Change*” is the starting point for review of the proposed development. The DP Guidelines are the most up-to-date and relevant source on the direction for new design and development and should be carefully followed. It can also draw from certain design principles of other historic areas. Limited principles from *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places* should also be followed as they apply to new development in a cultural landscape such as the historic district of Steveston Village.

This is elaborated on further in the following section of this report, which assesses strengths of the most current design development and which aspects may still require some refinement to achieve an even stronger design that respects the historic character of Steveston Village.

4. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL – 3560 MONCTON STREET

An earlier rezoning application with a design concept was submitted to the City that included public input and referral to the Heritage Advisory Committee. While that proposal had some merit, and received generally positive commentary from the HAC, there was mixed commentary from the public consultation piece. Positive commentary included the rhythm of the window pattern and integration of the development into the streetscape. Public commentary included concern for housing type and affordability, redirection of pedestrian traffic away from Moncton Street, massing and lane congestion and lack of a historical fishing “vision.”

Subsequently, in response to those public and committee comments, a new rezoning application was submitted to the City of Richmond Planning Department for a site-specific rezoning to develop a new two-storey mixed-use project to a maximum density of 1.15 FAR. The goal is to improve the design and make it more compatible with, complementary to, and respectful of, the heritage character of Steveston.

It is that application on which this design consult report is based.

Although the site is not in the ALR or subject to ESA considerations, it is located on a property scheduled as legally protected in the Steveston Village Heritage Conservation Area. As such it will require a Heritage Alteration Permit in conjunction with a Development Permit. The site currently contains a one-storey commercial building, which is not a listed heritage resource, while historically, the site contains intangible heritage value tied to the Tanaka Building, all documented in Section 2.3 and summarized in Section 2.4 of this report. Further direction on the approach to further

recognize and commemorate the historical association is noted in Section 5 of this report.

The purpose of the development is:

1. Develop a new residential building that respects the form, scale and character of the surrounding historic area, and streetscape, by way of massing and spatial separation, and detachment from the heritage resources with a use of fenestration to define and contrast the old and the new, and most importantly, is based on historic lot expression.
2. Use materials that are highly distinguishable yet complementary to the neighbouring heritage buildings.
3. Apply a colour scheme that reflects historic appearance and further distinguishes the various components of the single building that further reflect historic lot expression.
4. Ground level street-oriented retail units along both Moncton and Second Avenue to activate the pedestrian realm.

4.1. DEVELOPMENT TIED TO LOCAL PLANNING OBJECTIVES

The development meets a number of local planning objectives. The site does present some limitations due to its size, but it also presents an excellent opportunity to integrate principles that will enhance the heritage character of Steveston Village. These include:

- Placement on the lot, at front lot lines
- Historic lot pattern
- Strong corner orientation – which also speaks to the earlier Tanaka Building
- Rhythm of building form assisted by breezeways, open space or vertical division distinguished by use of materials, window patterns, etc.

While the historic lot pattern is not entirely evident, particularly due to the current buildings that occupies much of the existing site as a single structure, re-creating a pattern that harkens back to the earlier building(s) is recommended (see further detail in Section 4.2).

4.2. DEVELOPMENT DESIGN PRINCIPLES AND RATIONALE (PRECEDENT)

Although there are no **historic lot lines** currently identified on the subject site (see Figure 2, page 2), the staged development documented between 1928 and 1952 provides direction on the design approach, and the way in which any new development should be expressed vis a vis “historic lots” which for the purposes of this report is termed “**historic lot expression**.” In addition, the 1892 survey plan provides further context (Figure 25) of the historic lot expression.



Figure 25: Subject site outline superimposed on magnified historic lot pattern taken from the 1892 survey

The rationale for the support of this development proposal, in its current form, is the historic development pattern of this site and those along either side of Moncton Street.

The application of smaller-scale storefronts in a two-storey form can create a **rhythmic division of the streetscape** that reflects the historic lot expression of the subject site, which consisted of two and a half standard-width lots fronting Moncton Street and a wider lot fronting Second Avenue. The staged development from the 1920s to the 1950s resulted in the primary building (Tanaka Building), a narrower addition to the west (similar in scale to the neighbouring Watsida Building) and the former vacant Lot 3 along the southern part of the site. This needs to be the fundamental approach to designing a new building on the subject site.

The application of **breezeways** or other openings between buildings is characteristic of Steveston Village, certainly in the first half of the 20th century. This was also characteristic of other commercial areas such as Powell Street in Vancouver (which also had a strong Japanese-Canadian presence prior to 1942). Applying this concept should be explored, as it also serves to break up an extended continuous massing along the streetscape.

While it is not feasible to leave open space between buildings, a breezeway can also assist in the rhythmic “separation” of the streetscape face tied to the historic lot

expression: in this particular case, divided into three sections. The breezeways should be explored for both Moncton Street and Second Avenue, subject to CPTED considerations.

The design should integrate **materials** and **window and door openings** that are compatible with, and historically represent, early Steveston. This includes wood or metal doors and storefront windows at street level, and wood cladding, wood windows and fenestration (unless Building Code provisions tied to life safety or spatial separation dictates otherwise).

The rhythmic pattern of windows on the upper floor should vary single-set and paired windows, with strong divisions of mullions and trim. Double hung windows are the expected profile on the upper floors and wood is the expected material of choice. Rectangular form for double-hung windows should be the norm.

The expression of “separate” buildings within the one proposed can additionally be accomplished by **colour** application.

4.3. PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

The proposal is to develop a new mixed-use building that respects the form, scale and character of the heritage buildings on either side, and surrounding streetscape, by way of spatial separation, some variation in height (“sawtooth”), fenestration, window pattern, cladding and colour.

To achieve this, the proposed design presents a single building as several smaller buildings grouped together. The design, as it stands presently, is strongly supported on all major components, with some adjustments to be considered as part of this report.

Rather than replicating the footprint of the existing building, the proponent has developed a design that illustrates the historic lot expression of the site, more accurately conveys principles of small-lot development along Moncton Street that was apparent in the 1892 subdivision plan (Figure 25), and more accurately reflects the earlier buildings on this site (Figure 26).

The single building is presented in the form of four buildings, each slightly distinguished by height, entries, windows, cladding, parapets and cornices, and colour. This is the supported approach here, rather than creating a larger-looking building that follows the footprint of the current Steveston Marine and Hardware building.

Commercial uses are set at ground level along both the Moncton Street and Second Avenue sides, with residential use above and parking set at the rear.



Figure 26: Proposed Elevations

Streetscape massing:

The massing along Second Avenue is particularly long, and the design works to soften this by presenting the building in three sections with a slight variation in height: the centre (red) section is set slightly below those on either side. This creates a variable, visually interesting, and yet subtle, “sawtooth” streetscape, and is a supported approach here. The architect has amended the design so that the

façade widths are more representative of the historical sections of the two buildings that fronted Moncton Street (the 1928 building and the post-1943 addition).

Notably, the historical footprint of the original Tanaka Building was wider than the modest addition on the west side; the approach should not necessarily be identical to those historic widths, nor does it need to be. This adjustment to create two facades that are distinctly different widths creates the illusion of two distinctly different “buildings”. Similar to what has been refined with the frontages, the architect has amended the height to provide a subtle “sawtooth” profile between the two sections of the building fronting Moncton Street.

In addition, the most westerly (green) section has an extremely shallow setback. Despite the DP Guidelines noting that all buildings be set exactly to the front property line, the minimal setback of this section is supportable: it provides visual interest. Furthermore, early buildings in historic areas such as this were not always set exactly on the property line; they sometimes encroached or were slightly set behind the line. This is highly supportable. The slight setback creates a more defined separation and expresses the historic footprint of the original Tanaka Building from the historic addition immediately to the west – thereby distinguishing the two storefront facades on Moncton Street.

Rooftop definition:

Continuity of cornices is important to express each section: the corner (blue) building has a cornice defining the entire two street frontages and corner but does not fully extend to the ends of that section of the building. To be more historically accurate and appropriate, its continuity should be explored further. The other buildings facing Moncton Street and Second Avenue are each expressed slightly differently, with varying decorative elements along the cornice that distinguishes each of them from the neighbouring corner building. This is highly supportable.

Circulation:

The design incorporates a single breezeway from Second Avenue. This is an important design consideration and historically appropriate, and is furthermore supportable as it is set back slightly to properly distinguish it from the defining edge of the centre (red) building and additionally provides a “vertical expression” to create an additional separation from the “yellow” building.

An additional breezeway along Moncton Street to separates the “blue” and “green” sections of the development and to provide circulation from Moncton Street was explored as part of the design development, but it was felt that in order to maintain the historic frontage widths, and to meet parking requirements along with an adequate retail floor area for “CRU A”, it was not feasible. Excluding this additional breezeway is acceptable.

Cladding:

Each of the “buildings” is presented at the streetscape with a variation in cladding, alternating between lap siding and shingles. This is fully supportable and creates visual interest. As noted above, it also works with other components to break up the massing. The only recommendation is that the cladding be wood, as per the DP Guidelines, unless required by Building Code to be non-combustible (i.e. “hardiplank”).

Doors, windows and fenestration:

Entry doors are one of the key character-defining features and, on a “boomtown” Pioneer building, are most often centred and recessed on the façade. The DP Guidelines stipulate this provision. The proposed placement of doors is historically appropriate for the Moncton Street facades, and particularly the angled corner entry (“CRU B”), and is in keeping with the DP Guidelines. The placement of doors on that corner building reflects the historic corner of the historic Tanaka Building. The entry on the adjacent section (“CRU A”) fronting Moncton Street is recessed, which is also historically accurate. The Second Avenue side is more variable, with one door cleverly disguising the residential lobby, elevator and mechanical room. While this door is not recessed, it is supportable as it is not a retail entry. The doors on the southerly (red and yellow) buildings, for “CRU C” and “CRU D”, are similarly recessed.

All entries have a transom window set above the door(s) which is also historically accurate and compatible.

The placement and pattern of windows for both the storefronts and upper floor is variable and visually interesting. All storefront and upper floor windows have a bold horizontal and vertical division expressed using mullions. On the Second Avenue elevation of the corner (blue) building, one of the three single-set ground floor windows was removed, as this more accurately references the Tanaka Building’s windows on this side. Additionally it will create a wall face on which a Commemoration Plan might be set (see Section 5 for further details).

The articulation of storefronts, particularly on Second Avenue with the recessed residential entry and the breezeway, and on Moncton Street with the slight setback of the westerly building, allows for a variation in window types and configuration – set in singles, pairs and tripartite. The transoms on select sections have a division of glazing using muntins while the lower sections feature wider mullions, which is supportable and follows Section 9.3.2.1 of the General DP Guidelines, which calls for windows with traditionally dimensioned frames.

Particularly with the increased ceiling height on the upper floors, the lower windows take some cues from the taller paired “ribbon” windows of the Sockeye Hotel and London Hotel as examples (see Figures 8 and 9, pages 8 and 9).

As per the DP Guidelines, and similar to cladding, it is recommended that all windows and fenestration facing Moncton Street and Second Avenue be wood. Additional consideration should be given to providing a door and window schedule as part of the final DP drawings.

Colour:

The three sections are expressed by distinct colour patterns, one for each building, which is strongly supported. However, the lighter colours, particularly those on the west and south ends, should be reconsidered as darker colours will contrast better with the corner building. The window sashes should be a darker colour (they are often black) and should contrast with an off-white or cream tone for the window frames, trim and sills. It is recommended that the Vancouver Heritage Foundation’s *True Colours* pallet be considered when choosing a final colour scheme.

4.4. CONCLUSIONS

The design as currently proposed presents many improvements over the earlier design. These break up the massing, are visually interesting, variable and historically accurate, and clearly articulated, in terms of materials, including:

- Distinctive façade presentation tied to the pre-1963 built form that also reflects more of the historic lot expression of Moncton Street and specifically the setting of the former Tanaka Building at the corner and its westerly addition;
- Distinctive cornices on the Moncton and Second Avenue sides;
- Distinctive and recessed breezeway with a recessed residential entry on the Second Avenue side which, together, provide a vertical break to the massing, creating distinctly smaller sections resembling smaller buildings;
- Variable door and window patterns with tall windows on the storefronts and strong divisions using variable mullions and muntins;
- Recessed retail entries for each unit;
- Window profiles that are historically accurate;
- Variation in cladding;
- Colour variation for each of the four parts that make up the single building.

The following improvements should be considered to the existing design:

- Clarification on the materials – cladding, windows, trim – that should be wood as per the DP Guidelines;

- Distinctive colour for some of the facades and bolder contrasting window sash and trim colour, taking cues from the Vancouver Heritage Foundation’s *True Colours* pallet;
- Provide a window and door schedule as part of the final DP drawings.

The proposed development represents a significant improvement with design development principles that integrate more successfully into the Steveston Village Area. Also, it has considered commentary from both the public and the Richmond Heritage Advisory Committee and found ways to address most of the points brought forward in that process, which will further serve as a positive outcome. The proposed development is strongly supported, as one that works to respect the heritage character of the area, and will ultimately strengthen Moncton Street as the historic “high street” of the village. It has taken direction from the *Steveston Area Plan*, the DP Guidelines, draws from some principles other historic commercial areas, and uses certain principles for cultural landscapes (historic districts) from *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places*.

It is recommended that the proposed design for the rezoning of 3560 Moncton Street proceed forward, with minor improvements as recommended in this part of this report.

5. COMMEMORATION PLAN

Normally a Commemoration Plan is prepared as a result of the demolition of a building that is either formally recognized (i.e. on a Heritage Register) or has known heritage values, but in this case the commemoration is proposed to primarily recognize the historical and cultural significance of the Tanaka Building; that is, the building situated on the site prior to 1963 and particularly noting its pre-1943 significance. It is recommended that a Commemoration Plan be prepared, either as a condition of the Development Permit, or following issuance of the Development Permit. This will be a way of educating the public, and owners or tenants of the building, of the early importance of the site and its ties to the development of Steveston as a multi-cultural community strongly tied to the fishing industry.

5.1. PURPOSE

The purpose of a Commemoration Plan is public awareness and education. It should draw the reader in, and focus on this building’s ties to the fishing industry, its long-term historic commercial use (hardware store), its illustration of the development pattern of Steveston Village and its association with multiple owners, particularly Matsu Tanaka. The intangible cultural association is equally important as any building that previously existed on the site. It should also pay tribute to the

continuity of the business, led by several key owners, that served such an important role in Steveston Village for so many decades.

The Commemoration Plan should be placed in a public location where it is easy to locate and focus on key information that would be of interest to the public. It should take clues from the public commentary on how the earlier development lacked certain “vision,” particularly how the site had a strong connection to the dominant industry (i.e. fishing) in Steveston, despite its distance from the water.

5.2. DESIGN CONCEPTS (GRAPHIC LAYOUT)

A Commemoration Plan can be presented both in graphic and written form. The use of colour, photographs, maps and applicable text, if well designed, can draw the interest of those passing by to stop and read, and ultimately, to appreciate what came before this development. An excellent example of graphic layout of such information is housed at the Steveston Museum. The Commemoration Plan should draw from this example in terms of design, but be distinctly different in what information is presented so as not to duplicate.

The location of information presented is equally as critical. It should not be placed inside a commercial unit, since that is effectively a private space and is up to the tenant to decide how and what to present; it would also be interfering with their own marketing plan. Therefore, a space that is either public – for example, a wall facing the sidewalk – or semi-public, such as within a passageway that is open during business hours, is the most effective. The space does not necessarily have to be expansive; much information can be conveyed in a small area. Furthermore, a smaller display area has greater potential to draw the reader compared to a larger display area that might be overwhelming. Another concept is to have the information set on several smaller panels that work together to illustrate the timeline of the history of the site. The suggested location for a Commemoration Plan is facing Second Avenue (Figure 27).



Figure 27: Suggested location for Commemoration Plan, light yellow square set between two small windows, facing Second Avenue

In order to have an effective Commemoration Plan, maintenance and repairs need to be performed. Over time the information may need to be updated and improved.

Whether this is the responsibility of the building owner, or the municipality, and exactly who bears the costs, will need to be determined. However, in either case, a Section 219 covenant should be in place that allows for maintenance and updating. This could be made a condition of the Development Permit.

6. MAINTENANCE PLAN

6.1. MAINTENANCE GUIDELINES

A maintenance plan is critical to any development, whether heritage or new construction. Short-term and long-term targets need to be set for each element. A building that has undergone a higher degree of renovation, replication or repair is equally prone to the need for maintenance as compared to a building that has had more components retained and conserved. In particular, any errors or weaknesses in material or method should be identified in the early stages and corrected where necessary, so that accelerated deterioration does not take place.

Regularly scheduled maintenance ensures the longevity of any element, whether wood, stone, brick or other material. Water is essential to manage, as it is the singularly the most invasive and damaging to any building. Other forces such as sun-exposed wall faces, wind, ice and vermin affect building elements and the while the cost of maintenance on a regular basis may seem high, putting off this work inevitably leads to greater costs to restore, particularly for heritage buildings that often contain materials that are expensive, in short supply or need to be custom made.

6.2. REQUIRED PERMITS

The type and degree of permitting depends on the municipal requirements as commonly spelled out in general or heritage-specific requirements-of-maintenance by-laws, or in policy or other by-laws or guidelines. Since 3560 Moncton Street is scheduled as a protected site within the Steveston Village HCA, a Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP) would be necessary for any future work on the exterior, including painting.

Exemptions for more minor work (i.e. repair, re-painting in existing colours) may be possible, but in most cases, a HAP, either stand-alone or in conjunction with another permit (e.g. Development, Sign, Building) may be required.

6.3. ROUTINE, CYCLICAL AND NON-INVASIVE CLEANING

By undertaking work on a routine basis, a sensitive approach to the cleaning treatment is the more likely outcome since dirt or other damage will not have had as much time to build up. The principle of any cleaning should be in accordance with

Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places which specifies the gentlest means possible. In cases where the removal of dirt and other material is necessary on stucco, concrete or wood, a soft bristle brush without water is best, sweeping away the loosened material. The recommended approach for elements that require a more intensive cleaning is to use a soft bristle brush with warm water and a mild detergent. Pressure washing, sandblasting or any abrasive cleaning should not be used under any circumstances.

6.4. REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT OF COMPROMISED MATERIAL

Repair and replacement of material on 3560 Moncton Street must conform with those established under the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*. The buildings' design is expected to display character-defining elements, those characteristics that contribute to the tangible heritage value, such as materials, form and configuration, and must be conserved. This draws from the following principles:

- Minimal intervention must be a goal, and any intervention must be the least intrusive and gentle means possible;
- Character-defining elements must be repaired, rather than replaced, wherever possible;
- Repair may involve anything from the removal and cleaning or simple refinishing to extracting extensively deteriorated, decayed or missing material and reinstalling the same but with in-kind material to match existing, and using recognized conservation methods;
- Repaired or replaced material must be physically and visually compatible with the historic place

6.5. INSPECTIONS

6.5.1. INSPECTIONS AND SCHEDULE

Inspections are a key element in the maintenance plan, and should be carried out by a qualified person or firm, preferably with experience in the assessment of heritage buildings. These inspections should be conducted on a regular and timely schedule, addressing all aspects of the 3560 Moncton Street including exterior and site conditions. From this inspection, a report should be compiled that will include notes, sketches, and observations and to mark areas of concern, for example, cracks, staining and rot. The report need not be overly complicated, but must be thorough, clear and concise. Issues of concern, from the report, should be entered in a log book so that corrective action can be documented and tracked.

6.5.2. ONGOING MONITORING

An appropriate schedule for regular, periodic inspections would be twice a year, preferably during spring and fall. Comprehensive inspections should occur at five-year periods, comparing records from previous inspections.

6.6. INFORMATION FILE

The owner of 3560 Moncton Street should retain an information file where inspection reports can be filed. This file should also contain the Log Book that itemizes problems and corrective action. Additionally, this file should contain building plans, building permits, heritage reports, photographs and other relevant documentation so that a complete understanding of the building and its evolution is readily available to the owner(s), which will aid in determining appropriate interventions when needed.

A full record of these activities will help to plan for future repairs and provide valuable information in the overall maintenance of the building and will provide essential information for the longer-term and serve as a reminder to amend the maintenance and inspection activities on an as-needed basis. The owner(s) should retain an information file where inspection reports can be filed. This information file should be passed along to any subsequent owner(s). The file would include a list outlining the finishes and materials used. The building owner should keep on hand a stock of spare materials for minor repairs.

The maintenance Log Book is an important maintenance tool that should be kept to record all maintenance activities, recurring problems and building observations and will assist in the overall maintenance planning of the building. Routine maintenance work should be noted in the maintenance log to keep track of past, and plan future activities. All items noted on the maintenance log should indicate the date, problem, type of repair, location and all other observations and information pertaining to each specific maintenance activity.

6.7. EXTERIOR MAINTENANCE

The most potentially damaging element to buildings is water, including frost, freezing and thawing, and rain water runoff including pipes and ground water. Animal infestation is a secondary concern. 3560 Moncton Street, as a two-storey building with no basement, will require on-going and regular maintenance.

The most vulnerable part of any building is the roof, where water can enter in without warning. Roof repair and renewal is one of the more cost-effective strategies. Any leak, however minor it might be, needs to be taken seriously and

may be a sign that other areas are experiencing the same, or that a more significant leak or water entry is imminent.

The following checklist contains a wide range of potential problems specific to the 3560 Moncton Street such as water/moisture penetration, material deterioration and structural deterioration. This does not include interior inspections.

Exterior Inspection

Site and Foundation

- ☒ Does water drain away from the foundation?
- ☒ Is there back-splash occurring?
- ☒ Is there movement or settlement of the foundation as illustrated by cracks or an uneven surface?
- ☒ Is there any evidence of rising damp?

Wooden Elements

- ☒ Are there moisture problems present?
- ☒ Is any wood in direct contact, or extremely close to, the ground?
- ☒ Is there any evidence of insect infestation?
- ☒ Is there any evidence of fungal spread or any other type of biological attack?
- ☒ Is any wood warped or cupped?
- ☒ Does any wood display splits or loose knots?
- ☒ Are nails visible, pulling loose or rusted?
- ☒ Do any wood elements show staining?

Exterior Painted Materials

- ☒ Is the paint blistering, peeling or wrinkling?
- ☒ Does the paint show any stains such as rust, mildew or bleeding through?

Windows

- ☒ Is any glass cracked or missing?
- ☒ Does the putty show any sign of brittleness or cracking, or has any fallen out?
- ☒ Does paint show damage by condensation or water?
- ☒ Do the sashes operate easily or if hinged do they swing freely?
- ☒ Does the frame exhibit any distortion?
- ☒ Do the sills show any deterioration?
- ☒ Is the flashing properly shedding water?
- ☒ Is the caulking connection between the frame and cladding in good shape?

Doors

- ☒ Are the hinges sprung or in need of lubrication?
- ☒ Are the latches and locks working freely?
- ☒ Is the sill in good shape?

- ☒ Is the caulking connection between the door frame and cladding in good shape?
- ☒ Is the glazing in good shape and held securely in place?
- ☒ Is the seal of the door in good shape?

Gutters and Downspouts

- ☒ Are any downspouts leaking or plugged?
- ☒ Do the gutters show signs of corrosion?
- ☒ Are there any missing sections of downspouts and are they securely connected to the gutters?
- ☒ Is the water being redirected away from the building to either in-ground drainage or rainwater catchment?

Roof

- ☒ Are there water blockage points?
- ☒ Is the leading edge of the roof wet?
- ☒ Is there any sign of fungus, moss, birds, vermin, insects, etc.?
- ☒ Are the seams of the flat roof showing any advanced sign of weathering such as curling, cracking or exposure of sub-surface?
- ☒ Are the flashings well set?
- ☒ Are any metal joints or seams sound?
- ☒ Is there any water ponding present?



Courtenay Office:

6091 Ledingham Road, Courtenay, BC V9J 1M5

Vancouver Office:

57-3436 Terra Vita Place, Vancouver, BC V5K 5H6

(778) 308-4357

mcleanheritage@gmail.com

www.mcleanheritage.ca



Address: 3560 Moncton Street

File No.: RZ 18-817742

Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10075, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. (SRW) Granting a 2 m by 2 m Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) at the northeast corner of the subject property.
 - 1.1 The SRW's referenced in Section 1. shall provide for:
 - 1.1.1 24 hour-a-day, year-round public pedestrian access in the form of paved walkway(s) and related landscape features, which may include, but may not be limited to, lighting, furnishings, street trees and planting, decorative paving, storm water management measures and universal accessibility provisions, to the City's satisfaction;
 - 1.1.2 Vehicle use of driveways and driveway crossings (e.g., by owners, operators, tenants, visitors, and car-share operator and users), provided that this activity does not compromise the safe and convenient public pedestrian use of the SRW area;
 - 1.1.3 Emergency and service vehicle access, City bylaw enforcement, and any related or similar City-authorized activities; and
 - 1.1.4 Permanent building encroachments, provided that any such encroachments do not comprise the quality, functionality, safety, or amenity of the SRW area or associated landscape features, as determined to the satisfaction of the City and specified in the approved Development Permit*, including weather protection, habitable portions of the building, and similar structures and building projections, provided that such features are a minimum clear distance of 2.5 m (8.2 ft.) above the finished grade of the SRW area or as otherwise specified in an approved Development Permit*.
 - 1.1.5 Any works essential for public access within the required statutory right-of-way (SRW) are to be included in the Servicing Agreement (SA) and the maintenance & liability responsibility is to be at the sole cost and responsibility of the owner/developer, unless otherwise determined and approved by City staff. The design must be prepared in accordance with City specifications & standards and the construction of the works will be inspected by the City concurrently with all other SA related works. After completion of the works, the Owner is required to provide a certificate of inspection for the works, prepared and sealed by the Owner's Engineer in a form and content acceptable to the City, certifying that the works have been constructed and completed in accordance with the accepted design.
 - 1.1.6 The SRW shall not provide for gates or similar barriers to public access (e.g., chains), except in association emergency, maintenance, repair, or other City-authorized closures.
2. (Flood Protection) Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
3. (Transportation Demand Management Measures) Registration of the following legal agreement(s) on title related to this projects transportation demand management measures to the satisfaction of the City and specified in the approved Development Permit where applicable:
 - 3.1 Registration of a legal agreement for a transit pass program (residential) that includes the following provisions:
 - 3.1.1 10 monthly two zone transit passes are to be provided for 1 year for 100% of the residential units.
 - 3.1.2 Transit passes are to be distributed evenly amongst the residential units (i.e., 2 transit passes per unit).
 - 3.1.3 Program duration shall be when all applicable transit passes have been distributed or after a period of not less than 3 years from the date of full occupancy being provided by the City on the applicable building permit application.

- 3.1.4 Require the submission of letters of credit for the residential transit pass programs the amount to be based on the value of the total number of transit passes (at the time of the registration of the legal agreement) plus a 5% contingency.
- 3.1.5 The owner/developer shall be responsible for keeping all records that documents the distribution of the transit passes in accordance with the provisions of this legal agreement for submission and approval to the City as part of the process to release the submitted letters of credit.
- 3.2 Registration of a legal agreement for the purpose of requiring that the developer/owner provides, installs, and maintains cycling facilities to the satisfaction of the City as specified in the approved Development Permit and includes the following provisions:
 - 3.2.1 Residential
 - Provides Class 1 bicycle parking at a rate of 2.0 stalls per dwelling unit for the resident use.
 - At least 50% of the Class 1 residential bicycle parking stalls shall be upsized to the minimum dimensions (3 m length by 1.5 m width) to accommodate bicycles with trailers.
 - Space be provided to accommodate for an on-site bicycle maintenance repair facility that shall include a minimum of a bike repair stand with tools and manual operated pump with pressure gauge.
 - Electric battery charging provisions are to be provided for all Class 1 bicycle parking.
 - Prohibits the conversion of any bicycle maintenance/repair facility to any other use.
- 3.3 General – The legal agreements referenced in Section 3.1 and 3.2 may be modified to the satisfaction of Transportation where applicable.
- 4. (Shared parking) Registration of a legal agreement on title related to the sharing of residential visitor parking stalls with non-residential parking stalls (commercial uses) to the satisfaction of the City and specified in the approved Development Permit where applicable and includes the following provisions:
 - 4.1 Non-residential (commercial) and residential visitor parking stalls can be shared.
 - 4.2 Shared parking stalls are not permitted to be assigned and/or reserved to a particular use or user.
 - 4.3 Shared parking stalls are not permitted to be arranged in a tandem configuration.
 - 4.4 Implement the applicable signage to clearly identify shared parking stalls.
- 5. (Rental/Age Restrictions) Registration of a restrictive covenant prohibiting (a) the imposition of any strata bylaw that would prohibit any residential dwelling unit from being rented; and (b) the imposition of any strata bylaw that would place age-based restrictions on occupants of any residential dwelling unit.
- 6. (Mixed Use) Registration of a covenant on title that identifies the building as a mixed use building and includes the following provisions:
 - 6.1 That the design is required to mitigate unwanted noise and avoid noise generated from the internal use from penetrating into residential areas.
 - 6.2 Notify residential tenants of potential noise and/or nuisance that may arise due to proximity to retail, restaurant and other commercial uses and activities and that noise shall not exceed noise levels allowed in the City's Noise Bylaw.
 - 6.3 Noise generated from rooftop HVAC units will comply with the City's Noise Bylaw.
- 7. (Affordable Housing Cash-In-Lieu) City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$15.00 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$149,655) to the City's affordable housing fund.
- 8. (Geotechnical) Submission of reports from the appropriate professional consultants to address the following matters:
 - 8.1 Geotechnical investigation and accompanying report to assess the soil and groundwater conditions, potential impacts of the proposed development on neighbouring buildings and include recommendations on appropriate mitigation measures.

8.2 Report from the appropriate qualified consultant that confirms provisions to monitor and inspect the current condition of neighbouring/adjacent buildings prior to any work being undertaken, including follow-up monitoring and inspection should redevelopment of the subject site proceed forward.

9. (Development Permit) The submission and processing of a Development Permit*, completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.

10. (Servicing Agreement) Enter into a Servicing Agreement* for the design and construction of the following works. A Letter of Credit or cash security for the value of the Service Agreement works, as determined by the City, will be required as part of entering into the Servicing Agreement. Works include, but may not be limited to the following:

10.1 Water Works

- Using the OCP Model, there is 432 L/s and 558 L/s of water available at a 20 psi residual at Moncton Street and the 2nd Ave. respectively. Based on the proposed development, the site requires a minimum fire flow of 220 L/s.
- Developer is required to:
 - Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm the development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage and Building designs.
 - Provide fire hydrants at Moncton Road and 2nd Avenue frontage to meet minimum spacing and code requirements to service the proposed development.
- At the Developer's cost, the City is required to:
 - Abandon and cap at main the existing water service connection, and remove meter.
 - Install a new water service connection at the Moncton St frontage, complete with meter, meter box, and right-of-way. The dimensions of the right of way shall be finalized during the servicing agreement process.

10.2 Storm Sewer Works:

- The developer is required to:
 - Remove approximately 65 meters of existing 375mm diameter storm sewer along 2nd Avenue frontage from STMH9121 to STMH9138.
 - Install approximately 65 meters of new 600mm storm sewer along 2nd Avenue. The tie-in to the north shall be to a new 1200mm diameter manhole, which will replace the existing manhole STMH9121. Tie in to the south shall be to the manhole STMH9138. New storm sewer to be installed such that it is draining to the south, towards Bayview Street.
 - Protect existing AC watermain along Moncton Street during storm sewer installation. Any portions of the water main undermined or damaged by construction are to be replaced at developer's cost.
 - Replace 6m portion of AC watermain at Moncton Street where storm sewer crosses
 - Install a new storm service connection complete with inspection chamber at the 2nd Avenue frontage.
- At the Developer's cost, the City will:
 - Cut and cap at main all existing storm sewer connections to the development site.
 - Tie-in all the existing systems to the new system being installed.

10.3 Sanitary Sewer Works:

- The developer is required to:
 - Upgrade approximately 56 meters of existing 150mm diameter sanitary sewer to 200mm diameter sanitary sewer along the property frontage from MH 5119 to 5125 in the same alignment as the existing sewer. Tie-in to the existing sanitary sewers at both east and west ends shall be via new manholes.
 - Install a new sanitary service connection complete with an inspection chamber. Sanitary connection not to be made to sanitary sewer in rear lane.
 - Renew portions of the existing AC watermain along Moncton Street that will be impacted by the sanitary service connection.
- At the Developer's cost, the City will:

- Cut and cap, at main, the existing sanitary sewer connections to the development site.
- Tie-in all the existing systems to the new system being installed.

10.4 Moncton Street Frontage Improvements

- Construct a 2.0 m wide concrete sidewalk at the north property of the subject site. The remaining space between the edge of sidewalk and the existing south curb of Moncton Street is to contain hardscaped boulevard generally consisting of: stamped/tinted concrete; street trees (if applicable); street furniture (including benches, street lighting, bicycle racks, and garbage receptacles); and intermittent landscaping. The cross-section of the frontage improvements, measuring from the property line towards the south curb of Moncton Street, shall include the following:
 - 2.0 m wide concrete sidewalk
 - 0.88 m wide hardscaped boulevard
 - 0.15 m wide concrete curb and gutter.(Note: Should Council adopt the streetscape visions for the Steveston Village Area prior to the execution of the Servicing Agreement for the subject site, the above frontage improvements shall be adjusted to be in keeping with the adopted visions, in particular the corner treatment at the Moncton Street/2nd Avenue intersection).
- At the southwest corner of the Moncton Street and 2nd Avenue intersection, upgrade the existing wheelchair ramp with tactile warning strips for the visually impaired (MMCD R-15-SD).
- All existing driveways along the Moncton Street development frontage are to be closed permanently. The Developer is responsible for the removal of the existing driveway let-downs and the replacement with barrier curb/gutter and concrete sidewalk per standards described under item above.

10.5 2nd Avenue Frontage Improvements

- Construct a 1.67 m wide concrete sidewalk along the development frontage that matches the existing width of the sidewalk in this block of 2nd Avenue. The cross-section of the frontage improvements, measuring from the property line towards the west curb of 2nd Avenue, shall include the following:
 - 1.67 m wide concrete sidewalk.
 - 0.15 m wide concrete curb and gutter.(Note: Should Council adopt the streetscape visions for the Steveston Village Area prior to the execution of the Servicing Agreement for the subject site, the above frontage improvements shall be adjusted to be in keeping with the adopted visions).
- All existing driveways along the 2nd Avenue development frontage are to be closed permanently. The Developer is responsible for the removal of the existing driveway let-downs and the replacement with barrier curb/gutter and concrete sidewalk per standards noted under item above.
- Upon closing the existing driveways and back filling with new sidewalk and curb/gutter, the Developer is required to, across the 2nd Avenue development frontage, complete the following pavement marking and signage works:
 - Remove the existing pavement marking related to on-street parking. As part of the SA detailed design process, prepare a new pavement marking plan to back fill the development curb frontage with angle parking (45 degree at 5.5 m x 2.5 m car parking space dimensions).
 - Remove any affected traffic/parking signage and install new signage as required along the development frontage.

10.6 Lane Frontage Improvements

- The lane development frontage has a road right-of-way width of 10.06 m. The lane upgrade requirements shall include:
 - Upgrade the existing lane structure, including the construction of asphalt concrete pavement over the entire width of the lane, to comply with City of Richmond Engineering Design Standards. The upgrade is to match that carried out under SA 13-635022. The SA detailed design process shall determine the final cross-section profile, pavement structure, and other design details taking into considerations drainage and utility requirements.

- The Developer is required to check the existing lighting levels in the lane to determine if lighting is adequate. If it is not adequate, lighting that meets City of Richmond lighting standards are to be provided at the cost of the Developer.
- Construct a new driveway for vehicle access to the site. City design standards for commercial driveways are to be met (7.5 m driveway width at the property line).
- The required lane frontage improvements are limited to the site frontage only.

10.7 Statutory Right of Way Requirements

- A 2 m by 2m SRW is required at the northeast corner of the site (southwest corner of the Moncton Street and 2nd Avenue intersection.)
- All above ground hydro/telephone kiosk and other third party equipment must not be placed within any frontage works area including sidewalk and boulevard. On-site SRWs are to be secured for the placement of this equipment.

10.8 Other Frontage Improvements:

- The developer is required to:
 - Provide frontage improvements as per Transportation's requirements.
 - Coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers:
 - Before relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the property frontages.
 - To underground overhead service lines.
 - To locate/relocate all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks required to service the proposed development, and all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks located along the development's frontages, within the developments site (see list below for examples). A functional plan showing conceptual locations for such infrastructure shall be included in the development design review process. Please coordinate with the respective private utility companies and the project's lighting and traffic signal consultants to confirm the requirements (e.g., statutory right-of-way dimensions) and the locations for the aboveground structures. If a private utility company does not require an aboveground structure, that company shall confirm this via a letter to be submitted to the City. The following are examples of statutory right-of-ways that shall be shown on the architectural plans/functional plan, the servicing agreement drawings, and registered prior to SA design approval:
 - BC Hydro PMT – 4.0 x 5.0 m
 - BC Hydro LPT – 3.5 x 3.5 m
 - Street light kiosk – 1.5 x 1.5 m
 - Traffic signal kiosk – 2.0 x 1.5 m
 - Traffic signal UPS – 1.0 x 1.0 m
 - Shaw cable kiosk – 1.0 x 1.0 m
 - Telus FDH cabinet – 1.1 x 1.0 m
 - Provide street lighting along the lane frontage with bollards offset 0.5m away from the street lighting poles.
 - Review street lighting levels along all road and lane frontages, and upgrade as required.

10.9 General Items:

- The Developer is required to:
 - Enter into an encroachment agreement for any proposed building and awning encroachments prior to building permit issuance, including payment of any required fees. An encroachment agreement will only be granted if the encroachment will not hinder the use of and access to City infrastructure. Any proposed encroachments must be easily removable, and in the event that the City requires removal of the encroachment (for example, to access City utilities), removal and replacement will be at the Owner's cost.

- Provide, within the first servicing agreement submission or prior to start of site preparation works (whichever comes first), a geotechnical assessment of preload, de-watering, and soil preparation impacts on the existing utilities fronting the development site and provide mitigation recommendations.
- Provide a video inspection report of the existing sanitary service connection on the ROW and the sanitary sewer running from manhole SMH5126 to SMH5125 prior to start of site preparation works or within the first servicing agreement submission, whichever comes first. A follow-up video inspection, complete with a civil engineer's signed and sealed recommendation letter, is required after site preparation works are complete (i.e. pre-load removal, completion of dewatering, etc.) to assess the condition of the existing utilities and provide recommendations to retain, replace, or repair. Any utilities damaged by the pre-load, de-watering, or other ground preparation shall be replaced or repaired at the Developer's cost.
- Monitor the settlement at the adjacent utilities and structures during pre-loading, dewatering, and soil preparation works per a geotechnical engineer's recommendations, and report the settlement amounts to the City for approval.
- Submit a proposed strategy at the building permit stage for managing excavation de-watering. Note that the City's preference is to manage construction water onsite or by removing and disposing at an appropriate facility. If this is not feasible due to volume of de-watering, the Developer will be required to apply to Metro Vancouver for a permit to discharge into the sanitary sewer system. If the sanitary sewer does not have adequate capacity to receive the volume of construction water, the Developer will be required to enter into a de-watering agreement with the City to discharge treated construction water to the storm sewer system.
- Enter into, if required, additional legal agreements, as determined via the subject development's Servicing Agreement(s) and/or Development Permit(s), and/or Building Permit(s) to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering, including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, de-watering, drilling, underpinning, anchoring, shoring, piling, pre-loading, ground densification or other activities that may result in settlement, displacement, subsidence, damage or nuisance to City and private utility infrastructure.
- Not encroach into the existing SRW with proposed trees, non-removable fencing, or other structures.

Prior to a Development Permit* being forwarded to the Development Permit Panel for consideration, the developer is required to:

1. Submission of an appropriate landscape bond/letter of credit for on-site landscaping and registration of an accompanying legal agreement.
2. Additional requirements and legal agreements as determined to the satisfaction of the City through the processing of the Development Permit application.

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

1. Submission of a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to the Transportation Department. Management Plan shall include location for parking for services, deliveries, workers, loading, application for any lane closures, and proper construction traffic controls as per Traffic Control Manual for works on Roadways (by Ministry of Transportation) and MMCD Traffic Regulation Section 01570.
2. Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
3. Registration of a subsidence covenant on title. A signed and sealed letter from a geotechnical engineer must be provided to confirm that the proposed development will not impact the serviceability of neighbouring buildings, including the properties at 3480, 3500 and 3580 Moncton Street, and they may continue to be safely used for their intended purposes. All buildings must be built only in strict compliance with the recommendations set forth in the geotechnical report.
4. Enter into an encroachment agreement for the proposed fabric awnings along Moncton Street and 2nd Avenue and any other building encroachments.

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

Note:

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

All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall have priority over all such liens, charges and encumbrances as is considered advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall, unless the Director of Development determines otherwise, be fully registered in the Land Title Office prior to enactment of the appropriate bylaw.

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

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

- Signed Copy on File -

Signed _____

Date _____



**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500
Amendment Bylaw 10075 (RZ 18-817742)
3560 Moncton Street**

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

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 is amended by:
 - a. Inserting the following table at the end of the existing table contained in Section 5.15.1(d)(ii):

Zone	Sum Per Buildable Square Foot of Permitted Principal Building
ZMU43	\$15.00

- b. Inserting the following into Section 20 – Site Specific Mixed Use Zones, in numerical order:

“20.43 Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village

20.43.1 Purpose

The **zone** provides for a combination of commercial, industrial and residential **uses** in the Steveston Village Conservation Area.

20.43.2 Permitted Uses

- animal grooming
- broadcasting studio
- child care
- education
- education, commercial
- government service
- health service, minor
- housing, apartment
- industrial, general

20.43.3 Secondary Uses

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

- liquor primary establishment
- manufacturing, custom indoor
- microbrewery, winery and distillery
- office
- parking, non-accessory
- recreation, indoor
- recycling depot
- restaurant
- retail, convenience
- retail, general
- retail, second hand
- service, business support
- service, financial
- service, household repair
- service, personal
- studio
- veterinary service

20.43.4 Permitted Density

1. The maximum **floor area ratio** is 1.0.
2. Notwithstanding Section 20.43.4.1, the reference to “1.0” **floor area ratio** is increased to a higher **density** of “1.1” **floor area ratio** if the **owner** pays into the **affordable housing reserve** the sum specified in Section 5.15.1 of this bylaw, at the time **Council** adopts a zoning amendment bylaw to include the **site** in the ZMU43 **zone**.
3. There is no maximum **floor area ratio** for **non-accessory parking** as a **principal use**.

20.43.5 Permitted Lot Coverage

1. The maximum **lot coverage** is 100% for **buildings**.

20.43.6 Yards & Setbacks

1. There is no minimum **front yard, rear yard** or **side yard setback**.

20.43.7 Permitted Heights

1. The maximum **building height** for the **site** is 9 m, containing not more than two **storeys**.

20.43.8 Subdivision Provisions/Minimum Lot Size

1. There are no minimum **lot width**, **lot depth** or **lot area** requirements.

20.43.9 Landscaping & Screening

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

20.43.10 On-Site Parking

1. On-site **vehicle** and bicycle parking and loading shall be provided according to the standards set-out in Section 7.0 except that:
 - a) Required **parking spaces** for residential **use** visitors and non-residential **uses** may be shared.
 - b) On-site **vehicle** parking shall be provided at the following rate:
 - i) Non-residential **uses** – on-site parking requirements contained in this Section 7.0 of this Bylaw are reduced by 33% with the exception that a rate of 2 spaces per 100 m² of **gross leasable floor area** be applied to **retail convenience, retail general, retail second hand, service business support, service financial and service personal**.

20.43.11 Other Regulations

1. For **apartment housing**, no portion of the **first storey** of a **building** within 9.0 m of the **lot line abutting a road** shall be used for residential purposes.
 2. For **apartment housing**, an entrance to the residential **use** or parking area above or behind the commercial space is permitted if the entrance does not exceed 3.0 m in width.
 3. In addition to the regulations listed above, the General Development Regulations in Section 4.0 and the Specific Use Regulations in Section 5.0 apply.”
2. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following area and by designating it “**COMMERCIAL MIXED USE (ZMU43) – STEVESTON VILLAGE**”.

P.I.D. 001-067-915

Lot 25 Section 10 Block 3 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 25758

3. This Bylaw may be cited as “**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10075**”.

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON



SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

JUN 12 2023

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED by 
APPROVED by Director or Solicitor 

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



Regular Council
Monday, June 12, 2023

13. APPLICATION BY INTER LUCK TRADING CORP FOR REZONING
AT 3560 MONCTON STREET FROM “STEVESTON COMMERCIAL
(CS2)” ZONE TO “COMMERCIAL MIXED USE (ZMU43) –
(STEVESTON VILLAGE)” ZONE

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-010075, RZ 18-817742) (REDMS No. 7236314)

R23/11-7

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10075, to create the “Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village” zone, and to rezone 3560 Moncton Street from “Steveston Commercial (CS2)” zone to “Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – Steveston Village” zone, be introduced and given first reading.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with respect to (i) keeping Moncton Street as one storey commercial to preserve the historical aspect of the area (ii) the need for a hardware store in Steveston, (iii) residential units built above commercial units, (iv) Heritage Commission endorsement of the proposed application, (v) typology of proposed development being consistent with the heritage lot pattern, and (vi) potential increased residential traffic in the area.

As a result of the discussion the following **referral motion** was introduced:

R23/11-8

It was moved and seconded

That the application by “Inter Luck Trading Corp For Rezoning At 3560 Moncton Street From “Steveston Commercial (CS2)” Zone to “Commercial Mixed Use (ZMU43) – (Steveston Village)” Zone” be referred back to staff to explore options to maintain the heritage of Steveston as a fishing village with services for the people of Richmond and to explore options to maintain the current one-storey height and to orient the businesses toward Moncton Street.

DEFEATED

Opposed: Mayor Brodie

Cllrs: Au

Heed

Hobbs

Loo

McNulty

The question on the main motion was then called and **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Day, Gillanders and Wolfe opposed.



City of Richmond

Report to Committee

To: Planning Committee
From: Wayne Craig
Director, Development

Date: May 24, 2023
File: RZ 20-919113

Re: Application by Dava Developments Ltd. for Rezoning at 8911, 8931, 8951, 8991 Patterson Road from "Residential Single Family (RS1/F)" Zone to "Residential/ Limited Commercial (ZMU54)" Zone and "School & Institutional Use (SI)" Zone

Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10464 to create the "Residential/Limited Commercial (ZMU54)" zone and to rezone 8911, 8931, 8951, 8991 Patterson Road from "Residential Single Family (RS1/F)" zone to "Residential/Limited Commercial (ZMU54)" zone and "School & Institutional Use (SI)" zone be introduced and given first reading.

Wayne Craig
Director, Development
(604-247-4625)

WC:vk
Att. 9

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Law	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Community Social Development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Staff Report

Origin

Dava Developments Ltd., on behalf of the owner Patterson Richmond Nominee Ltd. (Directors: Denise She and David Chung), has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone lands at 8911, 8931, 8951, 8991 Patterson Road from the "Residential Single Family (RS1/F)" zone to a new "Residential/Limited Commercial (ZMU54)" zone and a "School & Institutional Use (SI)" zone, in the City Centre's Capstan Village area (Attachments 1 & 2) to permit the development of a mixed-use mid- and high-rise development.

The proposed development (Attachment 3) includes:

- A combined total floor area of 17,154.73 m² (184,651.80ft²) comprised of:
 - 12,246.23m² (131,817.30ft²) of residential uses (163 dwellings), including:
 - a) A maximum of 10,398.69 m² (111,930.56 ft²) of market housing (136 units); and
 - b) At least 1,847.54 m² (19,886 ft²) of affordable housing (27 units).
 - 4,908.50 m² (52,834 ft²) of non-residential- hotel uses along Garden City Way.
- Transfer of an approximately 829 m² fee simple parcel adjacent to Sea Island Way to the City for the purpose of public open space.
- Transfer of an approximately 927 m² parcel adjacent to Garden City Road to the City for the transportation related infrastructure.

Park, engineering and road network improvements shall be designed and constructed through the City's Servicing Agreement processes, and secured with Letters of Credit prior to rezoning bylaw adoption.

Findings of Fact

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

Subject Site Existing Housing Profile

The subject site is comprised of four contiguous lots, located west of Garden City Road, between Sea Island Way and Patterson Road. The lots are currently vacant.

Surrounding Development

To the North: Across Sea Island Way, a grocery store on a site zoned "Auto Oriented Commercial (CA)" and the Richmond Lions Manor (Bridgeport) Seniors Living Centre on a site zoned "Health Care (HC)".

To the South: Across Patterson Road/Patterson Park, residential apartments on a site zoned "High Rise Apartment and Artist Residential Tenancy Studio Units (ZHR10) – Capstan Village (City Centre)".

To the East: Across Garden City Road, a predominantly single-family residential neighbourhood in the West Cambie Planning Area.

To the West: Single detached dwellings zoned “Single Detached (RS1/F)” which are designated for future high-rise residential, commercial and mixed use development.

Related Policies & Studies

Official Community Plan/ Capstan Village Area Plan

The Official Community Plan (OCP) designation for the subject site is “Mixed Use”. The City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) Specific Land Use Map: Capstan Village (2031) (Attachment 2) designation for the subject site is ‘Urban Centre T5 (35 m)’.

In addition, the subject site is located within the ‘Capstan Station Bonus’ and ‘Village Centre Bonus’ CCAP density bonusing areas.

The proposal is consistent with current OCP and CCAP policies applicable to the subject site.

As per the Capstan Village Specific Land Use Map (T5 transect) in the CCAP, no residential dwelling units are permitted within 20 m of Sea Island Way. The proposal complies with this requirement and the residential dwelling units are located on the south side of the site, along Patterson Road.

Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

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

OCP Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development (ANSD) Policy

The subject site is located within ANSD “Area 3”, which permits consideration of all aircraft noise sensitive land use types provided that the building design satisfies City standards and potential purchasers are made aware of potential noise conditions.

Prior to rezoning adoption, a covenant will be registered on Title requiring that the developer satisfy all City requirements. An acoustic report will be submitted by the developer and prepared by a qualified acoustic professional at the Development Permit (DP) stage, indicating that the development can be designed and constructed in compliance with the applicable ANSD standards.

NAV Canada Building Height

Transport Canada regulates maximum permitted building heights in City Centre locations that may impact airport operations. The developer has submitted a letter, prepared by a BCLS registered surveyor, confirming that the development’s proposed maximum building height of 47 m (154 ft.) GSC complies with all applicable Transport Canada regulations.

Affordable Housing Strategy

In compliance with the City's Affordable Housing Strategy, the developer proposes to design and construct 27 low-end-of-market rental (LEMR) units, to a turnkey level of finish, at the developer's sole cost, comprising 1,847.54 m² (19,886.75 ft²) of habitable space, based on 15 per cent of the development's total residential floor area 12,246.23 m² (131,817.30 ft²).

Market Rental Housing Policy

This rezoning application was received prior to the current Market Rental Housing Policy adopted by City Council on June 20, 2022. Consistent with the provisions for in-stream rezoning applications, this application is exempt from the Market Rental Housing Policy if the rezoning bylaw is granted first reading prior to June 20, 2023.

Public Consultation

A rezoning sign has been installed on the subject property. Staff have received three comments from the public about the rezoning application in response to the placement of the rezoning sign on the property.

Two residents of the neighbouring property at 8988 Patterson Road contacted staff by phone and expressed concerns about the impact on their views and enquired about the public hearing and notification process. Staff reviewed the application with the inquirers including the conceptual plans prepared by the developer.

One area resident was concerned about the lack of existing on-street parking available in the neighbourhood. (Attachment 5). Staff informed the inquirer that each development is responsible for providing the required parking as per City bylaws to support the proposed development. As such, the proposed rezoning application under review will be required to meet the parking requirements on-site to support the proposed program, which includes parking for residents, visitors and delivery vehicles.

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant first reading to the rezoning bylaw, the bylaw will be forwarded to a Public Hearing, where any area resident or interested party will have an opportunity to comment. Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the *Local Government Act* and the City's *Zoning Bylaw 8500*.

Analysis

Dava Developments Ltd. has applied to rezone the subject site to permit the construction of a mixed use development, 163 residential units (including 27 affordable housing units), and a 100-room hotel. This proposal is consistent with the City's OCP and CCAP policies applicable to the subject site, which encourage high-rise, high-density mixed use development including, among other things, public open space and affordable housing.

Existing Legal Encumbrances

Development of the subject site is not encumbered by existing legal agreements on Title.

Built Form and Architectural Character

The developer proposes to construct a high-density, mixed residential and hotel development (Attachment 3) and is generally consistent with the CCAP's Development Permit Guidelines. The proposed form of development is an L-shaped building with a seven-storey hotel and a 14-storey residential building over a shared two-level below grade parkade. Outdoor amenities are proposed on the roof gardens of the residential and hotel sections of the building, to which residents will have access.

As per the CCAP, development sites for which net density is permitted to exceed 3.0 FAR in the Capstan Station Bonus area may be considered under 3.2.8 Sub-Area B.4, which allows maximum building height of 45 m (148 ft.).

Housing Type and Tenure

A. Overall Dwelling Unit Mix: The OCP and CCAP encourage the development of a variety of unit types and sizes supportive of the diverse needs of Richmond's population including, but not limited to, households with children.

- Staff support the developer's proposal for 49 per cent 1-bedroom units (80 units) and 49.7 per cent two and three-bedroom units, family-friendly units (81 units), including:

Unit Type	Market Housing	Affordable Housing	Total
Studio	-	7.4% (2 units)	1.2% (2 units)
1-bedroom	51.5% (70 units)	37% (10 units)	49.1% (80 units)
2-bedroom	36.0% (49 units)	33.4% (9 units)	35.6% (58 units)
3-bedroom	12.5% (17 units)	22.2% (6 units)	14.1% (23 units)
Total	136 Units	27 Units	163 Units

B. LEMR Housing: The developer proposes to design and construct 27 Low-End Market Rental (LEMR) units, to a turnkey level of finish, at the developer's sole cost, comprising at least 1,847.54 m² (19,886.75 ft²) of habitable space, based on 15 per cent of the development's total residential floor area. In order to promote the development of more family-friendly housing options in Richmond, the Affordable Housing Strategy requires at least 20 per cent of LEMR units to be provided with two or more bedrooms. The proposed development exceeds this minimum requirement, with 55 per cent of LEMR units having two and three-bedrooms.

The proposed affordable housing will be clustered together in Level 3 and Level 4 of the development. Per the requirements of the Affordable Housing Strategy, property developers have the option to cluster affordable housing units together within a development only if they have entered into a partnership with a qualified non-profit organization to own or manage the units. The developer has provided evidence of a partnership with S.U.C.C.E.S.S., a qualified non-profit organization, to own or manage the clustered affordable housing units (Attachment 6). The Developer has also provided a letter of support by S.U.C.C.E.S.S for the proposed LEMR units related to target tenant groups, programming, services and the unit mix proposed (Attachment 7).

Unit Type	Affordable Housing Strategy Requirements (1)			Project Targets (2)	
	Minimum Unit Area	Max. LEMR Rent	Total Maximum Household Income	Unit Mix	BUH (3)
Studio	37 m ² (400 ft ²)	\$811/month	\$34,650 or less	7.4% (2 units)	7.4% (2 units)
1-Bedroom	50 m ² (535 ft ²)	\$975/month	\$38,250 or less	37.0% (10 units)	33.3% (9 units)
2- Bedroom	69 m ² (741 ft ²)	\$1,218/month	\$46,800 or less	33.3% (9 units)	22.2% (6 units)
3-Bedroom	91 m ² (980 ft ²)	\$1,480/month	\$58,050 or less	22.2% (6 units)	22.2% (6 units)
TOTAL	1,847.54 m² (19,886.75 ft²)	N/A	N/A	27 Units	85.1% (23 units)

- (1) Values adopted by Council on July 24, 2017. May be adjusted periodically, as provided for under City policy.
 (2) Project Targets will be confirmed through the project's Development Permit processes.
 (3) BUH indicates units designed and constructed in compliance with the City's Basic Universal Housing standards.

Occupants of the LEMR units will enjoy full use of all on-site indoor and outdoor residential amenity spaces, which, together with parking, bike storage and related features, will be provided by the owner/operator at no additional charge to the affordable housing occupants.

A Housing Agreement and Housing Covenant will be registered on Title prior to final adoption of the zoning bylaw, which will secure the following conditions in perpetuity:

- LEMR units are required achieve occupancy prior to any other buildings or uses in the proposed development.
- The residential use of the 27 LEMR units is restricted to residential rental tenure.
- Age-related occupancy restrictions are prohibited.
- Single ownership of all 27 the LEMR units is maintained.

- C. Market Strata Housing: The developer proposes to design and construct 136 market strata housing units, comprising 10,469.37 m² (112,691.3 ft²) and common circulation space in the building.

Unit Type	Min. Unit Area	Unit Mix (1)	BUH (1)	Adaptable (1)
Studio	-	-	-	-
1-bedroom	51.8 m ² (558 ft ²)	51.5% (70 units)	5.1% (7 units)	5.1% (7 units)
2-bedroom	73.4 m ² (790 ft ²)	36.0% (49 units)	3.7% (5 units)	-
3-bedroom	91.5 m ² (985 ft ²)	12.5% (17 units)	2.2% (3 units)	2.9% (4 units)
Total	N/A	136 Units	11% (15 units)	8% (11 units)

(1) Unit area and unit mix in the above table may be adjusted through the Development Permit Process

Consistent with OCP policy respecting multiple family housing development projects and in order to maximize potential rental and housing opportunities throughout the City, a restrictive covenant will be registered on Title prior to rezoning bylaw adoption, prohibiting (a) the imposition of any strata bylaw that would prohibit any residential dwelling unit from being rented; and (b) the imposition of any strata bylaw that would place age-based restrictions on occupants of any residential dwelling unit.

D. Accessibility: Richmond's OCP seeks to meet the needs of the City's aging population and people facing mobility challenges by encouraging the development of accessible housing that can be approached, entered, used and occupied by persons with physical or sensory disabilities.

- Staff support the developer's proposal, which is consistent with City policy and will include:
 - i) Barrier-free lobbies, common areas, and amenity spaces;
 - ii) Aging-in-place features in all units (e.g., blocking for grab bars, lever handles, etc.); and
 - iii) 23.3 per cent Basic Universal Housing (BUH) units (i.e. 38 of 163 units) overall, including 11 per cent of market units (i.e. 15 of 136 units) and 85.1 per cent of affordable housing units (i.e. 23 of 27 units). In addition to the BUH units, eight per cent of market units (i.e. 11 of 136 units) will be adaptable units.

Village Centre Bonus (VCB)

Under the CCAP and Zoning Bylaw, developments that make use of the density bonus provisions of the Village Centre Bonus (i.e. 1.0 floor area ratio for commercial uses) must make an amenity contribution (based on five per cent of bonus VCB floor area) and as applicable, utilize the permitted bonus VCB floor area for commercial uses that are selected for their ability to enhance the vitality and amenity of the applicable City Centre Village (e.g., Capstan Village).

Community Amenity Contribution: Based on a review of the development proposal, staff confirm that no City-owned amenity space is required to be incorporated into the subject development and recommend that a cash-in-lieu contribution be accepted in lieu of on-site amenity space.

In compliance with the CCAP, prior to rezoning bylaw adoption, the developer proposes to make a voluntary cash contribution of \$2,300,833.60, based on the equivalent-to-construction-value rate of \$871.00 per square foot and 5% of the site's maximum permitted VCB bonus floor area (245.42 m² / 2,641.6 ft²). If the payment is not made within one year of third reading of the zoning amendment bylaw, the Council-approved "equivalent to construction value" community amenity contribution rate in effect for the City Centre at the time of final reading of the zoning amendment bylaw will be applicable.

Commercial Uses: The developer proposes that 100 per cent of the development's potential VCB floor area is comprised of 100 room hotel along Garden City Road. Prior to final adoption of bylaw, the developer is required to register a restrictive covenant(s) or alternative legal agreement(s) on Title, to the satisfaction of the City, which includes limit the length of stay of hotel guests to a maximum of six months and prohibiting cooking facilities within rooms and strata titling of individual or groups of hotel rooms.

Capstan Station Bonus (CSB)

Under the CCAP and Zoning Bylaw, developments that make use of the density bonus provisions of the Capstan Station Bonus (i.e. 0.5 floor area for residential uses) must:

- Prior to rezoning bylaw adoption, provide public open space in some combination of fee simple, dedication, and/or Statutory Right of Way (as determined to the City's satisfaction) at a rate of at least 5 m² (54 ft²) per dwelling, based on the total number of dwelling units.

The developer has agreed to provide a 10.0 m wide portion of the subject site adjacent to Sea Island Way totalling 829 m² in area to the City as public open space including the proposed Sea Island Way Greenway. This area is proposed to be designated as “School & Institutional Use (SI)” consistent with City-owned properties used for public open space purposes. Based on 163 units, the on-site landscape area requirement for public use would be 815 m². Staff support that the proposed public open space be considered to satisfy the obligation for the on-site landscaped/park use via the Capstan Station Bonus.

- Prior to rezoning bylaw adoption, enter into Service Agreement (SA) for design and construction of the greenway which will include minimum 3.5m wide tree boulevard (width to be refined as part of Servicing Agreement) design to accommodate potential future widening of Sea Island Way), 2.5 m wide bike path (transitioned to meet existing on-street bike path to the west) and 2 m wide sidewalk.
- Prior to Building Permit (BP) issuance, make a voluntary contribution towards the construction and integration of the Capstan Canada Line Station, based on the number of approved units and the Council-approved contribution rate in effect at the time of BP issuance (i.e. currently \$10,068.47 per unit, which rate is updated annually each October 1).
- Demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City that the additional density results in a superior building and landscape design and an attractive, pedestrian-friendly public realm.

Staff support the developer’s proposal which includes the landscape along Patterson Road, Garden City Road, and the dedication of land and provision of Sea Island Way Greenway along Sea Island Way.

Transportation and Site Access

The proposed development provides for transportation improvements and related features, all at the developer’s sole cost, to be secured through a combination of road dedication and legal agreements registered on Title, to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation, and the City’s standard Servicing Agreement process (secured with Letters of Credit), as applicable, as per the attached Rezoning Considerations (Attachment 9).

Staff support the developer’s proposal, which is consistent with City objectives and includes:

- Frontage improvements along Sea Island Way to accommodate road, off-street multi-purpose path, sidewalk, planted boulevard and related upgrades. This includes 10 m wide area of dedication along the Sea Island Way, and a 5 m x 5 m corner cut on the southwest corner of Garden City Road/Sea Island Way, measured from the new property line along Sea Island Way and off the existing property line along Garden City Road.
- Frontage improvements along Patterson Road to accommodate sidewalk, planted boulevard and related upgrades. This includes 2 m of road dedication at the vehicle turn around area (off 8911 & 8931 Patterson Road) and a 4 m x 4 m corner cut on the southeast corner of Garden City Road/Patterson Road.
- A pedestrian connection between Patterson Drive and the multi-use path along the south side of Sea Island Way along the west edge of the subject site.

This includes granting a minimum 1.5 m public-rights-of-passage Statutory Right-of-Way along the western portion of the property and the space to be determined through the Development Permit process. Maintenance will be the responsibility of the owner.

The number of site access driveways is limited to one vehicular access off Patterson Road.

The City's *Zoning Bylaw 8500* allows for parking reductions. The proposal includes a reduced parking space rate of 0.8 parking spaces per strata unit. The proposed 20 per cent reduction for residential and hotel parking rate is consistent with other comparable developments in the Metro Vancouver region and were also validated through a Transportation Impact Assessment, which was reviewed and accepted by the City and supported by the following required Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, which will be further reviewed through the required Development Permit process:

- Transit Pass Program: monthly bus pass (two-zone) will be offered to 25 per cent of the market strata units (136 units) for a period of one year and 100 percent of affordable housing units (27 units) and secured with a Letter of Credit and registration of a legal agreement on Title prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.
- Active Transportation:
 - A shared bicycle maintenance and repair facility.
 - End of trip facilities: Enhanced end of trip-cycling amenities for hotel employees.
- Car-share spaces: Allocate a minimum of two parking spaces for car-share vehicles within the residential visitor (1 stall) and hotel (1 stall) portions of the development, with a Statutory Right-of-Way registered on Title to ensure such spaces are publically accessible in perpetuity. The car-share space will be equipped with an electric vehicle (EV) quick-charge (240 V) charging station for the exclusive use of car-share vehicles parking in the designated car-share spaces.
- EV Charging: Electrical charging for 100 per cent of visitor parking spaces for affordable housing and 10 per cent for residential market strata visitors.
- Off-site cycling improvements:
 - Subject to consultation with MoTI, widen/improve existing pedestrian crossings on the south side of Sea Island Way/Garden City Road to enable cyclist crossings, including upgrade of the channelized right turn lane with a smart channel and a tighter radius to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety; and
 - Provide a new 2.5 m wide cycle track within the channelized island on the southeast corner of the Sea Island Way/Garden City Road intersection.

Tree Retention and Replacement

The applicant has submitted a Certified Arborist's Report; which identifies on-site and off-site tree species, assesses tree structure and condition and provides recommendations on tree retention and removal relative to the proposed development. The Report assesses 84 bylaw-sized trees on the subject property, two trees on neighbouring properties, and five street trees on City property.

The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has reviewed the Arborist's Report and supports the Arborist's findings, with the following comments:

- 84 trees (tag# 1-2, 4-19 & 21-86) are located on-site (Attachment 8).
- 63 trees are located on the future development lot. The built form with two levels of below grade parking extending across the site precludes the opportunities for tree retention. Replacement trees should be specified at 2:1 ratio.
 - Included in the on-site trees are a 2 significant trees (tag #18 and 67) that would require replacement at 3:1 ratio as per the OCP. While these trees are currently identified for removal, tree protection and retention for these trees will be subject to further review through the Development Permit process to see if modification to the parking structure will facilitate retention.
- 21 trees (tag # 19, 21, 24-29, 41-46, 79-85) are located on-site but within the area being provided to the City for the purposes of public open space and greenway. One tree (Tag #A) is located on City property on the north property line of 8891 Patterson but may conflict with proposed greenway works. Tree protection and retention within this area will be subject to further review through the design of the frontage improvements and proposed multi-use path and sidewalk facilities which to be coordinated as part of the required Servicing Agreement. Further details will be provided at the time of the Development Permit application.
- One Tree (tag #87) located off-site to the south on City property is in good health and condition, but conflicts with the building and parkade due to the proximity to the property line and is recommended for removal, \$ 2,250.00 required in compensation. Tree protection and retention will be further reviewed through the Development Permit process to see if modification to the parking structure will facilitate retention.
- Two Trees (tag# 3 & 20) located on adjacent neighbouring property to the east are located in close proximity to the development lot and proposed parkade structure. These trees are to be retained and protected unless appropriate authorization is obtained from the adjacent property owner. This will be further reviewed as part of the Development Permit application. If the owner does not consent to the removal, the development is required to provide tree protection as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.

Tree Replacement

The applicant wishes to remove 63 on-site trees (Trees # 1-2, 4-18, 22, 23, 30-40, 47-78, 86). The 2:1 replacement ratio for 61 trees and 3:1 replacement for the two larger caliper trees if they cannot be retained would require a total of 128 replacement trees. The preliminary landscape plans provided by the applicant identify a total of 31 new trees to be planted on-site. The required replacement trees are to be of the following minimum sizes, based on the size of the trees being removed as per Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057.

No. of Replacement Trees	Minimum Caliper of Deciduous Replacement Tree	Minimum Height of Coniferous Replacement Tree
14	8 cm	n/a
17	n/a	4 m

To satisfy the replacement ratios established in the OCP, the applicant will contribute \$72,750.00 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund in lieu of the remaining 97 trees that cannot be accommodated on the subject property after redevelopment. Additional opportunities for on-site tree planting will be reviewed through the Development Permit process.

Tree Protection

Two Trees (tag# 3 & 20) located on the neighbouring property at 8891 Patterson Road are located in close proximity to the subject site. The trees are in good health condition and have been identified for retention. Should the detailed design of the project determine that these are in conflict with the proposed development, the applicant will be required to obtain consent from the property owner to remove the two trees or redesign the building in order to retain the trees. If the trees are authorized for removal the applicant is required to provide 2:1 compensation. Further details will be provided at the time of the Development Permit application.

Three Trees (tag# B, C, D) located south of lot # 2, 8931 Patterson Road are to be retained and protected. However, these trees may be relocated or compensation provided for them as determined to the satisfaction of City Parks through the Development Permit process.

Six Trees along the Garden City Boulevard are in good health and condition and are to be retained and protected.

To ensure that the trees identified for retention are protected at the development stage, the applicant is required to complete the following items:

- Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, submission to the City of a contract with a Certified Arborist for the supervision of all works conducted within or in close proximity to tree protection zones. The contract must include the scope of work required, the number of proposed monitoring inspections at specified stages of construction, any special measures required to ensure tree protection and a provision for the arborist to submit a post-construction impact assessment to the City for review.
- Tree protection fencing must be installed to City standard in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03 prior to any works being conducted on-site and remain in place until construction and landscaping on-site are completed.

Public Art

The CCAP encourages voluntary developer contributions towards public art, especially in the case of projects, like the subject development, that are situated along key public open space corridors (e.g., Capstan Greenway). The developer has proposed to integrate public art with the proposed development. Staff recommend acceptance of the developer's offer with a minimum value of at least \$138,551.77, based on City-approved rates and the maximum buildable floor area permitted under the subject site's proposed "Residential/Limited Commercial (ZMU54)" zone, excluding affordable housing (as indicated in the table below). Prior to rezoning adoption, the developer will prepare a public art plan for consideration by the Richmond Public Art Advisory Committee and, as required, Council, followed by the registration of legal agreements on Title to secure the implementation of the approved plan to the City's satisfaction.

(NOTE: The developer prepared a public art plan, which was presented and endorsed by the Richmond Public Art Advisory Committee on Feb 14, 2023.)

Use	Max. Permitted Floor Area Under ZMU54 Zone	Affordable Housing Exemption	Min. Developer Contribution Rates	Min. Voluntary Developer Contribution
Residential	12,271.25 m ² (132,086.51 ft ²)	1,847.54 m ² (19,886.75 ft ²)	\$0.99/ft ²	\$111,077.77
Non-Residential	4,908.5 m ² (52,834.6 ft ²)	Nil	\$0.52/ft ²	\$27,473.99
TOTAL	17,179.75 m² (184,921.11 ft²)	1,847.54 m² (19,886.75 ft²)	Varies	\$138,551.77

Variance Requested

None.

Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

City policy requires that the developer is responsible for the design and construction of water, storm sewer and sanitary sewer upgrades, together with related public and private utility improvements, arising as a result of the proposed development, as determined to the satisfaction of the City. Prior to rezoning adoption, the developer will enter into a standard City Servicing Agreement, secured with a Letter of Credit, for the design and construction of required off-site works, as set out in the attached Rezoning Considerations (Attachment 8): including but not limited to:

- City utility works (water, sanitary, storm sewer) upgrades and connections.
- Road and frontage improvements to Patterson Road, Sea Island Way and Garden City Road.
- The greenway on the future City lot adjacent to Sea Island Way.
- Refinements to the interface with adjacent Patterson Park.

Sustainability

The sustainability requirements set out in the applicable sections of Richmond's BC Energy Step Code for the proposed mixed use residential and hotel buildings is Step 2 with the provision of a low-carbon building energy system with a provision for future connection to a future City owned district energy utility system. The mechanical engineer has provided a letter confirming the project is being designed to achieve Step 2 with the provision of a privately owned low-carbon building energy system on the subject site. More information regarding the development's sustainability initiatives will be provided at the Development Permit stage.

Future Development Permit Application Considerations

Development Permit approval, to the satisfaction of the Director, Development, is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. At Development Permit stage, additional design development is encouraged with respect to the following items:

- Streetscape along Sea Island Way: Soften the raised parkade using planting and proposed integration of public art on the north along the proposed Sea Island Way Greenway.

Refine the alignment of active transportation infrastructure within the Sea Island Way Greenway to maximize buffer to adjacent traffic should future widening of Sea Island Way be required.

- Parkade and Patio along Patterson Road: Lower the patio to have a better interface with Patterson while situating the portion of parkade below finished grade.
- Architectural Design: The façade and materiality are to be further developed in response to the key gateway site.
- Common Amenity Spaces: The proposal includes approximately 148.87 m² of shared indoor amenity space and 1,016.42 m² of shared outdoor amenity space, exceeding the OCP Development Permit Guidelines rates for indoor amenity space (Min. 100 m²) and for outdoor amenity space (Min. 978 m²). More information is required with respect to the programming, design, and landscaping of these spaces to ensure they satisfy City objectives.
- Accessibility: Design and distribution of Basic Universal Housing units, adaptable units, aging-in-place features, and common spaces.
- Sustainability: Opportunities to enhance building performance in coordination with architectural expression.
- Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED): Opportunities to enhance CPTED measures including surveillance and territoriality to promote a sense of security.
- Parking, Loading & Waste Management: The development proposal is consistent with the Zoning Bylaw and related City requirements. Further design of vehicle parking and circulation, truck manoeuvring, waste management activities, and related features and spaces to ensure all conditions of the Zoning Bylaw are met. This includes maintaining proposed parking provisions while ensuring all encroachments into parking and loading facilities are removed and adequate buffers and dimensions are maintained.

Financial Impact or Economic Impact

As a result of the proposed development, the City will take ownership of developer contributed assets constructed to City standards, such as road works, waterworks, storm sewers, sanitary sewers, street lights, street trees, bike lanes and traffic signals. The anticipated operating budget impact for the ongoing maintenance of these assets is insignificant.

Conclusion

Dava Developments Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone lands at 8911, 8931, 8951, 8991 Patterson Road from "Residential Single Family (RS1/F)" to a new "Residential/Limited Commercial (ZMU54)" zone and "School & Institutional Use (SI)" zone, in the City Centre's Capstan Village area to permit the development of a mixed-use mid rise and high-rise development, comprised of 163 dwellings and 100 hotel guest rooms.

It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10464 be introduced and given first reading.





Virendra Kallianpur
Program Manager, Urban Design
(604-247-4620)

VK:js

- Att.
- 1: Location Map
 - 2: City Centre Capstan Village Area Plan
 - 3: Conceptual Development Plans
 - 4: Development Application Data Sheet
 - 5: Public Correspondence
 - 6: Non-profit letter of partnership
 - 7: Non-profit letter of support
 - 8: Tree Management Plan
 - 9: Rezoning Considerations



City of Richmond



RZ 20-919113


Original Date: 12/17/20

Revision Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



City of Richmond



RZ 20-919113


Original Date: 12/17/20

Revision Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES

Specific Land Use Map: Capstan Village (2031)

Bylaw 9593
2017/05/08



Bylaw 10020
2019/05/21

Maximum building height may be subject to established Airport Zoning Regulations in certain areas.


PROJECT

8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC

VISUALLY EXPOSED ACCESSIBLE
RAMPS INSIDE AND OUTSIDE
HOTEL LOBBY CONNECTING
PODIUM LEVEL AND GARDEN
CITY ROAD WITH THE INTERIOR
STAIR CORE BEHIND

DIRECT PEDESTRIAN ENTRY
TO THE LOWERED HOTEL
LOBBY LEVEL FACING
GARDEN CITY ROAD WITH
FULL HEIGHT TRANSPARENT
GLAZING

EXTENDED TRANSPARENT
BUILDING FRONTAGE ON
GARDEN CITY ROAD WITH THE
LOWERED GROUND LEVEL HOTEL
AMENITY SPACE EXPOSED



PATTERSON ROAD PERSPECTIVE VIEW

PROPOSED HOTEL & RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
AT 8911-8991 PATTERSON ROAD RICHMOND BC

PROJECT TEAM

CLIENT/OWNER:
DAVA DEVELOPMENTS LTD.
ARCHITECTURAL:
TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
LANDSCAPE:
PMD LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS LTD.
CIVIL:
MPT ENGINEERING CO. LTD.
TRAFFIC:
BLUNT & ASSOCIATES ENGINEERING LTD.
ELECTRICAL & MECHANICAL:
WILLIAMS ENGINEERING CANADA INC.
STRUCTURAL:
BROWNS
CONSULTING STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS
ACOUSTIC:
BROWN STRACHAN ASSOCIATES
BUILDING CODE:
LMDO BUILDING CODE CONSULTANTS LTD.
PUBLIC ART:
LYNNE WIEKER ARCHITECT

ARCHITECTURAL DRAWING LIST

COVER PAGE
A-000
SITE PLAN - LEVEL 1
A-101a
SITE PLAN - EXISTING IMAGES
A-101b
PRELIMINARY PROJECT DATA
A-101c
SITE ACCESS PLAN
A-103
SITE PLAN - WASTE MANAGEMENT
A-104
SITE PLAN - WASTE MANAGEMENT
A-105
SHADOW ANALYSIS
A-106
SHADOW ANALYSIS - 35m BUILDING HEIGHT STUDY
A-107
SHADOW ANALYSIS - 35m BUILDING HEIGHT STUDY
A-108
PARKING LEVEL P1 FLOOR PLAN
A-201
PARKING LEVEL P2 FLOOR PLAN
A-202
RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 1 & HOTEL LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN
A-203
RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 2 & HOTEL LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN
A-204
RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 3 & HOTEL LEVEL 3 FLOOR PLAN
A-205
RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 4 & HOTEL LEVEL 4 FLOOR PLAN
A-206a
RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 5-7 & HOTEL LEVEL 5-7 FLOOR PLAN
A-206b
RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 8 & HOTEL LEVEL 8 FLOOR PLAN
A-207
RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 9 & HOTEL LEVEL 9 FLOOR PLAN
A-208
RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 10 FLOOR PLAN
A-209
RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 11-14 FLOOR PLAN
A-210
ROOF PLAN
A-211
BUILDING ELEVATIONS
A-301
BUILDING ELEVATIONS
A-302
BUILDING SECTION
A-303
BUILDING SECTION
A-304
BUILDING ELEVATION & SECTIONS
A-305
DESIGN REFERENCE IMAGES
A-306

REVISIONS	REMARKS
NO. DATE	
1. JAN 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
2. FEB 05, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
3. FEB 14, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
4. MAR 04, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
5. MAR 25, 2020	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
6. MAR 25, 2020	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
7. JUL 17, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
8. JUL 17, 2020	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
9. AUG 18, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
10. OCT 15, 2020	ISSUED FOR REZONING
11. OCT 15, 2020	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
12. JUL 29, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
13. AUG 18, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
14. SEP 27, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
15. SEP 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
16. SEP 27, 2021	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
17. OCT 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
18. NOV 20, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
19. JAN 24, 2022	ISSUED FOR REZONING
20. JAN 24, 2022	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
21. JAN 11, 2023	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
22. JAN 13, 2023	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
23. JAN 27, 2023	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
24. JAN 24, 2023	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
25. JAN 27, 2023	ISSUED FOR REZONING
26. FEB 02, 2023	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
27. APR 11, 2023	ISSUED FOR REZONING
28. MAY 11, 2023	APPLICATION

NOTES

- INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE DRAWINGS IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY AND NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION.
- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.
- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE

TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3865 VIKINGSWAY, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V6V 8W2

T 779-686-8826 E info@tackarchitect.com
W tackarchitect.com

DRAWING TITLE

COVER PAGE

SCALE	
DRAWN	TC
REVISION	AS SHOWN
PROJECT NO.	2019061101
DATE	MAY 11, 2023
DRAWING NO.	

A-0.00




GARDEN CITY ROAD PERSPECTIVE VIEW

PROJECT

SEA ISLAND WAY

8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC

281'-5 1/2" (85.79m)



REVISIONS	REMARKS
1. JAN 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
2. JAN 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
3. FEB 14, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
4. MAR 04, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
5. APR 04, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
6. MAY 25, 2020	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
7. JUL 17, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
8. AUG 18, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
9. OCT 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
10. OCT 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
11. OCT 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
12. JUL 29, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
13. AUG 18, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
14. SEP 27, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
15. SEP 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
16. NOV 20, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
17. JAN 24, 2022	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
18. JAN 24, 2022	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
19. JAN 24, 2022	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
20. JAN 24, 2022	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
21. JAN 11, 2023	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
22. JAN 13, 2023	REVIEW FOR REZONING
23. JAN 24, 2023	REVIEW FOR REZONING
24. JAN 24, 2023	REVIEW FOR REZONING
25. JAN 27, 2023	REVIEW FOR REZONING
26. APR 11, 2023	REVIEW FOR REZONING
27. APR 11, 2023	REVIEW FOR REZONING
28. MAY 11, 2023	APPLICATION

NOTES

INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE DRAWINGS IS FOR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES ONLY AND NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION. THE DRAWINGS ARE NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSES WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE

TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3865 VANGUARD WAY, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V6V 2V2

T 779-666-8826 E info@tchanarch.com
W tchanarchitect.com


DRAWING TITLE

SITE PLAN



SCALE	1/16" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	TC
REVISION	AS SHOWN
PROJECT NO.	2019061101
DATE	MAY 11, 2023
DRAWING NO.	

A-1.01a



PRELIMINARY PROJECT DATA	
Civic ADDRESS	8911-8991 PATTERSON ROAD, RICHMOND, BC
LEGAL DESCRIPTION	PLAN 3404, PLAN 7957 AS PER SURVEY DRAWING DESCRIPTION
ZONING/USE	PROPOSED: SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/F)
LOT SIZE	NET: 4,908.5 m ² AS PER SURVEY DRAWING
	DEDICATION: 830 m ² APPROX.
DENSITY (FAR)	GROSS: 5,738.5 m ² APPROX.
	NET: 4,908.5 m ² APPROX.
SETBACK	NORTH (FACING SEA ISLAND WAY): 10 m REQUIRED EAST (FACING GARDEN CITY ROAD): 3 m PROPOSED SOUTH (FACING PATTERSON ROAD): 3 m PROPOSED WEST (INTERIOR SIDE YARD): 0 m PROPOSED (TOWER SETBACK 17.5m REQUIRED)
BUILDING HEIGHT	ALLOWABLE: 35 m PER OCP/CARPATAN VILLAGE - URBAN CENTRE 15 PROPOSED (RESIDENTIAL): 41.33 m & 24.13 m TOP OF ROOF PROPOSED (HOTEL): 24.13 m TOP OF ROOF
LOT COVERAGE	ALLOWABLE: 90% PROPOSED: 74.13% (3,688.02 m ²)

RESIDENTIAL UNIT SUMMARY									
LEVEL	UNIT	BEDROOM	BEDROOM	BEDROOM	THREE	NO. OF UNITS	AFORDABLE HOUSING UNIT (AHU)	NO. OF UNITS	NO. OF BASIC UNIVERSAL HOUSING UNIT
1	--	--	--	--	3	3	--	--	--
2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3	1 (1 AHU)	3 (3 AHU)	4 (4 AHU)	4 (4 AHU)	12	12	876.95	10 (10 AHU)	10 (10 AHU)
4	1 (1 AHU)	1 (1 AHU)	2 (2 AHU)	2 (2 AHU)	15	15	970.59	13 (13 AHU)	13 (13 AHU)
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	2 AHU	80 (10 AHU)	55 (8 AHU)	23 (8 AHU)	3	163	27	1,847.54	38 (23 AHU)

PARKING CALCULATION				
LAND USE	UNITS/ROOMS/AREA	ZONING BYLAW REQUIREMENT	PARKING REQUIRED	PARKING PROVIDED
RESIDENCE	136 UNITS	7.9.3.1	1 PARKING SPACE PER DU/2 VISITOR	131 (109-23 VISITOR)
AFORDABLE HOUSING	27 UNITS	7.9.3.1	0.8 PARKING SPACE PER DU/2 VISITOR	23 (18-5 VISITOR)
HOTEL ROOMS	100 ROOMS	7.12.2.3/7.9.5.1	1 SPACE PER 2 GUEST ROOM	34
HOTEL RESTAURANT	131.00 m ²	7.12.2.3/7.9.4.1	+15% ZONE 1 REDUCTION	4
HOTEL OFFICE/STAFF AREA	45.92 m ²	7.12.2.3/7.9.4.1	3.7% PARKING SPACES PER 100 m ²	2
				194 (TOTAL REQUIRED)

PARKING SUMMARY									
LEVEL	RESIDENCE	VISITOR	HOTEL	CARSHARE	TOTAL NO. OF PARKING	REGULAR PARKING	SMALL PARKING	ACCESSIBLE PARKING	REMARKS
LEVEL P1	34	17	38	2	89	42 (10 RES-13 VISITOR-20 HOTEL)	47 (4 RES-4 VISITOR-18 HOTEL)	3 (2 RES-1 HOTEL)	
LEVEL P2	116	--	--	--	116	64 (RES)	52 (RES)	3 (RES)	
TOTAL	130	27	40	2	219	110 (74 RES-14 VISITOR-20 HOTEL-2 CS)	109 (69 RES-13 VISITOR-20 HOTEL)	6 (5 RES-1 HOTEL)	

LOADING CALCULATION				
LAND USE	GLA	UNITS/ROOMS	REFERENCE	LOADING SIZE
RESIDENTIAL	--	165	7.13.6.1	1
HOTEL	4,908.50 m ²	100	7.13.6.2	2
TOTAL REQUIRED				3
TOTAL PROVIDED				--

BICYCLE PARKING CALCULATION				
LAND USE	UNITS/GLA	ZONING BYLAW REFERENCE	CLASS 1	CLASS 2
RESIDENTIAL	163 UNITS	7.14.9.1	204	33
TOTAL REQUIRED	4,908.50 m ²	7.14.9.1	217	48
TOTAL PROVIDED			221 (HORIZONTAL 138 RES-14 HOTEL-1 VERTICAL 60 RES)	48 (20 RES-14 HOTEL)

GENERAL NOTES:
1. THE BEST TO STEP CODE AS PER BUILDING REGULATIONS (BYLAW NO. 729) AND SUBSEQUENT BYLAW NO. 3799 AND THE ENERGY STEP CODE TARGETS HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED IN THE PROPOSED DESIGN AS PER BULLETIN DEPART-13. THE DEVELOPMENT IS SITUATED IN A FUTURE DEU SERVICE AREA AND SUBJECT TO CITY CENTRE DISTRICT CONNECTION TO DISTRICT HEATING AND CHILLED WATER SERVICES. SINCE A LOTS WILL BE PROVIDED FOR THE SITE, (CES) AS WELL AS DESIGNED FOR FUTURE CONNECTION TO DISTRICT HEATING AND CHILLED WATER SERVICES. SINCE A LOTS WILL BE PROVIDED FOR THE SITE, BOTH THE RESIDENTIAL BUILDING AND HOTEL WILL BE TARGETING STEP 2 ENERGY PERFORMANCE AS PERMITTED BY BYLAW 3799.

RESIDENTIAL AREA SUMMARY									
LEVEL	GROSS AREA (m ²)	CORES	LOBBY & INT. CIRCULATION (m ²)	E & M CLOSET & REC'D ROOMS (m ²)	SUNLIT AREA (m ²)	G	H	INDOOR AMENITY (m ²)	OUTDOOR AMENITY (m ²)
1	47.74	60.84	82.35	212.09 (WITHIN PARKING)	119.49	--	--	--	282.68 (C-D-F)
2	1,065.23	60.84	145.49	3.15	876.95	--	--	--	1,022.43 (D-F)
3	1,269.29	75.27	109.09	3.15	1,081.78	--	--	--	1,190.87 (D-F)
4	1,269.29	75.27	109.09	3.15	1,081.78	--	--	--	1,190.87 (D-F)
5	1,269.29	75.27	109.09	3.15	1,081.78	--	--	--	1,190.87 (D-F)
6	1,269.29	75.27	109.09	3.15	1,081.78	--	--	--	1,190.87 (D-F)
7	1,269.29	75.27	109.09	3.15	1,081.78	--	--	--	1,190.87 (D-F)
8	1,269.29	75.27	109.09	3.15	1,081.78	--	--	--	1,190.87 (D-F)
9	825.34	75.27	86.10	3.15	611.95	--	--	--	1,016.42
10	801.11	56.10	80.98	3.15	760.88	--	--	--	841.85 (D-F)
11	801.11	56.10	80.98	3.15	760.88	--	--	--	841.85 (D-F)
12	801.11	56.10	80.98	3.15	760.88	--	--	--	841.85 (D-F)
13	801.11	56.10	80.98	3.15	760.88	--	--	--	841.85 (D-F)
14	801.11	56.10	80.98	3.15	760.88	--	--	--	841.85 (D-F)
ROOF	86.54	41.47	--	45.07	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	13,699.30					148.87		1,016.42*	12,316.91
FAR									2.50*

NOTES:
1. OUTDOOR AMENITY SPACE INCLUDED IN FAR AREA OF 48.15 m² PER UNIT X 165 UNITS.
2. BASIC UNIVERSAL HOUSING BULK FLOOR AREA EXEMPTION IS APPLIED FOR THE TOTAL FAR CALCULATION (1.86 m² PER BULK UNIT ZONING BYLAW 4.2.1).
3. ABOVE FIGURES ARE ROUNDED UP TO 0.01 m² AND CALCULATED WITH THE EXTERIOR WALL THICKNESS EXCLUSION AS PER ZONING BYLAW 4.2.1 (C).

HOTEL AREA SUMMARY									
LEVEL	GROSS AREA (m ²)	CORES	LOBBY & INT. CIRCULATION (m ²)	E & M CLOSET & REC'D ROOMS (m ²)	SUNLIT AREA (m ²)	G	H	INDOOR AMENITY (m ²)	OUTDOOR AMENITY (m ²)
1	750.69	60.26	316.51	71.82	181.10	121.00	678.87	C-D-F-H-G	--
2	769.09	60.26	89.48	24.73	594.62	--	684.10	D-F-H	15
3	769.09	60.26	89.48	2.58	616.77	--	708.25	D-F-H	17
4	769.09	60.26	89.48	2.58	616.77	--	708.25	D-F-H	17
5	769.09	60.26	89.48	2.58	616.77	--	708.25	D-F-H	17
6	769.09	60.26	89.48	2.58	616.77	--	708.25	D-F-H	17
7	769.09	60.26	89.48	2.58	616.77	--	708.25	D-F-H	17
ROOF	74.54						14.28 (D)		--
TOTAL	5,439.77						4,908.50		100
FAR									1.00

NOTES:
1. ABOVE FIGURES ARE ROUNDED UP TO 0.01 m² AND CALCULATED WITH THE EXTERIOR WALL THICKNESS EXCLUSION AS PER ZONING BYLAW 4.2.1 (C).

PROJECT
8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC

REVISIONS	NO.	DATE	REMARKS
1	JAN 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
2	FEB 14, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
3	MAR 04, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
4	MAY 25, 2020	CONSULTANT COORDINATION	
5	JUL 17, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
6	AUG 18, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
7	OCT 15, 2020	REVIEW FOR REZONING	
8	JAN 26, 2021	REVISION PROGRESS REVIEW	
9	AUG 18, 2021	STRUCTURAL COORDINATION	
10	SEP 15, 2021	CONSULTANT COORDINATION	
11	NOV 20, 2021	REVIEW FOR REZONING	
12	JAN 11, 2023	CONSULTANT COORDINATION	
13	JAN 13, 2023	REVIEW FOR REZONING	
14	JAN 24, 2023	REVIEW FOR REZONING	
15	JAN 27, 2023	ISSUED FOR REZONING	
16	FEB 01, 2023	ISSUED FOR REZONING	
17	APR 11, 2023	ISSUED FOR REZONING	
18	MAY 11, 2023	APPLICATION	


NOTES
- INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE DRAWINGS IS FOR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES ONLY AND NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION.
- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE
TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3865 VINCENY WAY, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V6R 5V2
T 779-666-8826 E info@tackarchitect.com
W tackarchitect.com

PRELIMINARY
PROJECT DATA

SCALE	TC
DRAWN	AS SHOWN
REVISION	2019061101
PROJECT NO.	MAY 11, 2023
DATE	
DRAWING NO.	


A-1.02




SUMMER SOLSTICE JUNE 21 - 12:00 PM



SUMMER SOLSTICE JUNE 21 - 04:00 PM



SUMMER SOLSTICE JUNE 21 - 10:00 AM



SUMMER SOLSTICE JUNE 21 - 02:00 PM

PROJECT
8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC

REVISIONS	NO.	DATE	REMARKS
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	1.	NOV 16, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
REVISION FOR REZONING	2.	NOV 16, 2020	REVISION FOR REZONING
REVISION FOR REZONING	3.	NOV 30, 2021	REVISION FOR REZONING
REVISION FOR REZONING	4.	JAN 24, 2022	REVISION FOR REZONING
REVISION FOR REZONING	5.	JAN 24, 2022	REVISION FOR REZONING
REVISION FOR REZONING	6.	JAN 24, 2022	REVISION FOR REZONING
REVISION FOR REZONING	7.	JAN 27, 2023	REVISION FOR REZONING
REVISION FOR REZONING	8.	JAN 27, 2023	REVISION FOR REZONING
REVISION FOR REZONING	9.	MAY 11, 2023	REVISION FOR REZONING
APPLICATION			

NOTES
- INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE DRAWINGS IS FOR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES ONLY AND NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION.
- THE INFORMATION IS NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE.
- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE
TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3865 VIKINGSWAY, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V6R 6W2
T 779-668-8826 E info@tchanarchitect.com
W tchanarchitect.com
DRAWING TITLE
SHADOW ANALYSIS



SCALE	1" = 50'-0" (1:600)
DRAWN	TC
REVISION	AS SHOWN
PROJECT NO.	2019061101
DATE	MAY 11, 2023
DRAWING NO.	

A-1.06

PROJECT
8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC

REVISIONS	
NO.	DATE
1.	NOV 16, 2020
2.	NOV 16, 2020
3.	NOV 16, 2020
4.	JAN 24, 2021
5.	JAN 24, 2021
6.	JAN 24, 2021
7.	JAN 27, 2023
8.	MAY 11, 2023
9.	MAY 11, 2023

REVISIONS
1. NOV 16, 2020
2. NOV 16, 2020
3. NOV 16, 2020
4. JAN 24, 2021
5. JAN 24, 2021
6. JAN 24, 2021
7. JAN 27, 2023
8. MAY 11, 2023
9. MAY 11, 2023

NOTES
- INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE DRAWINGS IS FOR
- CONSTRUCTION ONLY AND NOT FOR
- CONSTRUCTION. THE DRAWINGS ARE
- SUBJECT TO ENGINEERING AND CITY'S REVIEW.
- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE
- VERIFIED ON SITE.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE

TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3865 VIKINGSWAY, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V6V 8W2

T 779-686-8826 E info@tchanarch.com
W tchanarch.com


DRAWING TITLE

SHADOW ANALYSIS




SCALE	1" = 50'-0" (1:600)
DRAWN	TC
REVISION	AS SHOWN
PROJECT NO.	2019061101
DATE	MAY 11, 2023
DRAWING NO.	


A-1.07




AUTUMN EQUINOX SEPTEMBER 22 - 12:00 PM



AUTUMN EQUINOX SEPTEMBER 22 - 04:00 PM



AUTUMN EQUINOX SEPTEMBER 22 - 10:00 AM




AUTUMN EQUINOX SEPTEMBER 22 - 02:00 PM

SEA ISLAND WAY

PROJECT

8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC



PROPERTY LINE

STANDARD SPACE LEGEND
RES. STD. - RESIDENTIAL STANDARD SPACE 4.5m x 7.0m
RES. SC - RESIDENTIAL SMALL SPACE 3.0m x 7.0m
V-RES. STD. - RESIDENTIAL VISITOR STANDARD SPACE 4.5m x 7.0m
V-RES. SC - RESIDENTIAL VISITOR SMALL SPACE 3.0m x 7.0m
HOTEL STD. - HOTEL STANDARD SPACE 4.5m x 7.0m
HOTEL SC - HOTEL SMALL SPACE 3.0m x 7.0m
ACCESSIBLE - 4.5m x 7.0m WITH 1.5m SHARED BAY
VAN ACCESSIBLE - 4.5m x 7.0m WITH 1.5m SHARED BAY
PER ZONING BY LAW 7.5.11

RESIDENTIAL LEVEL P2
PARKING (116 STALLS)
[E.L. -1.87m]

PH - 126

REVISIONS	NO.	DATE	REMARKS
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	1	JAN 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	2	FEB 14, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	3	MAR 04, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	4	MAR 23, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	5	MAY 25, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	6	JUL 17, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	7	AUG 18, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	8	AUG 18, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	9	OCT 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	10	OCT 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	11	JUL 29, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	12	JUL 29, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	13	AUG 18, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	14	AUG 18, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	15	SEP 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	16	SEP 27, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	17	OCT 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	18	NOV 20, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	19	JAN 24, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	20	JAN 24, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	21	NOV 10, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	22	DEC 09, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	23	DEC 09, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	24	DEC 14, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	25	DEC 20, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	26	DEC 20, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	27	JAN 24, 2023	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	28	JAN 27, 2023	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	29	JAN 27, 2023	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	30	APR 11, 2023	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	31	MAY 11, 2023	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW

NOTES
- INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE DRAWINGS IS FOR CONSTRUCTION ONLY.
- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.
- SUBJECT TO ENGINEERING AND CITY'S REVIEW.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE

TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3865 WILSON AVENUE, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V6R 5N2

T 779-686-8826 E info@tackarchitect.com
W tackarchitect.com

DRAWING TITLE

PARKING LEVEL P2
FLOOR PLAN



SCALE	3/32" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	TC
REVISION	AS SHOWN
PROJECT NO.	2019061101
DATE	MAY 11, 2023
DRAWING NO.	

A-2.01

NO.	DATE	REVISIONS	REMARKS
1	01.03.2020	1	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
2	02.03.2020	2	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
3	03.03.2020	3	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
4	04.03.2020	4	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
5	05.03.2020	5	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
6	06.03.2020	6	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
7	07.03.2020	7	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
8	08.03.2020	8	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
9	09.03.2020	9	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
10	10.03.2020	10	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
11	11.03.2020	11	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
12	12.03.2020	12	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
13	13.03.2020	13	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
14	14.03.2020	14	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
15	15.03.2020	15	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
16	16.03.2020	16	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
17	17.03.2020	17	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
18	18.03.2020	18	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
19	19.03.2020	19	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
20	20.03.2020	20	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
21	21.03.2020	21	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
22	22.03.2020	22	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
23	23.03.2020	23	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
24	24.03.2020	24	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
25	25.03.2020	25	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
26	26.03.2020	26	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
27	27.03.2020	27	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
28	28.03.2020	28	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
29	29.03.2020	29	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
30	30.03.2020	30	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
31	31.03.2020	31	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW

- INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THIS DRAWING IS FOR PRELIMINARY REFERENCE ONLY AND NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION.
- SITE PLAN AND BUILDING CONFIGURATIONS ARE SUBJECT TO ENGINEERING AND CITY'S REVIEWS.
- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE

TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3665 KINGSWAY, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V5R 5M2


T 778-668-8826 **E** info@takchanarch.com
W TakChanArchitecture.com

DRAWING TITLE

PARKING LEVEL P1
FLOOR PLAN


SCALE	3/32" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	TC
REVISION	AS SHOWN
PROJECT NO.	2019061101
DATE	MAY 11, 2023
DRAWING NO.	

A-2.02



PROJECT

8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC



PH - 128

REVISIONS	NO.	DATE	REMARKS
1.	JAN 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
2.	FEB 14, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
3.	MAR 04, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
4.	MAY 25, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
5.	JUL 17, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
6.	AUG 18, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
7.	OCT 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
8.	NOV 10, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
9.	DEC 09, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
10.	JAN 14, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
11.	FEB 14, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
12.	MAR 04, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
13.	APR 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
14.	MAY 25, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
15.	JUN 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
16.	JUL 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
17.	AUG 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
18.	SEP 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
19.	OCT 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
20.	NOV 10, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
21.	DEC 09, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
22.	JAN 14, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
23.	FEB 14, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
24.	MAR 04, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
25.	APR 15, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
26.	MAY 25, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
27.	JUN 15, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
28.	JUL 15, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
29.	AUG 15, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
30.	SEP 15, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
31.	OCT 15, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	

NOTES

1. INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE DRAWINGS IS FOR CONSTRUCTION ONLY. IT IS NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSES WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT.

2. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE

TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3885 VICTORIA PARKWAY, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V6J 8V2

T: 779-668-8826 E: info@tchanarchitect.com
W: tchanarchitect.com

DRAWING TITLE

RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 1
& HOTEL LEVEL 1
FLOOR PLAN

NORTH

SCALE 3/32" = 1'-0"

DRAWN TC

REVISION AS SHOWN

PROJECT NO. 2019061101

DATE MAY 11, 2023

DRAWING NO.

A-2.03

8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC

REVIEWS	DATE	REMARKS
1	2020 FEB 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
2	2020 FEB 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
3	2020 FEB 14, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
4	2020 APR 22, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
5	2020 MAR 29, 2020	STRUCTURAL COORDINATION
6	2020 MAR 29, 2020	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
7	2020 MAR 29, 2020	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
8	2020 AUG 13, 2020	REVIEW FOR REZONING
9	2020 AUG 13, 2020	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
10	2020 JUL 17, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
11	2020 JUL 17, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
12	2020 JUL 17, 2020	STRUCTURAL COORDINATION
13	2020 AUG 28, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
14	2020 AUG 28, 2021	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
15	2020 SEP 27, 2021	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
16	2020 OCT 07, 2021	REVIEW FOR REZONING
17	2020 OCT 07, 2021	REVIEW FOR REZONING
18	2020 JAN 24, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
19	2020 JAN 24, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW
20	2020 JAN 24, 2022	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
21	2020 DEC 09, 2022	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
22	2020 DEC 09, 2022	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
23	2020 DEC 14, 2022	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
24	2020 DEC 14, 2022	CONSULTANT COORDINATION
25	2020 DEC 20, 2022	REVIEW FOR REZONING
26	2020 JAN 27, 2023	REVIEW FOR REZONING
27	2020 JAN 27, 2023	REVIEW FOR REZONING
28	2020 MAR 11, 2023	REVIEW FOR REZONING
29	2020 MAR 11, 2023	REVIEW FOR REZONING
30	2020 MAR 11, 2023	APPLICATION
31	2020 MAR 11, 2023	APPLICATION

- INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THIS DRAWING IS FOR PRELIMINARY REFERENCE ONLY AND NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION.
- SITE PLAN AND BUILDING CONFIGURATIONS ARE SUBJECT TO ENGINEERING AND CITY'S REVIEWS.
- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE

TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3665 KINGSWAY, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V5R 5W2


T 778-668-8826 **E** info@takchanarch.com
W TakChanArchitecture.com

DRAWING TITLE

RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 2
FLOOR PLAN

SCALE	3/32" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	TC
REVISION	AS SHOWN
PROJECT NO.	2019061101
DATE	MAY 11, 2023
DRAWING NO.	

A-2.04



SEA ISLAND WAY


PROJECT

8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC

PROPERTY LINE

BALCONY/FATIO DATA SUMMARY				
UNIT TYPE	AREA (m2)	W x D (DIMENSION (m))	UNIT TYPE	
18-B	7.77	3.9 x 2.50	25-B	8.79
18-C	7.77	3.81 x 3.00/1.73	25-C	14.20
18-D	6.24	2.84 x 2.50	25-D	10.47
18-E	6.24	2.84 x 2.39	25-E	10.47
18-F	6.24	3.76 x 2.00/1.24	25-F	12.70
18-G	6.24	3.76 x 2.00/1.24	25-G	12.70
18-H	6.00	3.49 x 2.00/1.24	25-H	15.61
18-I	6.00	3.49 x 2.00/1.24	25-I	15.61
18-J	6.00	3.49 x 2.00/1.24	25-J	13.30

HOTEL LEVEL 2



RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 3

PH - 130

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE

TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3865 WILSON AVENUE, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V6J 3V2

T: 779-686-8826 E: info@tchanarch.com
W: tchanarch.com

DRAWING TITLE

RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 3
& HOTEL LEVEL 2
FLOOR PLAN



SCALE	3/32" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	TC
REVISION	AS SHOWN
PROJECT NO.	2019061101
DATE	MAY 11, 2023
DRAWING NO.	

A-2.05

SEA ISLAND WAY

PROJECT

8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC

PROPERTY LINE

BALCONY/FATIO DATA SUMMARY				
UNIT TYPE	AREA (m2)	W x D DIMENSION (m)	UNIT TYPE	
1B-A	7.77	3.92 x 2.50	25-B	8.79
1B-B	7.77	3.92 x 2.50	25-C	14.20
1B-D	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	25-D	10.46
1B-E	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	25-E	12.70
1B-F	6.24	3.76 x 2.00/1.24	25-F	15.61
1B-G	6.24	3.76 x 2.00/1.24	25-G	13.30
1B-H	6.00	3.49 x 2.00/1.24	25-H	13.30
1B-I	6.00	3.49 x 2.00/1.24	25-I	13.30

HOTEL LEVEL 3-7

RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 4

PH - 131

REVISIONS	NO.	DATE	REMARKS
1.	JAN 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
2.	FEB 14, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
3.	MAR 04, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
4.	MAR 25, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
5.	JUN 17, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
6.	AUG 13, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
7.	OCT 15, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
8.	NOV 27, 2020	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
9.	JAN 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
10.	FEB 14, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
11.	MAR 04, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
12.	MAR 25, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
13.	APR 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
14.	MAY 04, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
15.	MAY 25, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
16.	JUN 17, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
17.	JUL 14, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
18.	AUG 13, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
19.	SEP 04, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
20.	SEP 27, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
21.	OCT 15, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
22.	NOV 27, 2021	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
23.	JAN 15, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
24.	FEB 14, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
25.	MAR 04, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
26.	MAR 25, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
27.	APR 15, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
28.	MAY 04, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
29.	MAY 25, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
30.	JUN 17, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	
31.	JUL 14, 2022	DESIGN PROGRESS REVIEW	

NOTES

1. INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE DRAWINGS IS FOR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES ONLY.

2. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.

3. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE

TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3865 VICTORIA PARKWAY, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V6J 8V2

T: 779-686-8826 E: info@tchanarch.com
W: tchanarch.com


DRAWING TITLE

RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 4
& HOTEL LEVEL 3-7
FLOOR PLAN



SCALE	3/32" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	TC
REVISION	AS SHOWN
PROJECT NO.	2019061101
DATE	MAY 11, 2023
DRAWING NO.	

A-2.06a



PATTERSON ROAD

GARDEN CITY ROAD

SCALE
1/8" = 1'-0"
1/4" = 1'-0"
1/2" = 1'-0"
3/4" = 1'-0"
1" = 1'-0"

SEA ISLAND WAY


PROJECT

8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC

PROPERTY LINE

BALCONY/FATTO DATA SUMMARY			
UNIT TYPE	AREA (m ²)	W x D (DIMENSION (m))	UNIT TYPE
1B-A	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-B	7.77	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2
1B-C	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-D	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2
1B-E	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-F	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2
1B-G	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-H	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2
1B-I	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-J	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2
1B-K	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-L	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2
1B-M	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-N	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2
1B-O	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-P	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2
1B-Q	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-R	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2
1B-S	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-T	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2
1B-U	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-V	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2
1B-W	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-X	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2
1B-Y	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 10m2
1B-Z	8.84	3.92 x 2.50	2B-A/7/3 12m2

HOTEL LEVEL 3-7



RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 5-7

PH - 132

NOTES

- 1. INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE DRAWINGS IS FOR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES ONLY.
- 2. THE DRAWINGS ARE NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSES WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE.
- 3. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE

TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3865 VIKINGSWAY, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V6V 8W2

T 779-668-8826 E info@tchanarchitect.com
W tchanarchitect.com

DRAWING TITLE

RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 5-7
& HOTEL LEVEL 3-7
FLOOR PLAN



SCALE	3/32" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	TC
REVISION	AS SHOWN
PROJECT NO.	2019061101
DATE	MAY 11, 2023
DRAWING NO.	

A-2.06b

SEA ISLAND WAY

PROJECT


8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC

PROPERTY LINE

BALCONY/FATIO DATA SUMMARY				
UNIT TYPE	AREA (m2)	W x D DIMENSION (m)	UNIT TYPE	
1B-A	8.78	3.92 x 2.50	1B-A	8.78
1B-B	8.78	3.92 x 2.50	1B-B	8.78
1B-C	8.78	3.92 x 2.50	1B-C	8.78
1B-D	10.07	4.56 x 2.50	1B-D	10.07
1B-E	10.07	4.56 x 2.50	1B-E	10.07
1B-F	12.70	5.28 x 2.50	1B-F	12.70
1B-G	12.70	5.28 x 2.50	1B-G	12.70
1B-H	13.13	5.69 x 2.50	1B-H	13.13
1B-I	13.13	5.69 x 2.50	1B-I	13.13
1B-J	13.13	5.69 x 2.50	1B-J	13.13
1B-K	16.61	7.30 x 2.50	1B-K	16.61
1B-L	16.61	7.30 x 2.50	1B-L	16.61
1B-M	13.30	6.08 x 2.50	1B-M	13.30

HOTEL LEVEL 3-7

RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 8



PH - 133

REVISIONS	
NO.	DATE
1.	JAN 15, 2020
2.	FEB 14, 2020
3.	MAR 04, 2020
4.	MAR 14, 2020
5.	MAR 23, 2020
6.	MAR 23, 2020
7.	JUL 17, 2020
8.	AUG 13, 2020
9.	AUG 13, 2020
10.	OCT 15, 2020
11.	JAN 14, 2021
12.	JUL 29, 2021
13.	AUG 18, 2021
14.	AUG 18, 2021
15.	SEP 15, 2021
16.	SEP 27, 2021
17.	SEP 27, 2021
18.	NOV 20, 2021
19.	JAN 24, 2022
20.	FEB 14, 2022
21.	NOV 10, 2022
22.	DEC 09, 2022
23.	DEC 09, 2022
24.	DEC 14, 2022
25.	DEC 20, 2022
26.	DEC 20, 2022
27.	JAN 24, 2023
28.	JAN 27, 2023
29.	FEB 02, 2023
30.	APR 11, 2023
31.	MAY 11, 2023

NOTES

INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE DRAWINGS IS FOR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES ONLY. THE DRAWINGS ARE SUBJECT TO ENGINEERING AND CITY'S REVIEW. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE

TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3865 VIKINGSWAY, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V6V 8W2

T 779-686-8826 E info@tchanarchitect.com
W tchanarchitect.com

DRAWING TITLE

RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 8 &
HOTEL LEVEL 3-7 FLOOR
PLAN



SCALE	3/32" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	TC
REVISION	AS SHOWN
PROJECT NO.	2019061101
DATE	MAY 11, 2023
DRAWING NO.	


A-2.07

SEA ISLAND WAY

PROJECT

8911-8991
PATTERSON ROAD
RICHMOND BC

PROPERTY LINE



REVISIONS	
NO.	DATE
1.	JAN 15, 2020
2.	FEB 10, 2020
3.	FEB 14, 2020
4.	MAR 04, 2020
5.	MAR 10, 2020
6.	MAY 25, 2020
7.	JUL 17, 2020
8.	AUG 15, 2020
9.	OCT 15, 2020
10.	OCT 15, 2020
11.	AUG 18, 2021
12.	JUL 29, 2021
13.	AUG 18, 2021
14.	AUG 18, 2021
15.	SEP 15, 2021
16.	SEP 27, 2021
17.	NOV 10, 2021
18.	NOV 20, 2021
19.	JAN 24, 2022
20.	NOV 10, 2022
21.	NOV 10, 2022
22.	DEC 09, 2022
23.	DEC 14, 2022
24.	DEC 14, 2022
25.	DEC 20, 2022
26.	DEC 20, 2022
27.	JAN 24, 2023
28.	JAN 27, 2023
29.	FEB 02, 2023
30.	APR 11, 2023
31.	MAY 11, 2023

NOTES

INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE DRAWINGS IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY AND DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A CONTRACT. THE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS ARE SUBJECT TO ENGINEERING AND CITY'S REVIEW. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND TO BE VERIFIED ON SITE.

TAK CHAN
ARCHITECTURE

TAK CHAN ARCHITECTURE INC.
300-3865 VIKINGSWAY, VANCOUVER
BC CANADA V6V 8W2

T 779-698-8826 E info@tackarchitect.com
W tackarchitect.com

DRAWING TITLE

RESIDENTIAL LEVEL 9
FLOOR PLAN



SCALE	3/32" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	TC
REVISION	AS SHOWN
PROJECT NO.	2019061101
DATE	MAY 11, 2023
DRAWING NO.	

A-2.08

NO.	DATE	REVISION DESCRIPTION	DR
16	2/21/14/06	GET 11 COMMENTS	
15	2/21/14/02	NEW SHOP PLAN	
14	2/21/14/02	NEW SITE LAYOUT CIVIL	
13	2/21/14/29	NEW SITE PLAN AND CITY COMMENTS	
12	2/21/14/29	NEW SITE PLAN AND CITY COMMENTS	
11	2/21/14/16	NEW SHOP PLAN	
10	2/21/14/06	NEW SITE PLAN AND CITY COMMENTS	
9	2/21/14/07	NEW SITE LAYOUT AND CITY COMMENTS	
8	2/21/14/07	NEW SITE LAYOUT AND CITY COMMENTS	
7	2/21/14/07	NEW SITE PLAN	
6	2/21/14/07	NEW SITE PLAN	
5	2/21/14/07	NEW SITE PLAN	
4	2/21/14/07	NEW SITE PLAN	
3	2/21/14/07	NEW SITE PLAN	
2	2/21/14/07	NEW SITE PLAN	
1	2/21/14/07	NEW SITE PLAN	

CLIENT:

PROJECT: RESIDENTIAL AND HOTEL DEVELOPMENT

8911 - 8991 PATTERSON ROAD,
RICHMOND, B.C.


DRAWING TITLE:
**LANDSCAPE
PLAN**

DATE: 20 JUN 11 DRAWING NUMBER:

1

DESIGN. IN. ...






20-070



FREE SCHEDULE				PWA PROJECT NUMBER: 26775	
ITEM	CITY	EST. PROJECT NAME	COMMON NAME	PLANTING 2021 / ESTIMATES	R / POT
1	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	JAPANESE MAPLE	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
2	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	AMERICAN LARIX	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
3	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	SEMIAN SPRUCE	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
4	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	ARCTIC SPRUCE, AUSTRALIAN BLACK PINE	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
FREE SCHEDULE TO BE A PART OF WEEKLY RATE PATH					
ITEM	CITY	EST. PROJECT NAME	COMMON NAME	PLANTING 2021 / ESTIMATES	R / POT
5	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
6	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
7	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
8	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
9	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
10	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
11	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
12	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
13	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
14	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
15	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
16	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
17	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
18	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
19	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
20	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
21	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
22	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
23	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
24	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
25	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
26	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
27	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
28	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
29	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
30	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
31	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
32	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
33	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
34	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
35	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
36	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
37	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
38	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
39	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
40	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
41	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
42	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
43	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
44	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
45	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
46	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
47	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
48	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
49	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
50	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
51	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
52	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
53	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
54	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
55	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
56	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
57	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
58	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
59	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
60	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
61	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
62	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
63	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
64	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
65	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
66	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
67	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
68	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
69	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
70	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
71	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
72	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
73	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
74	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
75	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
76	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
77	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
78	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
79	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
80	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
81	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
82	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
83	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
84	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
85	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
86	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
87	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
88	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
89	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
90	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
91	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
92	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
93	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
94	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
95	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
96	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
97	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
98	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
99	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH
100	ALBANY	ALBANY PARK	NO. YARLWOOD	40 FT. DBH	40 FT. DBH

NOTE:
REMOVED EXISTING TREES: 87.
REQUIRED REPLACEMENT TREES: 174.
PROPOSED REPLACEMENT TREE: 31.
MIN. 8 CM C.A., DECIDUOUS TREE OR MIN. 4M HIGH CONIFEROUS TREE)

LEGEND

	ON SITE PLANTED AREA SHRUBS, PERENNIALS AND GROUNDCOVERS
	OFF SITE PLANTED AREA SHRUBS, PERENNIALS AND GROUNDCOVERS
	SOD LAWN
	NEW PROPERTY LINE
	OLD PROPERTY LINE

© Copyright reserved. This drawing and design is the property of PMG Landscape Architects and may not be reproduced or used for other projects without their permission.

pmg
LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTS
Suite C100 - 4185 58th Street Drive
Richmond, B.C. V6X 2C2
P: 604.294-0011 | F: 604.294-0022

SEAL:




CORNER PLAZA PAVING EXAMPLE



CONCRETE STRUCTURE AT ENTRANCE WITH SIGNAGE




MAGLUN; ICONIC BIKE RACK



LANDSCAPE FORM: RAI



COZY DOME



JAMBETTE: THE ALGA CUMBER



GORIC BALLS AND HALF BALLS



JAMBETTE: MINI QUATTRO SPRING RIDGER

NO.	DATE	REVISION DESCRIPTION	DR.
1	2019/01/29	REVISED PLAN	PM
2	2019/02/20	REVISED PLAN	PM
3	2019/02/28	REVISED PLAN AND CITY COMMENTS	PM
4	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
5	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
6	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
7	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
8	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
9	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
10	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
11	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
12	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
13	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
14	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
15	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
16	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
17	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
18	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
19	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
20	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
21	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
22	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
23	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
24	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
25	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
26	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
27	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
28	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
29	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
30	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
31	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
32	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
33	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
34	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
35	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
36	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
37	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
38	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
39	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
40	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
41	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
42	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
43	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
44	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
45	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
46	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
47	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
48	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
49	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
50	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
51	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
52	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
53	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
54	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
55	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
56	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
57	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
58	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
59	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
60	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
61	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
62	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
63	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
64	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
65	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
66	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
67	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
68	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
69	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
70	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
71	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
72	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
73	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
74	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
75	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
76	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
77	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
78	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
79	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
80	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
81	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
82	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
83	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
84	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
85	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
86	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
87	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
88	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
89	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
90	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
91	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
92	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
93	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
94	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
95	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
96	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
97	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
98	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
99	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM
100	2019/03/08	REVISED PLAN	PM

CLIENT:

PROJECT:
**RESIDENTIAL AND HOTEL
DEVELOPMENT**

8911 - 8991 PATTERSON ROAD,
RICHMOND, B.C.

DRAWING TITLE:
**TREE AND FURNITURE
IMAGES**

DATE: 20 JUN 11
SCALE: L4
DRAWN: YR
DESIGN: YR
CHKD: NCK
PMG PROJECT NUMBER: 28-070
OF 5



PINUS NIGRA 'ARNOLD SENTINEL'



PICEA OMORIKA



CERCIDIPHYLLUM JAPONICUM



ACER RUBRUM 'ARMSTRONG'



ACER PALMATUM



ACER CIRCINATUM



RZ 20-919113

Attachment 4

Address: 8911, 8931, 8951, 8991 Patterson Road

Applicant: Dava Developments Ltd.

Planning Area(s): City Centre (Capstan Village)

	Existing	Proposed
Owner	Dava Developments	No change
Site Size (m ²)	4,908.5	No change
Land Uses	Single Detached	Hotel and Residential
OCP Designation	Mixed Use	No change
Area Plan Designation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use Designation: Urban Centre T5 (35m); Village Centre Bonus Area Capstan Station Bonus Area Richmond Arts District Key Mixed-Use Areas and Commercial Reserve Mixed-Use Core (Along Patterson Rd) Highway Commercial (Along Sea Island Way) 	No change
Zoning	Single Detached (RS1/F)	Residential/ Limited Commercial (ZMU54) and School and Institutional Use (SI)
Number of Units	Nil	Market Housing: 136 units Affordable Housing: 27 units Residential Total: 163 units Hotel: 100 guest rooms
Other Designations	ANSD Area 3 (new Aircraft Noise Sensitive Land Uses may be considered)	ANSD uses are proposed

	Site Specific ZMU 54 Zone	Proposed Development	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	3.5 FAR Including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base 2.0 Capstan Station Bonus (CSB): 0.5 Village Centre Bonus (VCB): 1.0 for hotel only 	3.5 FAR, including: Residential 2.5 Hotel 1.0	none permitted
Buildable Floor Area (m ²):*	17,179.75 m ² (184,921.11 ft ²), including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base (Residential): 9,817 m² (105,669.2 ft²) CSB (Residential): 2,454.12 m² (26,417.3 ft²) VCB (Hotel): 4,908.5 m² (52,834.6 ft²) 	17,154.73m ² (184,651.80 ft ²), including Residential: 12,246.23 m ² (131,817.30 ft ²) Hotel: 4,908.5 m ² (52,834.6 ft ²)	none permitted
Lot Coverage (% of lot area):	Building: Max. 90 %	Building: Max. 89.9 %	none
Lot Size:	4,000 m ²	4,079.5 m ²	none

Lot Dimensions (m):	None	Width: 75.23 m- 93.29 m Depth: 51.58 m -52.71 m	none
Setbacks (m):	Front (south): Min. 3 m Rear (north): Min. 0 m Interior Side (west): Min. 0 m Exterior Side (east): Min. 3 m	Front (south): Min. 3 m Rear (north): Min. 0 m Interior Side (west): Min. 0 m Exterior Side (east): Min. 3 m	none
Height (m):	45 m (148 ft)	Residential Top of structure 44.03m Hotel Top of Structure 29.77m	none
Off-street Parking Spaces – Regular (R) / Visitor (V):	At least 193 spaces, based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apartment: R 1.0 per du; V 0.2 per du Affordable Housing: R 0.8 per du; V 0.2 per du 20% reduction applied if both shared parking and TDM measures are implemented, as per an approved TIA 	Total 222 spaces, based on: Market Residential 135(R) + 22(V) Affordable Housing 18 (R)+ 5 (V) Hotel 40 Car share 2	none
Off-street Parking Spaces – Total:	194	222	none
Tandem Parking Spaces:	Not permitted	Nil	none
Amenity Space – Indoor:	Min. 70 m ²	148.87 m ²	none
Amenity Space – Outdoor:	Min. 978 m ²	1,016.42 m ²	none

Other: _____

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

Kallianpur,Virendra

From: Kallianpur,Virendra
Sent: July 27, 2022 1:57 PM
To: 'rdubnov@live.ca'
Subject: RE: Implement better parking

Hi Ryan

Good Afternoon.

Thank you for contacting the city and expressing your concern on the lack of sufficient street parking in the area in relation to the proposed development application. Your comments will be retained and noted on file.

Each development is responsible for providing the required parking as per City bylaws to support the proposed development program. Similarly, the proposed rezoning application at 8911-8991 Patterson, RZ 20-919113 which is under review will also be required to meet the parking requirements on site to support the proposed program, which includes parking for residents, visitors, and delivery vehicles.

Please note that the design of the street frontage works (including but not limited to street parking) associated with this proposal has not yet been determined, but that the City will take your comments into consideration.

Thank you for sharing your concern.

Have a good day

Best
Viren

Virendra Kallianpur MCIP-I, AICP, RELi AP, WELL AP, LEED AP BD+C
 Senior Urban Designer | Planning & Development | City of Richmond
 T : 604.247.4620 | E : vkallianpur@richmond.ca

From: Ryan Dubnov <rdubnov@live.ca>
Sent: July 26, 2022 3:22 PM
To: DevApps <DevApps@richmond.ca>
Subject: RE: Implement better parking

City of Richmond Security Warning: This email was sent from an external source outside the City. Please do not click or open attachments unless you recognize the source of this email and the content is safe.

Apologies the image did not attach correctly.

Find attached dev application for 8911 - 8991 Patterson road

All adjacent or surrounding developments are seriously lacking in street parking. Any given time of day, there is no free parking which causes trickle parking challenges to surrounding streets.

On Jul 26, 2022 08:21, DevApps <DevApps@richmond.ca> wrote:

Good morning,

Thank you for your email.

If you could please inform us of what proposed development is lacking street parking, we can ensure we forward your concern to the correct Planner.

Regards,

Development Applications

From: Ryan Dubnov <rdubnov@live.ca>

Sent: July 25, 2022 11:00 PM

To: DevApps <DevApps@richmond.ca>

Subject: Implement better parking

City of Richmond Security Warning: This email was sent from an external source outside the City. Please do not click or open attachments unless you recognize the source of this email and the content is safe.

The entire neighbourhood surrounding this proposed development is lacking adequate street parking for residents, visitors, and Logistics vehicles.

If the City may keep this in mind during review, and recommend for large aprons outside the budding floor plate to allow for more street parking, then this neighbourhood will be more viable

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**BETWEEN****Dava Developments Ltd.**

(BC Incorporation # BC0918547)

AND**S.U.C.C.E.S.S AFFORDABLE HOUSING SOCIETY**

(BC Incorporation #S0061005)

WHEREAS:

Dava Developments Ltd, a long-time prominent Richmond-base developer (the "Developer"), is developing a housing project in the City of Richmond at 8911-8991 Patterson Road which includes 29 Affordable Housing units. The project is currently in the Rezoning stage and the Developer anticipates commencing construction in 2025 with occupancy expected in 2027.

S.U.C.C.E.S.S Affordable Housing Society (the "Housing Operator") is experienced in providing housing operations, management, and maintenance services for affordable homes.

The Developer and the Housing Operator have been in discussions regarding the Housing Operator purchasing or leasing the Affordable Housing units from the Developer, upon completion of construction.

The Housing Operator is interested in purchasing or leasing the Affordable Housing units from the Developer to add to its affordable housing portfolio and increase the number of affordable housing units.

SECTION B. INTENT

1. The proposed project is located at 8911-8991 Patterson Road, Richmond and consists of a 14 story residential building a 6 story residential building and a 7 story hotel building.
2. The 14 story residential building will include 29 Affordable Housing units on the 3rd and 4th floors.

3. The project is currently in the rezoning stage. The number, size and mix of housing is subject to change through the permitting process.
4. The Developer and the Housing Operator will make best efforts to enter into a purchase and sale agreement of the Affordable Housing units to the Housing Operator. Failing a purchase and sale agreement, the Developer and the Housing Operator will enter into a lease agreement and the Housing Operator will operate the Affordable Housing units.

SECTION C. RESPONSIBILITIES: The Housing Operator

1. The Housing Operator will manage the Affordable Housing units as per City of Richmond Affordable Housing requirements during their ownership or lease term.
2. The Housing Operator will support the permitting process for the project, attending meetings with municipality as required.
3. The Housing Operator will provide general advice and guidance on specification and design however the Developer retains the right to develop in accordance with their requirements.

SECTION D. RESPONSIBILITIES: The Developer

1. The developer will ensure that all Affordable Housing units are delivered as per City of Richmond Affordable Housing requirements.
2. The developer will ensure that all affordable housing units are sold to and/or managed by one housing operator.

SECTION E. BINDING

This Memorandum is intended to be non-binding, and until a purchase and sale agreement or lease agreement is executed by both parties there will be no binding legal obligations between the parties. Although this Memorandum sets out the basic understandings reached between the Developer and the Housing Operator to date, the actual documentation may well be the subject of further good faith negotiation and contain terms not included in this Memorandum.

This Memorandum of Understanding outlines the parties' intentions prior to a legal agreement being entered into formalizing the terms of the relationship together

SIGNED:



NAME:

David Chung

TITLE:

President

DATE:

Jan 20, 2023

Dava Developments Ltd.

SIGNED:



NAME:

Ahmed Omran

TITLE:

Director of Community Real Estate and Asset Management

DATE:

Jan 20, 2023

S.U.C.C.E.S.S AFFORDABLE HOUSING SOCIETY

Mr. Virendra Kallianpur
 Development Applications Department
 City of Richmond
 6911 No. 3 Road
 Richmond BC V6Y 2C1

Delivered via email - vkallianpur@richmond.ca

April 12, 2023

Dear Mr. Virendra

I am writing in connection with Dava Developments' Affordable Housing Units (AHU's) at 8911-8991 Patterson Road. I understand from with Dava Developments that the project will be reviewed by the Planning Committee in short order. Per City Staff request, I am writing to clarify S.U.C.C.E.S.S.'s position regarding the following:

Any objectives that the non-profit organization has for the affordable housing related to target tenant groups

S.U.C.C.E.S.S. selects residents in a fair, equitable, non-discriminative, transparent, consistent, and accountable manner and does not discriminate against any applicant or resident by reason of race, colour, religion, national or ethnic origin, ancestry, class, sex, sexual orientation, familial status, disability, military/veteran status, source of income, age, the fact that there are children forming part of the family or any other cause prohibited by local, provincial, and federal laws. S.U.C.C.E.S.S. complies with federal and provincial laws regarding human rights and adheres to National Occupancy Standards. Per the National Occupancy Standards, studio and 1-bed units are reserved for single persons and couples while 2-bed and 3-bed units are reserved for families.

Any objectives the non-profit organization has for the affordable housing related to programming or services that will be offered.

S.U.C.C.E.S.S. offers programming and services at each housing sites appropriate to the needs of the tenants. These programs and services enable S.U.C.C.E.S.S. to achieve its goal as a bridge between individuals and the community at large, and assist them to integrate and contribute fully to society.

Once the AHU's are tenanted, S.U.C.C.E.S.S. will assess the tenant needs and develop the appropriate programs. S.U.C.C.E.S.S. will also lean on its well-established community relationships and partnerships to ensure the tenants are linked to community supports and benefit from increased engagement and activity for a healthier, inclusive, and less isolated living experience.

Confirmation that the non-profit organization supports the affordable housing unit mix proposed.

Overall, S.U.C.C.E.S.S. supports the current AHU mix. The current unit mix represents a very good balance between family and single units at approximately 50% each. We are also glad to see a relatively high number of 3-bed units which are in high demand for larger families.


Please let me know if you require any further information

Regards



Ahmed Omran
Director, Community Real Estate and Asset Management
April 12, 2023

Copies: Shiu Kee Tang, Dava Developments



PH - 147



Address: 8911, 8931, 8951, 8991 Patterson Road

File No.: RZ 20-919113

Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10464, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. **(Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw):** Final Adoption of OCP Amendment Bylaw 10464.
2. **(Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure - MOTI):** Provincial Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure Approval must be received.
3. **(NAV Canada Building Height):** Submit a letter of confirmation from a registered surveyor assuring that the proposed building heights are in compliance with Transport Canada regulations.
4. **(Consolidation, Subdivision, Dedication and Land Transfer)** Registration of a Subdivision Plan for the subject site and park land ownership transfer, to the satisfaction of the City. Prior to the registration of a Subdivision Plan, the following conditions shall be satisfied:
 - 4.1. **(Site Contamination – Dedicated and/or Transferred Land)** Prior to rezoning bylaw adoption, submission to the City of sufficient information and/or other assurances satisfactory to the City in its sole discretion to support the City's acceptance of the proposed dedicated and/or transferred land. Such assurances could include one or more of the following:
 - 4.1.1. a contaminated sites legal instrument (e.g. Certificate of Compliance (COC) or Final Site Determination (FSD) showing no contamination in the dedication and/or transferred lands);
 - 4.1.2. evidence satisfactory to the City, in its sole discretion, that the lands to be dedicated and/or transferred to the City are in a satisfactory state from an environmental perspective; and
 - 4.1.3. a legal commitment to provide a contaminated sites legal instrument (e.g. Certificate of Compliance (COC) or Final Site Determination (FSD) showing no contamination in the dedication lands and/or transferred), including security therefor in the amount and form satisfactory to the City.
 - 4.2. Road: Dedication of approximately 59.47 m² for road and related purposes, as indicated generally on the Preliminary Subdivision Plan (Schedule 1) and Preliminary Road Functional Plan (Schedule 2). Final extents and amounts to be determined through the required Servicing Agreement* application process, to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation. Road dedication areas include:
 - 4.2.1. 39.79 m² – 2 m road dedication along the vehicle turn around area off 8911 & 8931 Patterson Road frontage (to which Development Cost Charge credits shall NOT apply); Exact extent to be confirmed through the detailed design SA process to the satisfaction of the City;
 - 4.2.2. Corner Cuts:
 - 4.2.2.1 11.68 m²- 5m x 5m corner cut on the southwest corner of Garden City Road/Sea Island Way, measured from the new property line along Sea Island Way and off existing property line along Garden City Road (to which Development Cost Charge credits shall NOT apply); and
 - 4.2.2.2 8.00 m²- 4m x 4m corner cut on the northwest corner of Garden City Road/Patterson Road cuts (to which Development Cost Charge credits shall NOT apply)
 - 4.3. Granting of minimum 1.5m public-rights-of-passage statutory right-of-way for the purposes of providing a pedestrian connection between Patterson Drive on the south to the multi-use path along the south side of Sea Island Way along the west edge of the subject site. This will include the full area of the pedestrian walkway and access ramps and will be further designed as part of the Development Permit process.
 - 4.4 Lot Consolidation and Subdivision:

4.4.1. Consolidation of four existing lots into a single development parcel totalling 4,908.5 m².

- 4.6. Sea Island Way Greenway: Transfer of the approximately 829 m² (0.20 ac.) lot to the City as a fee simple lot to accommodate Sea Island Way Greenway for public use. The primary business terms of the required land transfer, including any environmental conditions, shall be to the satisfaction of the Director, Real Estate Services, the City Solicitor, the Director, Parks Services and the Director of Development. All costs associated with the land transfer shall be borne by the developer. The lands to be transferred are generally indicated on the Preliminary Subdivision Plan (Schedule 1).

NOTE: Development Cost Charge (DCC) credits shall not apply.

NOTE: This land transfer is required to satisfy the developer's CCAP and Zoning Bylaw public open space requirements with respect to the Capstan Station Bonus.

- 4.7 Garden City: Transfer of the approximately 927 m² (0.23 ac.) lot to the City as a fee simple lot or as road dedication to accommodate side walk, boulevard, open space for public use. The primary business terms of the required land transfer, including any environmental conditions, shall be to the satisfaction of the Director, Real Estate Services, the City Solicitor, the Director, Parks Services and the Director of Development. All costs associated with the land transfer shall be borne by the developer. The lands to be transferred are generally indicated on Reference Plan EPP93646 (Schedule 3).

NOTE: Development Cost Charge (DCC) credits shall not apply.

5. (**Capstan Station Bonus-CSB**): Registration of a restrictive covenant and/or alternative legal agreement, to the satisfaction of the City, securing that "no building" will be permitted on the subject site and restricting Building Permit* issuance for the subject site, in whole or in part, until the developer satisfies the terms of the Capstan Station Bonus (CSB) as provided for via the Zoning Bylaw. More specifically, the developer shall provide for cash and public open space contributions as follows:

- a) Capstan Station Reserve Contribution: The preliminary estimated cash contribution is as shown in the following table. The actual value of the developer contribution shall be based on the actual number of dwelling units and the City-approved contribution rate in effect at the time of the Building Permit* approval

TABLE 1

Use	No. of Dwellings (Preliminary Estimate)	CSB Contribution Rate (Effective to Sep 30,2023)	CSB Voluntary Contribution (Preliminary Estimate)
TOTAL	163	\$10,068.47/ dwelling	\$ 1,641,160.61

- b) Public Open Space Contribution: Prior to the final reading of the Rezoning Bylaw, granting of at least 815 m² (8,772.59 ft²) of publicly-accessible open space to the City, through dedication, based on 5.0 m² (53.82 ft²) per dwelling unit and a maximum of 163 dwellings. More specifically, prior to rezoning adoption the developer shall:

- i. Maximum Number of Dwellings: Register a covenant and/or alternative legal agreement on title, to the City's satisfaction, to restrict the maximum number of dwellings on the subject site to 165.

NOTE: This is consistent with findings of the rezoning review that indicate the subject site cannot reasonably accommodate more than 829 m² (8,923.28 ft²) of CSB public open space.

- ii. Publicly-Accessible Open Space: Provide public open space to the City (as shown in Schedule 1). The ultimate configuration of the open space shall be confirmed to the satisfaction of the City through the Development Permit review and approval process but the size shall not be less than the area indicated below:

Fee Simple Transfer: An area 10 m wide adjacent to Sea Island Way is required to accommodate the Sea Island Way Greenway, as per Section 2.6.3(c) of the CCAP, which results in 829 m² of land dedication for public and to accommodate road, off-street multi-purpose path, sidewalk, planted boulevard, and related upgrades.

NOTE: Site specific zone ZMU 54 provides for the developer to calculate density on this additional road dedication (Development Cost Charge credits shall NOT apply).

6. (**Hotel**): Registration of a restrictive covenant(s) and/or other legal agreement(s) on title to ensure that the use and operation of the proposed hotel are consistent with City policy with respect to the Village Centre Bonus and

Residential / Limited Commercial (ZMU54) zone, which permit bonus density on the subject site for non-residential purposes only. More specifically:

- a) The meaning of hotel shall comply with Richmond Zoning Bylaw definition and, for the purposes of the subject development, the meaning of hotel shall also include, but may not be limited to, requirements that a hotel shall:
 - i. Be a stand-alone building, which for the purposes of the subject development, shall mean it is located over, under, and or beside other uses on the lot, but functions independently of those other uses except as described below;
 - ii. Contain guest rooms for use as transient rental accommodation, together with complementary uses and spaces required directly or indirectly in support of the guest rooms (e.g. Recreation/leisure facilities, meeting/convention facilities, restaurant, retail, administration, and back of house uses);
 - iii. Guest room shall mean a habitable room wherein accommodation is offered for rent, or rented, to persons on a temporary basis and that does not contain cooking or food preparation facilities, but may include a microwave, coffee maker, tea kettle (or other similar small domestic appliances, as are customary in similar quality hotel properties, used primarily for heating pre-prepared food), a compact refrigerator with a maximum capacity of 0.14 m³ (5 ft³), and a single bowl bar-size sink installed within a counter space having a maximum width of 1.5 m (5 ft.) and a maximum depth of 0.6 m (2 ft.);
 - iv. Not contain any dwelling unit(s);
 - v. Not share a common interior corridor, lobby, emergency exit, or other indoor space(s) or use(s) with the resident(s) of any dwelling(s) on the lot, EXCEPT that:
 - a. Guests, visitors, and employees of the hotel and residents and visitors of the dwellings may have shared use of the parking structure on the lot, as determined to the satisfaction of the City through an approved Development Permit*;
 - b. If so determined by the developer, the residents of the dwellings on the lot may make use of any recreation/leisure facilities provided as part of the hotel (provided that the Richmond OCP residential amenity space requirements for the dwellings are satisfied as part of the residential portion of the development on the lot, exclusive of the hotel's recreation/leisure facilities); and
 - c. Hotel and residential uses may share a common wall, floor, or other features, as required to demise the two uses;
 - vi. Be permitted to be subdivided as an air space parcel, provided that any such air space parcel does not include any dwelling units or other residential uses.
 - b) Registration of a covenant or alternative legal agreement on title, to the satisfaction of the City, securing the owner's and the owner's assignee's commitment to limit the length of stay of hotel guests to a maximum of six months.
 - c) Registration of a covenant or alternative legal agreement on title, to the satisfaction of the City, for each hotel building prohibiting strata titling of individual or groups of hotel rooms.
 - d) "No development" shall be permitted on the lot, restricting Development Permit issuance for any building on the lot, in whole or in part (excluding parking), unless the approved Development Permit includes the hotel and plans are attached to the subject restrictive covenant to make clear the size, location, and related features of the hotel, to the satisfaction of the City.
 - e) Following Development Permit issuance, the City may permit alterations to the design of the hotel, provided that any such alterations comply with an approved Development Permit and the subject restrictive covenant is amended or replaced, as determined to the satisfaction of the City.
7. Submission of a Landscape Security in the amount of \$72,750 (\$750/tree) to ensure that a total of 97 replacement trees are planted and maintained; minimum 8 cm deciduous caliper or 4 m high conifers). **NOTE: minimum replacement size to be as per Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057 Schedule A – 3.0 Replacement Trees.**
 8. 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:
 - 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 31 required replacement trees with the following minimum sizes:

TABLE 2

No. of Replacement Trees	Minimum Caliper of Deciduous Tree	or	Minimum Height of Coniferous Tree
31	8 cm		4 m

If required replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site, a cash-in-lieu contribution in the amount of \$750/tree to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for off-site planting is required.

- City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$72,750 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of replacement trees within the City.
- 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 \$45,000 for the three trees (Tag# B, C, D) and the six trees Garden City boulevard to be retained.
- Submission of Tree compensation to the City in the amount of \$2,250 for one tree removal (tag # 87).
- 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.
- Registration of a legal agreement on title identifying that the proposed development must be designed and constructed in a manner that mitigates potential aircraft noise impacts to the proposed dwelling units. The owner-developer shall notify all initial purchasers of the potential aircraft noise impacts. Furthermore, prior to each Development Permit and Building Permit* issuance, the owner-developer shall submit a report(s) and/or letter(s) of confirmation prepared by an appropriate registered professional, which demonstrates that the interior noise levels and thermal conditions comply with the City's Official Community Plan and Noise Bylaw requirements.
 - CMHC guidelines for interior noise levels as indicated in the chart below:

TABLE 3

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.
- Mixed-Use Noise: Registration of a legal agreement on title that identifies the building as a mixed use building, and indicating that they are required to mitigate unwanted noise and demonstrate that the building envelope is designed to avoid noise generated by the internal use from penetrating into residential areas that exceed noise levels allowed in the City's Noise Bylaw and noise generated from rooftop HUAC units will comply with the City's Noise Bylaw.
 - Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
 - Registration of a restrictive covenant prohibiting (a) the imposition of any strata bylaw that would prohibit any residential dwelling unit from being rented; and (b) the imposition of any strata bylaw that would place age-based restrictions on occupants of any residential dwelling unit.
 - View and Other Development Impacts: Registration of a legal agreement on title stipulating that the development is subject to potential impacts due to other development that may be approved within the City Centre including without limitation, loss of views in any direction, increased shading, increased overlook and reduced privacy, increased ambient noise and increased levels of night-time ambient light, and requiring that the owner provide written notification of this through the disclosure statement to all initial purchasers, and erect signage in the initial sales centre advising purchasers of the potential for these impacts.
 - Shared Residential Rooftop Amenity Space: Registration of a legal agreement on title providing unrestricted access to the rooftop outdoor amenity space for the exclusive use and enjoyment of residential owners and occupants (including the affordable housing occupants). Any use of the rooftop outdoor amenity space by hotel users (i.e. operator, owner and/or guests) shall be at the sole discretion of the residential owner(s)/operator(s) (including the market residential

strata units and the affordable housing units) and be secured with a shared use agreement, which agreement may provide for, but may not be limited to the following, as determined to the satisfaction of the residential owner(s)/operator(s):

- a) The hotel's use of the amenity space shall not compromise the use or enjoyment of the amenity space or facilities by the residents;
- b) Restrictions on the hotel's use of the outdoor amenity space (e.g., no commercial activities, no alcohol, no smoking, no amplified music) and/or permitted hours of use; and
- c) Cost sharing arrangements, which shall not result in any additional costs to the residents as a result of the hotel's use of the outdoor amenity space (e.g., for cleaning, maintenance, repairs, security, liability, access to or use of facilities) and may include an access charge or other fee payable to the residential owner(s)/operator(s) by the hotel.

The ultimate configuration and size of the shared rooftop amenity space shall be confirmed to the satisfaction of the City through the Development Permit review and approval process.

20. The submission and processing of a Development Permit* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.
21. **(Village Centre Bonus (VCB) Amenity Contribution):** The City's acceptance of the developer's voluntary cash contribution in lieu of constructing City-owned community amenity space on the subject site (as indicated in the table below), which funds shall be applied to the construction of City Centre child care and/or other use(s) that provide a community amenity, as provided for under the development's site-specific ZMU54 zone, to the satisfaction of the City.

In the event that the contribution is not provided within one-year of the application receiving third reading of Council (Public Hearing), the Construction-Value Amenity Transfer Contribution Rate shall be increased annually thereafter based on the Statistics Canada "non-Residential Building Construction Price Index" yearly quarter-to-quarter change for Vancouver, where the change is positive.

TABLE 4

Use	Maximum Permitted VCB Bonus Floor Area Under the ZMU54 Zone	VCB Community Amenity Space Area (5% of Bonus Area)	Construction-Value Amenity Transfer Contribution Rate	Minimum Voluntary Developer Cash Contribution
TOTAL	4,908.50 m² (52,834.65 ft²)	245.42 m² (2,641.6 ft²)	\$871/ft²	\$2,300,833.60

22. **(TDM Measures):** Voluntary contribution of the following Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures:

- a) Transit Pass Program: Registration of a legal agreement on title to ensure the execution and completion of a transit pass program, including the following method of administration and terms:
 - i. Provide 1 year of two-zone compass cards for each of the 34 market units (25% of the total 136 strata units) and 27 affordable housing units (100% of the total 27 Affordable housing units). The intention of the transit pass program is to offer transit passes on a per unit and first-come-first-serve basis. If a tenant opts out or does not "subscribe" to the transit pass program, that pass remains in the pool for a future tenant until they have all been utilized. Number of passes capped at number of units for a period of one year;
 - ii. Letter of Credit provided to the City for 100% of transit pass program value;
 - iii. Administration by TransLink, housing society or management company. The owner is not responsible for the monitoring of use of transit passes but only noting number of "subscribed" users to the program, until full unit count is exhausted over a period of one year;
 - iv. If the transit pass program is not fully subscribed within one year, the program is to be extended until the equivalence of the costs of the full one year transit pass program has been exhausted. Should not all transit passes be utilized by the end of the second year, the remaining funds equivalent to the value of the unsubscribed transit passes are to be transferred to the City of Richmond for alternate transportation demand management measures at the City's discretion; and
 - v. The availability and method of accessing the 2-zone transit passes is to be clearly explained in the tenancy agreements.
- b) Enhanced Bicycle Facilities: Registration of a legal agreement on title ensuring that:

- i. End-of-trip facilities are provided for the commercial uses, including showers, wash basins, water closets, lockers, and change rooms; and
 - ii. Bicycle repair/maintenance stations are provided and shared amongst all uses on-site, including bicycle repair stand (with tools); foot pump; and faucet, hose and drain for bicycle washing. A note is required on the Development Permit and Building Permit.
- c) Car-share Parking: Registration of a restrictive covenant and Statutory Right-of-Way(s) on title, or alternative legal agreement, subject to the final approval of the Director of Transportation, securing the owner's commitment to provide a car share facility and car share equipment to a car share operator or the City, at no cost to the car share operator or the City, both as the case may be, the terms of which shall be generally as follows:
- i. A minimum of two (2) car share parking spaces within the development, along with pedestrian and vehicular access, designed, constructed, equipped and maintained by the owner, at the owner's cost, to be:
 - (a) Co-located and located on the surface parking lot;
 - (b) Provided with satisfactory pedestrian access;
 - (c) Designed to be safe, convenient and universally-accessible;
 - (d) Provided with design features, decorative finishing, lighting and signage, as determined through the Development Permit* and Servicing Agreement* processes;
 - (e) Each provided with one EV quick-charge (240 volt) charging station for its exclusive use;
 - (f) Accessible to all intended users (e.g. general public, car share operator personnel and car share operator members) at no added cost;
 - (g) Accessible to all intended users as follows:
 - (i) General public – 365 days a year for a time period equalling the lengthiest combination of standard business hours and the standard operating hours of local rapid transit; and
 - (ii) Car share operator personnel and members – 265 days a year for a 24 hours per day (e.g. code entry);
 - (h) Identify the car share stalls in the Development Permit plans;
 - (i) Identify the car share stalls in the Building Permit plans; and
 - (j) Prior to building inspection permitting occupancy, provide wayfinding and stall identification signage for the car share stalls, to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation;
 - ii. Terms of agreement between the owner and the car share operator which shall include:
 - (a) A minimum contractual period for the provision of car share services of three years from the first date of building occupancy; and
 - (b) Additional provisions as negotiated by the owner and car share operator (e.g. maintenance, repair and replacement by car share vehicles by the car share operator), or as required by the City, subject to the approval of the Director of Transportation.
 - iii. Supporting submissions provide to the City (Transportation Department) as follows:
 - (a) Prior to Public Hearing, a copy of the letter of intent addressed to the owner from the car share operator outlining the terms of the provision of car sharing services;
 - (b) Prior to Development Permit issuance, a copy of the draft contract between the owner and the car share operator describing the terms of the provision of car sharing services;
 - (c) Prior to building inspection permitting occupancy, a copy of the executed contract between the owner and the car share operator describing the terms of the provision of car sharing services;
 - iv. Granting of a Public Right of Passage Statutory Right-of-Way, in favour of the City, to secure the car share spaces and the vehicular and pedestrian accesses, subject to the final dimensions established by the surveyor on the basis of functional plans completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation; and
 - v. In the event that the car-share facilities are not operated for car-share purposes as intended via the subject rezoning application (e.g. operator's contract is terminated or expires), transfer control of the car-share facilities to the City, at no cost to the City, with the understanding that the City at its sole discretion, without penalty or cost, shall determine how the facilities shall be used going forward.

- d) Electric Vehicles (EV) Charging Infrastructure: Registration of legal agreement(s) on the subject site requiring that the developer/owner provides, installs, and maintains electrical vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure for the use of the building's residents, commercial tenants, and others as determined to the satisfaction of the City through an approved Development Permit*. This includes providing 100% of visitor parking spaces for affordable housing and 10% of visitor parking spaces for strata residential. More specifically, the minimum permitted rates for EV charging infrastructure shall be as indicated in the following table or as per the Official Community Plan or Zoning Bylaw rates in effect at the time of Development Permit* approval, whichever is greatest.

TABLE 5

User/Use	Energized Outlet – Minimum Permitted Rates	
	Vehicle Parking (1)	Class 1 Bike Storage (2)
Strata Residential (i.e. resident parking & bike storage)	(as per zoning bylaw)	1 per each 10 bikes or portion thereof in a bike storage room or locker (which Energized Outlet shall be located to facilitate shared use with bikes in the room/locker)
Affordable Housing (i.e. resident parking & bike storage)		
Non-Residential (e.g. commercial)	1 per 10 parking spaces (as per OCP)	

- (1) "Vehicle Parking" "Energized Outlet" shall mean all the wiring, electrical equipment, and related infrastructure necessary to provide Level 2 charging (as per SAE International's J1772 standard) or higher to an electric vehicle.
- (2) "Class 1 (Secured) Bike Storage" "Energized Outlet" shall mean an operational 120V duplex outlet for the charging of an electric bicycle and all the wiring, electrical equipment, and related infrastructure necessary to provide the required electricity for the operation of such an outlet.

23. (**Public Art**): City acceptance of the developer's offer to make a voluntary contribution towards the City's Public Art Fund, the terms of which shall include the following:

- a) The value of the developer's voluntary public art contribution shall be based on the Council-approved rates for residential and non-residential uses and the maximum buildable floor area permitted under the subject site's proposed zoning, excluding floor area associated with affordable housing and market rental, as indicated in the table below.

TABLE 6

Use	Maximum Floor Area Under the ZMU54 Zone	Affordable Housing Exemption	Minimum Developer Contribution Rate	Minimum Voluntary Developer Cash Contribution
Residential	12,271.25 m ² (132,086.51 ft ²)	1,847.54 m ² (19,886.75 ft ²)	\$0.99/ft ²	\$111,077.77
Non-Residential	4,908.5 m ² (52,834.6 ft ²)	Nil	\$0.52/ft ²	\$27,473.99
TOTAL	17,179.75 m² (184,921.11 ft²)	1,847.54 m² (19,886.75 ft²)	Varies	\$138,551.77

- b) In the event that the contribution is not provided within one year of the application receiving third reading of Council (i.e. Public Hearing), the contribution rate (as indicated in the table in item a) above) shall be increased annually thereafter based on the Statistics Canada Consumer Price Index (All Items) – Vancouver yearly quarter-to-quarter change, where the change is positive.
- c) Prior to rezoning bylaw adoption, the developer shall submit a Public Art Plan, for the subject site, to the satisfaction of the Director, Arts Culture and Heritage Services. The Public Art Plan shall be:
- Prepared by an appropriate professional.
 - Based on a contribution value of at least the total amount indicated in the table in item a) above.
 - Consistent with applicable City policies and objectives (for example, the Richmond Public Art Program, City Centre Public Art Plan, Capstan Public Art Plan and other relevant supplementary public art and heritage planning that may be undertaken by the City), as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development and Director, Arts, Culture, and Heritage Services.
 - Presented for review(s) by the Public Art Advisory Committee and endorsement by Council, as required by the Director, Arts, Culture, and Heritage Services.
 - NOTE: For contributions with a cumulative budget over \$250,000, the Public Art Plan is presented for Council approval prior to Building Permit issuance.

- vi) Implemented by the developer, as required by legal agreement(s) registered on Title to prior to rezoning adoption.
 - d) “No development” shall be permitted on the subject site, restricting Development Permit issuance for any building on the lot, in whole or in part (excluding parking), until the developer, to the City's satisfaction:
 - i) Enters into additional legal agreement(s), if any, required to facilitate the implementation of the City approved Public Art Plan, which may require that, prior to entering into any such additional agreement(s), a Detailed Public Art Plan is submitted by the developer for the subject site and/or an artist is engaged, to the satisfaction of the City (as generally set out in the legal agreement entered into and the Public Art Plan submitted prior to rezoning adoption).
 - ii) Submits a Letter of Credit or cash security or cash contribution (as determined in the sole discretion of the City) to secure the developer's implementation of the Public Art Plan, the collective value of which shall be at least \$138,551.77, including \$6,927.58 as a cash contribution equal to 5% of the total amount indicated in the table in item a) above (\$138,551.77) and a Public Art security Letter of Credit in the amount of \$138,551.77, being the total amount identified in item a) above.
 - e) “No occupancy” shall be permitted on the subject site, restricting final Building Permit* inspection granting occupancy of the building (exclusive of parking), in whole or in part, on the subject site until:
 - i) The developer, at the developer's sole cost and expense, commissions one or more artists to conceive, create, manufacture, design, and oversee or provide input about the manufacturing of the public artwork, and causes the public artwork to be installed on subject site, if expressly permitted by the City in writing and pre-approved by Council, or within a statutory right-of-way on the subject site (which right-of-way shall be to the satisfaction of the City and secured by one or more legal agreements for rights of public passage, public art, and related purposes including maintenance, in accordance with the City-approved Public Art Plan and, as applicable, Detailed Public Art Plan).
 - ii) The developer, at the developer's sole cost and expense and within 30 days after the date on which the applicable public art is installed in accordance with the City-approved Public Art Plan, executes and delivers to the City a transfer of all of the developer's rights, title, and interest in the public artwork to the City if on City property or to the subsequent strata corporation if on the subject site (including transfer of joint world-wide copyright) or as otherwise determined to be satisfactory by the City Solicitor and Director, Arts, Culture, and Heritage Services.
 - iii) NOTE: It is the understanding of the City that the artist's title and interest in the public artwork will be transferred to the developer upon acceptance of the artwork based on an agreement solely between the developer and the artist and that these interests will in turn be transferred to the City, subject to approval by Council to accept the transfer of ownership of the artwork.
 - iv) The developer, at the developer's sole cost and expense, has submitted a final report to the City, to be submitted promptly after completion of the installation of the public art in accordance with the City-approved Public Art Plan, which report, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development and Director, Arts, Culture, and Heritage Services, includes:
 - Information regarding the siting of the public art, a brief biography of the artist(s), a statement from the artist(s) on the public art, and other such details as the Director of Development and Director, Arts, Culture, and Heritage Services may require;
 - A statutory declaration, satisfactory to the City Solicitor, confirming that the developer's financial obligation(s) to the artist(s) have been fully satisfied;
 - The maintenance plan for the public art prepared by the artist(s);
 - Digital records (e.g., photographic images) of the public art, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development and Director, Arts, Culture, and Heritage Services.
 - f) As an alternative to the provision of public art on-site, the developer may offer to make a voluntary cash contribution in lieu; provided that the value of such voluntary public art contribution shall be at least the total amount indicated in the table in item a) above. In this case, the requirements of c) through e) above will not apply.
24. (**Affordable Housing**): The City's acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute affordable housing, in the form of low-end market rental (LEMR) units, constructed to a turnkey level of finish, at the sole cost of the developer, the terms of which voluntary contribution shall include, but will not be limited to, the registration of the

City's standard Housing Agreement and Covenant on title to secure the affordable housing units. The form of the Housing Agreement and Covenant shall be agreed to by the developer and the City prior to final adoption of the subject rezoning; after which time, only the Housing Covenants may be amended or replaced and any such changes will only be permitted for the purpose of accurately reflecting the specifics of the Development Permit* and other non-materials changes resulting thereof and made necessary by the Development Permit* approval requirements, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development and Director, Community Social Development. The terms of the Housing Agreements and Covenants shall indicate that they apply in perpetuity and provide for, but will not be limited to, the following requirements:

- a) Occupants of the affordable housing units subject to the Housing Agreement shall enjoy full and unlimited access to and use of all on-site indoor and outdoor amenity spaces.
- b) All affordable housing units shall be maintained under single ownership (within one air space parcel or one strata lot or legal agreement to the satisfaction of the Director of Development).
- c) The imposition of any place age-based restrictions on occupants of any affordable housing unit is prohibited.
- d) The developer shall, as generally indicated in the table below:
 - i) Ensure that the types, sizes, rental rates, and occupant income restrictions for the affordable housing units are in accordance with the City's Affordable Housing Strategy and guidelines for Low End Market Rental (LEMR) housing, unless otherwise agreed to by the Director of Development and Director, Community Social Development; and
 - ii) Achieve the Project Targets for unit mix and Basic Universal Housing (BUH) standard compliance or as otherwise determined to the satisfaction of the Director, Community Social Development through an approved Development Permit*.

TABLE 7

Unit Type	Minimum Unit Area	Maximum Monthly Unit Rent**	Total Maximum Household Income**	Number of Units	BUH
Studio	37 m ² (400 ft ²)	\$811/month	\$34,650 or less	7.4%(2 units)	7.4% (2 units)
1-Bedroom	50 m ² (535 ft ²)	\$975/month	\$38,250 or less	37.0%(10 units)	33.3% (9 units)
2- Bedroom	69 m ² (741 ft ²)	\$1,218/month	\$46,800 or less	33.3% (9 units)	22.2% (6 units)
3-Bedroom	91 m ² (980 ft ²)	\$1,480/month	\$58,050 or less	22.2% (6 units)	22.2% (6 units)
TOTAL	N/A	N/A	N/A	27 Units 1,847.54 m² (19,886.75 ft²)	85.1% (23 units)

* Unit mix in the above table may be adjusted through the Development Permit Process provided that the total area comprises at least 15% of the subject development's total residential building area.

** May be adjusted periodically as provided for under adopted City policy.

- e) Single ownership is required for the affordable housing units (single owner for all affordable housing units).
The affordable housing unit locations are to be as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development and Director, Community Social Development through an approved Development Permit*. Dispersed or clustered unit configurations may be considered; however, dispersed units are required unless a qualified non-profit operator (that requires a clustered unit arrangement) has agreed to partner with the developer to manage the units.
NOTE: The developer has provided evidence of a partnership with S.U.C.C.E.S.S., a non-profit organization, to own or manage the clustered affordable housing units. The Developer has also provided a letter of support by S.U.C.C.E.S.S for the proposed housing related to target tenant groups, programming, services and unit mix proposed. To support this partnership, the City is willing to accept clustering of the required units.
- f) Occupants of the affordable housing units shall, to the satisfaction of the City (as determined prior to Development Permit* approval), enjoy full and unlimited access to and use of all on-site indoor amenity spaces and outdoor amenity spaces provided on the lot as per OCP, City Centre Area Plan, and Development Permit* requirements, at no additional charge to the affordable housing tenants (i.e. no monthly rents or other fees shall apply for the casual, shared, or exclusive use of any amenities).
- g) On-site parking, "Class 1" bike storage, and related electric vehicle (EV) charging stations shall be provided for the use of affordable housing occupants as per the OCP, Zoning Bylaw, and approved Development Permit* at no additional charge to the affordable housing tenants (i.e. no monthly rents or other fees shall apply for the casual,

shared, or exclusive use of the parking spaces, bike storage, EV charging stations, or related facilities by affordable housing tenants), which features may be secured via legal agreement(s) on title prior to Development Permit* issuance.

- h) The affordable housing units, related uses (e.g., parking, garbage/recycling, hallways, amenities, lobbies), and associated landscaped areas shall be completed to a turnkey level of finish, at the sole cost of the developer, to the satisfaction of the Director, Community Social Development.
 - i) “No development” shall be permitted, restricting Development Permit* issuance for any building in whole or in part, until the developer, to the City’s satisfaction:
 - i) Designs the lot to provide for the affordable housing units and ancillary spaces and uses;
 - ii) If applicable, amends or replaces the Housing Covenant to accurately reflect the specifics of the affordable housing units and ancillary spaces and uses as per the approved Development Permit*; and
 - iii) As required, registers additional legal agreements on title to the lots to facilitate the detailed design, construction, operation, and/or management of the affordable housing units and/or ancillary spaces and uses (e.g., parking) as determined by the City via the Development Permit* review and approval processes.
 - j) No Building Permit* shall be issued for any building, in whole or in part, until the developer provides for the required affordable housing units and ancillary spaces and uses to the satisfaction of the City.
 - k) “No occupancy” shall be permitted, restricting final Building Permit inspection granting occupancy for any building, in whole or in part, until the required affordable housing units and ancillary spaces and uses are completed to the satisfaction of the City and have received final Building Permit inspection granting occupancy.
25. Registration of a restrictive covenant and/or alternative legal agreement(s), to the satisfaction of the City, securing the owner's commitment to connect to District Energy Utility (DEU), which covenant and/or legal agreement(s) will include, at minimum, the following terms and conditions:
- a) No building permit will be issued for a building on the subject site unless the building is designed with the capability to connect to and be serviced by a DEU and the owner has provided an energy modelling report satisfactory to the Director of Engineering;
 - b) If a DEU is available for connection, no final building inspection permitting occupancy of a building will be granted until:
 - iii) the building is connected to the DEU, which may include the owner’s supplied and installed central energy plant to provide heating and cooling to the building, at no cost to the City, or the City’s DEU service provider, Lulu Island Energy Company, on the subject site satisfactory to the City;
 - iv) if the City so elects, the owner transfers ownership of the central energy plant on the site, if any, at no cost to the City, or City’s DEU service provider, Lulu Island Energy Company, to the City and/or the City’s DEU service provider, Lulu Island Energy Company, on terms and conditions satisfactory to the City;
 - v) the owner enters into a Service Provider Agreement with the City and/or the City’s DEU service provider, Lulu Island Energy Company, executed prior to subdivision (including Air Space parcel subdivision) or depositing a Strata Plan with LTO on terms and conditions satisfactory to the City; and
 - vi) the owner grants or acquires all Statutory Right-of-Way(s) and/or easements necessary for supplying the DEU services to the building and the operation of the central energy plant, if any, by the City and/or the City’s DEU service provider, Lulu Island Energy Company registered prior to subdivision (including Air Space parcel subdivision) or depositing a Strata Plan with LTO.
 - c) If a DEU is not available for connection, no final building inspection permitting occupancy of a building will be granted until:
 - vii) the City receives a professional engineer's certificate stating that the building has the capability to connect to and be serviced by a DEU;
 - viii) the owner enters into a covenant and/or other legal agreement to require that the building connect to a DEU when a DEU is in operation, registered prior to Strata or subdivision (including Air Space parcel subdivision);
 - ix) the owner grants or acquires the Statutory Right-of-Way(s) and/or easements necessary for supplying DEU services to the building, registered prior to Strata or subdivision (including Air Space parcel subdivision); and

- x) the owner provides to the City a letter of credit, in an amount satisfactory to the City, for costs associated with acquiring any further Statutory Right of Way(s) and/or easement(s) and preparing and registering legal agreements and other documents required to facilitate the building connecting to a DEU when it is in operation.
26. Enter into a Servicing Agreement* for the design and construction of frontage and pedestrian network improvements and servicing improvements. A Letter of Credit or cash security for the value of the Service Agreement works, as determined by the City, will be required as part of entering into the Servicing Agreement. Works include, but may not be limited to the following:
- 1) Water Works:
 - a) Using the OCP Model, there is 294 L/s of water available at a 20 psi residual at the Patterson Road frontage and no watermains exist along the Garden City Road and Sea Island Way frontages. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of 220 L/s along all frontages. New watermains and fire hydrants are required along Garden City Road frontage and along Sea Island Way from Garden City Road to the west property line to service the proposed development. According to the City's hydraulic run, there will be 246 L/s of water available at 20 psi residual at the watermain dead end at Sea Island Way if new 300mm diameter watermains are installed along Garden City Rd and Sea Island Way.
 - b) The Developer is required to, at the developer's cost:
 - i) Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm the development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage designs.
 - ii) Install approximately 80 meters of 300 mm diameter water main along Garden City Road frontage complete with fire hydrants spaced as per the City's Engineering Design Specifications. Tie-in to the south shall be to the existing watermain at Patterson Road. The alignment of the required watermain shall be determined through the servicing agreement design review.
 - iii) Install approximately 120 meters of 300 mm diameter water main along Sea Island Way from Garden City to the west property line of the proposed development, complete with fire hydrants spaced as per City's Engineering Design Specifications. Alignment of the required watermain shall be determined through the servicing agreement design review.
 - iv) Install a fire hydrant at the dead end watermain at Sea Island Way frontage to meet City fire hydrant spacing requirements.
 - v) To address water quality and maintenance issues associated with the resulting dead end watermain, the developer is required to install a new automatic flushing system. The flushing system shall be located in a right-of-way within the north west portion of the proposed site. This potential right-of-way is to be located outside of the 10m wide right-of-way that will be provided along the north property line of the site for the road widening. The right-of-way requirements shall be determined through the servicing agreement.
 - vi) Provide a right-of-way for water meter chamber, if a chamber is required. The exact dimensions and location of the right of way shall be finalized at the servicing agreement process.
 - c) At developer's cost, the City is to:
 - i) Cut and cap at main the existing water service connections.
 - ii) Install new water service connection for the proposed site at the watermain dead end at Sea Island Way.
 - iii) Complete all required tie-ins to existing City water mains.
 - 2) Storm Sewer Works:
 - a) The developer is required to, at developer's cost:
 - i) Install approximately 270 meters of 600 mm diameter storm sewer (or OCP size) along Sea Island Way from Garden City Road to Sexsmith Road. A high point shall be established at the north-east corner of the proposed site so that all road run-off at Sea Island Way frontage shall be directed west to the existing drainage system at Sexsmith Road. Tie-in to the west shall be to the existing 900mm diameter storm sewer at Sexsmith Road. Alignment of the required storm sewer shall be determined through the servicing agreement design review. No runoff from the frontage improvements and road widening along Sea Island Way frontage shall be directed or tied into the existing storm sewers along the east side of Garden City Road.

- ii) Alternatively, confirm through hydraulic modelling, whether the existing drainage system along the east side of Garden City Road and the corresponding downstream drainage system along the north side of Patterson Rd (east of Garden City Rd) has capacity to accommodate the runoff from the proposed frontage improvements and road widening along Sea Island Way. If the existing drainage system does not have capacity, new downstream storm sewers will be required at Garden City Road frontage and along the north side of Patterson Road east of Garden City. City review and approval of the modelling results is required prior to the developer entering into a servicing agreement or prior to rezoning adoption, whichever occurs first.
- iii) Install a new storm service connection complete with an inspection chamber. Location and details of the service connection shall be finalized through the servicing agreement design review.
- b) At developer's cost, the City is to:
 - iv) Cut and cap all existing storm sewer service connections at all frontages of the proposed site.
 - v) Complete all required tie-ins to the existing City drainage system.
- 3) Sanitary Sewer Works:
 - a) At Developer's cost, the City is to:
 - i) Install new sanitary service laterals to proposed development and tie-in to existing sanitary manhole (SMH56969) in front of 8911 Patterson Road.
- 4) Transportation Works and Frontage Improvements
 - a) The Developer is required to, at the developer's cost:
 - ii) Complete the following frontage improvements:
 - a. Along the Sea Island frontage:
 - i. Provide the following from north to south: 0.2 m curb and gutter, minimum 3.5 m wide treed boulevard (width to be refined as part of Servicing Agreement* design to accommodate potential future widening of Sea Island Way), 2.5 m wide bike path (transitioned to meet existing on-street bike path to the west), and 2 m wide sidewalk.
 - ii. Bike path and sidewalk to be continuous with existing pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure along Garden City Road.
 - b. Along the Garden City Road frontage:
 - i. Construct landscaped area west of the existing concrete sidewalk.
 - ii. Maintain existing concrete sidewalk and asphalt shared pedestrian and cyclist path.
 - c. Along the Patterson Road frontage:
 - i. Construct a 2 m wide sidewalk extending from the frontage of 8851 Patterson Road to the existing 3 m wide multi-use path to the east;
 - ii. Re-instate driveways at 8871 and 8891 Patterson Road.
 - iii. Provide a grassed / landscaped area between the existing 3 m wide multi-use path and the south property line of the subject site.
 - d. At the Garden City Road and Sea Island Way intersection:
 - i. Construct new letdown.
 - ii. Upgrade the channelized right turn lane at the SW corner of Sea Island Way and Garden City Road with a smart channel with a tighter radius, subject to acceptance of the proposed works by MoTI.
 - iii. Widen and improve existing pedestrian crossing on the south side of Sea Island Way and Garden City Road to enable cyclists crossings.
 - iv. Provide a new 2.5 m wide cycle track within the channelized island on the southeast corner of the Sea Island Way / Garden City Road intersection, subject to acceptance of the proposed works by MoTI.
 - iii) Coordinate with BC Hydro Transmission to address the conflict between the existing poles, anchors and overhead lines and the proposed development along Garden City Road frontage. Poles and anchors relocation may be required. If pole relocations are required, the cost of relocating the poles and overhead lines shall be included in the servicing agreement security. Written confirmation of the relocation costs from BC Hydro is required prior to entering into the servicing agreement.

- iv) Pre-duct for future hydro, telephone and cable utilities along all road frontages.
- v) Locate all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks required to service the proposed development within the developments site (see list below for examples). A functional plan showing conceptual locations for such infrastructure shall be included in the Rezoning staff report and the development process design review. Please coordinate with the respective private utility companies and the project's lighting and traffic signal consultants to confirm the requirements and the locations for the aboveground structures. If a private utility company does not require an aboveground structure, that company shall confirm this via a letter to be submitted to the City. The following are examples of SRWs that shall be shown in the functional plan and registered prior to SA design approval:

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

5) Streetlights:

- a) Provide street lighting at Patterson Road, Garden City Road and Sea Island way frontages. Please consult the City Planner for the general requirements for street lighting which will be confirmed/finalized through the SA process

6) General Items:

- a) The Developer is required to, at the developer's cost:
- b) Provide, prior to start of site preparation works or within the first servicing agreement submission, whichever comes first, a preload plan and geotechnical assessment of preload, dewatering, and soil preparation impacts on the existing utilities fronting the development site and provide mitigation recommendations.
- c) Provide a video inspection report of the existing utilities along the road frontages prior to start of site preparation works or within the first servicing agreement submission, whichever comes first. A follow-up video inspection, complete with a civil engineer's signed and sealed recommendation letter, is required after site preparation works are complete (i.e. pre-load removal, completion of dewatering, etc.) to assess the condition of the existing utilities and provide recommendations to retain, replace, or repair. Any utilities damaged by the pre-load, de-watering, or other ground preparation shall be replaced or repaired at the Developer's cost.
- d) Conduct pre- and post-preload elevation surveys of all surrounding roads, utilities, and structures. Any damage, nuisance, or other impact to be repaired at the developer's cost. The post-preload elevation survey shall be incorporated within the servicing agreement design.
- e) Monitor the settlement at the adjacent utilities and structures during pre-loading, dewatering, and soil preparation works per a geotechnical engineer's recommendations, and report the settlement amounts to the City for approval.
- f) Submit a proposed strategy at the building permit stage for managing excavation de-watering. Note that the City's preference is to manage groundwater onsite or by removing and disposing at an appropriate facility. If this is not feasible due to volume of de-watering, the Developer will be required to apply to Metro Vancouver for a permit to discharge into the sanitary sewer system. If the sanitary sewer does not have adequate capacity to receive the volume of groundwater, the Developer will be required to enter into a de-watering agreement with the City wherein the developer will be required to treat the groundwater before discharging it to the City's storm sewer system.
- g) Not encroach into City rights-of-ways with any proposed trees, retaining walls, or other non-removable structures. Retaining walls proposed to encroach into rights-of-ways must be reviewed by the City's Engineering Department.
- h) Coordinate the servicing agreement design for this development with the servicing agreement(s) for the adjacent development(s), both existing and in-stream. The developer's civil engineer shall submit a signed and sealed letter with each servicing agreement submission confirming that they have coordinated with civil engineer(s) of the adjacent project(s) and that the servicing agreement designs are consistent. The City will not accept the 1st

submission if it is not coordinated with the adjacent developments. The coordination letter should cover, but not be limited to, the following:

- i) Corridors for City utilities (existing and proposed water, storm sewer, sanitary and DEU) and private utilities.
 - ii) Pipe sizes, material and slopes.
 - iii) Location of manholes and fire hydrants.
 - iv) Road grades, high points and low points.
 - v) Alignment of ultimate and interim curbs.
 - vi) Proposed street lights design.
 - i) Enter into, if required, additional legal agreements, as determined via the subject development's Servicing Agreement(s) and/or Development Permit(s), and/or Building Permit(s) to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering, including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, de-watering, drilling, underpinning, anchoring, shoring, piling, pre-loading, ground densification or other activities that may result in settlement, displacement, subsidence, damage or nuisance to City and private utility infrastructure
27. Payment of all fees in full for the cost associated with the Public Hearing Notices, consistent with the City's Consolidated Fees Bylaw No 8636, as amended.

Prior to a Development Permit* being forwarded to the Development Permit Panel for consideration, the developer is required to:

1. Legal Agreements: Satisfy the terms of legal agreement registered on title prior to rezoning adoption with respect to the development's Development Permit.
2. Additional Requirements: Discharge and registration of additional right-of-way(s) and/or legal agreements, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, Director of Transportation, Director of Engineering, Manager of Real Estate Services, Manager of Community Social Services, and Senior Manager of Parks.
3. Waste Management Plan: As part of the permit drawings, submit a Plan (i.e. drawings and related specifications), to the City's satisfaction, indicating the nature of all waste management-related facilities proposed on the subject site and their compliance with City bylaws and policies, including, but not limited to, carts/bins (e.g., uses, types, and numbers), waste/holding rooms (e.g., uses, locations, sizes, and clear heights), loading facilities (e.g., locations, sizes, and clear heights), pedestrian/vehicle access (e.g., routes and vehicles turning templates), and related features, as required (e.g., signage, janitor sinks, floor drains, lighting, ventilation, safety measures, and door/gate operations). w
4. Complete an acoustical report and recommendations prepared by an appropriate registered professional, which demonstrates that the interior noise levels and noise mitigation standards comply with the City's Official Community Plan and Noise Bylaw requirements. 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:

TABLE 7

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 Building Permit Issuance, the developer must complete the following requirements:

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

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

Note:

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

All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall have priority over all such liens, charges and encumbrances as is considered advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall, unless the Director of Development determines otherwise, be fully registered in the Land Title Office prior to enactment of the appropriate bylaw.

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

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

Signed

Date

PH - 163



City of Richmond
6911 16th AVENUE RICHMOND BC V6Y 2C1


[illegible]

MPT ENGINEERING CO. LTD.
1129 HORSESHOE WAY, RICHMOND, BC V6V 3H7 TEL. 604-270-6081 FAX: 604-270-4137

NOTES:

1. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE DERIVED FROM CITY OF RICHMOND HPN MOUNDPOINT #98 (77H4870). ELEV. = 7.93m.
2. CONTRACTOR TO CONFORM TO RICHMOND MPT ENGINEERING, PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION DISCREPANCIES TO MPT ENGINEERING, PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
3. CONTRACTOR TO CONFIRM LOCATIONS OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO MPT ENGINEERING, PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
4. ALL MATERIALS AND CONSTRUCTION TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RICHMOND WATER MUNICIPAL CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS (HARDY) AND THE CURRENT CITY OF RICHMOND SUPPLEMENTARY SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAIL DRAWINGS.

TITLE:	#8911, #8931, #8951, & 8981 PATTERSON ROAD			
	CITY FILE: SA 1 st - 89888			
DESIGN	MPT	DWC. No.	*****-1*-04	
DRAWN	MPT	SCALE:	1:500	DATE: JUL/20
CHECKED	MPT	SHEET No.	28	SIT No.: 3 OF 1
ENGINEER	MPT			



City of Richmond

NOTES:

1. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE DERIVED FROM CITY OF RICHMOND HPN MONUMENT #196 (77144970). Elev. = 1.7933m.
2. CONTRACTOR TO CONFIRM BENCHMARK WITH MPT ENGINEERING, PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
3. CONTRACTOR TO CONFIRM LOCATIONS OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO MPT ENGINEERING, PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
4. ALL MATERIALS AND CONSTRUCTION TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CURRENT "WATER MUNICIPAL CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS (AMCD)" AND THE CURRENT CITY OF RICHMOND "SUPPLEMENTARY SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAIL DRAWINGS".

AMPT ENGINEERING CO. LTD.

HOE WAY, RICHMOND, BC V7A 5H7 TEL: 604-270-0331

DAVA DEVELOPMENTS LTD.

MP DWG. No.: R16020-FP
SHT No.: 1 OF 3

'INTERIM' FUNCTIONAL PLAN

#8911, #8931, #8951, & 8991 PATTERSON ROAD


CITY FILE: SA 1*-*****
DWG. No.: *****-1*-15

OWN: QP-1	SCALE: 1:500	DATE: JUL/20
ENGINEER: MPT	SEC. No.: 28, 5-8	SHT. No.: 1 OF 3

CONCLUSIONS

2023-01-13

2023-01-13



City of Richmond

REVISIONS: 1. 10/11/2011 2. 10/11/2011 3. 10/11/2011

TITLE: 'ULTIMATE' FUNCTIONAL PLAN

#8911, #8931, #8951, & 8991 PATTERSON ROAD

CITY FILE: SA 11-1-11-15

Drawn: MPT
Checked: MPT
Engineered: MPT

DWG. No.: *****-11-15
DATE: JUL/20
SHEET NO. 1 OF 3

REVISIONS

NO.	DATE	BY	DESCRIPTION
1	13 JAN/23	MPT	ISSUE FOR RECORDING APPLICATION
2	13 JAN/23	MPT	ISSUE FOR RECORDING APPLICATION
3	13 JAN/23	MPT	ISSUE FOR RECORDING APPLICATION
4	13 JAN/23	MPT	ISSUE FOR RECORDING APPLICATION

MPT ENGINEERING CO. LTD.

480-1100 HOBBSVILLE WAY, RICHMOND, BC V6V 4P7 TEL: 604-270-8121 FAX: 604-270-4137

DATA DEVELOPMENTS LTD.

MPT DWG. No.: R16020-FP


SHT. No.: 2 OF 3

NOTES:

- ALL ELEVATIONS ARE DERIVED FROM CITY OF RICHMOND MPM MONUMENT #116 (77H4375). ELEVATION = 1.793M.
- CONTRACTOR TO CONFIRM BENCHMARK WITH MPT ENGINEERING PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
- CONTRACTOR TO CONFIRM LOCATIONS OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO MPT ENGINEERING PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
- ALL MATERIALS AND CONSTRUCTION TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CURRENT 'MASTER SPECIFICATIONS' FOR THE CITY OF RICHMOND AND THE CURRENT 'MASTER SPECIFICATIONS' FOR THE CITY OF RICHMOND.

REFERENCE PLAN OF PART OF LOT 36 EXCEPT: PART WITHIN RED OUTLINE TAKEN BY HIGHWAY
STATUTORY RIGHT OF WAY PLAN 17236, SECTIONS 27 AND 28
BLOCK 5 NORTH RANGE 6 WEST NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT PLAN 3404

BCGS 92G.015
PURSUANT TO SECTION 107 OF THE LAND TITLE ACT
CITY OF RICHMOND



INTEGRATED SURVEY AREA NO. 18, CITY OF RICHMOND, NA035 (5295) 4.00 E.C. (GRID).
GROUND BEARINGS ARE DERIVED FROM GEODETIC CONTROL. MONUMENTS 7715805 AND 7715819
ARE REFERRED TO THE CENTRAL MERIDIAN OF UTM ZONE 18.
THE UTM COORDINATES AND ESTIMATED ABSOLUTE ACCURACY ACHIEVED ARE DERIVED
FROM THE GEODETIC CONTROL MONUMENTS 7715805 AND 7715819.
THIS PLAN SHOWS HORIZONTAL GROUND DISTANCES UNLESS
OTHERWISE SPECIFIED. TO COMPUTE GROUND DISTANCES, MULTIPLY
DISTANCES BY THE AVERAGE COMBINED FACTOR OF 0.999904. THE AVERAGE
COMBINED FACTOR HAS BEEN DETERMINED BASED ON COMBINED COORDINATE MONUMENTS 7715805 AND 7715819.
OFFSET POINTS AND PLUGS ARE ON PRODUCTION OF PROPERTY LINES UNLESS INDICATED OTHERWISE.
POINTS OF THIS PLAN ARE NOT TO SCALE FOR PLOT PURPOSES.

MATSON PECK & TOPLISS
SURVEYORS & ENGINEERS
#320 - 11120 HORSESHOE WAY
RICHMOND, B.C., V7A 5H7
PH: 604-270-8331
FAX: 604-270-4137

THE FIELD SURVEY REPRESENTED BY THIS PLAN
WAS COMPLETED ON THE 17TH DAY OF JUNE, 20
WILLIAM P. WONG, BOLS (#697)



**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500
Amendment Bylaw 10464 (RZ 20-919113)
8911, 8931, 8951, 8991 Patterson Road**

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

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

“20.54 Residential / Limited Commercial (ZMU54) – Capstan Village (City Centre)”

20.54.1 Purpose

The **zone** accommodates low rise and high-rise apartments within the **City Centre**, plus a limited amount of **commercial use** and compatible **secondary uses** and additional **uses**. Additional **density** is provided to achieve, among other things, **City** objectives in respect to **affordable housing units, child care, amenity, commercial use, and the Capstan Canada Line station.**

20.54.2 Permitted Uses

- **child care**
- **congregate housing**
- **entertainment, spectator**
- **hotel**
- **housing, apartment**
- **housing, town**
- **live/work dwelling**
- **office**
- **restaurant**
- **retail, convenience**
- **retail, general**
- **service, financial**
- **service, personal**

20.54.3 Secondary Uses

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

20.54.5 Permitted Density

1. For the purposes of this **zone**, if the **owner** transfers not less than 829 m² of land to the City as public **open space**, the calculation of **floor area ratio** shall be based on a net **development site** area of 4,908.5 m².
2. The maximum **floor area ratio** (FAR) of the site is 2.0.
3. Notwithstanding Section 20.54.5.2 the reference to 2.0 is increased to a higher **density** of 2.5 if:
 - a) the **site** is located in the Capstan Station Bonus area designated by the **City Centre** Area Plan;
 - b) the owner pays a sum into the **Capstan station reserve** as specified in Section 5.19 of this bylaw;
 - c) the **owner** grants to the **City**, via a statutory **right-of-way**, **air space parcel**, or fee simple **lot**, as determined at the sole discretion of the City, rights of public use over a suitably landscaped area of the **site** for **park** and related purposes at a rate of 5.0 m² per **dwelling unit**;
 - d) the **owner** provides in the **building** not less than 27 **affordable housing units** and the combined **habitable space** of the total number of **affordable housing units** would comprise at least **15% of the total building area**; and
 - e) the **owner** enters into a **housing agreement** with respect to the **affordable housing units** and registers the **housing agreement** against the title to the **owner's lot**, and files a notice in the Land Title Office.
4. Notwithstanding Section 20.54.5.2, if the **owner** has provided **affordable housing units** under section 20.54.5.3, an additional 1.0 **density bonus floor area ratio** is permitted, provided that:
 - a) the **lot** is located within the Village Centre Bonus area designated by the **City Centre** Area Plan;
 - b) the **owner** uses the additional 1.0 **density bonus floor area ratio** for non-residential **hotel** use only; and
 - c) for the 4,908.5 m² area resulting from the additional 1.0 **density bonus floor area ratio** for non-residential **hotel** purposes, the **owner** pays a sum to the **City** prior to final reading/adoption of the bylaw, in lieu of granting 5% of the additional 1.0 **density bonus floor area ratio** (i.e. the **gross floor area** of the additional **building area**) to the **City** as **community amenity space**, equal to 5% of the 1.0 **density bonus floor area**:
 - i) multiplied by the "equivalent to construction value" rate of \$871 per square foot, if the payment is made within one year of third reading of the zoning amendment bylaw;

or

- ii) multiplied by the Council-approved “equivalent to construction value” community amenity contribution rate in effect for the **City Centre** at the time of final reading of the zoning amendment bylaw, if the payment is not made within one year of third reading of the zoning amendment bylaw,

whichever is greater.

20.54.6 Permitted Lot Coverage

1. The maximum **lot coverage** for **buildings** and **landscaped** roofs over **parking spaces** is 90%, exclusive of portions of the **sites** the **owner** grants to the City, via a statutory **right-of-way**, **air space parcel**, or alternative means satisfactory to the **City**, for **park** or **road** purposes.

20.54.7 Yards & Setbacks

1. Minimum **setbacks** shall be:
 - a) for **road** and **park** setbacks, measured to a **lot** line or the boundary of an area granted to the City for **road**, **park**, or **open space** purposes: 6.0 m, but may be reduced to 3.0 m if a proper interface is provided as specified in a Development Permit approved by the City; and
 - b) for parts of a **building** situated below finished **grade**, measured to a **lot** line: 0.0 m.
2. There is no minimum interior side yard.
3. There is no minimum setback to the north property line.
4. Architectural features such as cornices, leaders, pilasters, and sills may project into a required **setback**, but may not project more than a distance of 1.0 m, if a proper interface is provided as specified in a Development Permit approved by the **City**.
5. Entry stairs, ramps and **landscape** elements such as paving and **fences** may project into the required **setback** but may not exceed 40% of the **frontage** as specified in a Development Permit approved by the **City**.

20.54.8 Permitted Heights

1. The maximum **building height** shall be 47.0 m geodetic.
2. The maximum **height** for **accessory buildings** is 5.0 m.
3. The maximum **height** for **accessory structures** is 12.0 m.

20.54.9 Subdivision Provisions

1. The minimum **lot area** is 4,000 m².

20.54.10 Landscaping & Screening

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

20.54.11 On-Site Parking and Loading

1. On-site **vehicle** and bicycle parking and loading shall be provided according to the provisions of Section 7.0, except that:
 - a) **City Centre** Parking Zone 1 rates shall apply for the purpose of minimum number of **parking spaces**, except that 0.8 **parking spaces** for residents shall be required per **affordable housing unit** plus 0.2 spaces for visitors per **affordable housing unit**, subject to the provision of Transportation Demand Management measures to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation; and
 - b) large size **loading spaces** shall not be required.

20.54.12 Residential Rental Tenure

1. For the purposes of this zone, **residential rental tenure** means, in relation to a **dwelling unit** in a multi-family residential **building**, occupancy of a **dwelling unit** that includes an **affordable housing unit** in accordance with a **housing agreement** registered on title, and governed by a tenancy agreement that is subject to the *Residential Tenancy Act* (BC), as may be amended or replaced from time to time.
2. A minimum of 27 **dwelling units** shall be **residential rental tenure**.

20.54.13 Other Regulations

1. **Telecommunication antenna** must be located a minimum 20.0 m above the ground (i.e., on a roof of a **building**).
2. In addition to the regulations listed above, the General Development Regulations in Section 4.0 and the Specific Use Regulations in Section 5.0 apply.”
2. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following area and by designating it
 - 2.1 **“RESIDENTIAL / LIMITED COMMERCIAL (ZMU 54) – CAPSTAN VILLAGE (CITY CENTRE)”**.

That area shown hatched and indicated as “A” on “Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of Bylaw 10464”.
 - 2.2 **“SCHOOL & INSTITUTIONAL USE (SI)”**.

That area shown cross-hatched and indicated as “B” on “Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of Bylaw 10464”.

3. This Bylaw may be cited as **“Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10464”**.

FIRST READING

PUBLIC HEARING

SECOND READING



THIRD READING

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE APPROVAL

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED


ADOPTED

JUN 12 2023

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED by 
APPROVED by Director or Solicitor 

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER





Regular Council
Monday, June 12, 2023

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REMOVED FROM THE
CONSENT AGENDA

11. APPLICATION BY DAVA DEVELOPMENTS LTD. FOR REZONING AT 8911, 8931, 8951, 8991 PATTERSON ROAD FROM "RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY (RS1/F)" ZONE TO "RESIDENTIAL/ LIMITED COMMERCIAL (ZMU54)" ZONE AND "SCHOOL & INSTITUTIONAL USE (SI)" ZONE
(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-010075, RZ 18-817742) (REDMS No. 7205757)

R23/11-5

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10464 to create the "Residential/Limited Commercial (ZMU54)" zone and to rezone 8911, 8931, 8951, 8991 Patterson Road from "Residential Single Family (RS1/F)" zone to "Residential/Limited Commercial (ZMU54)" zone and "School & Institutional Use (SI)" zone be introduced and given first reading.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with respect to: (i) tree replacement and retention, (ii) shared parking option with neighboring property, and future development plans for the neighborhood.

The question on the motion was then called and **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Gillanders and Wolfe opposed.



City of Richmond

Report to Committee

To: Planning Committee
From: Wayne Craig
Director, Development

Date: May 24, 2023
File: RZ 21-922202

Re: Application by Interface Architecture Inc. for Rezoning at 5800, 5840, 5860 Granville Avenue from the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" Zone to the "Low-Density Townhouses (RTL4)" Zone

Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10470, for the rezoning of 5800, 5840, 5860 Granville Avenue from the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" zone to the "Low-Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone, be introduced and given first reading.

Wayne Craig
Director, Development
(604-247-4625)

WC:cl
Att. 7

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Affordable Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Staff Report

Origin

Interface Architecture Inc. (on behalf of Satwant Atwal and Surinder Grewal of 1275306 BC Ltd.) has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 5800, 5840 and 5860 Granville Avenue from the “Single Detached (RS1/E)” zone to the “Low-Density Townhouses (RTL4)” zone, to permit the property to be developed for 18 townhouse units, with vehicle access from Granville Avenue. A location map and aerial photo of the subject site are provided in Attachment 1.

Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details about the development proposal is provided in Attachment 2.

Existing Site Condition and Context

A survey of the subject site is included in Attachment 3. The subject site consists of three lots located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Granville Avenue and Ledway Road.

Subject Site Existing Housing Profile

The subject site consists of three lots, each containing a single-family dwelling that is occupied by rental tenants. Within the dwelling at 5860 Granville Avenue, there is also a two-bedroom secondary suite that is occupied by rental tenants. The existing dwellings are proposed to be demolished at future development stage.

Surrounding Development

Existing development immediately surrounding the subject site is as follows:

- To the North: Across Granville Avenue, are large lots zoned “Low-Density Townhouses Zone (RTL1)”, “Medium Density Low Rise Apartments (RAM1)”, and “Assembly (ASY)” containing multi-family housing and the Canadian Martyrs Catholic Church, respectively.
- To the South: Are large lots zoned “Single Detached (RS1/E)” containing single-family housing fronting Linscott Road.
- To the East: Is a large lot zoned “Single Detached (RS1/E)” containing a single-family house fronting Granville Avenue.
- To the West: Across Ledway Road are large lots zoned “Single Detached (RS1/E)” containing single-family housing fronting Ledway Road.

Existing Legal Encumbrances

There is a City Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) registered on Title of the subject properties for the sanitary sewer. The applicant has been advised that encroachment into the SRW is not permitted.

The proposed Site Plan will be further refined as part of the Development Permit (DP) application review process to ensure no encroachments.

Related Policies & Studies

Official Community Plan

The Official Community Plan (OCP) land use designation for the subject properties is “Neighbourhood Residential”. This redevelopment proposal is consistent with this designation.

Arterial Road Land Use Policy

The Arterial Road Land Use Policy designation for the subject properties is “Arterial Road Townhouse”, subject to the development criteria in the Policy. This redevelopment proposal is consistent with this designation and with the Policy criteria.

Housing Type and Tenure

This proposal is for 18 townhouse units that are intended to be strata-titled. Consistent with the OCP policy respecting townhouse development projects and in order to maximize potential rental and housing opportunities throughout the City, the applicant has agreed to register a restrictive covenant on Title prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, prohibiting (a) the imposition of any strata bylaw that would prohibit any residential dwelling unit from being rented; and (b) the imposition of any strata bylaw that would place age-based restrictions on occupants of any residential dwelling unit.

Affordable Housing Strategy

The City’s Affordable Housing Strategy requires that all townhouse rezoning applications provide a cash-in-lieu contribution to the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund. Consistent with the Strategy, the applicant proposes to submit a cash-in-lieu contribution to the Affordable Housing Reserve fund in the amount of \$12.00 per buildable square foot (for sites outside of the City Centre Area Plan) for a total contribution of \$244,512.00 prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

Market Rental Housing Policy

This rezoning application was received prior to the current Market Rental Housing Policy, which was adopted by City Council on June 20, 2022. Consistent with the provisions for in-stream rezoning applications, this application is exempt from the Market Rental Housing Policy if the rezoning bylaw is granted first reading prior to June 20, 2023.

Public Art Program Policy

Based on the maximum buildable floor area of approximately 1,893 m² (20,376 ft²), the recommended Public Art contribution based on administrative guidelines of \$0.99/ft² (2023 rate) is approximately \$20,172.24.

As the project will generate a recommended Public Art Contribution less than \$40,000.00 and there are limited opportunities to locate Public Art on-site, as per Policy, it is recommended that the Public Art contribution be directed to the Public Art Reserve Fund for City-wide projects on City lands. The contribution is required to be submitted prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

Accessibility

Consistent with the OCP guidelines regarding accessible housing, the applicant proposes to provide aging-in-place features in all of the units (e.g., stairwell handrails, lever-type handles for plumbing fixtures and door handles, and solid blocking in washroom walls for future grab bar installation beside toilet, bathtub, and shower). In addition, the applicant proposes two Convertible Units (in Building 4). Further review of the Convertible Unit design will be undertaken as part of the DP application review process.

Energy Step Code

Consistent with the City's Energy Step Code requirements, the project architect has confirmed that the applicable Energy Step Code performance targets have been considered in the proposed design. The proposal is anticipated to achieve Step 3 of the Energy Step Code with the use of a Low Carbon Energy System.

Further details on how the proposal will meet this commitment will be reviewed as part of the DP and Building Permit (BP) application review processes.

Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

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

Public Consultation

A rezoning sign has been installed on the subject property. In response to the placement of the rezoning sign on the property, an email inquiry was received from the resident to the south at 5811 Linscott Road regarding potential hedge retention or replanting along the south property line of 5800 Granville Avenue to address privacy concerns. Attachment 4 includes the email correspondence between the resident at 5811 Linscott Road and City staff.

There is an existing hedge located on the neighbour's property which provides some screening of the proposed development on the subject site.

The applicant proposes to remove the existing on-site hedge, install a new privacy fence and plant a new hedge along the south property line of 5800 Granville Avenue to respond to the neighbour's concerns.

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant first reading to the rezoning bylaw, the bylaw will be forwarded to a Public Hearing, where any area resident or interested party will have an opportunity to comment.

Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the *Local Government Act* and the City's *Zoning Bylaw 8500*.

Analysis

Site Planning and Open Space

The proposed development consists of 18 townhouse units on a site that would be approximately 3155 m² (33,960 ft²) in area after the required road dedication (8 m²). Conceptual development plans proposed by the applicant are included in Attachment 5.

The proposed site layout consists of:

- Two three-storey buildings along the north side of the site facing Granville Avenue.
- One two-and-a-half-storey triplex building on the south side of the site facing Ledway Road. The upper storey is positioned in the centre of the building, with minimal window openings, to provide a sensitive interface with existing single-family housing to the west and south.
- Two two-storey duplex buildings along the south side of the site along the interface with existing single-family housing on Linscott Rd.

Private outdoor space for the three-storey units fronting Granville Avenue and Ledway Road is proposed in the form of front yards at ground level and decks on the second level facing either Ledway Road or the internal drive-aisle. Private outdoor space for the two-storey units is proposed in the form of rear yards at ground level.

Common outdoor amenity space is proposed in the southeast corner of the site opposite the main site entry and its preliminary size meets the minimum guidelines in the OCP. Opportunities exist to further examine the location, configuration and programming of the common outdoor amenity space on-site as part of the DP application review process.

Consistent with the OCP, the applicant proposes to submit a contribution to the City prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw in lieu of providing common indoor amenity space on-site. The current rate for this 18-unit townhouse proposal is \$2,066.00/unit for a total contribution of \$37,188.00 to the City's Leisure Facilities Reserve Fund. In the event that the contribution is not received within one year of the rezoning bylaw receiving third reading, the contribution shall be recalculated based on the rate in effect at the time of payment, as updated periodically.

Site Access, Parking and Road Improvements

Vehicle access to the subject site is proposed off Granville Avenue. By virtue of the existing centre median located within Granville Avenue, which separates eastbound and westbound traffic, vehicle turning movements into and out of the subject site are limited to right-in/right-out.

Prior to rezoning bylaw adoption, the applicant must register a SRW on Title for public-right-of-passage over the drive-aisle to enable potential shared access to future townhouse development to the east.

Pedestrian access from the public sidewalks along Granville Avenue and Ledway Road to each of the street-fronting units is proposed via individual pathways, and pedestrian access to the internal units is proposed via the drive-aisle.

On-site parking is proposed consistent with the requirements in Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500. Resident parking is proposed to be provided within each unit's garage (in either a side-by-side or tandem arrangement) or to be split between single-car garages and surface parking spaces. For the spaces proposed in a tandem arrangement, the applicant is required to register a restrictive covenant on Title prohibiting the conversion of the tandem parking area into a habitable space. Surface parking spaces are also proposed for visitors, one of which is Van Accessible. Resident bike parking is also proposed to be located within each unit's garage, and a visitor bike rack is proposed within the common outdoor amenity space.

The applicant is required to provide a 4 m x 4 m corner cut road dedication at the intersection of Granville Avenue and Ledway Road and to enter into a Servicing Agreement (SA) for the design and construction of boulevard improvements along both Granville Avenue and Ledway Road. The scope of improvements is to include (but is not limited to): a new treed/grass boulevard and wider multi-use path (consisting of a concrete sidewalk and off-street bike path) along both frontages, improved bus stop area design, and new wheelchair ramps at the intersection of Ledway Road and Granville Avenue to align with the existing crosswalk across Granville Avenue. The location and width of the new treed/grass boulevards and sidewalks has been purposely varied to allow for retention of existing City street trees and trees on the subject site. Complete details on the scope of the works are included in Attachment 7. The frontage design will be further refined through the SA design review process. The road dedication must be registered at the Land Title Office prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, and the SA must be entered into prior to BP issuance.

Traffic and Parking Assessment

The applicant submitted a Traffic and Parking Assessment prepared by a Professional Engineer, which assesses traffic operations along the subject site's road frontages. The proposed frontage improvements are adequate to accommodate site-generated traffic with no impact on existing traffic.

The Assessment confirms the proposed Site Plan is adequate to accommodate on-site circulation of all types of vehicle movements (passenger vehicles, garbage/recycling trucks, delivery trucks and fire trucks).

The provision of on-site vehicle parking meets the requirements in Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500.

The Assessment has been reviewed and the findings supported by City staff.

Tree Retention and Replacement

The applicant has submitted a Certified Arborist's Report; which identifies on-site and off-site tree species, assesses tree structure and condition, and provides recommendations on tree retention and removal relative to the proposed development. The Report assesses:

- 16 bylaw-sized trees on the subject property (Trees # 455, 457-465, 467-472).
- Two trees on-site that are shared with the City (Trees # 456, 466).
- Two trees on-site that are shared with the neighbouring property to the east (Trees # 473, 474).
- One tree on-site that is shared with the City and the neighbouring property to the east (Tree # 475).
- Seven trees located on neighbouring properties to the south and the east (Trees # N01-N06 and an unnumbered Walnut tree).
- Four street trees and two hedgerows on City property (Trees # C01-C07).

Three undersized hedges are also identified on-site along the west, south and east property lines of 5800 Granville Avenue (un-numbered).

The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator and Parks Department Arborist reviewed the Arborist's Report and a summary of the outcome is provided in the following table:

Trees to be retained and protected	
# Trees	Location/Tree #/Comments
5	On-site (Trees # 455, 457, 458, 459 and 467); in good condition and must be retained and protected.
1	On-site and shared with the City (Tree # 456); in good condition and must be retained and protected.
3	On-site and shared with the City and the neighbouring property to the east (Trees # 473, 474, 475). Although these trees are in poor condition from historic pruning treatments and decayed wounds, the applicant was unable to obtain authorization from the neighbouring property owner to the east for the removal of these shared trees, therefore the trees must be retained and protected as per the City's tree protection information Bulletin Tree-03.
5	On neighbouring properties to the south and east (Trees # N01, N04, N05, N06 and the unnumbered Walnut tree); in fair to good condition and must be retained and protected.
2	In the boulevard on City-owned property along Ledway Road (Trees # C05, C06); in good condition and must be retained and protected.
Total: 16	

Trees recommended for removal	
# Trees	Location/Tree #
11	On-site (Trees # 460-465, 468-472). All are in poor condition and are either dying (sparse canopy foliage), have been historically topped and have significant structural defects such as previous stem failure, narrow and weak secondary stem unions at the main branch union (below previous topping cuts) and co-dominant stems with inclusions. These trees are not good candidates for retention and should be removed and replaced.
1	On-site and shared with the City. Tree # 466 should be removed due to poor condition from historic pruning and a buried tree base.
2	On the neighbouring properties to the south (Trees # N02, N03). These trees are fully dead and decayed, and should be removed and replaced. The applicant has obtained written authorization from the adjacent property owners (a copy of which is on file), and the applicant must obtain a valid tree removal permit prior to removal.
2	In the boulevard on City-owned property along Ledway Road (Trees # C02 and C03). These trees are suppressed by Hedgerow #C01 resulting in poor, asymmetrical crown structure. Historical pruning of the trees has resulted in large, decayed wounds. These trees are also in conflict with the required frontage improvements along Ledway Road.
Total: 16	

On-site trees identified for removal are required to be replaced at a 2:1 ratio as per the OCP and the City's Tree Protection Bylaw 8057.

The two hedgerows located on City-owned property along Ledway Road and Granville Avenue (# C01 and C07) are in conflict with the required frontage improvements and must be removed.

Although not assessed by the project Arborist or City staff, two of the undersized hedges at 5800 Granville Avenue (one along the west property line and one along the east property line) are proposed to be removed due to conflict with the proposed development (i.e., the drive-aisle and on-site parking), and to improve the public realm along Ledway Road.

As identified previously in this report, the undersized hedge along the south property line of 5800 Granville Avenue is proposed to be removed and a new hedge planted in its place.

Tree Protection

To summarize, the following trees are required to be retained and protected:

- Nine on-site trees (Trees # 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 467, 473, 474 and 475; four of which are shared with either the City or neighbour to the east).
- Five trees on neighbouring properties to the south and east (Trees # N01, N04, N05, N06 and the unnumbered Walnut tree).
- Two trees in the boulevard on City-owned property along Ledway Road (Trees # C05, C06).

The applicant has submitted a tree management drawing showing the trees to be retained and the required tree protection areas (Attachment 6).

To ensure that the 16 trees identified for retention are protected at development stage, the applicant is required to complete the following items:

- Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, submission to the City of:
 - A contract with a Certified Arborist for the supervision of all works conducted within or in close proximity to tree protection zones. The contract must include the scope of work required, the number of proposed monitoring inspections at specified stages of construction, any special measures required to ensure tree protection and a provision for the arborist to submit a post-construction impact assessment to the City for review.
 - A tree survival security in the amount of \$45,000.00 for Trees # 455, 457, 458, 459, 467, 473 and 474.
 - A tree survival security in the amount of \$5,000.00 for Tree # 456 and \$5,000.00 for Tree # 475.
 - A tree survival security in the amount of \$10,000.00 for Tree # C05 and \$5,000.00 for Tree # C06.

The applicant must enter into a legal agreement to accompany the tree survival securities, which sets the terms for the use and release of the securities.

- Prior to demolition of the existing dwelling on the subject site, installation of tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained. Tree protection fencing must be installed to City standard in accordance with the City's tree protection information Bulletin Tree-03 prior to any works being conducted on-site and remain in place until construction and landscaping on-site is completed.

Tree Replacement

11 on-site trees, two trees on neighbouring property, and three trees that are shared with the City or on City property are proposed to be removed (Trees # 460-466, 468-472, N02, N03, C02, C03). In accordance with the 2:1 tree replacement ratio in the OCP and Tree Protection Bylaw 8057, 22 replacement trees are required to be planted and maintained for the 11 on-site trees proposed to be removed (minimum 8 cm caliper deciduous or 4 m high conifer). For the proposed removal of the three trees that are shared with the City or on City property, the applicant is required to submit a contribution in the amount of \$4,500.00 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw (i.e., \$1,500.00 for Tree # 466; \$1,500.00 for Tree # C02; and \$1,500.00 for Tree # C03).

The applicant's preliminary Landscape Plan illustrates that 22 trees of a variety of species and sizes are proposed. To ensure that the replacement trees are planted and maintained on-site, the applicant is required to submit a Landscaping Security prior to DP issuance in the amount of 100 per cent of a cost estimate prepared by the Registered Landscape Architect (including installation and a 10 per cent contingency). As part of the DP application review process, the number and size of proposed replacement trees is to be refined and additional planting opportunities are to be examined where appropriate.

Variance Requested

The conceptual development plans are generally in compliance with the “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)” zone of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, with the exception of a variance request to reduce the exterior side yard setback along Granville Avenue from 6.0 m to 4.5 m.

Staff is supportive of the variance request for the following reasons:

- A reduction in the setback from the north property line along Granville Avenue enables a deeper setback to be provided to the south property line, resulting in a more sensitive interface with existing adjacent single-family housing to the south.
- Although the setback is reduced, the proposal maintains consistency with the minimum private outdoor space guidelines in the OCP through the provision of front yards at ground level and secondary south-facing balconies off the main living areas on the second level.
- At DP stage, the applicant will be required to provide an acoustic report prepared by a registered professional to confirm that the units will achieve the CMHC interior noise standards for traffic noise identified in the OCP.

Site Servicing

Prior to BP issuance, the applicant is required to enter into a SA for the design and construction of: drainage upgrades along Ledway Road (i.e. to increase the size of the storm sewer to 600 mm diameter for approximately 50 m); the water, storm and sanitary service connection designs; and for the boulevard improvements described previously in this report.

Complete details on the scope of the site servicing requirements are included in Attachment 7.

Future DP Application Considerations

A DP application is required to be processed to a satisfactory level prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. The DP application will involve further review of the form and character of the proposed development to ensure it is consistent with the design guidelines for multi-family development contained within the OCP, and further refinements may be made to the drawings as part of the review. This includes, but is not limited to:

- Examining opportunities to improve the Site Plan and Landscape Plan with respect to the entry drive-aisle, extent of surface parking, common outdoor amenity space, children’s play structure, and on-site planting and permeable surfaces.
- Refining the Architectural Plans to clarify proposed lot grading and to demonstrate compliance with the maximum allowable building height.
- Confirming that all Aging-in-Place and Convertible Unit Features have been incorporated into dwelling design.
- Reviewing the proposed exterior building material and colour palette.
- Reviewing the applicant’s design response to the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).

- Gaining a better understanding of the proposed environmental sustainability features to be incorporated into the project, including acquiring further details about how the proposal will meet the Energy Step Code.

Additional items may be identified as part of the DP application review process.

Financial Impact

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

Conclusion

This application is to rezone the property at 5800, 5840, 5860 Granville Avenue from the “Single Detached (RS1/E)” zone to the “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)” zone, to permit the property to be developed for 18 townhouse units with vehicle access to Granville Avenue.

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

The list of rezoning considerations is included in Attachment 7, which has been agreed to by the applicant (signed concurrence on file).

It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10470 be introduced and given first reading.



Cynthia Lussier
Planner 2
(604-276-4107)



CL:js

- Att.
- 1: Location Map/Aerial Photo
 - 2: Development Application Data Sheet
 - 3: Site Survey
 - 4: Email correspondence with the resident at 5811 Linscott Road
 - 5: Conceptual Development Plans
 - 6: Tree Management Drawing
 - 7: Rezoning Considerations



City of Richmond

ATTACHMENT 1



RZ 21-922202


Original Date: 02/01/21

Revision Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



City of Richmond



RZ 21-922202

Original Date: 02/01/21

Revision Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



RZ 21-922202

Address: 5800, 5840, 5860 Granville Avenue

Applicant: Interface Architecture Inc.

Planning Area(s): Blundell

	Existing	Proposed
Owner:	1275306 BC Ltd	To be determined
Site Size (m²):	3,163 m ² (34,046 ft ²)	3,155 m ² (33,960 ft ²)
Land Uses:	Single-family housing	Townhousing
OCP Designation:	Neighbourhood Residential	No change
Zoning:	Single Detached (RS1/E)	Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)
Number of Units:	3	18

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.60	0.60	None permitted
Buildable Floor Area (m ²):	Max. 1,893 m ² (20,376 ft ²)	1,886.77 m ² (20,309 ft ²)	None permitted
Lot Coverage (% of lot area):	Building: Max. 40% Non-porous Surfaces: Max. 65% Live Plant Material: Min. 25%	Building: 35.2% Non-porous Surfaces: 64.5% Live Plant Material: 31%	None
Minimum Lot Width:	50 m	71.9 m	None
Minimum Lot Depth:	35 m	45.1 m	None
Minimum Lot Area:	N/A	3,155 m ² (33,960 ft ²)	None
Setbacks (m):			
Front Yard (Ledway Road):	Min. 6.0 m	6.0 m	None
Exterior Side Yard (Granville Avenue):	Min. 6.0 m	4.5 m	Request to reduce from 6.0 m to 4.5 m
Rear Yard (East):	Min. 3.0 m	6.0 m	None
Interior Side Yard (South):	Min. 3.0 m	6.4 m	None
Building Height (m):	12.0 m	10.9 m	None
Resident On-site Parking Spaces:	2.0 spaces/unit = 36	36	None

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Visitor On-site Parking Spaces:	0.2 spaces/unit = 4 0.02 of which must be Van Accessible	4 1 of which is Van Accessible	None
Total:	40	40	None
Resident Tandem Parking Spaces:	Max. 50% = 18 spaces	50% = 18 spaces	None
Standard-sized Spaces:	Min. 50% = 18 spaces	Standard: 86.2% = 31 spaces	None
		Small: 13.8% = 5 spaces	None
Amenity Space – Indoor:	50 m ² or cash-in-lieu	cash-in-lieu	N/A
Amenity Space – Outdoor:	6 m ² /unit (108 m ²)	113.9 m ²	N/A

TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY OF:

1) LOT 127 PLAN 27743

2) LOT 129 PLAN 27915

3) LOT 130 PLAN 28015

ALL OF SECTION 13 BLOCK 4 NORTH RANGE 7 WEST

NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT

#5800 GRANVILLE AVENUE (LOT 130),
RICHMOND, B.C.
P.I.D. 008-927-821

#5840 GRANVILLE AVENUE (LOT 129),
RICHMOND, B.C.
P.I.D. 004-316-401

#5860 GRANVILLE AVENUE (LOT 127),
RICHMOND, B.C.
P.I.D. 004-211-421

NOTE:

Elevations shown are based on

City of Richmond HPN

Benchmark network.

Benchmark: HPN #234

Control Monument 77H4891

Elevation: 1.125m

Benchmark: HPN #235

Control Monument 77H4885

Elevation: 1.103m

LEGEND:



- (C) denotes conifer
- (D) denotes deciduous
- denotes water meter
- denotes manhole
- denotes cleanout
- denotes inspection chamber
- denotes electric inspection chamber
- denotes lamp standard
- denotes gas valve
- denotes sign
- denotes power post
- T: denotes top of wall
- denotes site benchmark

LEDWAY ROAD

© copyright
J. C. Tam and Associates
Canada and B.C. Land Surveyor
115 - 8833 Odlin Crescent
Richmond, B.C. V6X 3Z7
Telephone: (604) 214-8928
Fax: (604) 214-8929
E-mail: office@jctam.com
Website: www.jctam.com
Job No. 7531
FB-388 P123-127, 136, 137 & 143-148
FB-390 P23
Drawn By: WK

NOTE:
Use site Benchmark Tag #967 for
construction elevation control.

DWG No. 7531-Topo-02



CERTIFIED CORRECT:
LOT DIMENSION ACCORDING TO
FIELD SURVEY.

JOHNSON C. TAM, B.C.L.S., C.L.S.

September 10th, 2020.

Lussier,Cynthia

From: Kevin Qin <qwlkevin@gmail.com>
Sent: May 16, 2023 12:49 PM
To: Lussier,Cynthia
Subject: Re: privacy question (5800/5840/5860 Granville Ave - RZ 21-922202)

City of Richmond Security Warning: This email was sent from an external source outside the City. Please do not click or open attachments unless you recognize the source of this email and the content is safe.

Thank you for letting me know the process and the new plan, I will contact you if my family and I have more concerns, thank you very much.

Lussier,Cynthia <CLussier@richmond.ca> 于2023年5月16日周二 11:02写道 :

Hi Kevin,

Your email inquiry below about the rezoning application at 5800, 5840, 5860 Granville Avenue (RZ 21-922202) has been forwarded to me for response. I am the planner assigned to this project since Jordan left the City to pursue another opportunity.

In response to your concerns about potential privacy concerns/overlook from the north, I spoke with the Rezoning applicant yesterday and today. Although the existing hedge along the south property line of 5800 Granville Avenue is proposed to be removed to enable redevelopment of the property, the applicant has agreed to replant a new hedge along the south property line of 5800 Granville Avenue adjacent to your property. I am awaiting a revised Landscape Plan that I anticipate will show the new hedge to be planted. In addition, the new buildings on the applicant's site are proposed to be located 21 ft (6.45 m) away from your property line, which will provide a large separation between the new buildings and your backyard. You're welcome to make an appointment with me in the coming weeks to view the proposed plans.

Please contact me if you have any questions. I'd be happy to speak by phone if needed. You can contact me directly at 604-276-4108.

Thanks,

Cynthia Lussier

Planner 2

Development Applications Department

City of Richmond

Tel: 604-276-4108

Email: clussier@richmond.ca

www.richmond.ca

From: Smith,Suzanne <SSmith3@richmond.ca>
Sent: May 15, 2023 1:30 PM
To: Lussier,Cynthia <CLussier@richmond.ca>
Subject: FW: privacy question (5800/5840/5860 Granville Ave - RZ 21-922202)
Importance: High

From: Kevin Qin <qwlkevin@gmail.com>
Sent: May 15, 2023 1:24 PM
To: Smith,Suzanne <SSmith3@richmond.ca>
Subject: Fwd: privacy question (5800/5840/5860 Granville Ave - RZ 21-922202)

City of Richmond Security Warning: This email was sent from an external source outside the City. Please do not click or open attachments unless you recognize the source of this email and the content is safe.

----- Forwarded message -----

发件人: **Kevin Qin** <qwlkevin@gmail.com>
Date: 2023年5月15日周一 13:15
Subject: Re: privacy question (5800/5840/5860 Granville Ave - RZ 21-922202)
To: Rockerbie,Jordan <JRockerbie@richmond.ca>

Hello Suzanne,

My name is Kevin. I sent email but got auto reply said Jordon is no longer with the City of Richmond and direct all inquiries to you.

The builder came to visit me and my backyard, and took a picture of my cedar hedge and theirs, and they said the City already approved their landscape plan on cutting their cedar hedge, will the City have a new landscape plan with them that can keep both our privacy?

Thank you!

Rockerbie, Jordan <JRockerbie@richmond.ca> 于2021年10月4日周一 09:50写道 :

Hello Kevin, thank you for your inquiry about this rezoning application.

The owner has asked to remove the hedge, however this has not been approved by the City. The original proposal was based on a new driveway from Ledway Road, which would have severely impacted the health of the hedge cedars and required their removal. However, the City has instructed the owner to relocate the driveway to Granville Avenue, so the hedge cedars should not be negatively affected by construction.

Currently, I am waiting for the owner to submit a new development proposal and a revised tree retention plan based on the comments provided by City staff.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Regards,

Jordan Rockerbie

Planner 1

Planning and Development Division

City of Richmond

T: 604-276-4092

E: jrockerbie@richmond.ca

From: Q Zzzzyakyak <qwlkevin@gmail.com>

Sent: September 23, 2021 4:35 PM

To: DevApps <DevApps@richmond.ca>

Subject: privacy question

City of Richmond Security Warning: This email was sent from an external source outside the City. Please do not click or open attachments unless you recognize the source of this email and the content is safe.

Hello,

My name is Kevin, I lives in 5811 linscott rd, Richmond, BC. I found my neighbours just sold their houses and the builder has a rezoning application for developing 18 townhouses. I am worried about the privacy problem if the builder remove the cedar hedge which are in their yard and near our boundary line(I marked green on the picture 2). You can check my pictures. If they wants to remove, can they replace with other trees to keep that height? that will be much better to keep privacy. I have a picture with the side of my yard too, you can check it.

Thank you very much.



CONTACTS	
Architect INTERFACE ARCHITECTURE INC. #230 - 11590 CAMBIE ROAD RICHMOND, B.C. V6X 3Z5 Tel: 604-821-1162 Fax: 604-821-1146 Email: ken@interfacearchitecture.com	Civil MPT ENGINEERING CO. LTD. #230 - 11120 HORSESHOE WAY RICHMOND, B.C. V7A 9H7 Tel: 604-270-9331 Fax: 604-270-4137 Email: daniel.wong@mpt.bc.ca
Surveyor J. C. TAM AND ASSOCIATES #115 - 8833 ODILIN CRESCENT RICHMOND, BC V6X 3Z7 Tel: 604-214-0293 Fax: 604-214-8929 Email: office@jctam.com	Traffic Analysis ISL ENGINEERING AND LAND SERVICES LTD. #201 - 8500 200 STREET LANGLEY TWP. B.C. V2Y 0M1 Tel: 604-371-0091 Fax: 604-371-0098 Email: boban@iselengineering.com
Landscape Architect DONALD DUNCAN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT #603-220 11TH STREET NEW WESTMINSTER BC V3M 6N9 Tel: 778-791-4393 Email: ddsduncan@gmail.com	Arbourist ARBORTECH CONSULTING #145 - 12051 HORSESHOE WAY RICHMOND, BC V7A 4V4 Tel: 604-275-3484 Fax: 604-275-9554 Email: tressa@adgroup.ca


DRAWING LIST	
Architectural	
A1.1	PROJECT DATA, SITE PLAN
A1.2	PARKING PLAN, FIRE FIGHTING PLAN
A1.3	SITE AREA OVERLAYS - LOT COVERAGE, IMPERMEABILITY, AND OUTDOOR SPACE
A1.4	F.A.R. OVERLAY - BUILDING 1 & 2
A2.1	PLANS AND ELEVATIONS - BUILDING 1
A2.2	PLANS AND ELEVATIONS - BUILDING 2
A2.3	PLANS AND ELEVATIONS - BUILDING 3
A2.4	PLANS AND ELEVATIONS - BUILDING 4 & 5
A2.5	FLOOR PLANS - CONVERTIBLE UNIT (A6)
Landscape	
L0-01	NOTES AND SYMBOLS
L2-01	HARD LANDSCAPE PLAN
L4-01	PLANTING PLAN
L5-01	DETAILS
L5-02	DETAILS
L5-03	DETAILS
Arbourist	
REPORT DATED OCTOBER 13, 2021	
Survey	
SURVEY DATED SEPT 10, 2020	
Transportation (AutoTurn analyses)	
DIAGRAMS DATED MAY 3, 2023	

REZONING APPLICATION (3 LOTS, 18-UNIT TOWNHOMES)	
CIVIC ADDRESS	LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS:
(1) #5800	(1) REM LOT 126, PLAN 27915
(2) #5840	(2) REM LOT 130, PLAN 28015
(3) #5860	(3) REM LOT 127, PLAN 27743
ALL OF SECT 13 BLK 4N RNG 7W NMD	
ZONING	
(1) RS1/E	(1) RS1/E
(2) RS1/E	(2) RS1/E
(3) RS1/E	(3) RS1/E
REVISIONS	
MAY 18, 2023	RZ26 RE-SUBMISSION
MAY 04, 2023	RZ26 RE-SUBMISSION
MAR 09, 2023	RZ3 RE-SUBMISSION
OCT 15, 2021	RZ2 RE-SUBMISSION
DEC 23, 2020	RZ1 APPLICATION
CONSULTANTS	

CONTEXT PLAN

FAR AREA BY BUILDING				
BLDG NO.	NO. UNIT	BLDG GROSS	BLDG EXEMPT	BLDG FAR AREA (m ²)
1	2 x B-1, 2 x B-2, 1 x C	8,747 sf	(3,140 sf)	5,607 sf
2	2 x B-1, 3 x B-2, 1 x B-6	10,226 sf	(3,702 sf)	6,524 sf
3	1 x D-1, 1 x D-2, 1 x D-3	4,438 sf	(1,280 sf)	3,158 sf
4	2 x A-6	3,542 sf	(1,032 sf)	2,510 sf
5	2 x A	3,542 sf	(1,032 sf)	2,510 sf
18 UNITS				20,309 sf

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	
AN RT14 REZONING OF THE 3163 M ² SITE (64.046 SF) (BLUNDELL AREA PLAN) IS PROPOSED TO DEVELOP AN 18-UNIT TOWNHOUSE PROJECT TO A MAXIMUM DENSITY OF 3.155 UNITS PER 1000 M ² OF LAND. THE DEVELOPMENT IS SUBJECT TO THE ARTERIAL ROAD POLICY (COP 3.0.1) AND NUL14-FAMILY "DP" DESIGN GUIDELINES (COP 14.4).	
GRANVILLE AVENUE IS A MAJOR ARTERIAL ROAD. A BUS STOP IS LOCATED IN FRONT OF 5800. THERE IS AN EXISTING 6.0 M WIDE SANITARY SRW ACROSS THE ENTIRE SOUTH PL. STADDLING ABOUT HALF OF THE EAST PORTION. SINGLE LANE ROAD SURROUNDING THE SITE TO THE WEST, SOUTH, & EAST. THERE ARE NO OPEN SPACES OR ACCESS. THE OCP IDENTIFIES POTENTIAL TOWNHOUSE EXPANSION AT THE EASTERN 3 LOTS. SITE PLANNING CONSIDERATION:	
• THE SITE ACCESS POINT, NOW REQUIRED TO BE AT THE EAST PL, REDUCES TRAFFIC CONGESTION AT THE LEDWAY FRONTAGE. PROVIDES CLEARANCE FROM THE EXISTING BUS STOP, AND ANTICIPATES FUTURE MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT TO THE EASTERN 3 LOTS.	
• THE INTERNAL T-DRIVE AISLE ALLOWS SU-9 TRUCK MANOEUVERING AND 3-POINT TURNAROUND.	
• THE DEAD-END DRIVE AISLE WILL PRESERVE AN OFF-SITE CITY TREE (C05, CHERRY PLUM) AT LEDWAY.	
• THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT (3 STOREY, 18 UNITS) WILL PROVIDE 18 CAR SPACES (3 STANDARD, 15 SMALL) ARE GROUPED TOGETHER TO CREATE A BUS STOP AT CENTRE OF OPEN SPACE.	
• THE SINGLE PMT IS LOCATED AT THE DEAD-END DRIVE AISLE BEHIND THE PROTECTED TREE C05 AND WILL BE WELL-SCREENED WITH THICK LANDSCAPING AT THE LEDWAY FRONT YARD.	
BUILDINGS 1 & 2 FRONTING GRANVILLE ARE 3-STORYS, BUILDING 3 FRONTING LEDWAY IS 2-1/2 STOREYS, AND BUILDINGS 4 & 5 ADJACENT TO SINGLE FAMILY HOUSES ARE 2-STORY DUPLEXES. TWO CONVERTIBLE UNITS ARE PROPOSED AT BUILDING 4 (UNITS 15 & 16). NO LOCKOFF UNITS ARE PROPOSED.	
THE PROPOSED SETBACK VARIANCE AT THE PLANNING SIDE YARD (GRANVILLE) IS PERMITTED FROM 6.0M TO 4.5M.	



All designs and other information shown herein are for use on the project described and for the purposes stated. The user assumes all liability for the use of the information and shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from the appropriate authorities. This drawing must not be reproduced without written permission from the architect. The architect shall not be responsible for any errors or omissions in the information provided, and shall not be liable for any damages or losses resulting from the use of the information. The architect shall not be responsible for any delays or costs incurred by the user in obtaining permits or approvals from the appropriate authorities.	
SEAL	

INTERFACE:
Suite 230
11590 Cambie Road
Richmond BC
Canada V6X 3Z5
T 604 821 1162
F 604 821 1146
www.interfacearchitecture.com

PROJECT	Proposed 18-Unit Townhouse Development
3 LOT ASSEMBLY	5800 / 5840 / 5860 GRANVILLE AVENUE RICHMOND, BC
PROJECT NO.	2006GRAN
SCALE	As Noted
DATE	DEC 23, 2020
DRAWN BY	KYC, SRS
CHECKED BY	KYC
SHEET TITLE	PROJECT DATA, SITE PLAN
DRAWING	

A1.1

REVISIONS	
MAY 18, 2023	RZ2B RE-SUBMISSION
MAY 04, 2023	RZ2A RE-SUBMISSION
MAR 09, 2023	RZ3 RE-SUBMISSION
OCT 15, 2021	RZ2 RE-SUBMISSION
DEC 23, 2020	RZ1 APPLICATION
CONSULTANTS	
All designs and other information shown herein are for use on the project and are not to be used for any other purpose. This drawing must not be reproduced without written permission from the author and shall be the property of the author. The author shall not be responsible for any errors or omissions in any drawings or specifications or for any consequences arising from the use of the drawings or specifications.	
SEAL	



INTERFACE:

Suite 230
11590 Cambie Road
Richmond BC
Canada V6X 3Z5

T 604 821 1162
F 604 821 1163
www.interfacearchitecture.com





PROJECT	Proposed 18-Unit Townhouse Development 3 LOT ASSEMBLY 5800 / 5840 / 5860 GRANVILLE AVENUE RICHMOND, BC
PROJECT NO.	2006GRAN
SCALE	As Noted
DATE	DEC 23, 2020
DRAWN BY	KYC, SRS
CHECKED BY	KYC
SHEET TITLE	PARKING PLAN FIRE FIGHTING PLAN
DRAWING	

A1.2



[illegible]

PROJECT	Proposed 18-Unit Townhouse Development
3 LOT ASSEMBLY	5800 / 5840 / 5860 GRANVILLE AVENUE RICHMOND, BC
PROJECT NO.	2008GRAN
SCALE	As Noted
DATE	DEC. 23, 2020
DRAWN BY	KYC, SRS
CHECKED BY	KYC
SHEET TITLE	PLANS & ELEVATIONS BUILDING 1
DRAWING	A2.1






REVISIONS	
MAY 18, 2023	RZ2b RE-SUBMISSION
MAY 04, 2023	RZ3a RE-SUBMISSION
MAR 09, 2023	RZ3 RE-SUBMISSION
OCT 15, 2021	RZ2 RE-SUBMISSION
DEC 23, 2020	RZ1 APPLICATION
CONSULTANTS	
At designs and other information shown herein are to be used on the project as shown and not to be altered or modified without the written permission of the office.	
This drawing must not be reproduced without written permission of the office.	
Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions and conditions shown on the drawings and conditions shown on the drawings.	
SEAL	

INTERFACE:


Suite 230
11590 Cambie Road
Richmond BC
Canada V6X 3Z5
T 604 821 1162
F 604 821 1146
www.interfacearchitecture.com

PROJECT	Proposed 18-Unit Townhouse Development 3 LOT ASSEMBLY 5800 / 5840 / 5860 GRANVILLE AVENUE RICHMOND, BC
PROJECT NO.	2006GRAN
SCALE	As Noted
DATE	DEC 23, 2020
DRAWN BY	KYC, SRS
CHECKED BY	KYC
SHEET TITLE	PLANS & ELEVATIONS BUILDING 2
DRAWING	


A2.2




AGING-IN-PLACE MEASURES (ALL UNITS)	
ALL ROOMS	LARGE TOGGLE-TYPE ELECTRICAL SWITCHES
	LEVER TYPE DOOR HANDLES
	MINIMIZE THRESHOLD HEIGHTS (LESS THAN 1/2") WHERE POSSIBLE
	MINIMIZE CONTRAST IN COLOURS OF FLOOR FINISHES WHERE POSSIBLE
STAIRS & LANDINGS	WALL BLOCKING FOR FUTURE ADDITIONAL HANDRAIL INSTALLATION
	INTERMEDIATE STAIR LANDINGS WHENEVER POSSIBLE
BATHROOMS	LESS STEEP RISE/RUN DIMENSIONS WHERE POSSIBLE
	WALL BLOCKING FOR FUTURE GRAB BAR INSTALLATION (AT BATHTUB, TOILET)
	LEVER HANDLE TAPS AND FAUCETS
KITCHEN	2-3" SLIDING DOORS WHERE POSSIBLE
	LEVER HANDLE TAPS AND FAUCETS
HALLWAYS	MIN. 900 MM WIDTH




WEST ELEVATION (ALONG LEDWAY RD.) - BUILDING 3
Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"




EAST ELEVATION (ALONG DRIVE AISLE) - BUILDING 3
Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"




NORTH ELEVATION - BUILDING 3
Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"




SOUTH ELEVATION - BUILDING 3
Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"



FLOOR PLAN - LEVEL 3, BUILDING 3
Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"



FLOOR PLAN - LEVEL 2, BUILDING 3
Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"



FLOOR PLAN - LEVEL 1, BUILDING 3
Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"

REVISIONS	
MAY 18, 2023	RZ2b RE-SUBMISSION
MAY 04, 2023	RZ3a RE-SUBMISSION
MAR 09, 2023	RZ3 RE-SUBMISSION
OCT 15, 2021	RZ2 RE-SUBMISSION
DEC 23, 2020	RZ1 APPLICATION
CONSULTANTS	
SEAL	
At design and other information shown herein are to be used on this drawing must not be reproduced without written permission of the office. This drawing is the property of the office and is not to be used for any other project without the written permission of the office. Contractors shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions and conditions shown on the drawing. The architect shall not be responsible for any errors or omissions on the drawing.	

INTERFACE:

Suite 230
11590 Cambie Road
Richmond BC
Canada V6X 3Z5
T 604 821 1162
F 604 821 1146
www.interfacearchitecture.com

PROJECT	Proposed 18-Unit Townhouse Development 3 LOT ASSEMBLY 5800 / 5840 / 5860 GRANVILLE AVENUE RICHMOND, BC
PROJECT NO.	2006GRAN
SCALE	As Noted
DATE	DEC 23, 2020
DRAWN BY	KYC, SRS
CHECKED BY	KYC
SHEET TITLE	PLANS & ELEVATIONS BUILDING 3
DRAWING	A2.3

REVISIONS	
MAY 18, 2023	RZ2b RE-SUBMISSION
MAY 04, 2023	RZ3a RE-SUBMISSION
MAR 09, 2023	RZ3 RE-SUBMISSION
OCT 15, 2021	RZ2 RE-SUBMISSION
DEC 23, 2020	RZ1 APPLICATION
CONSULTANTS	
At design and other information shown herein are to be used on the basis of the information provided by the client. This drawing must not be reproduced without written permission of the client. The client is responsible for all dimensions and conditions shown on the drawing.	
SEAL	


INTERFACE:

Suite 230
11590 Cambie Road
Richmond BC
Canada V6X 3Z5
T 604 821 1162
F 604 821 1146
www.interfacearchitecture.com

PROJECT	Proposed 18-Unit Townhouse Development 3 LOT ASSEMBLY 5800 / 5840 / 5880 GRANVILLE AVENUE RICHMOND, BC
PROJECT NO.	2006GRAN
SCALE	As Noted
DATE	DEC 23, 2020
DRAWN BY	KYC, SRS
CHECKED BY	KYC
SHEET TITLE	PLANS & ELEVATIONS BUILDING 4 & 5
DRAWING	


A2.4

AGING-IN-PLACE MEASURES (ALL UNITS)	
ALL ROOMS	LARGE TOGGLE-TYPE ELECTRICAL SWITCHES
	LEVER TYPE DOOR HANDLES
	MINIMIZE THRESHOLD HEIGHTS (LESS THAN 1/2") WHERE POSSIBLE
	MINIMIZE CONTRAST IN COLOURS OF FLOOR FINISHES WHERE POSSIBLE
STAIRS & LANDINGS	WALL BLOCKING FOR FUTURE ADDITIONAL HANDRAIL INSTALLATION
	INTERMEDIATE STAIR LANDINGS WHENEVER POSSIBLE
BATHROOMS	LESS STEEP RISE/RUN DIMENSIONS WHERE POSSIBLE
	WALL BLOCKING FOR FUTURE GRAB BAR INSTALLATION (AT BATHTUB, TOILET)
	LEVER HANDLE TAPS AND FAUCETS
	2'-8" SLIDING DOORS WHERE POSSIBLE
KITCHEN	LEVER HANDLE TAPS AND FAUCETS
HALLWAYS	MIN. 900 MM WIDTH




FLOOR PLAN - LEVEL 2, BUILDING 4 & 5

Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"




FLOOR PLAN - LEVEL 1, BUILDING 4 & 5

Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"




NORTH ELEVATION - BUILDING 4 & 5

Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"



SOUTH ELEVATION - BUILDING 4 & 5

Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"




WEST ELEVATION - BUILDING 4 & 5

Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"

EAST ELEVATION - BUILDING 4 & 5


Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"



DECIDUOUS TREES

		
Gleditsia triacanthos	Acer circinatum	Cornus nuttallii



CONIFEROUS TREES

		
Taxus x media 'Hicksii'	Chamaecyparis o. 'Gracilis'	Polystichum munium




CONIFEROUS SHRUBS

		
Juniperus horizontalis 'Wiltonii'	Juniperus comm. 'Alpine Carpet'	Pinus mugo 'Pumilio'

BROADLEAF EVERGREEN SHRUBS

		
Arbutus unedo	Gaultheria shallon	Vaccinium ovatum

DECIDUOUS SHRUBS

		
Cornus stolonifera	Cotinus coggygria 'Royal Purple'	Ribes sanguineum 'King Edward VII'

PLANT LIST

CODE	QTY	SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	SIZE	COMMENTS	MATURE SIZE	SPACING
AC	6	Acer circinatum	Vine Maple	3m clump	888 min, 60cm root ball dia.	10m height 150cm spread	AS SHOWN
CN	7	Cornus nuttallii	Pacific Dogwood	8cm cal	150cm standard 888 min, 70cm root ball dia.	21m height 21m spread	AS SHOWN
GT	2	Gleditsia triacanthos	Honey Locust	8cm cal	150cm standard 888 min, 70cm root ball dia.	21m height 21m spread	AS SHOWN
CO	7	Chamaecyparis obtusa 'Gracilis'	Slender Hinoki False Cypress	4.0 m ht.	Dense Tight Habit 888 min, 80cm root ball dia.	15m height 2.4m spread	AS SHOWN

CONIFEROUS SHRUBS

CODE	QTY	SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	SIZE	COMMENTS	MATURE SIZE	SPACING
JW	8	Juniperus horizontalis 'Wiltonii'	Blue Rug Juniper	#2 pot	min. 30cm spread	15cm height 120cm spread	60cm
JS	10	Juniperus comm. 'Alpine Carpet	Alpine Carpet Native Juniper	#2 pot	min. 60cm spread	20cm height 150cm spread	75cm
pp	12	Pinus mugo 'Pumilio'	Dwarf Mugo Pine	#2 pot	min. 30cm spread min. 20cm height	135cm height 250cm spread	75cm
tm	190	Taxus x media 'Hicksii'	Hick's Yew	1.2m	min. 30cm spread	15cm height 120cm spread	75cm

BROADLEAF EVERGREEN SHRUBS

CODE	QTY	SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	SIZE	COMMENTS	MATURE SIZE	SPACING
ah	69	Azalea japonica 'Hino Crimson'	Crimson Japanese Azalea	#2 pot	min. 200mm height	100cm height 120cm width	75cm
au	13	Arbutus unedo 'Compacta'	Dwarf Strawberry Tree	#5 pot	min. 45cm height	300cm height 300cm spread	100cm
gs	119	Gaultheria shallon	Salal	#1 pot	min. 20cm height	100cm height 150cm spread	65cm
vo	106	Vaccinium ovatum 'Thunderbird'	Evergreen Huckleberry	#2 pot	min. 60cm height	180cm height 190cm spread	75cm
ri	50	Rhododendron 'Impeditum'	Impeditum Rhododendron	#2 pot	min. 30cm height	60cm height 75cm spread	75cm

DECIDUOUS SHRUBS

CODE	QTY	SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	SIZE	COMMENTS	MATURE SIZE	SPACING
cs	25	Cornus stolonifera	Redtwig Dogwood	#1 pot	min. 50cm height heavy	300cm height 200cm spread	90cm
cc	7	Cotinus coggy 'Royal Purple'	Smoke Tree	#5 pot	min. 60cm height heavy	200cm height 150cm width	90cm
rs	7	Ribes s. 'King Edward VII'	King Edward VII Currant	#1 pot	min. 40cm height	240cm height 120cm spread	75cm

PERENNIALS

CODE	QTY	SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	SIZE	COMMENTS	MATURE SIZE	SPACING
aj	56	Astilbe x japonica 'Rheinland'	Rheinland False Spirea	#1 pot	min. 25cm height	55cm height 60cm spread	45cm

FERNS

CODE	QTY	SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	SIZE	COMMENTS	MATURE SIZE	SPACING
pm	1	Polystichum munium	Swordfern	#1 pot	min. 25cm height	100cm height 100cm spread	60cm
GROUND COVERS							
CODE	QTY	SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	SIZE	COMMENTS	MATURE SIZE	SPACING
ar	120	Arctostaphylos uva-ursi	Kinnikinnick	10cm pot	min. 25cm spread 30cm O.C.	10cm height 60cm spread	30cm
la		Lawn	Shade Tolerant Blend				30cm

GENERAL NOTES

- COMPLIANCE, GOVERNMENT - ALL WORK SHALL BE COMPLETED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND AND SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS OF THE SAME. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ENSURE COMPLIANCE OF ALL WORK PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
- COMPLIANCE, BONTABCSLA - ALL MATERIAL, SHIPPING PROCEDURES, AND INSTALLATION OF LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS SHALL CONFORM TO LATEST EDITION OF BONTABCSLA LANDSCAPE STANDARD AVAILABLE AT COMMENCEMENT OF WORK.
- COMPLIANCE, MMCD - ALL WORKS SHALL CONFORM TO THE LATEST MMCD DETAILS AND SPECIFICATIONS AVAILABLE AT COMMENCEMENT OF WORK WHERE NO SPECIFIC DETAIL, NOTE OR SPECIFICATION IS PROVIDED IN THE DRAWING SET OR ATTACHED MATERIALS.
- EXISTING SERVICES – REFER TO ENGINEERING DRAWINGS FOR LOCATIONS OF ALL BURIED SERVICES. CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING AND PAYING FOR ALL UTILITIES LOCATIONS AND ANY AND ALL COSTS WHICH ARISE FROM DAMAGE TO SERVICES CAUSED BY ANY ACT OR FAILURE TO ACT OF THE CONTRACTOR.
- COORDINATION – THESE DRAWINGS SHALL BE TAKEN TO BE PART OF THE LARGER SET OF DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS, WHETHER DIRECTLY ATTACHED OR NOT, ISSUED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE ASSOCIATED BOULEVARD WORKS. THESE DRAWINGS SHALL BE READ IN CONCERT WITH SUCH DOCUMENTATION AND, WHERE CONFLICTS ARISE, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL IMMEDIATELY REPORT SUCH CONFLICTS TO THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT. THE WORK IS TO BE DONE IN COORDINATION WITH THE CONTRACTOR OR CONTRACTORS ENGAGED IN CONSTRUCTION OF SUCH ADJACENT WORKS.
- CONCRETE, FORMS - THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPARE DIMENSIONS PROVIDED WITH SITE CONDITIONS AND IMMEDIATELY REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT AND THE ENGINEER. ONCE COMPLETED THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CALL FOR INSPECTION OF THE FORMS PRIOR TO PLACING STEEL REINFORCEMENT. CONTACT LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO DESIRED INSPECTION TIME.
- CONCRETE REINFORCEMENT - ALL CONCRETE REINFORCEMENT SHALL BE DONE IN CONCORD WITH THE ENGINEER. CONTACT THE ENGINEER PRIOR TO POURING OF CONCRETE. CONTACT THE STRUCTURAL ENGINEER A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO DESIRED INSPECTION TIME.
- GRADING, GENERAL - THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ESTABLISH GRADES SUCH THAT THERE IS, IN ALL AREAS, POSITIVE DRAINAGE TO AN ADJACENT DRAIN. MINIMUM SLOPES SHALL BE AS FOLLOWS:

PEDESTRIAN PAVED AREAS	1%
VEHICULAR PAVED AREAS	1%
LAWN AREAS	2%
PLANTED BEDS	5%
- GRADING, ALLOWANCES AND TOPSOIL PLACEMENT - OVERALL DEPTH OF PLANTING MEDIUM AFTER SETTLEMENT SHALL BE:

GRASS AREAS	150 MM
SHRUB BEDS	450 MM
GROUND COVER AREAS	300 MM
TREES	600 MM
- N.BALL SOIL SHALL BE TESTED NOT MORE THAN 14 DAYS PRIOR TO INSTALLATION ON SITE. TESTING SHALL BE SPECIFIC TO THIS WORK. CONTRACTOR SHALL AMEND THE SOIL ACCORDING TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SOILS TESTING LAB.
- GRADING, BUILDING FINISHED FLOOR & CORNER ELEVATIONS - SEE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS.
- GRADING, GENERAL RETENTION WORKS - ALL RETENTION WORKS, EITHER SHOWN HERE OR REQUIRED DUE TO UNANTICIPATED CONDITIONS AT THE TIME OF CONSTRUCTION, SHALL BE SPLIT FACED ALLIAN BLOCK, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF RETAINING WORKS IN THE SIDE YARD DRAINAGE AREAS. SPECIFICATIONS NOTED AS STRESSURE TREATED WOOD, SHOULD BE QUALITY TREATED TO PREVENT ROT AND INSECT DAMAGE. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT SHALL INFORM THE CITY IN WRITING OF THE LOCATION, HEIGHT AND EXTENT OF SUCH WALL.
- PLANT MATERIAL QUANTITIES - CONTRACTOR SHALL CONFIRM ALL PLANT LIST AND THE DRAWING SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE CONSULTANT, IN CASE OF DISCREPANCY CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL PLANT MATERIAL AS PER DRAWING. IN CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE THERE IS A DISCREPANCY BETWEEN GROUND COVER QUANTITY AND SPACING REQUIREMENT WILL PREVAIL.
- PLANT MATERIAL SUBSTITUTIONS - NO SUBSTITUTIONS TO PLANT LIST SHALL BE MADE BY CONTRACTOR WITHOUT PRIOR WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION FROM CONSULTANT.
- PLANT MATERIAL - HEALTH - ALL PLANT MATERIALS MUST BE DISEASE FREE FROM CERTIFIED NURSERIES.
- MULCH - PLANTING AREAS SHALL BE MULCHED WITH 50 MM OF HEM FIR BARK MULCH. THE USE OF CEDAR MULCH OR ANY MIX CONTAINING CEDAR IS NOT PERMITTED.


DRAWING INDEX

- L0-01 NOTES & SYMBOLS
 L2-01 HARD LANDSCAPE PLAN
 L4-01 PLANTING PLAN
 L5-01 DETAILS
 L5-02 DETAILS
 L5-03 DETAILS

DATE	ISSUED FOR	REV
2020-12-23	REZONING	A
2023-05-18	REZONING	B
<p>All dimensions shall be confirmed on site and discrepancies reported immediately. Required setbacks shall govern in all cases.</p> <p>This drawing has been prepared solely for the use of the CLIENT and there are no representations of any kind made by Donald V. S. Duncan to any party with whom Donald V. S. Duncan has not entered into a contract.</p> <p>This drawing shall not be used for construction purposes until the seal appearing hereon is signed and dated by the Landscape Architect.</p>		

Consultants

Architectural:
 Arborist:
 Civil:
 Structural:
 Mechanical:
 Electrical:



Donald V. S. Duncan
 DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANT
 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
 603 - 220 Eleventh Street
 New Westminster BC
 Canada V3M 6N9
 778-791-4323
 dvsduncan@gmail.com

RICHMOND FILE #
 -

Project Leader
 DVS Duncan
 Drawn
 DVS Duncan
 Revision

Residential Development
 5800 Granville (Granville & Ledway)
 Richmond BC


Prepared for:
 HorizonDevelopmentWest
 6831 Gamba Drive
 Richmond BC V7C 2G4


Drawing Title
 NOTES & SYMBOLS


Check Scale (may be photo reduced)
 0 10mm
 0 1inch

Project No. 20-0089



Drawing No. L0-01



<p>Consultants</p>	
<p>Architectural: Arboreal: Civil: Structural: Mechanical: Electrical:</p>	<p>DIV Donald V. S. Duncan SD DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANT LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT</p> <p>603 - 2210 Eleventh Street New Westminster BC Canada V3M 6N9 778-791-4323 dvsduncan@gmail.com</p>
	<p>RICHMOND FILE #</p>




DATE	ISSUED FOR	REV
2020-12-23	REZONING	A
2023-05-18	REZONING	B
All dimensions shall be confirmed on site and discrepancies reported immediately. Required setbacks shall govern in all cases.		
This drawing has been prepared solely for the use of the CLIENT and there are no representations of any kind made by Donald V. S. Duncan to any party with whom Donald V. S. Duncan has not entered into a contract.		
This drawing shall not be used for construction purposes until the seal appearing hereon is signed and dated by the Landscape Architect.		
Consultants		
Architectural: Arborist: Civil: Structural: Mechanical: Electrical:		
Project Leader Drawn Revision		
Project Drawn Revision		
Residential Development 5800 Granville (Granville & Ledvey) Richmond BC		
Prepared for: HorizonDevelopmentWest 6831 Gamba Drive Richmond BC V7C 2G4		
Drawing Title DETAILS		
Check Scale (may be photo reduced) 0 10mm 0 10mm		
Project No. 20-0089		
Drawing No. L5-02		




01 BENCH INSTALLATION

SCALE 1:20




PLAN VIEW



02 BICYCLE RACK INSTALLATION



SCALE 1:20



SECTION VIEW

03 METAL FENCE


SCALE 1:20



INTERIOR ELEVATION - GATE ENTRANCE

04 WOODEN BARRIER FENCE



SCALE 1:20



DV **SD**
Donald V.S. Duncan
 DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANT
 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

RICHMOND FILE #

B	Project Leader	DVS
	Duncan	
Revision	Drawn	
	DVS	Duncan
Residential Development 5800 Granville (Granville & Ledwey) Richmond BC		
Prepared for: Horizon Development West 6831 Camba Drive Richmond BC V7C 2G4		
Drawing Title DETAILS		
Check Scale (may be photo reduced) <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> 0 1 inch 0 10mm </div>		
Project No. 20-0089		
Drawing No. L5-03		



LEGEND-TREE PROTECTION:

- Tree Protection Zones (TPZ) are compiled of a CPL, RPT and WSS as detailed below and with limitations and restrictions as described herein and in the attached report. All free protection setbacks are dimensioned from the outside of free trunk and/or from the reference property line or the features as applicable. The project architect should be consulted prior to barrier installation to provide on-site direction as well as to inspect and provide sign off once they are constructed. Barriers aligned with or dimensioned from property lines or ESA setbacks will require surveying/staking prior to the barrier installation and inspection. Temporary interim barriers for demolition phase may be applicable, but will be superseded after demolition with the final barrier alignment as specified.

denotes CROWN PROTECTION ZONE – CPZ

(exclusion zone – no aerial encroachment of buildings, vehicles, cranes, etc)

denotes **ROOT PROTECTION ZONE - RPZ**

(minimum alignment for **TREE PROTECTION BARRIERS** and no soil disturbance)

— denotes **WORKING SPACE SETBACK** – WSS

- on-site supervision by the Project Artist) (an offset from RFP where construction work requires advance approval and/or

1 **Special Measures**

includes **SPECIAL MEASURES** required
(the Project Architect required to direct or implement as per the number in the

LEGEND-TREE RETENTION:

AGGED TREES:

see arborist report and details herein for further details)

 denotes ARBORIST TAG NUMBER or ID REFERENCE

(see tree inventory and assessment list)

XXX denotes SURVEY TAG NUMBER or ID REFERENCE

(if applicable)

approx denotes **APPROXIMATE LOCATION** for an un-surveyed tree

(if contemplated to be retained we recommend accurately located before design is finalized)

● **DEFINITION** A function f is **convex** if its graph is always below any chord connecting two points on the graph.

behaviors **RETENTION** free
(protection measures as specified)

 denotes **REMOVAL** tree

✓ (municipal permit or approvals required as applicable)

 denotes **HIGH RISK** tree to be **REMOVED** or **MODIFIED**

(municipal permit or approvals required as applicable)

denotes **UNDERSIZE TREE** that is smaller than bylaw defined size

(if to be retained consult this office for protection measures)

(It to be removed a permit may be required from municipality)

TREE #S 473, 474, AND 475;
THESE TREES SHOULD BE TREATED COHESIVELY AND THEIR RETENTION IS
CONDITIONAL TO DESIGN REVISION TO ACCOMMODATE PROTECTION
MEASURES, INCLUDING A RETAINING WALL TO MAINTAIN EXISTING GRADES IN
THE ROOT PROTECTION ZONE, WATERING AND ROOT ZONE ENHANCEMENTS.
FURTHER INVESTIGATION BY THE PROJECT ARBORIST VIA ROOT MAPPING IS
NECESSARY TO DETERMINE IMPACTS FROM CONSTRUCTION. PROTECTION
MEASURES AS SPECIFIED BY THIS OFFICE MAY BE REVISED DEPENDING
UPON THE RESULTS OF ROOT MAPPING AND PRUNING IMPACT ASSESSMENT
TO ACCOMMODATE DRIVEWAY CONSTRUCTION AND INTENDED USE.

CONFLICT WITH THE PROPOSED BALCONY PROVISION AND RELATED CONSTRUCTION ACCESS WITHIN THE CROWN PROTECTION ZONE TO ACCEPT ENCROACHMENT AND DIRECT MITIGATION MEASURES AS NECESSARY. THE BALCONY STRUCTURE SHOULD BE CANTILEVERED FROM THE EXISTING BUILDING TO AVOID ENCROACHING IN THE ROOT PROTECTION ZONE FOR POST FOOTINGS.


TREE PROTECTION ZONE RESTRICTIONS:

Trees that are specified to be retained must be protected from damage during all phases of development related work on the site. Any access or construction related work within the TPZ (CPZ, RPZ and/or WSS) requires advance approval, guidance and on-site direction or supervision by the project arborist. General restrictions in the **TPZ** are as follows:

- No soil disturbance of any scope or to any depth for cuts or fills, including but not limited to: trenching, stripping of over-burden, bulk excavation, fill placement, site preparation, grade transitions, topsoil placement, etc.,
- No passage or operation of machinery, trucks, vehicles or equipment (including small track machines, skid steers, lifts, etc.) except as approved and directed by the project arborist, and subject to special measures.
- No storage of soil, spoil, gravel, construction materials, waste materials, etc.,
- No waste or washing of concrete, stucco, drywall, paint, or other potentially harmful materials.
- No placement of temporary structures or services,
- No affixing lights, signs, cables or any other device to retained trees.
- No pruning or cutting of retained trees, except as approved and directed by the project arborist, and performed by a qualified tree service firm employing ISA Certified Arborists and working to ANSI A300 and ANSI Z133 Standards.
- No landscape finishing, such as, but not limited to: installing retaining walls, digging planting holes, placing growing medium, installing irrigation or conduit, etc., except as approved and directed by the project arborist.

TREE PROTECTION BARRIER DETAIL - SAMPLE:

BARRIERS MUST BE ALIGNED AS SPECIFIED ON THE TREE MANAGEMENT DRAWING OR BY THE PROJECT ARBORIST NOT TO SCALE



ISSUED FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE REVIEW PURPOSES
CITY LETTER TREE MANAGEMENT DRAWING - SHEET 2 OF 3

PROJECT:	PROPOSED TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT		
ADDRESS:	5800, 5840 & 5860 GRANVILLE AVE., RICHMOND		
CLIENT:	HORIZON WEST DEVELOPMENT		
CITY REF:		ACL FILE: 20197	
PLOT SIZE:	11"X17"	REV #:	6 DATE: MAY 15, 2023





Address: 5800, 5840, 5860 Granville Avenue

File No.: RZ 21-922202

Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10470, the applicant is required to complete the following:

1. 4 m x 4 m corner cut road dedication at the intersection of Granville Avenue and Ledway Road.
2. Consolidation of all the lots into one development parcel (which will require the demolition of the existing dwellings).
3. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$4,500.00 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of replacement trees within the City (i.e., \$1,500.00 for Tree # 466; \$1,500.00 for Tree # C02; and \$1,500.00 for Tree # C03)..
4. Submission of a Contract/Letter of Undertaking between the applicant and a Certified Arborist for supervision of any works conducted within the tree protection zone of the trees to be retained (Trees # 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 467, 473, 474, 475, N01, N04, N05, N06, C05, C06 and the unnumbered Walnut tree). 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. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of \$45,000.00 for Trees # 455, 457, 458, 459, 467, 473 and 474 to be retained. To accompany the tree survival security, the applicant must enter into a legal agreement, which sets the terms for its use and release.
6. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of \$5,000.00 for shared Tree # 456 and \$5,000.00 for shared Tree # 475 to be retained. To accompany the tree survival securities, the applicant must enter into a legal agreement, which sets the terms for its use and release.
7. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of \$10,000 for City Tree # C05 and \$5,000 for City Tree # C06 to be retained. To accompany the tree survival securities, the applicant must enter into a legal agreement, which sets the terms for its use and release.
8. City acceptance of the applicant's voluntarily contribution in the amount of \$12.00 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$244,512.00) to the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund.
9. City acceptance of the applicant's offer to make a voluntary cash contribution towards the City's Public Art Reserve Fund, the terms of which shall include the following:
 - a) The value of the applicant's voluntary public art contribution shall be based on the Council-approved rates for residential and non-residential uses and the maximum buildable floor area permitted under the subject site's proposed zoning, excluding floor area associated with affordable housing and market rental, as indicated in the table below.

Building Type	Rate	Maximum Permitted Floor Area (after exemptions)	Minimum Voluntary Cash Contribution
Townhouses	\$0.99/ft ² (2023 rate)	1,893 m ² (20,376 ft ²)	\$20,172.24

- b) In the event that the contribution is not provided within one year of the application receiving third reading of Council (i.e. Public Hearing), the contribution rate (as indicated in the table in item a) above) shall be increased annually thereafter based on the Statistics Canada Consumer Price Index (All Items) – Vancouver yearly quarter-to-quarter change, where the change is positive.
10. Contribution of \$2,066.00 per dwelling unit (e.g. \$37,188.00) in-lieu of the provision of on-site common indoor amenity space.

11. Payment of all fees in full for the cost associated with the Public Hearing Notices, consistent with the City's Consolidated Fees Bylaw No 8636, as amended.
12. Submission of a concept plan for the proposed Servicing Agreement works.
13. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
14. Registration of a legal agreement on title identifying that the proposed development must be designed and constructed in a manner that mitigates potential traffic noise to the proposed dwelling units. Dwelling units must be designed and constructed to achieve:
 - a) 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
 - b) the ASHRAE 55-2004 "Thermal Environmental Conditions for Human Occupancy" standard for interior living spaces.
15. Registration of a restrictive covenant prohibiting (a) the imposition of any strata bylaw that would prohibit any residential dwelling unit from being rented; and (b) the imposition of any strata bylaw that would place age-based restrictions on occupants of any residential dwelling unit.
16. Registration of a cross-access easement, statutory right-of-way, 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 the public and future developments to the east, including the installation of way-finding and other appropriate signage on the subject property, and requiring a covenant that the owner provide written notification of this through the disclosure statement to all initial purchasers, provide an acknowledgement of the same in all purchase and sale agreements, and install signage in the initial sales centre advising purchasers of the potential for these impacts.
17. Registration of a legal agreement on title prohibiting the conversion of the tandem parking area into habitable space.
18. The submission and processing of a Development Permit* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.

Prior to a Development Permit application* being forwarded to the Development Permit Panel for consideration, the applicant is required to:

- Complete an acoustical and thermal report with recommendations prepared by an appropriate registered professional, which demonstrates that the interior noise levels and noise mitigation standards comply with the City's Official Community Plan and Noise Bylaw requirements. 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

- Submit a finalized Landscape Plan, prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development. The Landscape Plan should:
 - comply with the guidelines of the OCP's Arterial Road Policy 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 22 required replacement trees (minimum 8 cm caliper deciduous or 4 m high conifer).

If any of the required replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site, a cash-in-lieu contribution in the amount of \$750/tree to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for off-site planting is required.

Among other items to be identified at Development Permit* stage, prior to Development Permit issuance, the applicant must complete the following requirements:

- Submit a Landscape Security in the amount of 100 % of a cost estimate for the finalized Landscape Plan works prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect (including installation and a 10% contingency). A legal agreement is to accompany the Security, which sets the terms for its use and release. If any of the required replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site, a cash-in-lieu contribution in the amount of \$750/tree to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for off-site planting is required.

Prior to Demolition Permit* issuance, the applicant must complete the following requirements:

- Installation of tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained. Tree protection fencing must be installed to City standard in accordance with the City's tree protection information Bulletin Tree-03 prior to any works being conducted on-site and remain in place until construction and landscaping on-site is completed.

Prior to Building Permit* issuance, the applicant must complete the following requirements:

- Enter into a Servicing Agreement (SA)* for the design and construction of servicing and frontage improvements. A Letter of Credit or cash security for the value of the SA works, as determined by the City, will be required as part of entering into the SA. The works are to include, but may not be limited to:

Water Works:

- a) Using the OCP Model, there is 1332 L/s and 708 L/s of water available at a 20 psi residual at the Granville Ave and Ledway Rd frontages respectively. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of 220 L/s.
- b) At the applicant's cost, the applicant is required to:
 - i. Install a new water service connection off of the existing 200 mm water main along Ledway Rd frontage complete with meter and meter box in a proposed utility right of way. Minimum statutory right-of-way (SRW) dimensions to be the size of the meter box (from the City of Richmond supplementary specifications) + any appurtenances (for example, the bypass on W2o-SD) + 0.5 m on all sides. Exact SRW dimensions to be finalized through the SA process. Connection to the existing 400 mm City watermain at Granville Ave is not permitted as per City of Richmond's Engineering Design Specifications.
 - ii. Review hydrant spacing on all road frontages and install new fire hydrants as required to meet City spacing requirements for the proposed land use.
 - iii. Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage building designs.
- c) At the applicant's cost, the City will:
 - i. Complete all tie-ins for the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.
 - ii. Cut and cap, at main, the existing water service connection located at the Granville Ave frontage.

Storm Sewer Works:

- d) At the applicant's cost, the applicant is required to:
 - i. Upgrade the existing storm sewer along Ledway Rd frontage to a 600 mm storm sewer within the roadway. Approximate length of required upgrade is 50 metres. Tie-in to the south shall be to the existing storm sewer at the west side of Ledway Rd via new manholes (complete with stub). After removing existing manhole STMH661, tie-in to the north shall be to the existing storm sewer along the south side of Granville Ave with a new manhole.
- e) At the applicant's cost, the City will:
 - i. Tie-in the proposed storm sewers to the existing drainage systems.
 - ii. Install a new storm service connection complete with inspection chamber connecting to the existing storm sewer along Granville Ave.
 - iii. Cut and cap all existing storm connections along the Granville Ave frontage.

Sanitary Sewer Works:

- f) At the applicant's cost, the applicant is required to:
 - i. Not start on-site excavation or foundation construction until completion of rear-yard sanitary works by City crews.
 - ii. Ensure no soil fill or building encroaches into the existing sanitary SRWs along the south property line.
- g) At the applicant's cost, the applicant will:
 - i. Cut and cap all existing connections and remove inspection chambers along the south property line.
 - ii. Complete all tie-ins for the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.
 - iii. Install a new sanitary service connection c/w inspection chamber and tie-in to the existing sanitary manhole at the high end of the existing sanitary system.

Frontage Improvements:

- h) At the applicant's cost, the applicant is required to:
 - i. Complete frontage improvements along Granville Avenue to include an off-street bike path, new arterial road standard sidewalk, and treed/grassed boulevard. The cross-section of the required frontage improvements (measured from south to north) is to include:
 - 1.5 m wide grass boulevard
 - 2.0 m wide concrete sidewalk.
 - 0.3 m wide buffer strip (with different surface texture/colour).
 - 2.0 m wide off-street machine paved asphalt bike path.
 - 1.5 m wide treed/grassed boulevard (outside of bus stop/shelter area).
 - 0.15 m wide curb (existing south curb of Granville Avenue).
 - (Note: measuring from the curb, a 3.0 m x 9.0 m bus stop/shelter area plus bus stop pole is to be provided).

The frontage improvements are to transition to meet the existing frontage condition to the east of the subject site and the sidewalk and bike path alignments are to take into account requirements for tree protection.
 - ii. The joint City/Translink initiative to enhance the Granville Avenue bus lanes has since been implemented along the subject site's frontage. The project comprised the installation of plastic delineators between the existing bike lane and adjacent vehicle lane. The requirements for the applicant will be to add delineators where the existing driveways will be closed and to remove the existing delineators as required where the new driveway crossing to the site will be located.
 - iii. As per Engineering Design Specifications, the southeast corner of the Granville Avenue/Ledway Road intersection is to be reconstructed to show a 5.5 m corner radius. Two separate wheelchair ramps (east-west and north-south) are to be included in the corner reconstruction.
 - iv. All existing driveways along the Granville Avenue site frontage are to be closed permanently. The applicant is responsible for the removal of the existing driveway letdowns and the replacement with barrier curb/gutter, boulevard and concrete sidewalk as per the standards described above.
 - v. The design of the proposed driveway off Granville Avenue requires modifications to be consistent with Engineering Design Specifications. The design is to be further refined through the SA design review process.
- i) The City's Parks Department will provide details on the Granville Avenue frontage requirements for tree protection/placement including tree species and spacing as part of the SA design review process.
- j) At the applicant's cost, the applicant is required to:
 - i. Complete frontage improvements along Ledway Road to include a new sidewalk and treed/grassed boulevard. The cross-section of the required frontage improvements (measured from east to west) is to include:
 - 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk (existing sidewalk is to be removed).
 - Treed/grassed boulevard over the remaining width between the new sidewalk and the existing east curb of Ledway Road.
 - 0.15 m wide curb (existing east curb of Ledway Road).

- The frontage improvements are to transition to meet the existing frontage condition to the south and the sidewalk alignment is to take into account requirements for tree protection.
- ii. All existing driveways along the Ledway Road frontage are to be closed permanently. The applicant is responsible for the removal of the existing driveway letdowns and the replacement with barrier curb/gutter, boulevard and concrete sidewalk as per the standards described above.
 - iii. The frontage design is to be further refined through the SA design review process.
 - iv. The City's Parks Department will provide details on the Ledway Road frontage requirements for tree protection/placement including tree species and spacing as part of the SA design review process.
- k) There is an existing special crosswalk at the southeast corner of the Granville Avenue/Ledway Road intersection. The required corner radius reconstruction may impact the existing crosswalk infrastructure. The SA design is to identify any required traffic signal device modifications. The costs of design works and actual crosswalk infrastructure works are the full responsibility of the applicant.

General Items:

- l) At the applicant's cost, the applicant is required to:
 - i. Complete the other frontage improvements as per the Transportation Department's requirements as described above.
 - ii. Not encroach into City SRWs with any proposed trees, retaining walls, or other non-removable structures. Retaining walls proposed to encroach into SRWs must be reviewed by the City's Engineering Department.
 - iii. Relocate the existing private utility overhead lines along Granville Ave that may conflict with the required sidewalk at the property line.
 - iv. Applicant to coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers:
 - To pre-duct for future hydro, telephone and cable utilities along all road frontages at the applicant's cost.
 - When relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the rear yards.
 - To locate all above ground utility cabinets and kiosks required to service the proposed development within the developments site (see list below for examples). A functional plan showing conceptual locations for such infrastructure shall be included in the design review. Please coordinate with the respective private utility companies and the project's lighting and traffic signal consultants to confirm the requirements and the locations for the above ground structures. If a private utility company does not require an above ground structure, that company shall confirm this via a letter to be submitted to the City. The following are examples of SRWs that shall be shown in the functional plan and registered prior to SA design approval:
 - BC Hydro PMT – 4 m w X 5 m d
 - BC Hydro LPT – 3.5 m w X 3.5 m d
 - Street light kiosk – 1.5 m w X 1.5m d
 - Traffic signal kiosk – 2 m w X 1.5m d
 - Traffic signal UPS – 1 m w X 1m d
 - Shaw cable kiosk – 1 m w X 1m d – show possible location in functional plan
 - Telus FDH cabinet - 1.1 m w X 1 m d – show possible location in functional plan
- Submission of a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to the Transportation Department for approval. The Management Plan shall address the requirements 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 details, refer to <https://www.richmond.ca/services/transportation/special.htm#ConstructionZonePermit>). The Management Plan is also to meet the following requirements over the course of the construction period of the subject development:
 - Access to the site via Ledway Road is not permitted.
 - Construction-related parking is not permitted in the adjacent residential area. Other off-site parking arrangements are to be made.

- The existing bus stop at the subject site's Granville Avenue frontage is to be maintained and kept operational. If this condition cannot be met and the bus stop needs to be relocated temporarily, contact TransLink through City Traffic Operations (Bill Dhaliwal) for interim bus stop relocation.
- Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
- Obtain a Building Permit for any construction hoarding. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a public street, the air space above a public street, or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For additional information, contact the Building Approvals Department at 604-276-4285.

Notes:

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

All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall have priority over all such liens, charges and encumbrances as is considered advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall, unless the Director of Development determines otherwise, be fully registered in the Land Title Office prior to enactment of the appropriate bylaw.

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

(signed concurrence on file)

Signed

Date



**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500
Amendment Bylaw 10470 (RZ 21-922202)
5800, 5840, 5860 Granville Avenue**

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. 004-316-401

Lot 129 Section 13 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 27915

P.I.D. 008-927-821

Lot 130 Section 13 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 28015

P.I.D. 004-211-421

Lot 127 Section 13 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 27743

2. This Bylaw may be cited as **"Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10470"**.

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

JUN 12 2023

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED By 
APPROVED by Director or Solicitor 

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



Regular Council
Monday, June 12, 2023

12. APPLICATION BY INTERFACE ARCHITECTURE INC. FOR
REZONING AT 5800, 5840, 5860 GRANVILLE AVENUE FROM THE
“SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E)” ZONE TO THE “LOW-DENSITY
TOWNHOUSES (RTL4)” ZONE

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-010470, RZ 21-922202) (REDMS No. 7216004, 7232833)

R23/11-6

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10470, for the rezoning of 5800, 5840, 5860 Granville Avenue from the “Single Detached (RS1/E)” zone to the “Low-Density Townhouses (RTL4)” zone, be introduced and given first reading.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with respect to (i) tree retention, (ii) the City’s House Moving and Salvage program, (iii) the variance request to reduce the exterior side yard setback along Granville Avenue, and (iv) the maximum height restrictions for this proposal.

The question on the motion was then called and **CARRIED.**



City of Richmond

Report to Committee

To: Planning Committee
From: Wayne Craig
Director, Development

Date: June 5, 2023
File: RZ 21-945951

Re: Application by Benito Kho and Verney Kho for Rezoning at 7520 Ash Street from
"Single Detached (RS1/F)" Zone to "Single Detached (RS2/E)" Zone

Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10472, for the rezoning of 7520 Ash Street from the "Single Family (RS1/F)" zone to the "Single Family (RS2/E)" zone, be introduced and given first reading.

Wayne Craig
Director, Development
(604-247-4625)

WC:le

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF ACTING GENERAL MANAGER
Affordable Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Staff Report

Origin

The owners, Benito Kho and Verney Kho has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 7520 Ash Street from the “Single Detached (RS1/F)” zone to the “Single Detached (RS2/E)” zone, to allow the property to be subdivided into two single-family lots (Attachment 1). Vehicle access to the west lot (proposed Lot 1) is proposed from Ash Street. Vehicle access to the eastern lot (Lot 2) is proposed from a new extension of Armstrong Street. The site is currently occupied by an existing single-family dwelling on the western portion of the lot, which will remain on proposed Lot 1. A site survey showing the proposed subdivision plan is included in Attachment 2.

Findings of Fact

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

Subject Site Existing Housing Profile

The existing single detached house is currently rented and does not contain a secondary suite. The applicant has confirmed that the existing tenants will remain in the dwelling following the rezoning and subdivision application.

Surrounding Development

Development immediately surrounding the site is as follows:

To the North: A single-family dwelling zoned “Single Detached (RS1/F)” fronting onto Ash Street.

To the South: Two single-family lots zoned “Single Detached (RS2/E)” one lot fronts onto Ash Street while the other lot fronts onto Armstrong Street, (RZ 09-500671 and SD 09-500672).

To the East: Across Armstrong Street, a single-family dwelling zoned “Single Detached (ZS14) – South McLennan (City Centre)” fronting onto Breden Avenue.

To the West: Across Ash Street, the City-owned Paulik Park.

Related Policies & Studies

Official Community Plan/City Centre Area Plan

The Official Community Plan (OCP) land use designations for the subject property is “Neighbourhood Residential” (NRES). The City Centre Area – McLennan South Sub-Area Plan land use designation for the subject property is “Residential, Historic Single Family” (Attachment 4). The Plan identifies minimum lot sizes along Ash Street (minimum 18 m [59 ft.] frontage and 550 m² [5,920 ft²] area) and along Armstrong Street (minimum 11.3 m [37 ft.] frontage and 320 m² [3,444ft²] area.)

The proposed lot along Ash Street (Lot 1) will be approximately 19.2 m (63 ft.) wide and 799 m² (8,600 ft²) in area. The proposed lot along Armstrong Street (Lot 2) will be approximately 19.2 m (63 ft.) wide and 799 m² (8,600 ft²) in area. The proposed rezoning and subdivision complies with these designations and lot configuration requirements.

Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

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

Public Consultation

A rezoning sign has been installed on the subject property. Staff have not received any comments from the public about the rezoning application in response to the placement of the rezoning sign on the properties. The applicant has contacted the adjacent property owner to the north at 7600 Ash Street to make them aware of the application and to determine if they were interested in rezoning at this time. The applicant advised staff in writing that the property owner is aware of the proposed rezoning and has no specific objections to the rezoning application as proposed (Attachment 5).

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant first reading to Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10472 (the “Rezoning Bylaw”), the Rezoning Bylaw will be forwarded to a Public Hearing, where any area resident or interested party will have an opportunity to comment. Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the Local Government Act.

Analysis

Proposed Rezoning and Subdivision

This redevelopment proposes to rezone and subdivide the subject site into two single-family lots, to retain the existing single-family dwelling on the western portion of the site (proposed Lot 1), and to construct a new single detached house with a secondary suite on the eastern portion of the site (proposed Lot 2). The applicant has provided a review by a qualified professional confirming that the existing dwelling meets all of the requirements of the proposed zone upon rezoning and subdivision. This development proposal is consistent with the redevelopment along this block of Ash Street, including the adjacent property to the south, 7540 Ash Street (RZ 09-500671).

Transportation and Site Access

Vehicle access to the western lot (Lot 1) is proposed to be from Ash Street via the existing driveway location and vehicle access to the eastern lot (Lot 2) is proposed to be from the new Armstrong Street.

Tree Retention and Replacement

The applicant has submitted a Certified Arborist's Report; which identifies on-site and off-site tree species, assesses tree structure and condition, and provides recommendations on tree retention and removal relative to the proposed development. The Report assesses a total of 21 trees on the subject property 18 of which are bylaw-sized, and two street trees on City property. Of the 18 bylaw-sized trees on the subject property, seven trees are located within the required City road dedication for Armstrong Street (Attachment 6).

The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has reviewed the Arborist's Report and supports the Arborist's findings, with the following comments:

- Two trees (tags #1 & 2) located on City property along the Ash Street frontage are in good condition and are identified to be retained and protected in the Arborist report. The applicant is required to provide tree protection as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.
- Two trees (tags #3 & 4) located on the development site in the rear yard of the proposed lot fronting Armstrong Street are in good condition and are identified to be retained and protected in the Arborist report.
- Nine trees (tags #6, 7, 8, 11, 15, 19, 21, 22, and 23) on the development site are in poor condition (sparse canopy, previously topped, Bronze Birch Borer infestation) and are proposed to be removed and replaced.
- Seven trees (tags #9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 20) are located within the future City Road (Armstrong Street). The 2:1 ratio as per the O.C.P. for replacement trees does not apply to the trees identified within a planned future neighbourhood roadway.
- Replacement trees should be at the 2:1 ratio specified in the OCP.

Tree Replacement

The applicant wishes to remove nine on-site trees (Trees #6, 7, 8, 11, 15, 19, 21, 22 and 23.) The 2:1 replacement ratio would require a total of 18 replacement trees. In addition to the two trees (Tag #3 & 4) to be retained on-site, the applicant has agreed to plant five trees on proposed Lot 1 and three trees on proposed Lot 2 for a total of eight replacement trees. Accordingly, after redevelopment, Lot 1 would contain five trees, and proposed Lot 2 would contain five trees. The required replacement trees are to be of the following minimum sizes, based on the size of the trees being removed as per Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057.

No. of Replacement Trees	Minimum Caliper of Deciduous Replacement Tree	Minimum Height of Coniferous Replacement Tree
8	8 cm	4.0 m

To satisfy the 2:1 replacement ratio established in the OCP, the applicant will contribute \$7500.00 (\$750/per tree) to the City's Tree Compensation Fund in lieu of the remaining 10 trees that cannot be accommodated on the subject property after redevelopment.

Tree Protection

Two trees (tag #1 & 2) on City property and two trees on the subject property (tag #3 & 4) are to be retained and protected. The applicant has submitted a tree protection plan showing the trees to be retained and the measures taken to protect them during development stage (Attachment 6). To ensure that the trees identified for retention are protected at development stage, the applicant is required to complete the following items:

- Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant must submit Tree Retention Security in the amounts of: \$20,000.00 for the retention of two on-site trees, and \$20,000.00 for the retention of two trees on City property.
- Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, submission to the City of a contract with a Certified Arborist for the supervision of all works conducted within or in close proximity to tree protection zones. The contract must include the scope of work required, the number of proposed monitoring inspections at specified stages of construction, any special measures required to ensure tree protection and a provision for the arborist to submit a post-construction impact assessment to the City for review.
- Prior to demolition of the existing dwelling on the subject site, installation of tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained. Tree protection fencing must be installed to City standard in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03 prior to any works being conducted on-site, and remain in place until construction and landscaping on-site are completed.

Affordable Housing Strategy

The City's Affordable Housing Strategy for single-family rezoning applications requires a secondary suite or coach house on 100 per cent of new lots created through single-family rezoning and subdivision applications; a secondary suite or coach house on 50 per cent of new lots created including a cash-in-lieu contribution towards the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund of the total buildable area of the remaining lots; or a cash-in-lieu contribution on the total buildable area of all lots where a secondary suite cannot be accommodated in the development.

The existing single detached dwelling which will be retained on the proposed western lot (Lot 1), does not contain a secondary suite. Consistent with the Affordable Housing Strategy, the applicant has agreed to the registration of a covenant on Title that stipulates that any future development on Lot 1 must include a minimum one-bedroom secondary suite. Registration of this legal agreement will be required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

On the proposed eastern lot (Lot 2), the applicant proposes to provide a minimum one-bedroom secondary suite of 93 m² (1,000 ft²). To ensure that the secondary suite is built to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the City's Affordable Housing Strategy, the applicant is required to enter into a legal agreement registered on Title, stating that no final Building Permit inspection will be granted until a minimum one-bedroom secondary suite of 93 m² is constructed to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the BC Building Code and Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500. Registration of this legal agreement is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the developer is required to provide a 9.0 m wide road dedication along the entire east property line of the subject property for the extension of Armstrong Street.

At Subdivision stage, the applicant must enter into a Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of engineering infrastructure and frontage improvements, as described in Attachment 7. Frontage improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Install a new storm service connection, complete with inspection chambers near the Armstrong Street frontage to service proposed Lot 2.
- Armstrong Street: pavement widening, new 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk at the new property line, 1.5 m wide treed/grassed boulevard and 0.15 m wide curb and gutter.
- Ash Street: road widening, new 1.75 m wide concrete sidewalk at the property line, 3.1 m wide treed/grassed boulevard and 0.15 m wide curb and gutter.

Also at Subdivision stage, the applicant is required to pay Property Taxes, Development Cost Charges, School Site Acquisition Charge, Address Assignment Fees and the costs associated with the completion of the design and construction of engineering infrastructure and frontage improvements as described in Attachment 7.

Financial Impact or Economic Impact

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

Conclusion

The purpose of this rezoning application is to rezone the property at 7520 Ash Street from the “Single Detached (RS1/F)” zone to the “Single Detached (RS2/E)” zone to permit the property to be subdivided into two single-family lots.

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

The list of rezoning considerations is included in Attachment 7 which has been agreed to by the applicant (signed concurrence on file).

It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10472 be introduced and given first reading.




Laurel Eyton
Planning Technician
(604-276-4262)

LE:he

- Att.
- 1: Location Map
 - 2: Conceptual Development Plans
 - 3: Development Application Data Sheet
 - 4: South McLennan Sub Area Plan
 - 5: 7600 Ash St – Neighbour Letter regarding Development
 - 6: Tree Management Plan
 - 7: Rezoning Considerations



City of
Richmond




RZ 21-945951



Original Date: 01/25/22

Revision Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



Note: Dimensions are in METRES



NOTES:

- All dimensions are derived from field survey.
- Elevations are based on the Geodetic Datum of 1985. All elevations are derived from control monument 94H1624 situated at the intersection of No. 5 Road and Granville Avenue. Elevation = 2.339 meters.
- For elevation control, use site benchmarks only.
- Elevation control must be checked against second source.
- Contractor assumes all responsibilities and risk when carrying out work using elevation control.
- Building envelope shown is just an approximate interpretation of City Zoning Bylaws. Consult Planning Department for final City Zoning Bylaws prior to design.
- All trees shown are those that are required by municipal bylaws.
- All elevations along curb lines are gutter levels.
- All dimensions are to exterior faces unless otherwise noted.
- Symbols plotted are for illustrative purposes and are not representative of their true size.
- denotes standard from post (IP).

CERTIFIED CORRECT.
DATED THIS 4TH DAY OF OCT., 2021

CIVIC ADDRESS
7520 ASH STREET
RICHMOND, B.C.

ZONING: RS1/F


IVAN NGAN

B.C.L.S.

L N L S METRO VANCOUVER
LAND SURVEYORS

PID: 012-032-015

FILE# 11588 05TP



DRAWN BY AC	DRAWING
SCALE (@ A1) 3/32" = 1'-0"	A0
DATE DECEMBER 1, 2021	



T: 604-371-1455
203-145 SCHOOLHOUSE
ST.
COQUITLAM, BC
V3K 4X8

CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS AND MATERIALS ON THESE DRAWINGS AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO COMMENCING WITH CONSTRUCTION. KENARAH DESIGN + BUILD IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE ARCHITECT'S CONSTRUCTION PLANS AND THE ACTUAL CONSTRUCTION. PLANS ARE NOT REPORTED IN WRITING PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. THIS AGREEMENT IS COPYRIGHTED FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE OF KENARAH DESIGN + BUILD. ANY REPRODUCTION OR REUSE OF ANY INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF KENARAH DESIGN + BUILD IS PROHIBITED.

[illegible]

PROJECT & ADDRESS

KHO
7520 ASH STREET
RICHMOND B.C.












[illegible]

KEY PLAN

DRAWN BY AC	DRAWING A1.A
SCALE (@A1) 1/16" = 1'-0"	
DATE JAN 14, 2023	

SITE PLAN LEGEND




	TO BE REMOVED
	EXISTING CONSTRUCTION
	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION
	BUILDING SETBACKS
	PROPERTY LINE
	TREE PROTECTION BARRIER
	TREE TO BE RETAINED
	TREE TO BE REMOVED
	WATER
	STORM
	SANITARY

- [illegible]

- [illegible]

PH 225





RZ 21-945951

Attachment 3

Address: 7520 Ash Street

Applicant: Benito Kho and Verney Kho

Planning Area(s): City Centre – McLennan South


	Existing	Proposed
Owner:	Benito Kho and Verney Kho	Lot 1: No change Lot 2: To be determined
Site Size (m²):	1769.5 m ²	Lot 1: 799 m ² Lot 2: 799 m ²
Land Uses:	Single-family residential	No change
OCP Designation:	Neighbourhood Residential	No change
Area Plan Designation:	Single Family	No change
Zoning:	Single Detached (RS1/F)	Single Detached (RS2/E)
Number of Units:	One existing Single Family Dwelling	2 Single Family Dwellings

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.55 for lot area up to 464.5 m ² plus 0.3 for area in excess of 464.5 m ²	Max. 0.55 for lot area up to 464.5 m ² plus 0.3 for area in excess of 464.5 m ²	none permitted
Buildable Floor Area (m ²):*	Lot 1: Max. 360 m ² (3870 ft ²) Lot 2: Max. 360 m ² (3870 ft ²)	Lot 1: Max. 360 m ² (3870 ft ²) Lot 2: Max. 360 m ² (3870 ft ²)	none permitted
Lot Coverage (% of lot area):	Building: Max. 45% Non-porous Surfaces: Max. 70% Landscaping: Min. 30%	Building: Max. 45% Non-porous Surfaces: Max. 70% Landscaping: Min. 30%	none
Lot Size:	Min. 550 m ²	Lot 1: 799 m ² Lot 2: 799 m ²	none
Lot Dimensions (m):	Width: Min. 18.0 m Depth: Min. 24.0 m	Width: 19.2 m Depth: 41.6 m	none
Setbacks (m):	Front: Min. 6.0 m Rear: Min. 8.32 m (1 st storey) / 10.40m (2 nd storey) Side: Min. 1.8 m	Front: Min. 6.0 m Rear: Min. 8.32 m (1 st storey) / 10.40m (2 nd storey) Side: Min. 1.8 m	none
Height (m):	Max. 2 ½ storeys	Max. 2 ½ storeys	none

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

City of Richmond

Land Use Map

 Bylaw 9106
2015/09/14


Note: Sills Avenue, Le Chow Street, Keefer Avenue, and Turnill Street are commonly referred to as the “ring road”.

7500 Ash Street
Richmond, BC

May 25, 2023


To Whom It May Concern:


I, *Sharon MacBougan*, am the owner of 7500 Ash Street Richmond.

I confirm that I am aware of the development potential of 7500 Ash Street and 7520 Ash Street together can be rezoned and subdivided into three lots fronting onto Armstrong.


I confirm that I know about the application for rezoning of 7520 Ash Street and that further development of 7520 Ash Street is going forward.

MacBougan.





Northwest Property Tree Management Plan, Scale 1/16" = 1'



Central Lot Tree Management Plan, Scale 1/16" = 1'





Address: 7520 Ash Street

File No.: RZ 21-945951

Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10472, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. Road dedication along the entire east property line measuring 9.0 m wide for the extension of Armstrong Street.
2. Submission of a Landscape Security in the amount of \$6,000.00 (\$750/tree) to ensure that five replacement trees are planted and maintained on proposed Lot 1 and three replacement trees are planted and maintained on proposed Lot 2 (minimum 8 cm deciduous caliper or 4 m high conifers). NOTE: If any of the five replacement trees required to be planted on proposed Lot 1 cannot be accommodated, the applicant is required to submit a letter from a qualified professional confirming this to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, and a cash-in-lieu contribution in the amount of \$750/tree to the City's Tree Compensation Fund may be accepted.
3. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$7500.00 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of 10 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. 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. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of \$20,000.00 for the two trees to be retained on the subject property.
6. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of \$20,000 for the two trees to be retained on City property.
7. 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.
8. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
9. Registration of a legal agreement on Title to ensure that no final Building Permit inspection is granted until a minimum one-bedroom secondary suite is constructed on Lot 1, and a minimum 1 bedroom 93 m² (1000 sqft) secondary suite is constructed on Lot 2, to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the BC Building Code and the City's Zoning Bylaw.
10. Payment of all fees in full for the cost associated with the Public Hearing Notices, consistent with the City's Consolidated Fees Bylaw No 8636, as amended.

Prior to Demolition Permit* Issuance, the developer must complete the following requirements:

1. Installation of tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained. Tree protection fencing must be installed to City standard in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Information Bulletin TREE-03 prior to any works being conducted on-site, and must remain in place until construction and landscaping on-site is completed.

At Subdivision* stage, the developer must complete the following requirements:

1. Payment of the current year's property taxes, Development Cost Charges, School Site Acquisition Charge, Address Assignment Fees, and the costs associated with the completion of the design and construction of engineering infrastructure and frontage improvements.
2. Enter into a Servicing Agreement* for the design and construction of engineering infrastructure improvements. A Letter of Credit or cash security for the value of the Service Agreement works, as determined by the City, will be required as part of entering into the Servicing Agreement. Works include, but may not be limited to:

a) *Water Works:*

Using the OCP Model, there is 444 L/s of water available at a 20 psi residual at the Ash Street frontage. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of 95 L/s.

At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:

- b) Cut and cap the existing water service connection on Ash St and replace with a 25mm water service connection complete with water meter and water meter box, as per standard City specifications.
- c) Install a new 200mm water main extending from the existing 200mm water main located on Armstrong St and Breden Ave. Proposed water main to extend until the north PL of 7520 Ash St.
- d) Install a new water service connection complete with water meter and water meter box from the newly proposed water main extension to service the proposed east lot.
- e) Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection on both frontages. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage building designs.
- f) Review hydrant spacing on all road frontages and install new fire hydrants as required to meet City spacing requirements for the proposed land use.
- g) Provide a right-of-way for the water meter. Minimum right-of-way dimensions to be the size of the meter box (from the City of Richmond supplementary specifications) + any appurtenances (for example, the bypass on W20-SD) + 0.5 m on all sides. Exact right-of-way dimensions to be finalized during the building permit process (or via the servicing agreement process, if one is required).

At Developer's cost, the City will:

- h) Complete all tie-ins for the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

Storm Sewer Works

At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:

- i) Cut and cap the existing storm sewer service connection located at the North West corner of the site.
- j) Confirm the condition and capacity of the existing storm sewer service connection located at the south west corner of the site to be 100mm diameter or larger. If adequate to standard City specifications reuse to service the west lot.
- k) Install a new 600mm storm sewer main extending from the north face of the manhole located on Armstrong St and Breden Ave, to the north PL of 7520 Ash St.
- l) Install a new storm sewer service connection complete with inspection chamber from the newly proposed storm sewer main extension to service the proposed east lot.
- m) Provide an erosion and sediment control plan for all on-site and off-site works, to be reviewed as part of the servicing agreement design.

At Developer's cost, the City will:

- n) Complete all tie-ins for the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

Sanitary Sewer Works:

At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:

- o) Confirm the condition and capacity of the existing sanitary service connection located in the North West corner of the lot. Reuse if in good condition to service the west lot.
- p) Install a new 200mm sanitary sewer main extending from the north face of the manhole located on Armstrong St and Breden Ave, to the north PL of 7520 Ash St.

- q) Install a new sanitary sewer service connection complete with inspection chamber from the newly proposed sanitary main extension to service the proposed east lot.
- r) Not start onsite excavation or foundation construction until completion of rear-yard sanitary works by City crews.

At Developer's cost, the City will:

- s) Complete all tie-ins for the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

Street Lighting:

At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:

- t) Review street lighting levels along all road and lane frontages, and upgrade as required.

Frontage Improvements:

At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:

- u) Complete other frontage improvements as per Transportation requirements, e.g.:
 - (1) Armstrong Street: pavement widening, new 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk at the new property line, 1.5 m wide treed/grassed boulevard and 0.15 m wide curb and gutter. The road widening is to include +/- 6.35 m wide new pavement to meet the existing edge of pavement.
 - (2) Ash Street: road widening to meet existing pavement for a total width of 8.5m, new 1.75 m wide concrete sidewalk at the property line, 3.1 m wide treed/grassed boulevard and 0.15 m wide curb and gutter. All frontage works along the Ash Street frontage are to be designed to ensure the retention and protection of is to be two trees (Tag #1 and #2).
 - (3) Not encroach into City rights-of-ways with any proposed trees, retaining walls, or other non-removable structures. Retaining walls proposed to encroach into rights-of-ways must be reviewed by the City's Engineering Department.

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

1. Submission of a Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan to the Transportation Department. Management Plan shall include location for parking for services, deliveries, workers, loading, application for any lane closures, and proper construction traffic controls as per Traffic Control Manual for works on Roadways (by Ministry of Transportation) and MMCD Traffic Regulation Section 01570.
2. Obtain a Building Permit (BP) for any construction hoarding. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a public street, the air space above a public street, or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For additional information, contact the Building Approvals Department at 604-276-4285.

Note:

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

All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall have priority over all such liens, charges and encumbrances as is considered advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall, unless the Director of Development determines otherwise, be fully registered in the Land Title Office prior to enactment of the appropriate bylaw.

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

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

Signed

Date



**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500
Amendment Bylaw 10472 (RZ 21-945951)
7520 Ash 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. 012-032-115

South Half of Lot 2, Block "F", Section 15, Block 4 North, Range 6 West, New Westminster District, Plan 1207.

2. This Bylaw may be cited as **"Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10472"**.

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON


SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

JUN 26 2023

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED by 
APPROVED by Director or Solicitor 

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500
Amendment Bylaw 10472 (RZ 21-945951)
7520 Ash 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. 012-032-115

South Half of Lot 2, Block “F”, Section 15, Block 4 North, Range 6 West, New Westminster District, Plan 1207.

2. This Bylaw may be cited as **“Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10472”**.

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED by 
APPROVED by Director or Solicitor 

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



Regular Council
Monday, June 26, 2023

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REMOVED FROM THE
CONSENT AGENDA

11. APPLICATION BY BENITO KHO AND VERNEY KHO FOR
REZONING AT 7520 ASH STREET FROM “SINGLE DETACHED
(RS1/F)” ZONE TO “SINGLE DETACHED (RS2/E)” ZONE

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-010472, RZ 2021-945951) (REDMS No. 3218459,7246432,7227004)

R23/12-5

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10472, for the rezoning of 7520 Ash Street from the “Single Family (RS1/F)” zone to the “Single Family (RS2/E)” zone, be introduced and given first reading.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion took place on retention of trees, higher density and more affordable housing units.

The question on the motion then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllr. Wolfe opposed.