



---

**City Council**

**Council Chambers, City Hall  
6911 No. 3 Road**

**Monday, September 23, 2019  
7:00 p.m.**

Pg. #      ITEM

MINUTES

- CNCL-10**    1.    *Motion to adopt the **minutes** of the Regular Council meeting held on September 9, 2019.*

☐

AGENDA ADDITIONS & DELETIONS

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

2.    *Motion to resolve into Committee of the Whole to hear delegations on agenda items.*

☐

3.    Delegations from the floor on Agenda items.

**PLEASE NOTE THAT FOR LEGAL REASONS, DELEGATIONS ARE NOT PERMITTED ON ZONING OR OCP AMENDMENT BYLAWS WHICH ARE TO BE ADOPTED OR ON DEVELOPMENT PERMITS/DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS – ITEM NO. 19.**

4.    *Motion to rise and report.*

☐

## RATIFICATION OF COMMITTEE ACTION

## CONSENT AGENDA

**PLEASE NOTE THAT ITEMS APPEARING ON THE CONSENT AGENDA WHICH PRESENT A CONFLICT OF INTEREST FOR COUNCIL MEMBERS MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA AND CONSIDERED SEPARATELY.**

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE WILL APPEAR ON THE REVISED COUNCIL AGENDA, EITHER ON THE CONSENT AGENDA OR NON-CONSENT AGENDA DEPENDING ON THE OUTCOME AT COMMITTEE.**

## CONSENT AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- Receipt of Committee minutes
- Award of Contract 6331F Supply, Service and Delivery of Turnout Gear (Personal Protective Equipment)
- Proposed Richmond Food Recovery Network Program
- Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan
- Land use applications for first reading (to be further considered at the Public Hearing on October 21, 2019):
  - 9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 Steveston Highway & 10831 Southdale Road – Rezone from RS1/E to RTL4 (CLO Ventures K2 Ltd. – applicant)
  - 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 and 10397 No. 2 Road – Rezone from RS1/E to RTL4 (Konic Development Ltd. – applicant)
- Housekeeping Request - Abandonment of Unadopted Bylaws
- Transport 2050 - Phase 1 Consultation
- Amendment to Traffic Bylaw No. 5870 to Establish a Fee for Issuance of Permits Related to Use of City Streets
- Ageing Utility and Road Infrastructure Planning – 2019 Update

5. *Motion to adopt Items No. 7 through No. 15 by general consent.*



Consent  
Agenda  
Item

6. COMMITTEE MINUTES

*That the minutes of:*

- |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| CNCL-26                  | (1) the <b>Special General Purposes Committee</b> meeting held on September 9, 2019;         |
| CNCL-29                  | (2) the <b>Community Safety Committee</b> meeting held on September 10, 2019;                |
| <b>ADDED</b><br>CNCL-332 | (3) the <b>General Purposes Committee</b> meeting held on September 16, 2019;                |
| CNCL-338                 | (4) the <b>Planning Committee</b> meeting held on September 17, 2019; and                    |
| CNCL-344                 | (5) the <b>Public Works and Transportation Committee</b> meeting held on September 18, 2019; |

*be received for information.*



Consent  
Agenda  
Item

7. AWARD OF CONTRACT 6331F SUPPLY, SERVICE AND DELIVERY OF TURNOUT GEAR (PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT)

(File Ref. No. 09-5140-01) (REDMS No. 6225671 v. 4)

CNCL-65

**See Page CNCL-65 for full report**

COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

1. *That staff be authorized to award a contract to Associated Fire and Safety, for the supply, service and delivery of turnout gear (Personal Protective Equipment), as outlined in the report titled “Award of Contract 6331F – Supply, Service and Delivery of Turnout Gear (Personal Protective Equipment), for Fire-Rescue emergency response personnel, dated July 29, 2019 from the Fire Chief Tim Wilkinson; and*
2. *That the Chief Administrative Officer and the General Manager, Community Safety be authorized to execute, on behalf of the City, an agreement for the supply, service and delivery of Turnout Gear (Personal Protective Equipment), as outlined in the staff report with Associated Fire and Safety at the rates quoted for a five-year term.*



## Council Agenda – Monday, September 23, 2019

Pg. # ITEM

Consent  
Agenda  
Item

8. **PROPOSED RICHMOND FOOD RECOVERY NETWORK PROGRAM**

(File Ref. No. 08-4150-01) (REDMS No. 6266216 v. 2)

CNCL-93

See Page **CNCL-93** for full report

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

**REVISED**

*That the Chief Administrative Officer and General Manager of Finance and Corporate Services be authorized to enter into a partnering agreement with FoodMesh for the delivery of the proposed Richmond Food Recovery Network Program as outlined in the staff report from the Director, Corporate Business Service Solutions dated August 30, 2019 entitled “Proposed Richmond Food Recovery Network Program”.*



Consent  
Agenda  
Item

9. **DEMENTIA-FRIENDLY COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN**

(File Ref. No. 07-3400-01) (REDMS No. 6201288 v 4)

CNCL-100

See Page **CNCL-100** for full report

PLANNING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

**REVISED**

- (1) *That the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan, as outlined in Attachment 1 of the staff report titled, “Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan”, dated August 23, 2019, from the Director, Community Social Development, be adopted; and*
- (2) *That the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan be distributed to key stakeholders and posted on the City website.*



Council Agenda – Monday, September 23, 2019

Pg. # ITEM

Consent  
Agenda  
Item

10. **APPLICATION BY CLO VENTURES K2 LTD. FOR REZONING AT 9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 STEVESTON HIGHWAY & 10831 SOUTHDALE ROAD FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E) TO LOW DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTL4)**

(File Ref. No. RZ 17-763712) (REDMS No. 6177240)

CNCL-141

See Page CNCL-141 for full report

PLANNING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

**REVISED**

*That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10082, for the rezoning of 9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 Steveston Highway & 10831 Southdale Road from the “Single Detached (RS1/E)” zone to the “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)” zone, in order to permit the development of 20 townhouse units with vehicle access from Steveston Highway, be introduced and given first reading.*



Consent  
Agenda  
Item

11. **APPLICATION BY KONIC DEVELOPMENT LTD. FOR REZONING AT 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 AND 10397 NO. 2 ROAD FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E) TO LOW DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTL4)**

(File Ref. No. RZ 17-794300) (REDMS No. 6245187)

CNCL-187

See Page CNCL-187 for full report

PLANNING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

**REVISED**

*That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10088, for the rezoning of 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 and 10397 No. 2 Road from “Single Detached (RS1/E)” to “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)”, be introduced and given first reading.*



# Council Agenda – Monday, September 23, 2019

Pg. # ITEM

Consent  
Agenda  
Item

## 12. HOUSEKEEPING REQUEST - ABANDONMENT OF UNADOPTED BYLAWS

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-01) (REDMS No. 6106697)

CNCL-270

See Page CNCL-270 for full report

### PLANNING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

**REVISED**

*That the unadopted Zoning Amendment Bylaws, as outlined in Attachment 1, of the staff report titled “Housekeeping Request – Abandonment of Unadopted Bylaws” dated August 23, 2019 from the Director, City Clerk’s Office, be abandoned.*



Consent  
Agenda  
Item

## 13. TRANSPORT 2050 - PHASE 1 CONSULTATION

(File Ref. No. 01-0154-04) (REDMS No. 6236611 v. 10)

CNCL-277

See Page CNCL-277 for full report

### PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

**REVISED**

- (1) *That the attached report titled “Transport 2050 – Phase 1 Consultation” dated August 22, 2019 from the Director, Transportation be forwarded to TransLink for consideration as part of its Phase 1 consultation for the development of Transport 2050; and*
- (2) *That No. 1 Road be removed as an option for rapid transit as outlined in the staff report titled “Transport 2050 – Phase 1 Consultation” dated August 22, 2019 from the Director, Transportation.*



Consent  
Agenda  
Item

14. **AMENDMENT TO TRAFFIC BYLAW NO. 5870 TO ESTABLISH A FEE FOR ISSUANCE OF PERMITS RELATED TO USE OF CITY STREETS**

(File Ref. No. 10-6450-19-01) (REDMS No. 6247261)

CNCL-289

See Page CNCL-289 for full report

PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
RECOMMENDATION

**REVISED**

- (1) *That Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, Amendment Bylaw No. 10076, to establish a fee for the issuance of permits to external agencies for the processing of traffic management plans and lane closure requests, be introduced and given first, second and third reading.*
- (2) *That Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636, Amendment Bylaw No. 10079, which quantifies the fee for the issuance of various permits established in Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, be introduced and given first, second and third reading.*



Consent  
Agenda  
Item

15. **AGEING UTILITY AND ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING – 2019 UPDATE**

(File Ref. No. 10-6060-01) (REDMS No. 6203674)

CNCL-297

See Page CNCL-297 for full report

PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
RECOMMENDATION

**REVISED**

*That the staff report titled, “Ageing Utility and Road Infrastructure Planning – 2019 Update”, dated August 16, 2019, from the Manager, Engineering Planning be utilized as input in the annual utility rate review and budget process.*



\*\*\*\*\*

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REMOVED FROM THE  
CONSENT AGENDA

\*\*\*\*\*

## NON-CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

### GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair

16. **STEVESTON COMMUNITY CENTRE AND BRANCH LIBRARY  
PROPOSED PROGRAM AND SITE AREA**

(File Ref. No. 06-2052-25-SCCR1) (REDMS No. 6209212 v. 62)

CNCL-77

See Page CNCL-77 for full report

CNCL-352

See Page CNCL-352 for updated staff report

### GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Opposed: Cllrs. Day and Steves

**REVISED**

- (1) *That the program totaling 60,350 sq. ft, (Table 2, page 5) for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library be approved, as outlined in the staff report titled, “Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Proposed Program and Site Area,” dated August 22, 2019, from the Director, Recreation and Sport Services and the Acting Director, Facilities; and*
- (2) *That staff be directed to:*
  - (a) *provide specific project cost estimates;*
  - (b) *review options to mitigate project costs;*
  - (c) *provide information on potential building sites and formations;*
  - (d) *provide information on the transition of programming from the existing facility to the new facility; and*
  - (e) *review options to expand the size of the proposed multipurpose rooms by 750ft<sup>2</sup>;**and report back.*



Additional Recommendations

**ADDED**

- (1) *That staff proceed with the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project without the use of the airspace parcel on the Steveston Community Park as outlined in the report titled "Housing Options Associated with the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement," dated September 18, 2019, from the Acting Director, Facilities, and the Director, Recreation and Sport Services; and*
- (2) *That staff pursue affordable housing options and a potential transit exchange for the future use of 4320 Moncton Street as outlined in the report titled "Housing Options Associated with the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement," dated September 18, 2019, from the Acting Director, Facilities and the Director, Recreation and Sport Services.*



PLANNING COMMITTEE

Councillor Linda McPhail, Chair

17. **APPLICATION BY KONIC DEVELOPMENT LTD. FOR REZONING AT 4571, 4591, AND 4611/4631 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM "SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E)" AND "TWO-UNIT DWELLINGS (RD1)" TO "LOW DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTL4)"**  
(File Ref. No. RZ 18-839945) (REDMS No. 6246089)

CNCL-233

See Page CNCL-233 for full report

PLANNING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Opposed: Cllr. Day

**REVISED**

*That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10081, for the rezoning of 4571, 4591, and 4611/4631 Steveston Highway from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" and "Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1)" to "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)," be introduced and given first reading.*



18. *Motion to rise and report.*



RATIFICATION OF COMMITTEE ACTION

☐

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS AND EVENTS

NEW BUSINESS

BYLAWS FOR ADOPTION

- CNCL-319**      Housing Agreement (5333 No. 3 Road) Bylaw No. 9933, Amendment **Bylaw No. 10037**  
Opposed at 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> Readings – None.

☐

- CNCL-325**      Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment **Bylaw No. 9713**  
(7000/7002, 7020 Williams Road and 10060 Gilbert Road, RZ 16-743741)  
Opposed at 1<sup>st</sup> Reading – None.  
Opposed at 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> Readings – None.

☐

- CNCL-327**      Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment **Bylaw No. 9905**  
(10320 Lassam Road, RZ 18-810261)  
Opposed at 1<sup>st</sup> Reading – None.  
Opposed at 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> Readings – None.

☐





## Regular Council

**Monday, September 9, 2019**

Place: Council Chambers  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Councillor Chak Au  
Councillor Carol Day  
Councillor Kelly Greene  
Councillor Alexa Loo  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Linda McPhail  
Councillor Harold Steves  
Councillor Michael Wolfe

Corporate Officer – Claudia Jesson

Call to Order: Mayor Brodie called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

RES NO. ITEM

### MINUTES

- R19/14-1 1. It was moved and seconded  
*That:*
- (1) *the minutes of the Regular Council meeting held on July 22, 2019, be adopted as circulated;*
  - (2) *the minutes of the Special Council meeting held on September 3, 2019, be adopted as circulated;*
  - (3) *the minutes of the Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings held on September 3, 2019, be adopted as circulated; and*



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

- (4) *the Metro Vancouver 'Board in Brief' dated July 26, 2019, be received for information.*

**CARRIED**

**AGENDA ADDITIONS & DELETIONS**

R19/14-2

It was moved and seconded

*That Richmond General Hospital Acute Tower Update be added to the Consent Agenda as Item No. 14A.*

**CARRIED**

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

R19/14-3

2. It was moved and seconded

*That Council resolve into Committee of the Whole to hear delegations on agenda items (7:02 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**

3. Delegations from the floor on Agenda items.

Item No. 15 – Passenger Transportation Board Decisions on Ride Hailing Services in the Province

George Pope, Richmond resident, expressed that regulations for ride hailing services should match regulations for taxis to ensure fair competition. Also, he noted his support for initiatives that encourage the expansion of accessible vehicle fleet size for taxis and ride hailing services.

Item No. 10 – Final Homelessness Strategy 2019–2029

Michelle Li, Richmond resident, expressed concern with regard to food security for those who are homeless. She noted that residents should have access to food and encouraged the City to dedicate resources to improve food security and support community groups that assist homeless individuals.



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

Item No. 10 – Final Homelessness Strategy 2019–2029

De Whalen, representing the Richmond Poverty Response Committee, expressed support for the Strategy and encouraged that the proposed advisory committees (Community Homelessness Table and Service Provider Table) include representatives from lived experience experts, seniors, the faith community and the outreach community.

Item No. 10 – Final Homelessness Strategy 2019–2029

Theresa Head, representing the Richmond Advocacy and Support Committee, spoke on the Strategy and noted the importance of including input from individuals with lived experience. Also, she expressed that access to food and shelter is essential and that support should be provided to vulnerable individuals in the city.

- R19/14-4    4.    It was moved and seconded  
*That Committee rise and report (7:18 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- R19/14-5    5.    It was moved and seconded  
*That Items No. 6 through No. 9, No. 11, No. 12 and No. 14A be adopted by general consent.*

**CARRIED**

6.    **COMMITTEE MINUTES**

*That the minutes of:*

- (1)    the General Purposes Committee meeting held on September 3, 2019;*
  - (2)    the Finance Committee meeting held on September 3, 2019; and*
  - (3)    the Planning Committee meeting held on September 4, 2019;*
- be received for information.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

**7. PUBLIC ELECTRIC VEHICLE (EV) CHARGING EXPANSION – 2019  
FUNDING APPLICATION TO NATURAL RESOURCES CANADA**  
(File Ref. No. 10-6460-03) (REDMS No. 6251444 v. 11)

*That, as described in the staff report titled, " Public Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Expansion – 2019 Funding Application to Natural Resources Canada" dated August 9, 2019 from the Director, Sustainability & District Energy:*

- (1) The expansion of 20 public electric vehicle charging ports at a cost of \$700,000 funded by the Gas Tax Provision be approved;*
- (2) The application to Natural Resources Canada's 2019 Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure Program for up to \$100,000 in grant funding be approved;*
- (3) Should the funding application be successful, the Chief Administrative Officer and the Acting General Manager, Engineering and Public Works be authorized to execute the agreement with Natural Resources Canada on behalf of the City of Richmond;*
- (4) The list of priority electric vehicle charging sites as described in the staff report titled "Public Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Expansion – 2019 Funding Application to Natural Resources Canada" be endorsed; and*
- (5) That the Consolidated 5 Year Financial Plan (2019-2023) be amended accordingly.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

**8. CLEANBC PLASTICS ACTION PLAN - POLICY CONSULTATION PAPER**

(File Ref. No. 10-6370-01) (REDMS No. 6251344 v. 5)

*That the City of Richmond response to the CleanBC Plastics Action Plan – Policy Consultation Paper, as outlined in the staff report dated August 8, 2019 from the Manager, Fleet and Environmental Programs, be approved and forwarded to the B.C. Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

**9. APPLICATION FOR A NEW LIQUOR PRIMARY LIQUOR LICENCE - HOTEL VERSANTE LTD. DOING BUSINESS AS: BAR CHLOE, 8499 BRIDGEPORT ROAD, 12TH FLOOR**

(File Ref. No. 12-8275-30-001) (REDMS No. 6234639; 6234641)

- (1) *That the application from Hotel Versante Ltd., doing business as, Bar Chloe, for a new Liquor Primary Liquor Licence to operate an upscale lounge establishment, at premises located at 8499 Bridgeport Rd, 12th Floor, with liquor service, be supported for:*
- (a) *a new Liquor Primary Liquor Licence with total person capacity of 150 persons;*
  - (b) *Family Food Service allowing minors accompanied by a parent or guardian until 10:00 PM; and*
  - (c) *Liquor service hours for Monday to Sunday, from 9:00 AM to 2:00AM; and*
- (2) *That a letter be sent to Liquor Control and Licensing Branch, which includes the information attached as Appendix A, advising that Council recommends the approval of the licence application for the reasons that this new application for a Liquor Primary Licence is acceptable to the majority of the residents, businesses and property owners in the area and community.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

**10. FINAL HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY 2019–2029**

(File Ref. No. 08-4057-11-03) (REDMS No. 6203390 v. 7, 6207485)

Please see Page 8 for action on this item.

**11. HOUSING AGREEMENT BYLAW NO. 9933, AMENDMENT BYLAW NO. 10037 TO PERMIT THE CITY OF RICHMOND TO AMEND THE EXISTING HOUSING AGREEMENT SECURING AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS LOCATED AT 5333 NO. 3 ROAD (FORMERLY 7960 ALDERBRIDGE WAY AND 5333 AND 5411 NO. 3 ROAD)**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-010037) (REDMS No. 6177361 v. 6; 6197892)

*That Housing Agreement (5333 No. 3 Road) Bylaw No. 9933, Amendment Bylaw No. 10037 be introduced and given first, second and third readings to permit the City to amend the existing Housing Agreement pursuant to an Amending Agreement substantially in the form attached hereto, in accordance with the requirements of section 483 of the Local Government Act, to secure the Affordable Housing Units required by the Rezoning Application RZ 15-692485.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

**12. APPLICATION BY GBL ARCHITECTS TO AMEND SCHEDULE 2.11A OF OFFICIAL COMMUNITY BYLAW 7100 (WEST CAMBIE AREA PLAN), CREATE THE “MIXED USE EMPLOYMENT-RESIDENTIAL (ZMU41) - ALEXANDRA NEIGHBOURHOOD (WEST CAMBIE)” ZONE, AND REZONE THE SITE AT 9080, 9086, 9100, 9180 ODLIN ROAD AND 4420, 4440 GARDEN CITY ROAD FROM “SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/F)” TO “MIXED USE EMPLOYMENT-RESIDENTIAL (ZMU41) - ALEXANDRA NEIGHBOURHOOD (WEST CAMBIE)”**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-01006; 12-8060-20-009999; RZ 18-807620) (REDMS No. 6117527 v. 4; 3186793; 6221555; 6124120; 6146166)



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

- (1) *That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 10006 to amend Schedule 2.11A (West Cambie Area Plan) to amend the “Alexandra Neighbourhood Open Space System Map”, the “Alexandra Neighbourhood Character Area Map” and the “Character Area 1 – Mixed Use Employment-Residential Alexandra Map” to include a pedestrian and bicycle connection between Garden City Road and Dubbert Street, be introduced and given First Reading.*
- (2) *That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 10006, having been considered in conjunction with:*
  - (a) *The City’s Financial and Capital Program; and*
  - (b) *The Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;**is hereby found to be consistent with said programs and plans, in accordance with Section 477(3)(a) of the Local Government Act.*
- (3) *That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 10006, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is hereby found not to require further consultation.*
- (4) *That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9999 to create the “Mixed Use Employment- Residential (ZMU41) - Alexandra Neighbourhood (West Cambie)” zone, and to rezone 9080, 9086, 9100, 9180 Odlin Road and 4420, 4440 Garden City Road from “Single Detached (RS1/F)” to “Mixed Use Employment-Residential (ZMU41) - Alexandra Neighbourhood (West Cambie)”, be introduced and given First Reading.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

**13. APPLICATION BY SNC LAVALIN INC. FOR REZONING OF PORTIONS OF 12700 AND 12800 RICE MILL ROAD, 12280 AND 12300 NO. 5 ROAD FROM AGRICULTURE (AG1) AND LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (IL) TO A SITE SPECIFIC ZONE**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009940; RZ 18-824565) (REDMS No. 6251917; 6220730; 5977294; 6040362)

Please see Page 10 for action on this item.



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

**14. RICHMOND RESPONSE: METRO VANCOUVER'S REFERRAL TO AMEND THE METRO 2040 REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY AS REQUESTED BY THE CITY OF DELTA**

(File Ref. No. 01-0157-30-RGST1) (REDMS No. 6245125 v. 3)

Please see Page 11 for action on this item.

**14A. RICHMOND GENERAL HOSPITAL ACUTE TOWER UPDATE**

(File Ref. No.)

*That a letter be sent to the Premier and the Provincial Ministers of Health and Finance, requesting an update on the status of the Richmond General Hospital Acute Care Tower Business Plan and timeline of the Treasury Board approval.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

\*\*\*\*\*

**CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REMOVED FROM THE  
CONSENT AGENDA**

\*\*\*\*\*

**10. FINAL HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY 2019–2029**

(File Ref. No. 08-4057-11-03) (REDMS No. 6203390 v. 7; 6207485)

R19/14-6

It was moved and seconded

*That the final Homelessness Strategy 2019–2029, as outlined in Attachment 1 of the report titled “Final Homelessness Strategy 2019–2029”, dated August 19, 2019 from the Director, Community Social Development, be approved.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to making minor edits to the headings and the body of the Strategy.

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



Regular Council  
Monday, September 9, 2019

R19/14-7

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the word “Support” be included in heading “Non-Profit, Social Service and Faith-Based Organization” under Part 2, in Page 6 of the Final Homelessness Strategy 2019-2029; and*
- (2) *That the words “when appropriate” be removed from Part 5 under the heading of “Strategic Direction 4” in Page 27 of the Final Homelessness Strategy 2019-2029.*

The question on the motion was not called as there was agreement to deal with Parts (1) and (2) separately.

Discussion then ensued with regard to staff reviewing proposed minor edits to the Strategy.

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

R19/14-8

It was moved and seconded

*That the following proposed edits to the Homelessness Strategy 2019–2029 be referred back to staff for review:*

- (1) *That the word “Support” be included in heading “Non-Profit, Social Service and Faith-Based Organization” under Part 2, in Page 6 of the Final Homelessness Strategy 2019-2029; and*
- (2) *That the words “when appropriate” be removed from Part 5 under the heading of “Strategic Direction 4” in Page 27 of the Final Homelessness Strategy 2019-2029;*

*and report back.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to proceeding with the Strategy while staff review proposed edits.

The question on the referral motion was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Loo and McPhail opposed.

The question on the main motion was then called and it was **CARRIED**.



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

**13. APPLICATION BY SNC LAVALIN INC. FOR REZONING OF PORTIONS OF 12700 AND 12800 RICE MILL ROAD, 12280 AND 12300 NO. 5 ROAD FROM AGRICULTURE (AG1) AND LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (IL) TO A SITE SPECIFIC ZONE**

(File Ref. No. RZ 18-824565) (REDMS No. 6251917; 6220730; 5977294; 6040362)

R19/14-9

It was moved and seconded

*That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9940 to create the “BC Ferries Fleet Maintenance and Moorage (ZI14)” zone, and to:*

- (1) Rezone 12300 No. 5 Road and 12800 Rice Mill Road from “Light Industrial (IL)” to “BC Ferries Fleet Maintenance and Moorage (ZI14); and*
- (2) Rezone a portion of 12280 No. 5 Road and 12700 Rice Mill Road from “Agriculture (AG1) and Light Industrial (IL)” to “BC Ferries Fleet Maintenance and Moorage (ZI14);*

*be introduced and given first reading.*

The question on the motion was not called as concern was expressed regarding (i) the location of the proposed sanitary sewer line from the site, (ii) potential impact to future George Massey Tunnel upgrades and replacement, (iii) potential impact to future widening of Rice Mill Road, (iv) potential loss of trees on-site and farmland, and (v) potential impacts to the adjacent railway.

In reply to queries from Council, staff noted that (i) should the application proceed, the applicants will implement a traffic management plan, (ii) staff were advised by the George Massey Tunnel Replacement team that the application does not negatively impact potential future upgrades to the tunnel, (iii) the potential expansion or widening of Rice Mill Road will be based on the dimensions of the Right-of-Way, (iv) staff can provide more information on the designation of the Environmentally Sensitive Area north of the CN Rail line as a “site” rather than a “hub”, and (v) staff can provide more information on the installation of the proposed sanitary sewer line.

The question on the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllr. Wolfe opposed.



Regular Council  
Monday, September 9, 2019

14. **RICHMOND RESPONSE: METRO VANCOUVER'S REFERRAL TO AMEND THE METRO 2040 REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY AS REQUESTED BY THE CITY OF DELTA**  
(File Ref. No. 01-0157-30-RGST1) (REDMS No. 6245125 v. 3)

R19/14-10

It was moved and seconded

*That staff be directed as detailed in the report titled "Richmond Response: Metro Vancouver's Referral to Amend the Metro 2040 Regional Growth Strategy as Requested by the City of Delta" dated August 20, 2019 from the Manager, Policy Planning, to advise the Metro Vancouver Regional District Board that the City of Richmond has no objections to the minor amendments outlined in the Metro Vancouver request dated June 10, 2019.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to potential negative effects to Burns Bog as a result of proposed amendments to the Regional Growth Strategy. It was then suggested that the City express its objection to the proposed amendments and support conservation efforts of Burns Bog.

In reply to queries from Council, staff summarized the proposed amendments, noting that the subject site along the Highway 91 connector is proposed to be rezoned from agricultural land to industrial and that other areas near the subject site would then be transferred to the City of Delta to be part of the Burns Bog Ecological Conservancy Area.

The question on the motion was then called and it was **DEFEATED** with Cllrs. Au, Day, Greene, Steves and Wolfe opposed.

Discussion then ensued with regard to Richmond expressing its objection to the proposal.

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

R19/14-11

It was moved and seconded

*That staff be directed to advise the Metro Vancouver Regional District Board that the City of Richmond has objections to the Metro 2040 Land Use Designation Amendment requested by the City of Delta, as outlined in the Metro Vancouver letter dated June 10, 2019.*

**CARRIED**

Opposed: Mayor Brodie



Regular Council  
Monday, September 9, 2019

NON-CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair

15. **PASSENGER TRANSPORTATION BOARD DECISIONS ON RIDE  
HAILING SERVICES IN THE PROVINCE**

(File Ref. No. 12-8275-02) (REDMS No. 6279337 v. 2)

R19/14-12

It was moved and seconded

*That the City send a letter to the Province, the Vancouver Airport Authority and to the Passenger Transportation Board (PTB) to request that they address the discrepancies between taxi and Transportation Network Services (TNS) regulations, specifically as outlined in the following recommendations:*

- (1) That a fleet size vehicle cap be set for TNS vehicles, except for accessible vehicles;*
- (2) That TNS vehicles and Taxis be permitted to operate across municipal boundaries;*
- (3) That TNS vehicles and Taxi rate structures should be aligned;*
- (4) That TNS vehicles and Taxis can utilize different booking structures for passenger bookings;*
- (5) That TNS vehicles and Taxis can utilize different payment structures for fare payments;*
- (6) That TNS and Taxis can display outside trade dress/vehicle identifiers as currently done, so long as company name and logo are displayed;*
- (7) That TNS vehicles have the same interior trade dress/vehicle identifier requirements as Taxis;*
- (8) That TNS vehicles and Taxis be required to share data with the Province for monitoring purposes;*



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

- (9) *That TNS vehicles be required to install in-vehicle cameras, similar to Taxis;*
- (10) *That TNS vehicles have the same accessibility requirements as Taxis, and if not possible, then have requirements as currently set out separately for Taxis and TNS vehicles;*
- (11) *That Low Emission Vehicle requirements for TNS vehicles and Taxis be aligned and a per trip fee should be added to all Taxi and TNS vehicles that are not low emissions, except for accessible vehicles;*
- (12) *That TNS vehicles and Taxis have a maximum vehicle age of 10 years and 1 month, except for accessible vehicles; and*
- (13) *That TNS vehicles have insurance comparable to Taxis.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to (i) insurance for TNS vehicles, (ii) TNS vehicles operating in the Vancouver Airport, (iii) encouraging the expansion of accessible TNS and Taxi vehicle fleets, and (iv) harmonizing Taxi and TNS vehicle regulations.

As a result of the discussion, it was suggested that should the item proceed, the forthcoming letter should highlight the importance of incentives to increase the fleet size of Taxi and TNS accessible vehicles.

In reply to queries from Council, staff noted that TNS vehicles will be commercially insured through the TNS company and that staff will be introducing business license regulations for TNS vehicles, similar to current Taxi regulations, which would prohibit the refusal of fares. Staff added that the City will have the ability to introduce additional regulations.

The question on the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

**PUBLIC DELEGATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

- R19/14-13    16. It was moved and seconded  
*That Council resolve into Committee of the Whole to hear delegations on non-agenda items (9:00 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation (Copy on-file, City Clerk's Office), Adriana Zylmans and Erik van der Ven, representing Dutch Liberation 2020 Canadian Society, briefed Council on the 75th Liberation Commemorative events.

Discussion ensued with regard to education and commemorative initiatives in the city.

As a result of the discussion, it was suggested that the City examine commemorative events such as a Proclamation for a heritage day or tulip plantings on City boulevards.

- R19/14-14 17. It was moved and seconded  
*That Committee rise and report (9:13 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**

**PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mayor Brodie announced that the authorization and approval of the Services Agreement with the Richmond Art Gallery Association for a term of five years has been completed.

Mayor Brodie announced that Samantha Siu was appointed to the Richmond Advisory Design Panel for the remainder of the term to expire on December 31, 2020.

**BYLAWS FOR ADOPTION**

- R19/14-15 It was moved and seconded  
*That the following bylaws be adopted:*  
*Traffic Bylaw No. 5870 Amendment Bylaw No. 10049*  
*Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 9930*  
*Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 9989*  
*Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 9994*



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

*Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 10055*

**CARRIED**

**DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL**

- R19/14-16 18. It was moved and seconded
- (1) *That the minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on July 24, 2019 and August 28, 2019 and the Chair's report for the Development Permit Panel meetings held on April 25, 2018, May 15, 2019 and March 13, 2019, be received for information; and*
  - (2) *That the recommendations of the Panel to authorize the issuance of:*
    - (a) *a Development Permit (DP 17-778295) for the property at 7341 and 7351 No. 5 Road; and*
    - (b) *a Development Variance Permit (DV 18-825820) for the property at 12033 Riverside Way;**be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to the proposed parking for the property at 12033 Riverside Way.

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

- R19/14-17 It was moved and seconded
- That the Development Variance Permit (DV 18-825820) for the property at 12033 Riverside Way be referred back to staff to examine alternatives to the proposed small stalls parking and report back.*

**DEFEATED**

Opposed: Mayor Brodie  
Cllrs. Au  
Loo  
McNulty  
McPhail  
Steves

The question on the main motion was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Greene and Wolfe opposed.



Regular Council  
Monday, September 9, 2019

ADJOURNMENT

R19/14-18

It was moved and seconded  
*That the meeting adjourn (9:23 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**

Certified a true and correct copy of the  
Minutes of the Regular meeting of the  
Council of the City of Richmond held on  
Monday, September 9, 2019.

---

Mayor (Malcolm D. Brodie)

---

Corporate Officer (Claudia Jesson)



## Special General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, September 9, 2019

Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair  
Councillor Chak Au  
Councillor Carol Day  
Councillor Kelly Greene  
Councillor Alexa Loo  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Linda McPhail  
Councillor Harold Steves  
Councillor Michael Wolfe

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

### AGENDA ADDITION

It was moved and seconded

*That Richmond General Hospital Acute Tower Status Update be added to the agenda as Item No. 1A.*

**CARRIED**

### COMMUNITY SAFETY DIVISION

#### 1. PASSENGER TRANSPORTATION BOARD DECISIONS ON RIDE HAILING SERVICES IN THE PROVINCE

(File Ref. No. 12-8275-02) (REDMS No. 6279337 v. 2)

Discussion ensued with regard to (i) harmonizing regulations for Transportation Network Services (TNS) vehicles with taxis, (ii) establishing accessibility requirements for TNS vehicles, and (iii) encouraging an increase of accessible vehicles in the composition of TNS vehicle fleets.

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

1.

**General Purposes Committee**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

---

It was moved and seconded

*That the City send a letter to the Province and to the Passenger Transportation Board (PTB) to request that they address the discrepancies between taxi and Transportation Network Services (TNS) regulations, specifically as outlined in the following recommendations:*

- (1) That a fleet size vehicle cap be set for TNS vehicles, except for accessible vehicles;*
- (2) That TNS vehicles and Taxis be permitted to operate across municipal boundaries;*
- (3) That TNS vehicles and Taxi rate structures should be aligned;*
- (4) That TNS vehicles and Taxis can utilize different booking structures for passenger bookings;*
- (5) That TNS vehicles and Taxis can utilize different payment structures for fare payments;*
- (6) That TNS and Taxis can display outside trade dress/vehicle identifiers as currently done, so long as company name and logo are displayed;*
- (7) That TNS vehicles have the same interior trade dress/vehicle identifier requirements as Taxis.*
- (8) That TNS vehicles and Taxis be required to share data with the Province for monitoring purposes;*
- (9) That TNS vehicles be required to install in-vehicle cameras, similar to Taxis;*
- (10) That TNS vehicles have the same accessibility requirements as Taxis, and if not possible, then have requirements as currently set out separately for Taxis and TNS vehicles;*
- (11) That Low Emission Vehicle requirements for TNS vehicles and Taxis be aligned and a per trip fee should be added to all Taxi and TNS vehicles that are not low emissions, except for accessible vehicles; and*
- (12) That TNS vehicles and Taxis have a maximum vehicle age of 10 years and 1 month, except for accessible vehicles.*

**CARRIED**

**2. RICHMOND GENERAL HOSPITAL ACUTE TOWER UPDATE**  
(File Ref. No.)

Discussion ensued with regard to the status of the proposed Richmond General Hospital Acute Tower project.

**General Purposes Committee**  
**Monday, September 9, 2019**

---

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

It was moved and seconded

*That a letter be sent to the Premier and the Provincial Ministers of Health and Finance, requesting an update on the status of the Richmond General Hospital Acute Care Tower Business Plan and timeline of the Treasury Board approval.*

**CARRIED**

**ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (4:21 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Monday, September 9, 2019.

---

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Chair

---

Evangel Biason  
Legislative Services Coordinator



## Community Safety Committee

Date: Tuesday, September 10, 2019

Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair  
Councillor Alexa Loo  
Councillor Carol Day  
Councillor Kelly Greene  
Councillor Harold Steves

Also Present: Councillor Chak Au  
Councillor Linda McPhail  
Councillor Michael Wolfe

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

### MINUTES

It was moved and seconded

*That the minutes of the meeting of the Community Safety Committee held on July 9, 2019, be adopted.*

**CARRIED**

### NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

Wednesday, October 16, 2019, (tentative date) at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room

### DELEGATION

1. Martin Van Den Hemel, Communications Director, and Austin Zhang, CEO, GoKabu Group, distributed materials (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as Schedule 1), and provided the following information:

## Community Safety Committee

Tuesday, September 10, 2019

---

- Kabu is a Richmond based software development company, that operates several other companies including Go Kabu Technologies and Kabu Ride;
- Go Kabu was created three years ago by two university students;
- as the company waited for ride hailing regulations to be put in place it continued to grow;
- on September 3, 2019, Go Kabu put in an application to the Passenger Transportation Board for a ride hailing application to operate in Richmond;
- since 2016 Go Kabu has provided 1.3 million rides;
- should Go Kabu not receive a licence prior to legislation taking effect on September 16, 2019, the ride sharing app will be shut down; and
- Go Kabu puts emphasis on safe driving and provides a comprehensive benefits package to their drivers as well as an excellent driving experience for their customers.

In reply to queries from Committee, Go Kabu staff noted that:

- Go Kabu is planning to match drivers and customers based on language preference;
- drivers must complete their Class 4 training and participate in daily inspections of cars before starting their day;
- the application process can take from 6-8 weeks to complete;
- negotiations are underway with another Richmond business with regard to outfitting cars to be more accessible for wheelchairs and operate during the weekdays;
- all drivers and customers will be covered under Go Kabu's insurance policy; and
- the app is available in the App store and Google store in all languages available on the Android and IOS platforms.

**Community Safety Committee**  
**Tuesday, September 10, 2019**

---

**COMMUNITY SAFETY DIVISION**

**2. COMMUNITY BYLAWS MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT – JUNE 2019**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-01) (REDMS No. 6231164 v. 4)

In reply to queries from Committee, Carli Williams, Manager, Community Bylaws and Licencing, noted that (i) all Short-Term Rental violations were not all for the same property, (ii) staff are investigating one property in particular and escalating enforcement, (iii) some non-compliance of the Soil Bylaw cases are in court and some have been issued an order to comply, and (iv) the increase in animal control offences in June is due to the Canvasser Program and the large number of dog bite incidents that occurred over the summer months.

It was moved and seconded

*That the staff report titled “Community Bylaws Monthly Activity Report – June 2019”, dated July 12, 2019, from the General Manager, Community Safety, be received for information.*

**CARRIED**

**3. COMMUNITY BYLAWS MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT – JULY 2019**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-01) (REDMS No. 6249551 v. 2)

In reply to queries from Committee, Susan Lloyd, Manager, Parking Enforcement, Animal Control and Administration, Community Bylaws, advised that morning patrols of schools resumed on the first day of school and staff were proactively patrolling through the summer months for summer school.

It was moved and seconded

*That the staff report titled “Community Bylaws Monthly Activity Report – July 2019”, dated August 19, 2019, from the General Manager, Community Safety, be received for information.*

**CARRIED**

**Community Safety Committee**  
**Tuesday, September 10, 2019**

---

**4. BUSINESS LICENCES QUARTERLY REPORT - SECOND QUARTER 2019**

(File Ref. No. 12-8375-03) (REDMS No. 6236740)

Ms. Williams advised that (i) the repeat offenders for illegal taxis were different companies, (ii) another campaign in conjunction with the Passenger Transportation Board and the RCMP will be in effect once ride hailing legislation is in place, (iii) another enforcement campaign will take place and drivers without a licence will be ticketed, and (iv) any drivers from Go Kabu without a licence will be subject to an administration penalty of \$50,000 to \$100,000 a day.

It was moved and seconded

*That the staff report titled "Business Licences Quarterly Report – Second Quarter 2019", dated July 19, 2019, from the General Manager Community Safety be received for information.*

**CARRIED**

**5. EMERGENCY PROGRAMS QUARTERLY ACTIVITY REPORT – SECOND QUARTER 2019**

(File Ref. No. 09-5126-01) (REDMS No. 6242899 v. 2)

Norman Kotze, Manager, Emergency Programs, highlighted that the Kwantlen Polytechnic University has completed their assessment of the Richmond Resilient Community Public Education Program and provided some recommendations which are being implemented and staff are re-launching the program for next year.

It was moved and seconded

*That the staff report titled "Emergency Programs Quarterly Activity Report – Second Quarter 2019", dated July 25, 2019, from the General Manager, Community Safety, be received for information.*

**CARRIED**

**6. RICHMOND FIRE-RESCUE MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT – JUNE 2019**

(File Ref. No. 99-Fire Rescue) (REDMS No. 6231409 v. 1)

It was moved and seconded

*That the staff report titled "Richmond Fire-Rescue Monthly Activity Report – June 2019", dated July 12, 2019, from the Fire Chief, Richmond Fire-Rescue, be received for information.*

**CARRIED**

**Community Safety Committee**  
**Tuesday, September 10, 2019**

---

7. **RICHMOND FIRE-RESCUE MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT – JULY 2019**

(File Ref. No. 99-Fire Rescue) (REDMS No. 6241551 v. 1)

It was moved and seconded

*That the staff report titled “Richmond Fire-Rescue Monthly Activity Report – July 2019”, dated August 12, 2019, from the Fire Chief, Richmond Fire-Rescue, be received for information.*

**CARRIED**

8. **AWARD OF CONTRACT 6331F SUPPLY, SERVICE AND DELIVERY OF TURNOUT GEAR (PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT)**

(File Ref. No. 09-5140-01) (REDMS No. 6225671 v. 4)

It was moved and seconded

*1. That staff be authorized to award a contract to Associated Fire and Safety, for the supply, service and delivery of turnout gear (Personal Protective Equipment), as outlined in the report titled “Award of Contract 6331F – Supply, Service and Delivery of Turnout Gear (Personal Protective Equipment), for Fire-Rescue emergency response personnel, dated July 29, 2019 from the Fire Chief Tim Wilkinson; and*

*2. That the Chief Administrative Officer and the General Manager, Community Safety be authorized to execute, on behalf of the City, an agreement for the supply, service and delivery of Turnout Gear (Personal Protective Equipment), as outlined in the staff report with Associated Fire and Safety at the rates quoted for a five-year term.*

**CARRIED**

9. **FIRE CHIEF BRIEFING**

(Verbal Report)

Item for discussion:

***Recruitment Update***

Jim Wishlove, Deputy Fire Chief, Richmond Fire-Rescue highlighted that (i) the recruitment process is underway and the first round of recruits will be on-boarded this month and deployed in December, (ii) the next group of recruits will be on-boarded next spring, (iii) the recruitment process will be refreshed next year for 2021 hiring, and (iv) a training program has been created to split the 12 recruits into two manageable groups to ensure more hands-on training.

**Community Safety Committee**  
**Tuesday, September 10, 2019**

---

**10. RCMP MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT – JUNE 2019**

(File Ref. No. 09-5000-01) (REDMS No. 6211316 v. 2)

Will Ng, Superintendent, Officer in Charge, Richmond RCMP, reviewed the staff report and noted that (i) there has been a positive reduction in property crime, (ii) mental health related calls have been high, and (iii) the RCMP have implemented education awareness around catalytic inverter thefts and have had major joint arrests between Surrey and Vancouver.

It was moved and seconded

*That the report titled “RCMP Monthly Activity Report – June 2019”, dated July 18, 2019, from the Officer in Charge, Richmond RCMP Detachment, be received for information.*

**CARRIED**

**11. RCMP MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT – JULY 2019**

(File Ref. No. 09-5000-01) (REDMS No. 6240983 v. 2)

It was moved and seconded

*That the report titled “RCMP Monthly Activity Report – July 2019”, dated August 8, 2019, from the Officer in Charge, Richmond RCMP Detachment, be received for information.*

**CARRIED**

**12. 2019-2020 RICHMOND RCMP DETACHMENT ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN FIRST QUARTER RESULTS (APRIL 1 TO JUNE 30, 2019)**

(File Ref. No. 09-5000-01) (REDMS No. 6234877 v. 3)

Superintendent Ng, reviewed the report and highlighted the following information:

- there is a 5% reduction in property crime this year;
- the Organized Crime Unit has begun connecting with local Money Service Businesses to ensure compliance;
- Richmond Detachment has established new programs to combat organized crime and money laundering;
- Mental Health related calls have increase; however with the deployment of Fox 80, RCMP are hoping to reduce the numbers;
- Fox 80 training will begin tomorrow and the media event will take place on October 10, 2019;

**Community Safety Committee**  
**Tuesday, September 10, 2019**

---

In reply to queries from Committee, Superintendent Ng noted that (i) the increase in mental health related calls is across the Lower Mainland, (ii) wait times at Richmond General Hospital are challenging when dealing with mental health related calls, (iii) the RCMP hope that the implementation of Fox 80 streamlines processes at the hospital to reduce long wait times for officers, (iii) drug possession charges have decreased since the legalization of marijuana, (iv) large mental health related call volumes are not attributed to only one person, (v) the RCMP are examining implementing a youth mental health component, and (vi) there is a reduction in distracted driving due to enforcement and vehicle impounds due to excessive speeding.

It was moved and seconded

*That the report titled "2019-2020 Richmond RCMP Detachment Annual Performance Plan First Quarter Results (April 1 to June 30, 2019)", dated August 8, 2019, from the Officer in Charge, Richmond RCMP Detachment, be received for information.*

**CARRIED**

**13. RCMP/OIC BRIEFING**

(Verbal Report)

Item for discussion:

***Fox 80 Car***

See Page 6 for discussion on this item.

***RCMP at Fire Hall #5***

Superintendent Ng highlighted that Richmond Fire-Rescue has provided the Richmond RCMP with space at Fire Hall #5 in Hamilton to complete paperwork and provide a positive police presence in the area.

***Homeless Camp Patrols***

Superintendent Ng advised that officers regularly patrol the area and have not had any problems reported lately. He noted that RCMP are proactive with ATV patrols in Hamilton and provide a good community relation.

***Mobile Enforcement Team***

Superintendent Ng highlighted that due to Council's approval of additional officers, the RCMP has the capacity to create a second Mobile Enforcement Team to patrol the SkyTrain and City Centre area.

**Community Safety Committee**  
**Tuesday, September 10, 2019**

---

**14. MANAGER'S REPORT**

***Homeless camp in Hamilton***

Cecilia Achiam, General Manager, Community Safety, advised that (i) the number of occupants remain the same, (ii) some complaints were received regarding increase in possessions; however once spoken to items were cleaned up, and (iii) staff are continuously working with the occupants of the camp and actively exploring housing options.

**ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded  
***That the meeting adjourn (4:50 p.m.).***

**CARRIED**

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Community Safety Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Tuesday, September 10, 2019.

---

Councillor Bill McNulty  
Chair

---


Sarah Goddard  
Legislative Services Coordinator

# KABU


**A Richmond, B.C. software development company,**  
KABU designs and creates App-based transportation  
solutions in the ride-hailing and food/package-delivery  
sectors, as well as electronic payment solutions.


CONFIDENTIAL 37





# **City of Richmond X GOKABU**





# Executive Summary

KABU-Ride Inc., doing business as KABU, is a Canadian company headquartered in Richmond seeking a special authorization licence to operate as a Transportation Network Services Company in British Columbia.

KABU-Ride Inc. is a subsidiary of **GoKABU Group** which was founded in 2016 and is headquartered in Richmond.

GoKABU Group's subsidiary *GoKABU Technologies Inc.*, a software development firm, created the software application KABU Rider, which has connected riders and drivers through the Chinese social media platform WeChat since 2016. KABU Rider has provided more than one million rides to tens of thousands of customers over the past three years.

The goal of GoKABU Group, through its subsidiary KABU-Ride Inc., is to help solve transportation shortcomings in communities across British Columbia where there is a demand for ride-hailing and a sufficient supply of ride-hailing drivers. We also have plans to operate elsewhere in Canada, the United States, and overseas.

Drawing from our three years of operational experience in Canada, we have created a model that can be replicated in other communities, and customized for that community's specific needs and unique challenges.

We have identified an under-served and growing market niche that exists across Canada. The growing number of immigrants moving to Canada, the increasing number of tourists visiting Canada, and the influx of international students studying here, represent both potential customers and drivers.

What sets us apart from our competitors is our focus on recognizing the time, effort and resources that our drivers are bringing to the table. We are in the midst of implementing an industry-leading Driver Health Benefits Reward System, where our drivers will receive incentives for investing in their personal healthcare needs and those of their families.

KABU continues to forge connections with other businesses, government agencies and institutions in the transportation industry as KABU works towards its goal of crafting a multi-modal App that will help solve many of the transportation challenges that exist in cities around the world.

While technology is at the heart of what we do, it's the team we've assembled who are the key to our success.

And the team is focused on bettering the community and making life easier on the people who live here.





**KABU WILL  
BRING YOU THERE  
ANYWHERE  
ANYTIME**

# About Us

**KABU-Ride Inc. is a Canadian ride-hailing company** powered by a young, talented and driven team focused on improving the world by better connecting people and places through technological innovation and community collaboration.

KABU-Ride Inc.'s vision is to provide a multi-modal transportation platform in Vancouver that integrates ride-hailing services, public transit buses, Canada Line/SkyTrain, vehicle rentals, taxis, ferries and other transportation options into a single application, or App, for users.

Powering the smart cities of the future, starting today...

# Mission & Vision



CNCL - 41

## Mission

To link people with places—enabling everyone to *Travel Like a Local*—one safe ride at a time, anywhere in the world.

## Vision

Delivering the smart cities of the future into the hands of the people through a single App, starting today.

# KABU

## Company Goals and Objectives

- To become the market leader in the ride-hailing industry while prioritizing the needs and well-being of our riders, our driver partners and the community as a whole
- To forge partnerships with local stakeholders and businesses to create a multi-modal App that incorporates the full-range of transportation options, and even a combination of them
- To become the first ride-hailing App to provide an industry-leading rewards system to drivers who are urged to invest in themselves by securing fully-portable health benefits



### Industry leaders



At KABU, we don't just want to be part of the gig economy. We strive every day to be industry leaders and innovators in the ride-hailing space, and are doing so by being the first to reward drivers who invest in themselves by securing fully-portable health benefits.





# GOKABU GROUP

**GOKABU GROUP HOLDINGS INC.**  
A company incorporated under the laws of the Province of British Columbia



# KABU

## Meet Our Management Team



**Hugo Yuan**  
Marketing Director



**Austin Zhang**  
CEO of GokABU Group



**Billy Xiong**  
President



**Hill Huang**  
Operations Director



**Ge Zhang**  
Product Director



**Lex Kan**  
CTO



**Daniel Xiao**  
Finance Director

**Timo Hengge**  
PR Director



**Mao Mao**  
Customer Service  
Manager



**Martin van den Hemel**  
Communications Director



**Lulu Yuan**  
HR Manager

Our leadership team firmly believes that we must be transparent with, and accountable to, the entire community with respect to our office culture, corporate governance practices, stockholder engagement, corporate responsibility and sustainability, and human capital development.

# Key Professional and Advisory Support

MLT AIKINS



**Steven Meng**  
Corporate Finance and Securities Advisor  
MLT AIKINS



**Garland Chow**  
Operations and Logistics Advisor  
Associate professor emeritus  
Sauder School of Business, UBC



**Chad Schmiedge**  
Insurance Advisor  
Cyber and TNC  
Hub International



**MAHDI SHAMS**  
Canada Legal Advisor




**Matthew W. Daus**  
US Legal Advisor  
Tenth Commissioner  
and Chairman of NYC TLC



**Philip L.**  
Accounting Advisor  
LLN Partners L

# Target Market

KABU will tap into Canada's strength as a globally-respected multi-cultural country where immigrants are welcomed, respected, valued and rewarded for their skills, work ethic and passion. For **NEW IMMIGRANTS**, finding a job that pays a livable wage and provides benefits for their family is their **FIRST PRIORITY**. KABU will target these newcomers with positions that have a low-barrier to entry, and which provide a way for them to utilize their language skills while doing a job that allows them to learn about and better connect with their new surroundings and the people who live there.



# The Ride-Hailing Problem



## Language Barrier

With increasing international travel and immigration, communication between riders and drivers is becoming more challenging due to the language barrier.



## Information Gap

Due to varying situations in a traveller's home country, they are often unaware of transportation options upon arrival at their new destination.



## Downloading requirement

Different ethnic groups are accustomed to different platforms to acquire services that are often geo-blocked. This creates issues with downloading apps which becomes cumbersome and inconvenient for the traveller and is a barrier to entry.



## Choosing Transportation

With so many means of transportation available, it is difficult for people to choose the fastest, greenest or shortest route at a glance.

# The KABU-Ride Solution



## Global Translations

KABU analyses travel patterns to and from any city with active operations. Based on this data, we translate our entire in-app experience to the most commonly-spoken languages. Upon request, we will match any traveller to a driver speaking the same language.



## Global Outreach

By advertising to travellers at the most common source airports and in their native language, KABU can convert them before they even arrive at their destination.



## Targeted Delivery Channels

Replicating our previous success, KABU delivers the app via channels that travellers are familiar with and accustomed to. In most instances, no downloads are required.



## Multi-Modal Transportation

At a glance, riders can see different means of transportation and choose based on Cheapest, Fastest or Greenest routes.

# Ride-Hailing with Added Value

## Travel Like a Local


Connecting riders and drivers continues to be our specialty.

While the service through our APP is a simple and seamless experience, it takes a dedicated and talented team to ensure the system operates smoothly and efficiently. From 24-hour customer service staff adept at addressing emergent issues, to a visionary team of designers and coders focused on innovation, to top-calibre driver recruitment and training staff, and an administrative team committed to excellence: these continue to be the secret ingredients to KABU's success.



## KABU Local Guides

Tourists can Travel Like a Local, by simply asking KABU drivers about the best tourist spots, top restaurants and best hotels.



## All-in-One App

Tourists can Travel Like a Local, by utilizing the App regardless of whether the user is looking for ride-hailing services, public transportation or another means of transportation.



## True Driving Partners

KABU is the first ride-hailing firm to provide a Driver Health Benefits and Rewards System.



## Unbeatable Industry Experience

Operating in Canada since 2016. No one knows Canada's ride-hailing industry as well as KABU.

# Target Customers

## Summary

KABU is focusing on markets with a large immigrant community in Canada. We provide better and more tailored services for the specific needs of these customers.



## International Students

China and India are the top 2 origin countries for international students in Canada and America. The top five origin countries of international students: USA—China (33%), India (17%), South Korea (5%), Saudi Arabia (5%) and Canada (3%). Canada—China (24.98%), India (30.16%), South Korea (4.23%), France (3.97%) and Vietnam (3.55%).



## New Immigrants

Canada currently has 37 million residents, of whom more than 21% are immigrants. By 2036, this immigrant population will reach 34.4% of Canada's total population. Asian immigrants will comprise 60% of Canada's immigrant population. There are currently 1.7 million Chinese immigrants living in Canada.



## Travellers

By leveraging word-of-mouth and social media marketing, KABU can capture a larger market share both locally and with potential tourists in their countries of origin.

# Downtown demand for transportation

On weekends, our busiest service locations are in Downtown Vancouver, where KABU Ride drivers simply can't keep up with the demand. Taxi companies face a similar problem, and are unable to provide enough service to meet the demand from customers who are leaving nightclubs, bars, restaurants and other night-time gathering places to head home on a Friday night, early Saturday morning, or Saturday night and early Sunday morning. There's no questions that some of these KABU Rider customers would consider driving if our service wasn't available. With taxis unable to meet the demand at those hours, that could have dangerous consequences that puts the general public at risk. Attached is another heat map that provides evidence to support this supposition.

There's also evidence to suggest that our customers use our services for the first-mile and last-mile of their commutes. Consider the provided heat map which shows the large number of rides that end near a Canada Line station. Without our services, will ridership on public transit suffer?



# 7-day heat map


## Demand on display

This recent 7-day snapshot provides an indication of the **number of rides** we provide customers each week.

Notable hotspots are near Richmond's high schools, Richmond's shopping centres and Canada Line stations along No. 3 Road, Metrotown mall in Burnaby, and post-secondary institutions including UBC, Simon Fraser University and BCIT, as well as Downtown Vancouver.

The international students who rely daily on our services don't only go to school using KABU Rider. They get together with friends, go to shopping centres to pick up necessities or do banking and other errands.

## KABU Order Distribution in Vancouver Area





## KABU Order Distribution in Skytrain Area



## KABU Order Distribution in Area of Canada Line

### First-mile and last-mile

Our data suggests that KABU customers use our service to access the Canada Line, judging from this heat map which shows drop-off locations near the Canada Line stations in Richmond, Vancouver and Downtown Vancouver.

Our goal is to provide a multi-modal App, where our customers can book various modes of transportation to complete their journey, including public transit, vehicle rentals and even taxis and bike rentals.

We believe ride-hailing plays a critical role in the first-mile and last-mile of many journeys.

Canada Line users request to be dropped off either at the Canada Line stations, or nearby, so they can do other errands before beginning their journey.

# Operations

While technology plays a critical role in KABU's services, equally important is people power, in the form of the members of the operations team. From screening to training and monitoring its fleet of drivers, to ensuring complaints and concerns are addressed in a timely fashion, **the Operations team is the backbone of the organization.** In many ways, they are the most public face of KABU.

KABU-Ride Inc. president Billy Xiong will be responsible for the operation of the ride-hailing services, and has a team to assist him, including Director of Operations Hill Huang. Hill Huang oversees the management of drivers as well as driver recruitment and training, while he receives support from Lex Can, chief technology officer, who is responsible for the performance of the App and for ensuring that drivers can be monitored. Hill Huang and Lex Kan work closely with customer service manager Mao Mao, who heads the Customer Service Department, which is charged with handling rider and driver issues and complaints around the clock. KABU-Ride Inc. is headquartered in Richmond, B.C. The KABU Rider app meets all the TNS App requirements— including those that pertain to data sharing—and is capable of geo-fencing areas as required by the Passenger Transportation Branch and/or Passenger Transportation Board. A future version of our App will enable those who are visually impaired to use our App for their transportation needs. And we are currently negotiating with another Lower Mainland business to provide wheelchair-accessible ride-hailing vehicles to our growing customer base.





**KABU App at your fingertips**

**Available at App Store or Google Play**

KABU-Ride Inc.'s app will be made available in iOS and Android forms to customers through Apple's App Store and Android's Google Play app store.

## Helping Customers and Drivers

KABU-Ride Inc.'s App will be available to customers in iOS form through Apple's App Store and via Google Play for Android users.

The App will connect riders to drivers throughout the Lower Mainland and in other B.C. communities where there's demand for ride-hailing services and a sufficient supply of ride-hailing drivers.

*Customers* can either book a ride for their immediate needs, or schedule one for a future need. They can select the level of service they want, ranging from KABU Eco, which involves electric and hybrid vehicles, to KABU Premium, for those who want a more luxurious drive on those special occasions, to KABU Plus, for groups of up to five adults.

Our App will also be offered to users of the Chinese social media platform WeChat, through which rides can be booked, and payments processed.

*Drivers* will be connected with riders through the KABU Driver App. Once the App is switched on, and the driver makes himself or herself available, he or she will receive a ride request in the area they've specified in the App. To mark the end of their day, the Driver only needs to switch the App off.



# Driving Partner On-Boarding

## Drivers are the engine that power KABU

If the operations team is the backbone of KABU, then our fleet of drivers is the engine that powers our future.

Recognizing the time, effort and resources our drivers bring to the table, KABU is committed to providing an industry-leading Driver Health Benefits Rewards System. Drivers will receive incentives for investing in their personalized health benefits package.


By showing our drivers that we're serious about providing them a living wage and connecting them with health and dental benefits, and creating community partnerships that will help lower the cost of vehicle operation and maintenance, we hope to keep them loyal to KABU.

Together with our drivers, we strive to help solve the transportation challenges that local residents face everyday.

# Aiming to serve all of B.C.

## SERVICE EXPANSION


Aside from immediately operating in Region 1 (Lower Mainland) and Region 2 (Victoria) and Region 3 (Nanaimo), KABU-Ride Inc. plans to expand its operations to Region 4 (Okanagan) within the first year of the launch of our service. We anticipate a fleet size of 40 vehicles to serve the Central Okanagan (Kelowna) and Thompson-Nicola (Kamloops) areas at launch by the end of 2020, with the hope of increasing the fleet to match demand. We hope to expand to Region 5, focusing on the Sunshine Coast (Gibsons, Sechelt) and Fraser-Fort George (Prince George) areas, but also considering other areas with sufficient demand. The launch in Region 5 could happen in early 2021 or sooner, with an initial fleet size of 25 vehicles.



# KABU CARES Driver BENEFITS program


Driver Health Benefits Rewards  
Program, an industry first, provided by  
The Edge Benefits and The Co-operators  
Insurance.


Ultimate			
Basic	Better	Pro	Pro-plus
<b>Bronze</b> Basic Health & Dental plan \$1,000 disability (injury) Use doesn't impact future rates Available for single, couple, family	<b>Silver</b> Health & Dental Plan with Dental upgrade \$2,000 Disability (injury) Same rates for smokers/non-smokers Boost ranking and subsidy	<b>Gold</b> Fully upgraded health/dental plans \$3,000 disability (injury) Mega boost ranking/subsidy Single/couple/family rates Available for single/couple/family One family rate Boost ranking and subsidy	<b>Platinum</b> Fully upgraded health/dental plans \$3,000 disability (injury) Large boost ranking/subsidy Use doesn't impact future rate



# Commission Rate

WE RESPECT OUR DRIVING PARTNERS. KABU's commission rate will cover the cost of commercial insurance and licensing, as well as operations. But KABU's rate is much lower than what UBER and Lyft will be charging drivers, which is reportedly between 30 and 35 per cent.





## Safety Is Always The First Priority

Drivers who permit somebody else to use their account and drive their vehicle will be immediately suspended and face a potential permanent ban from KABU.

### **DRIVER SCREENING and RENEWALS:**

**All KABU drivers are required to meet provincial standards and requirements.** This includes: Class 4 licence, driver's abstract, vehicle inspection, vulnerable sector criminal record check. Drivers who do not meet these standards will not have access to the KABU driver App.

An automated system will remind drivers a month prior to when their documents must be renewed each year. Drivers who do not meet company and provincial requirements will be barred from the KABU driver App until their documents are in order.

### **DRIVER AUDITING:**

**We will be implementing a MYSTERY DRIVER program**, where an anonymous employee will be taking rides in KABU vehicles; and grading drivers on their performance, and doing a visual inspection of their vehicle to ensure it meets with both company and provincial policies and guidelines.

### **DRIVER TRAINING:**

**We will be bringing in new Driver Training tools in the form of live-training**, video-training and best-practices documents. We want to position our drivers to succeed, and will arm them with the knowledge they need to do so.

### **DRIVER MONITORING:**

**Driver behaviour and wages will be monitored through the App** to ensure all company and provincial requirements are met.

# Technologies

Our riders and drivers don't care much about how the technology works... They're more concerned that the App is easy-to-use and works reliably. But it's the technology that powers these connections, ensuring that drivers know exactly where they're supposed to pick up their next customer, and that the quickest route gets the customer to his or her destination safely. And it's this technology that efficiently deploys our fleet, and makes the best use of their valuable resources to serve our growing ridership, connecting the right driver with riders as quickly as possible.

As customer needs become more diverse, and there's an increasing desire to have tailor-made solutions to meet those needs, technology must keep up with those changes. Our research and design team is working with other firms as well as educational institutions, in the hope of bringing added functionality to our App and better services to the community.






# Application Rider native App design

## KABU RIDER APP X KABU DRIVER APP


All KABU Apps are fully designed and programmed in house here in Richmond, B.C. and powered by our proprietary algorithms. This lets us match the best possible driver for any given rider. Our technology takes distance, rating, cancellations and more into account for an omni-channel view of each driver.

KABU has the unique ability to place the rider App inside other platforms like WeChat. This makes software downloads unnecessary and eases rider acquisition. And it also means our App can be easily dovetailed into any country's or culture's preferred social media channels.



# Big Data

KABU analyses more than twenty data points with easy access to key data like current driver status, operational information, billing, and real-time mapping of driver position. For our community partners, this information is critical for infrastructure and logistics planning, and the data can provide new insight and suggest solutions to address transportation challenges. KABU uses this data to improve services, capture new markets and improve advertising return on investment.




# Driver Behaviour Monitor

KABU will be employing old and new technology to ensure drivers and riders are safe. From mandatory start-of-work-day, and end-of-work-day vehicle inspections recorded in log books, to a "mystery driver" monitoring program that utilizes an employee to inspect and grade drivers and vehicles randomly each week, to an industry-leading real-time driver behaviour monitor—which checks for speeding, phone use, hard acceleration/braking/turns—that's baked directly into our App, we have redundant checks and balances in place. These, combined with mandatory proof of Class 4 licensing, annual driver abstracts, annual criminal record checks and annual (or every 40,000 km) vehicle inspections, help to ensure no short cuts will be taken when it comes to monitoring driver performance and behaviour and rider safety.

Drivers and riders ratings systems will provide KABU with another means to monitor and measure behaviour among our customers and clients. This tool will also enable us to help avoid a situation from escalating.

An automated system will alert both KABU and drivers when renewals (for driver abstract, annual vehicle inspections, criminal record checks) are coming up, and when they've expired without being renewed.





# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

**To:** Community Safety Committee

**Date:** July 29, 2019


**From:** Tim Wilkinson  
Fire Chief




**File:** 09-5140-01/2019-Vol 01

**Re:** **Award of Contract 6331F**  
**Supply, Service and Delivery of Turnout Gear (Personal Protective Equipment)**

### Staff Recommendation

1. That staff be authorized to award a contract to Associated Fire and Safety, for the supply, service and delivery of turnout gear (Personal Protective Equipment), as outlined in the report titled "Award of Contract 6331F – Supply, Service and Delivery of Turnout Gear (Personal Protective Equipment), for Fire-Rescue emergency response personnel, dated July 29, 2019 from the Fire Chief Tim Wilkinson; and
2. That the Chief Administrative Officer and the General Manager, Community Safety be authorized to execute, on behalf of the City, an agreement for the supply, service and delivery of Turnout Gear (Personal Protective Equipment), as outlined in the staff report with Associated Fire and Safety at the rates quoted for a five-year term.

  
Tim Wilkinson  
Fire Chief  
(604-303-2701)

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
<b>ROUTED TO:</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER</b>
Finance Department	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE</b>	<b>INITIALS:</b> 	<b>APPROVED BY CAO</b> 

## **Staff Report**

### **Origin**

The City of Richmond contracts for the supply, inspection and maintenance of personal protective turnout gear jacket and pant ensembles. Richmond Fire-Rescue (RFR) staff perform in-house cleaning and inspection services to a minimum certified level and, in order to meet national standards, this equipment needs to be inspected annually by a recognized, independent inspection facility. Associated Fire and Safety proposed a combined service of provision, inspection and maintenance of the inventory for RFR.

As the total value over the proposed contract term exceeds \$500,000, the Officer and General Manager Bylaw No. 8215 stipulates Council approval.

Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #1 A Safe and Resilient City:

*Enhance and protect the safety and well-being of Richmond.*

*1.1 Enhance safety services and strategies to meet community needs.*

### **Analysis**

#### **Notice Process**

This report follows a Notice of Intent to Contract (NOITC 6331F) posted on BC Bid on March 20, 2019 that was available for challenge until April 3, 2019. The NOITC confirmed the intention of the City to enter into a contract with the incumbent supplier of turnout gear, Associated Fire and Safety for a five-year term. At the closing of the NOITC there were no challenges or responses from other industry suppliers.

#### **Review Process**

Associated Fire and Safety is the incumbent supplier of turnout gear to RFR and were originally contracted by the City of Richmond in 2012 to provide turnout gear following a competitive procurement process (RFQ 4568Q) that was originally advertised on BC Bid in 2011.

A key goal at the time was for RFR to standardize turnout gear to ensure staff familiarity, interoperability, compatibility and serviceability; that key goal is still current and necessary for RFR to maintain efficient operation staff training and staff familiarity.

After the closing of the notice period, Associated Fire and Safety submitted a financial proposal to the City that meets specified needs for the ongoing supply, inspection, service and delivery of turnout gear over a five-year term.

#### **Contract Term**

Staff recommend that the City award to Associated Fire and Safety a contract to supply, service and deliver turnout gear for a five-year term to commence.


This contract award value presents an increase in overall costs for turnout gear compared against the previous five-year term. Projected increases will be attributed to additional emergency response staff being added to the deployment roster at RFR over the next three years. The contract will combine procurement, advanced inspection and maintenance services creating efficiencies in down-time when gear is being repaired. One further driver for an increased total value is an increase in base materials costs. Costs to the City will increase an average of 3.5% per year from current costs and the total value of this contract award is approximately \$885,000 for the five-year term.

### **Financial Impact**

Funding for the first year of the contract is included in the operating budget and this contract will be included in the 5 Year Financial Plan (2020-2024) accordingly.

### **Conclusion**

Associated Fire and Safety has been the City's supplier of turnout gear to RFR since 2012 and have consistently demonstrated their ability to meet RFR's supply and service expectations since being awarded the contract. Staff therefore recommend the award of a new five-year contract be approved.



Tim Wilkinson  
Fire Chief  
(604-303-2701)

TW:jw



# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

**To:** General Purposes Committee  
**From:** Kim Somerville  
Director, Community Social Development

**Date:** August 15, 2019  
**File:** 07-3190-01/CL Vol. 02

Martin Younis, B.Eng., M.Eng.  
Acting Senior Manager, Capital Buildings  
Project Development

**Re:** Rick Hansen Foundation Accessibility Certification Program

### Staff Recommendation

That the staff report titled "Rick Hansen Foundation Accessibility Certification Program," dated August 15, 2019 from the Director, Community Social Development and Acting Senior Manager, Capital Buildings Project Development, be received for information.

Kim Somerville  
Director, Community Social Development  
(604-276-4671)

Martin Younis, B.Eng., M.Eng.  
Acting Senior Manager, Capital Buildings  
Project Development  
(604-204-8501)

Att. 2

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
<b>ROUTED TO:</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER</b>
Recreation and Sport Services Arts, Cultural and Heritage Services Parks Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE</b>	<b>INITIALS:</b> 	<b>APPROVED BY CAO</b> 

## Staff Report

### Origin

The purpose of this report is to provide City Council with an update on the Rick Hansen Foundation Accessibility Certification program, the status of City facilities certifications (28) and how the program relates to other current City accessibility initiatives.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018–2022 Strategy #4 – An Active and Thriving Community:

*An active and thriving community characterized by diverse social and wellness programs, services and spaces that foster health and well-being for all.*

*Priority 4.2— Ensure infrastructure meets changing community needs, current trends and best practices.*

This report supports the 2013–2022 Social Development Strategy's Strategic Direction #2 – Enhance Community Accessibility:

*Action 3.5— Promote best practices in the assessment and upgrading of accessibility features in City and non-City facilities (e.g. continued participation with the Rick Hansen Foundation and others on the promotion and enhancement of the Planat online venue accessibility rating tool).*

This report also supports Council Policy 4012 – Access and Inclusion (Attachment 1) that states:

*Richmond is an accessible and inclusive city by:*

*4. Collaborating with senior levels of government, partner organizations and stakeholder groups to promote social and physical infrastructure to meet the diverse needs of people who visit, work and live in Richmond.*

### Analysis

#### City Accessibility Initiatives

The City has a long-standing practice of working with Richmond Centre for Disability (RCD) to enhance accessibility. On a quarterly basis, RCD representatives meet with City staff to identify and discuss areas where accessibility for various types of disability can be improved throughout the city, based on their lived experience. RCD representatives also provide input on accessibility features in the design of new recreation facilities and participate in pre-event site reviews at major City events. Site reviews utilize the City's Accessible Event Checklist (Attachment 2) as a standardized survey to ensure events are accessible and welcoming to all individuals.

To further expand access for all members of the community in City facilities, City Council adopted the Enhanced Accessibility Design Guidelines and Technical Specifications in 2018 to assist City staff and the development community in incorporating accessibility features in City-owned facilities that go beyond the BC Building Code requirements. The intent of the Design Guidelines is to promote enhanced accessibility and barrier-free access for all members of the community and to foster independence and mobility in all parts of the city.

RCD along with the Alzheimer's Society of BC, Barrier Free BC, Developmental Disabilities Association, Richmond Seniors Advisory Committee, Richmond Society for Community Living and Vancouver Coastal Health contributed to the development of the City's Enhanced Accessible Design Guidelines.

### Awards

In 2017, the City's efforts to increase accessibility were nationally recognized by the Rick Hansen Foundation (RHF) when Richmond was one of three communities across Canada to receive the Rick Hansen Foundation Accessible Cities Award. The award recognized municipalities that are leaders in planning accessibility into their built environments and encouraging their communities to be more inclusive. In addition, the RHF also inducted the Richmond Olympic Oval into the Accessible Cities' Circle of Excellence as a "best in class" example of an accessible and inclusive community space.

### The Rick Hansen Foundation

The City has been working with the RHF to improve physical accessibility in the City's built environment since 2013, when the RHF Planat rating system was first implemented. Planat was an online resource that provided information to the public about the physical accessibility of a venue. Since Planat ended in 2015, the City has continued to support RHF accessibility initiatives and was a pilot city in the development of the Rick Hansen Accessibility Certification (RHFAC) program.

The RHFAC program is a rating system that uses trained professionals to evaluate the accessibility of retail, commercial, institutional and multi-family residential buildings and sites. The RHFAC program considers the experience of people of all abilities; including those with mobility, vision and hearing disabilities. When assessing facilities, the RHFAC program evaluates the interior and exterior of the building, including parking, public spaces and staff areas. RHFAC assessments go beyond the BC building code requirements when rating a facility. Once an assessment is complete, a score card, recommendation report and letter of certification (if applicable) are provided to the facility operator.

A facility may be designated either RHF Accessibility Certified (rated 60–79 per cent) or RHF Accessibility Certified Gold (rated 80 per cent and over). Facilities with ratings below 60 per cent or facilities that do not have a public entrance and key functional spaces and amenities being physically accessible for everyone are not certified.

In 2018, RHF launched the RHFAC program with funding from the Provincial government to complete 1,100 free assessments throughout the province. Richmond was one of a number of municipalities, including Surrey, New Westminster, North Vancouver, Abbotsford and Kelowna, participating in the RHFAC program. The City was a leader in municipalities with 28 City of Richmond facilities assessed between May and December 2018 as part of this pilot program. Of the 28 City facilities assessed, 26 facilities have been RHF Accessibility Certified. Two facilities (South Arm and Steveston Outdoor Pools) are not certified.

#### Rick Hansen Foundation Accessibility Certification Program Evaluation

The RHFAC program continues to be refined after the first year of implementation. In City staff's review of the RHFAC score cards and recommendation reports submitted to date, some inconsistencies in how RHFAC Professionals have applied the rating system to evaluate facilities have been noted. Variances in the RHFAC recommendation reports by facility have also been identified. City and RHF staff are working together to further clarify RHFAC recommendations and support the continued development of the program. City and RHF staff are also meeting to discuss the technical requirements necessary to achieve RHF Accessibility Certified Gold, as the requirements for a facility to achieve gold status is currently not defined. As such, City staff are working through the RHFAC recommendations to best improve accessibility.

To date, there has been no cost to the City to participate in the RHFAC program as previous facility assessments were part of the RHFAC pilot program. However, if the City continues to assess City facilities through the program both the RHFAC Registry Application and Professional Rating fees would apply. Costs for the RHFAC Registry Application and Professional Rating fees range from \$2,250 - \$6,850 per facility, depending on the size and complexity of the facility. Certifications must be renewed every five years and the RHFAC Registry Application and Professional Rating fees would apply. Additionally, if any sites are reassessed during the five year certification period there would also be associated costs.

While RHFAC recommendation reports identify areas where accessibility can be improved in a facility, further assessment including drawings, plans and associated costs may also need to be prepared for facility improvements addressing RHFAC feedback. City staff are currently assessing the feasibility of recommended accessibility improvements to determine the cost/benefit as many older City facilities may require costly infrastructure upgrades to fulfill some of the recommendations.

The RHFAC program is a guide to furthering physical accessibility in the built environment as it identifies barriers to participation. City staff continue to evaluate RHFAC program recommendations to determine how they can best complement current City accessibility initiatives and most effectively contribute to furthering accessibility in the city.

**Next Steps**

To ensure the City continues to address accessibility in City facilities in a timely and cost effective manner, staff will take the following steps:

- Meet with RHF staff to review RHFAC recommendations and clarify any inconsistencies amongst the 28 sites assessed;
- Evaluate whether or not the RHFAC recommendations are in compliance with City bylaws, safety regulations and the City's Enhanced Accessible Design Guidelines;
- Prioritize recommendations considering health and safety concerns, the ability to address immediately in daily operations, timing and budgetary impact;
- Meet and discuss with City facility operators the RHFAC recommendations for each corresponding site;
- Explore accessibility recommendations for older buildings considering cost and structural implications;
- Determine which, if any, of the RHFAC recommendations for the 28 community facilities assessed should be addressed on a facility by facility case basis; and
- Develop an implementation plan to address accessibility recommendations with corresponding financial impact for Council's consideration.

Should RHFAC recommendations to improve accessibility be warranted, alternative sources of funding will be explored to support accessibility upgrades to City facilities through various funding streams, including grants.

The City has benefitted by participating in the RHFAC pilot program, which has identified areas where accessibility can be improved in City facilities. As the pilot program is now complete, City staff continue to work through the RHFAC recommendations and meet with RHF staff to better understand the scope of RHFAC's evaluation and to respond to the recommendations. The RHFAC program is a progressive national movement and involvement in the program assists the City in identifying barriers in the built environment. City staff continue to evaluate the RHFAC program assessments to determine what and if certain recommendations need to be addressed, sequencing and timing of addressing the recommendations, and how the recommendations further the City's commitment to improving accessibility and access to participation in facilities.

**Financial Impact**


None.

## Conclusion

In addition to working with RHF, the City continues to incorporate principles of accessible design in City buildings and open spaces to ensure that people of all ages and abilities feel welcome and are able to access City programs and services. Through participation in the RHFAC program, development of the City's Enhanced Accessibility Design Guidelines and work with RCD, the City continues to further accessibility in the city and as a result, improve the livability of Richmond.



Melanie Burner  
Accessibility Coordinator  
(604-276-4390)



Martin Younis, B.Eng., M.Eng.  
Acting Senior Manager, Capital Buildings  
Project Development  
(604-204-8501)

Att. 1: City of Richmond Access and Inclusion Policy

Att. 2: Accessible Events Checklist



## Policy Manual

Page 1 of 1	<b>Access and Inclusion</b>	<b>Policy 4012</b>
	Adopted by Council: October 13, 1981 Amended by Council: December 8, 2014	

### **POLICY 4012:**

It is Council policy that:

Richmond is an accessible and inclusive city by:

1. Acknowledging and keeping abreast of the accessibility and inclusiveness needs and challenges of diverse population groups in Richmond.
2. Ensuring that the Official Community Plan and other key City plans, strategies and policies incorporate measures to support Richmond's efforts to be an accessible and inclusive city.
3. Developing programs and adopting practices to ensure Richmond residents and visitors have access to a range of opportunities to participate in the economic, social, cultural and recreational life of the City.
4. Collaborating with senior levels of government, partner organization and stakeholder groups to promote social and physical infrastructure to meet the diverse needs of people who visit, work and live in Richmond.
5. Promoting barrier free access to the City's facilities, parks, programs and services.
6. Promoting a welcoming and respectful municipal workplace.
7. Providing information to the public in a manner that respects the diverse needs and characteristics of Richmond residents.

## City of Richmond Accessible Events Checklist

The Accessible Events Checklist identifies the key areas to address when planning an event to ensure they are accessible for everyone to participate. By addressing each point on this form, event planners will ensure that all participants' accessibility needs have been taken into account.

	CHECKMARK
<b>Pre-Event Publicity and Promotion</b>	
All event publicity and promotion highlights the accessible features of the planned event.	
<b>Entrances and Exits</b>	
There is a designated entrance into the event that does not require attendees use stairs.	
Where there are stairs, there are railings to assist for support.	
There are unobstructed pathways both in and outside of the event venue, including curb cuts on the sidewalk and, if needed, curb ramps within the event site.	
Everyone, including persons in wheelchairs or mobility aids can enter the main entrance of the event (entrance greater than 36" or more recommended). If not, there is clear signage directing to an accessible entrance.	
<b>Parking and Drop off</b>	
There are designated accessible parking spaces close to the main entrance or alternate accessible entrance- including wider spots suitable for side loading vehicles.	
If no parking is provided, there are alternate accessible transportation arrangements.	
There is a suitable Handydart and taxi drop off and/or pick up area at the event.	
<b>Washrooms</b>	
There are accessible routes to washrooms.	
A minimum of 10% of all washrooms at the event are accessible.	
There are signs and site maps directing people to accessible washrooms.	

<b>On Site</b>	
Site maps that indicate accessibility features are available to staff, volunteers and the general public.	
Appropriate staff and volunteers on site are fully aware of event accessibility features and trained to meet the needs of members of the public living with physical disabilities.	
All ramps used on site are non-slip.	
The height of the tables for writing surfaces, registration, food, beverages etc., will accommodate people in wheelchairs (minimum 29" knee clearance).	
There are wheelchair ramps to stage areas, if needed.	
If a person with a disability is presenting or performing, they can operate and adjust microphones, lecterns, or the position of the surface on which their computer or equipment rests.	
There is adequate and appropriate signage on site to meet the needs of people with disabilities.	
There is adequate scooter storage at the event (if needed).	
There are accessible back stage areas, e.g.: greens rooms, changing areas, hospitality areas (if needed).	
Consider providing an accessible, integrated and unobstructed event viewing area, which will allow wheelchair users and others living with physical disabilities to fully participate.	
<b>Safety</b>	
All electrical cables and/or cords that cross any paths covered. The lips/edges of covers should be no more than 1/2" thick to prevent tripping and allow any mobility devices to traverse over them.	
Emergency exits and refuge areas are accessible and emergency plans incorporate the needs of those with disabilities.	
<b>Exhibits and Activations</b>	
All pathways and vendors are well lit to ensure safety of all attending, including seniors, young children, and persons who use mobility aids.	
Routes to vendors and booths are accessible and unobstructed.	
Vendors can assist persons in wheelchairs or mobility aids over the counter (at least a portion of the counter should be a maximum of 36" to allow service to person in a wheelchair or mobility aid).	

**NOTE:** This checklist is designed as a starting point when planning an accessible event. You are still required to comply with all City, Federal, and Provincial Disability Access Requirements where applicable.



# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

**To:** General Purposes Committee  
**From:** Elizabeth Ayers  
Director, Recreation and Sport Services

**Date:** August 22, 2019  
**File:** 06-2052-25-  
SCCR1/Vol 01

Jim V. Young, P.Eng.  
Acting Director, Facilities

**Re:** **Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Proposed Program and Site Area**

### Staff Recommendations

1. That the program totaling 60,350 sq. ft, (Table 2, page 5) for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library be approved, as outlined in the staff report titled, "Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Proposed Program and Site Area," dated August 22, 2019, from the Director, Recreation and Sport Services and the Acting Director, Facilities;
2. That the area on Steveston Community Park as shown on Attachment 2, be approved as the area for site options, as outlined in the staff report titled, "Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Proposed Program and Site Area," dated August 22, 2019, from the Director, Recreation and Sport Services and the Acting Director, Facilities.

Elizabeth Ayers  
Director, Recreation and Sport Services  
(604-247-4669)

Jim V. Young, P.Eng.  
Acting Director, Facilities  
(604-247-4610)

Att. 2

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
<b>ROUTED TO:</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER</b>
Finance Department	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Richmond Public Library	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Community Social Development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
RCMP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Parks Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE</b>	<b>INITIALS:</b> 	<b>APPROVED BY CAO</b> 

## Staff Report

### Origin

At the General Purposes Committee meeting on July 16, 2018, staff received the following referral in relation to the proposed program:

- (2) That staff work with the Steveston Community Centre Concept Design Building Committee to further examine the size of the community centre and library and to review whether the community centre and library should be standalone facilities or build additional space.*

At the General Purposes Committee meeting on November 19, 2018, staff received the following referral in relation to the proposed program:

*That the staff report titled "Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Program Update" dated November 1, 2018 be referred back to staff to work with the Steveston Community Centre Concept Design Building Committee to examine:*

- (1) options for meeting rooms;*
- (2) options for child care space;*
- (3) potential use of the airspace parcel;*
- (4) a bus exchange;*
- (5) multipurpose room space;*
- (6) changerooms and washrooms for the Park; and*
- (7) potential impacts on the Community Police Station.*

Responses to the abovementioned referrals will be addressed in three reports. This report addresses referral item (2) from July 16, 2018, as well as referral items (1), (2), (5), (6) and (7) from November 19, 2018. Items (3) and (4) are being addressed in separate reports.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #3 One Community Together:

*Vibrant and diverse arts and cultural activities and opportunities for community engagement and connection.*

*3.1 Foster community resiliency, neighbourhood identity, sense of belonging, and intercultural harmony.*

*3.2 Enhance arts and cultural programs and activities.*

*3.3 Utilize an interagency and intercultural approach to service provision.*

*3.4 Celebrate Richmond's unique and diverse history and heritage.*

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #4 An Active and Thriving Richmond:

*An active and thriving community characterized by diverse social and wellness programs, services and spaces that foster health and well-being for all.*

*4.1 Robust, affordable, and accessible sport, recreation, wellness and social programs for people of all ages and abilities.*

*4.2 Ensure infrastructure meets changing community needs, current trends and best practices.*

## Analysis


### Background

On December 12, 2016, Council identified the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library as a priority Phase 2 Major Facilities project.

The current work plan is to develop a concept design for the new community centre and branch library, which would include program, location, preliminary floor plans, form and character, site orientation and costing, for Council consideration.

The steps in the development of a major facility are illustrated in Table 1 below. To date, project work has been focused on the Advanced Planning/Program Development step for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library project. In order to progress to the Concept Design step, Council approval of the proposed program and direction on potential use of the airspace parcel is required.

Table 1: Steps to Deliver Major Facilities



### Recommended Program

In conjunction with the Steveston Community Centre Concept Design Building Committee (the "Building Committee"), staff have reconfirmed that the program, as outlined in Table 2 below, exceeds current community needs, allows for future population growth, and provides space for regional level programs and events. It provides 60 per cent more space overall, and is 19,000 sq. ft. larger than most other community centres in Richmond. Importantly, the program responds to the Steveston Community Society's (the "Society") request for a larger gymnasium, kitchen and storage areas to support local programs as well as regional tournaments for karate, judo and kendo.

The Building Committee supports the program outlined in this report.

Table 2: Recommended Program for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library

Program Area		Existing Facility Program (sq. ft.)	Proposed Facility Program (sq. ft.)
<b>COMMUNITY CENTRE</b>			
1.	Gymnasium	5,300 (1 gym)	14,000 (2 high school basketball courts with extra clearance and spectator space)
2.	Fitness Rooms – includes Active Studio	4,700 (1 room)	6,000 (2 rooms + specialized training space)
3.	Multipurpose Rooms	5,100 (3 rooms)	7,800 (5 rooms)
4.	Meeting Rooms – includes Society Meeting Room	700 (2 rooms)	1,000 (3 rooms)
5.	Social/Games Room	900 (1 room)	1,000 (1 room)
6.	Kitchen	300 (1 kitchen)	750 (1 kitchen + food servery)
7.	Administration and Reception – offices, staff room, reception	1,500	2,000
8.	Foyer and Gathering	1,800	1,500
9.	Circulation and Support Areas – corridors, service areas, washrooms, changerooms, storage	11,400	13,900
10.	Other – stage, squash court	1,700	0
<b>Subtotal – Community Centre</b>		<b>33,400</b>	<b>47,950</b>

Table 2: Recommended Program for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library  
(Continued)

Program Area		Existing Facility Program (sq. ft.)	Proposed Facility Program (sq. ft.)
<b>CO-LOCATED BRANCH LIBRARY</b>			
11.	Collections Space	2,600	3,100
12.	Children's and Youth's Resources/Reading Space	0	2,700
13.	Digital Services and Computers	0	1,000
14.	Silent Study/Reading Areas	0	1,300
15.	Educational Program Rooms	0	800
16.	Administration and Control – offices, info desk, self-checkout	1,250	1,400
17.	Circulation and Support Areas – corridors, service areas	150	2,100
<b>Subtotal – Library</b>		<b>4,000</b>	<b>12,400</b>
<b>Total Floor Area – Community Centre and Library</b>		<b>37,400</b>	<b>60,350</b>

A detailed program chart outlining potential program room uses is provided in Attachment 1.

#### Program Review and Confirmation

To address the July 16, 2018 and November 19, 2018 referrals from the General Purposes Committee, several program reviews were conducted, which resulted in no suggested space change and confirmation that the program outlined in Table 2 is the recommended option for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library.

The program review included:

- Review and confirmation of community needs identified through public engagement;
- Review and confirmation of population projections of 28,023 to year 2041 for the Steveston planning area;
- Comparison of the program space to the City standard of one square foot of community recreation space per resident, which exceeds the standard by 19,925 sq. ft.;
- Meetings with subject matter experts from the Society to discuss space requirements;
- Site visits to Lower Mainland recreation and child care facilities; and

- Building Committee meetings, including presentations by subject matter experts and detailed reviews of the proposed program areas.

The program review re-confirmed that the recommended program aligns with:

- The Steveston Community Centre Concept Design Guiding Principles;
- Community needs, values and priorities identified through public engagement;
- Feedback from stakeholders and subject matter experts; and
- Best practices and trends for recreation, sports fitness and library facilities.

During the review of the program, the Society raised two predominant concerns – storage for martial arts mats and replacement or expansion of the Salmon Shed. The outcomes of these discussions are outlined below:

- Following consultation with representatives from Steveston's Martial Arts Groups, the Building Committee was advised that the martial arts mats can remain in the Tennis Net Shed unless it is displaced by the new facility; in which case, approximately 1,000 sq. ft. of storage space will need to be provided elsewhere.
- The project scope for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Concept Design does not include replacement or expansion of the Salmon Shed, a storage shed that supports the Society's delivery of large-scale special events. Staff recommend that a new shed not be built, unless it is displaced by the new community centre and branch library. Alternately, staff will work with the Steveston Community Society to identify solutions to address their storage requests, such as improving the internal functionality of the current shed, building an addition onto the existing structure or providing off-site storage for special event vehicles. Identified solutions may result in additional funding requests through the annual budget process.

Staff have confirmed with the Building Committee that the recommended program meets the needs of the Steveston Community Society and Richmond Public Library Board, meets both current and future population growth, and accommodates programs, services and events for the local community, as well as regional special events and tournaments.

#### Co-location

Co-locating the community centre and branch library has several advantages and is recommended over the alternative of two standalone facilities. Co-location offers numerous space efficiencies, including shared washrooms, staff rooms and lobbies, as well as opportunities for synergies in program and service delivery, resulting in improved customer service and increased community connectedness. The program totaling 60,350 sq. ft. is contingent on the community centre and branch library being co-located; if two standalone facilities are required, the program area would increase due to the loss of space efficiencies.

### Analysis of Program Expansion Opportunities

In response to the November 19, 2018, referrals from the General Purposes Committee in relation to the program, opportunities for expansion were explored for multipurpose and meeting rooms, child care space, changerooms and washrooms for Steveston Community Park, and the Steveston Community Police Office.

#### *Multipurpose and Meeting Rooms*

The proposed program includes multipurpose and meeting rooms of varying sizes, to be used primarily for community centre and library programs and events. As per current practice, unused space would be available for community groups to book.

Through a detailed review and discussion with the Building Committee, it has been confirmed that the multipurpose and meeting room areas in the recommended program meet the needs of the Steveston Community Society and Richmond Public Library Board; therefore, additional space for multipurpose and meeting rooms is not recommended.

#### *Options for Child Care Space*

The Society currently provides three licensed preschool programs for children aged three to five years which are running at an 86 per cent fill rate, indicating extra capacity. The multipurpose rooms within the recommended program will accommodate the Society's current licensed preschool classes, and accommodate space to expand their services to offer Before and After School Care.

Staff consulted with the Building Committee regarding the option of adding space to the community centre and branch library program to provide full-day child care along with the licensed preschool programs already offered at Steveston Community Centre. The objective of these discussions was to understand the impacts that the addition of purpose-built child care space could have on the recommended program and future service delivery.

Opportunities and challenges identified are outlined below:

#### **Opportunities**

- Meets City-wide and community child care needs;
- Heightens awareness of other community centre and library programs due to more children, parents and caregivers at the facility;
- Promotes lifelong participation in recreation and library use;
- Strengthens parenting capacity by enhancing access to other support services within the community centre and library;
- Broadens staff and volunteer support base; and
- Potential to explore reciprocal use of child care, community centre and library spaces for mutually agreed upon compatible activities.

## Challenges

- Increase in construction time to the project schedule;
- Increase in capital cost;
- Probable loss of green space due to a larger building and separate licensed outdoor play area, as well as increased parking requirements;
- Potential increase to building footprint if the licensed outdoor play area is placed on an upper floor;
- Limits facility layout options, including room adjacencies and programming considerations (to ensure compatible activities are placed in rooms adjacent to child care spaces due to potential noise transfer);
- Additional operating costs due to required upkeep and maintenance for the child care facility;
- Increases vehicle traffic during child care drop-off and pick-up times;
- Co-location of three facilities increases the complexity of space planning and may require compromise from stakeholders in order to accommodate areas required by Licensing;

The need for additional child care spaces in Richmond and the Steveston Planning Area is confirmed by the following<sup>1</sup>:

- There are 3,425 children aged zero to 12 years in Steveston, which is the second highest number of children in a Richmond Planning Area (following City Centre);
- In the Steveston planning area, only 11.4 per cent of children aged zero to two years old have access to licensed group child care spaces, compared to 17.7 per cent city-wide;
- In the Steveston planning area, 35.6 per cent of children aged three to five years have access to licensed group child care spaces, compared to 48.6 per cent city-wide; and
- Recent provincial child care initiatives, that reduce fees and increase access to child care benefits for families, are expected to increase the number of families able to afford and require child care in the next several years.

The Building Committee is supportive of adding space to the program to co-locate a purpose-built, City-owned child care facility with the new Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library.

Should Council choose to add purpose-built child care space to the recommended program, staff suggest a 9,000 sq. ft. (5,000 sq. ft. indoor space, and 4,000 sq. ft. outdoor space), 37-space, City-owned child care facility to be co-located with the community centre and branch library. This would accommodate 12 spaces for Group Child Care (under 36 months) and 25 spaces for Group Child Care (30 months to school age), including distinct indoor and outdoor spaces for play and activity for each age group, as well as a kitchen, staff office and storage. The child care facility would also have access to other amenities on site.

---

<sup>1</sup> 2017 – 2022 Richmond Child Care Needs Assessment and Strategy – 2018 Update

Associated construction costs are estimated to be \$6.5 million (2022 dollars) for a co-located space. This cost estimate does not include furniture, fixtures and equipment which are normally supplied by the operator. In addition, the OBI is estimated at \$75,000.

Staff do not recommend the addition of full-day child care space to the program. Full-day child care was not identified as a program priority during the extensive community engagement. With competing corporate interests and priorities, cost escalation, growing demands for other city infrastructure and costs associated with preservation of existing ageing facility infrastructure, the increased scope and capital cost associated with adding child care space may preclude the realization of other priority projects.

#### *Changerooms and Washrooms for Steveston Community Park*

The recommended program for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library includes washrooms to support visitors of the adjacent playground and splash park. Changerooms are not a level of service typically provided to support playgrounds or splash parks, as they are not required by Vancouver Coastal Health regulations, incur additional maintenance costs, and pose safety and security risks for staff and public. Therefore, staff do not recommend the addition of exterior-access changerrooms to the program.

Depending on the final location of the facility, a standalone washroom facility would be provided if the location of the community centre and branch library does not facilitate connectivity to the playground.

#### *Community Police Office*

The existing Steveston Community Police Office (the “CPO”), currently located on the southeast quadrant of the Steveston Community Park site, achieves a strong community presence and serves community needs through crime prevention programs and services. Staff re-confirmed with the Community Safety Division that it is not recommended to rebuild the CPO unless the existing facility is impacted by the location chosen for the new community centre and library facility.

Although the proposed site area for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library is not expected to impact the CPO, an additional 1,500 sq. ft. to 2,000 sq. ft. of ground level, storefront space will be incorporated into the program if it is impacted. This would provide the same level of service currently provided while ensuring the community police station meets modern safety requirements.

#### Proposed Area on Steveston Community Park for Development of Building Site Options (Attachment 2)

The current Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library facility is located on Steveston Community Park, along with other buildings and amenities such as the Tennis Net Shed, Steveston Martial Arts Centre, Japanese Canadian Cultural Centre, Steveston Outdoor Pool and changing house, Steveston Interurban Tram Building, Salmon Shed storage facility, baseball

concession and storage building, fieldhouse/caretaker suite, and Steveston Community Police Office. The Park is also home to other recreation amenities including a destination playground and splash park, outdoor tennis courts, lacrosse box, three baseball diamonds, horseshoe pitch, and educational gardens.

Upon Council approval of the program, staff recommend that the new community centre and branch library be located within the highlighted area on Steveston Community Park indicated in Attachment 2, and that the current facility be demolished. Through the site selection process, staff will explore various options for the building footprint within the proposed area.

Some of the buildings that currently exist on Steveston Community Park, such as those mentioned above, may be impacted by the selected site of the new facility, with the exception of the Japanese Canadian Cultural Centre and Steveston Martial Arts Centre. These impacts will be detailed within each of the site options presented to Council during the next phase of the project.

#### Steveston Community Park Context

While considering the program for the new facility, it is important to note that Steveston Community Park has a total area of 30.65 acres and is the third smallest of Richmond's parks containing community centres, after Hamilton and Sea Island. Building and parking lot footprints on Steveston Community Park currently occupy 14 per cent of the total park area. In comparison, South Arm Park has a total area of 37.23 acres (not including School District property), with building and parking lot footprints occupying 8.9 per cent of the total park area. During development of concept design options, the amount of park area that is already fully programmed will be taken into consideration when determining the footprint of the new facility.

#### Financial Analysis

A preliminary estimate of \$90 million for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library capital project was included in the Consolidated 5 Year Financial Plan (2019-2023) for the 2020 year, which includes an assumption for items that may be added to the base. Once the full scope of the project has been refined, staff will bring forward an updated project budget, anticipated for the second quarter of 2020.

As of July 31, 2019, \$5.5 million has been received into the Steveston Community Amenity provision for the improvement of the Steveston Community Centre. The City has also applied to the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program Community, Culture and Recreation Stream, to request funding of up to \$10 million for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project, as per Council's endorsement on January 28, 2019. Should the City be successful, the amount received will reduce the City funding accordingly.

Based on the 60,350 sq. ft. program, the project cost for the new Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library is estimated to range from \$92 million to \$110 million (2022 dollars). Upon continuation of the concept design process, and development of building footprint and site options for the new building, project costs will be refined depending on what might be included (or not included) in the base scope such as parking, temporary utility services, temporary relocation of displaced programs and services, and replacement of or repairs to impacted

buildings or amenities such as the Tennis Net Shed, Steveston Outdoor Pool and/or Salmon Shed. As an example, additional costs associated with the Minoru Centre for Active Living included sport field demolition and relocation, pavilion demolition and other temporary services.

On May 24, 2016, Council was presented with the staff report titled, “Steveston Pool Repair Proposal,” which outlined critical pool lining failures that prevented the pool from opening. Council adopted staff’s recommended solution which extended the pool life by approximately 10 years. Should the chosen site of the new Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library impact the Steveston Outdoor Pool, a replacement pool would be included in the project scope.

### *Operating Budget Impact*

The preliminary Operating Budget Impact (OBI) for the facility is \$1.1 million (2027 dollars) when the facility is anticipated to be operational, if approved by Council for construction starting in 2022. A detailed business plan, including service levels and refinement of the OBI, will be submitted to Council for consideration in a future report to be brought forward by Community Services.

Once site options for the new building are developed, the OBI will be finalized and submitted to Council for consideration, and will include any buildings or amenities on Steveston Community Park that will be impacted by each of the options (e.g., Tennis Net Shed, Salmon Shed).

### **Next Steps**

Upon Council approval of the program, staff will proceed to the Concept Design stage by developing site options, and concept designs within the highlighted area on Steveston Community Park, outlined in Attachment 2.

In an effort to minimize the building footprint while maximizing operational efficiencies, options for a multi-storey building will be explored.

The process to develop preferred site and concept design options will include:

- Evaluation and ranking of criteria, such as synergies with existing site amenities, access to transportation, parking requirements, construction costs, impacts to green space and established trees, proximity to residents, program adjacencies, future expansion, and staff operations; and
- Consultation with the Building Committee, key stakeholders and the public through a design charrette and open house.

Preferred site and concept design options, including building footprints and layouts with program adjacencies and efficiencies for each of the site options, will be presented to Council. These options will include costing for items such as program, parking, replacement or repairs to impacted amenities, and a funding strategy for Council consideration.

*Eligibility for Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program Funding*

On January 28, 2019, Council endorsed the City's submission to the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program Community, Culture and Recreation (CCR) Stream. Council's approval of the program, as outlined in this report, followed by concept design and site selection (next report to Council) for the replacement facility is required by late Fall of 2019 in order to meet the latest eligible project completion of March 31, 2027, in keeping with the CCR funding guidelines. As program approval by Council has not yet been confirmed, staff will seek schedule saving opportunities such as fast tracking design and construction procurement to meet the CCR schedule. Any further project delays may impact the funding request.

**Financial Impact**

Based on the 60,350 sq. ft. program, the project cost for the new Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library is estimated to range from \$92 million to \$110 million (2022 dollars).

Once preferred site and concept design options are determined, further refinement of costing and identification of funding sources will be brought forward to Council for consideration, projected for the second quarter of 2020, and the Consolidated 5 Year Financial Plan (2020 – 2024) will be amended accordingly.

Any amounts received through the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program will reduce the City funding allocated to the project.

**Conclusion**

The Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library program has been reconfirmed and will meet both current and future community needs. Upon confirmation of the program, next steps include the development of site and concept design options, continued public consultation, and the development of costing and a funding strategy for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement facility, which will be brought forward to Council for consideration in the second quarter of 2020.

A new Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library will serve the community into the future and contribute to the City of Richmond becoming the most appealing, livable and well-managed community in Canada.



Kirsten Close  
Coordinator,  
Community Services Major Projects  
(604-247-4461)



Martin Younis, B.Eng., M.Eng.  
Acting Senior Manager,  
Capital Buildings Project Development  
(604-204-8501)

- Att. 1: Program Details for Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library  
2: Proposed Area for Site Options Within Steveston Community Park

Program Details for Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library

Program Area		Key Ideas/Uses	Approximate Area (sq. ft.)
<b>COMMUNITY CENTRE</b>			
1.	Gymnasium	Dividable; sports programs (two 84 ft. high school basketball courts, eight badminton/pickleball courts, two volleyball courts); martial arts tournaments; and special events.	14,000
2.	Fitness Rooms – includes Active Studio	Cardio and strength equipment, free weights and stretching areas; includes an alcove for spin, TRX or other specialized training, and an Active Studio for group fitness, yoga, dance, martial arts, and other movement-based classes.	6,000
3.	Multipurpose Rooms	Flexible, adaptable and dividable; preschool, children's and youth programs such as visual arts, music, playtime, group fitness, martial arts and creative movement classes; community functions; and special events.	7,800
4.	Meeting Rooms	Group meetings, book clubs, educational workshops, smaller group activities; includes a Society meeting space.	1,000
5.	Social/Games Room	Inclusive, active space to play games, watch movies, hangout and socialize.	1,000
6.	Kitchen	Support space for multiple rooms; space for cooking classes, and food preparation and service for activities and events; includes separate food servery.	750
7.	Administration and Reception	Offices, staff room and reception desk.	2,000
8.	Foyer and Gathering	Accessible, safe, welcoming and inclusive spaces to read and relax, meet new neighbours, and engage with friends and family.	1,500
9.	Circulation and Support Areas	Corridors; mechanical, electrical and communications rooms; janitors closets; washrooms and changerooms; and storage.	13,900
<b>Subtotal – Community Centre Area</b>			<b>47,950</b>

Program Details for Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library (Continued)

Program Area		Key Ideas/Uses	Approximate Area (sq. ft.)
<b>CO-LOCATED BRANCH LIBRARY</b>			
10.	Collections Space	Accessible book stacks, periodicals, and reading area to support the library's diverse and evolving collection.	3,100
11.	Children's and Youth Resources/ Reading Spaces	Comfortable spaces to study and read with age-appropriate resources; includes storytime/program room.	2,700
12.	Digital Services and Computers	Computer workstations, computer lab, and space for scanning, printing and copying.	1,000
13.	Silent Study/ Reading Areas	Quiet, comfortable place for individual reading, studying and relaxing.	1,300
14.	Educational Program Rooms	Group activities, studying, reading circles, meetings and classes.	800
15.	Administration and Control	Offices, circulation workroom, information desk and self-checkout.	1,400
16.	Circulation and Support Areas	Corridors, and mechanical, electrical and communications rooms.	2,100
<b><i>Subtotal – Library</i></b>			<b><i>12,400</i></b>
<b>Total Floor Area – Community Centre &amp; Library</b>			<b>60,350</b>

Proposed Area for Site Options Within Steveston Community Park



LEGEND

- ..... STEVESTON PARK PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- ..... PROPOSED AREA FOR SITE OPTIONS



# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

**To:** General Purposes Committee

**Date:** August 30, 2019

**From:** Laurie Bachynski  
Director, Corporate Business Service Solutions

**File:** 08-4150-01/2019-Vol 01

**Re:** **Proposed Richmond Food Recovery Network Program**

### Staff Recommendation

That the Chief Administrative Officer and General Manager of Finance and Corporate Services be authorized to enter into a partnering agreement with FoodMesh for the delivery of the proposed Richmond Food Recovery Network Program as outlined in the staff report from the Director, Corporate Business Service Solutions dated August 30, 2019 entitled "Proposed Richmond Food Recovery Network Program".

Laurie Bachynski  
Director, Corporate Business Service Solutions  
(604-276-4335)

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
<b>ROUTED TO:</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER</b>
Finance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Law	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Community Social Development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Parks Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sustainability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Corporate Communications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE</b>	<b>INITIALS:</b> 	<b>APPROVED BY CAO</b> 

## Staff Report

### Origin

FoodMesh has submitted a proposal to the City of Richmond seeking one-time funding in the amount of \$25,000 to support the expansion of their Food Recovery Network into Richmond.

By supporting the expansion of the FoodMesh Food Recovery Network into Richmond, the City can be a leader in the development of a more sustainable local business community and agrifoods sector.

This initiative supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #2 - A Sustainable and Environmentally Conscious City:

*Environmentally conscious decision-making that demonstrates leadership in implementing innovative, sustainable practices and supports the City's unique biodiversity and island ecology.*

*2.1. Continued leadership in addressing climate change and promoting circular economic principles.*

This initiative supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #7 - A Supported Economic Sector:

*Facilitate diversified economic growth through innovative and sustainable policies, practices and partnerships.*

*7.1. Demonstrate leadership through strategic partnerships, collaborations and exploring innovative and emerging economic practices and technical advancements.*

The Food Recovery Network supports the Richmond Food Charter, endorsed by Council in 2016. The Charter outlines Richmond's values and commitments concerning the production, processing, distribution, consumption and disposal of food. FoodMesh's Program complements the Charter in all aspects, most notably as follows:

#### Economic Development

*Foster a culture that values and supports farmers and farm workers*

#### Responsible Government

*Collaborate with community groups, businesses & all levels of government to ensure a food secure future*

The FoodMesh Food Recovery Network also supports goals from the Metro Vancouver Regional Food Systems Action Plan. The Council-endorsed Action Plan specifically focuses on actions that local governments have committed to in the next three to five years, as well as suggested new actions to advance a sustainable and resilient regional food system. Examples of some of the goals the Food Recovery Network support are as follows:

Goal 4: Everyone has Access to Healthy, Culturally Diverse and Affordable Food

*4.1. Improve access to nutritious food among vulnerable groups*

*4.3. Enable non-profit organizations to recover nutritious food*

Goal 5: A Food System Consistent with Ecological Health

*5.2. Reduce waste in the food system*

*5.3. Facilitate adoption of environmentally sustainable practices*

## **Background**

The development of a Richmond Food Recovery Network has been proposed by FoodMesh, which is an incorporated, for-profit social enterprise<sup>1</sup>. Active in other communities across the province including the Fraser Valley and Kelowna, FoodMesh's Food Recovery Network is an online exchange platform for food manufacturers, processors and retailers to divert unsold food inventory to secondary markets and away from waste streams. Edible food is connected to the highest value end use which includes meals, food production inputs, feedstock and compost.

According to a recently released technical report on food waste<sup>2</sup>, 58% of all food produced in Canada is never consumed. Over half of that waste (32%) is avoidable, but is discarded because it is currently easier and cheaper to discard food than to redistribute it. Meanwhile the need for accessible food is evident as the Richmond Food Bank had 3,484 users who visited over 27,000 times in 2018 while more than 100,000 people in Canada access food banks monthly.

The introduction of a Food Recovery Network in Richmond would enable local food manufacturing, processing, and retail businesses to adopt circular economy practices and add value to what would otherwise be a waste stream in their operations. Food products that are surplus or off-spec (i.e. mislabelled or deviate from a specified recipe) would be sold to other businesses or donated to local charities and social groups. FoodMesh has developed an online business-to-business exchange portal that simplifies and digitizes the redistribution of this surplus food for companies and social groups.

---

<sup>1</sup> Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada defines a social enterprise as a revenue-generating organization whose objective is to have a social impact. It does not have a specific corporate form and can include non-profit organizations, registered charities and for-profit businesses.

<sup>2</sup> The Avoidable Crisis of Food Waste: Technical Report. <https://secondharvest.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Avoidable-Crisis-of-Food-Waste-Technical-Report-January-17-2019.pdf>

## Analysis

FoodMesh is successfully operating in communities across British Columbia through partnerships with municipalities, regional districts, major businesses and community organizations. Since launching in 2016, FoodMesh has diverted over 1,400,000 kg of edible food from landfills to higher value uses. The company has already established relationships with key stakeholders in Richmond including Save-On-Foods, PriceSmart, and the Richmond Food Bank. By providing one-time financial support for this initiative, the City would enable the expansion of the Food Recovery Program in Richmond through broad engagement with local food businesses and other key stakeholders. The anticipated outcomes for the Richmond Food Recovery Network over a one year period are as follows:

- Divert 225,000 kg of food from waste streams;
- Create 300,000 meals for charity;
- Generate \$1.25 million in savings to food brands and charities; and
- Provide 50,000 kg of feed to local hobby farmers.

### FoodMesh Proposal

FoodMesh proposes to expand its Food Recovery Network to Richmond for a one-time cost to the City of \$25,000. This funding would be used to educate and engage the private sector to join this online food exchange portal, with the goal of diverting 225,000 kg of food from waste streams to the highest end use. By supporting this initiative, the City would be encouraging sustainable growth of the agrifoods sector while encouraging the adoption of circular economy practices, as well as achieving additional environmental and social goals. The proposed partnering agreement terms are outlined in Attachment 1.

Aside from funding, the City's involvement in the development of the Richmond Food Recovery Network would be limited to communication support and strategic input from staff. Specifically, the City would provide the following:

- a) Communications support with a joint press release
- b) Digital and Social Marketing support via City channels for community engagement
- c) Provision of a staff member from the Economic Development Department to liaise with for City events, marketing and reporting
- d) Recommendations for potential businesses/charities/farmers to participate

It is anticipated that this program will be self-sustaining after one year and no additional financial resources will be sought from the City. Table 1 includes a summary of the deliverables to be completed by FoodMesh.

**Table 1: Summary of FoodMesh Program Deliverables**

<b>Communication Package</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Press release x 1</li><li>• Webinars x 2</li><li>• Community events x 2</li><li>• Social media coverage (monthly)</li><li>• Blog post - spotlight a Richmond business</li><li>• Co-host project completion celebration (2020)</li><li>• Richmond Recovery Network website</li></ul>
<b>Network Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Attract 30 Richmond food businesses, charities and farmers to agree to divert not dispose their surplus via the exchange platform.</li><li>• Train and provide ongoing technical support for users.</li><li>• Semi-dedicated account manager to ensure listings find a local home (charity or buyer)</li></ul>
<b>Network Results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 225,000 kg food diverted from waste streams</li><li>• 300,00 meals created</li><li>• \$1.25 million in savings to food brands and charities</li><li>• 50,000 KG to local hobby farmers (feed savings)</li><li>• Year-end sustainability report</li></ul>

### Next Steps

Based on input from the Law and Purchasing departments, the next steps are as follows:

1. Publish a Notice of Intent to Contract

A Notice of Intent to Contract will be published on BC Bid for a duration of two weeks to provide notification that the City plans to enter into a partnering agreement with FoodMesh. This will provide the opportunity for any comparable companies to come forward with a similar proposal, though staff are not aware of any entities that could deliver the program as described.

2. Enter into a Partnering Agreement

The City would enter into a partnering agreement with FoodMesh for a one-year term in order for the company to deliver the Richmond Food Recovery Network Program on behalf of the City. Notice would be provided in accordance with Section 94 of the *Community Charter*. The key business terms that would form this agreement are found in Attachment 1.

### **Financial Impact**

A one-time cost to the City of \$25,000 is required to implement the Richmond Food Recovery Network Program. This will be jointly funded from operating budgets of the Economic Development, Sustainability, Community Social Development, and Environmental Programs departments.

### **Conclusion**

Staff are seeking approval to enter into a partnering agreement for a one-year term with FoodMesh in order to implement the Richmond Food Recovery Network Program. By supporting this initiative, the City would be encouraging sustainable growth of the agrifoods sector while encouraging the adoption of circular economy practices. This is a cross-departmental initiative that aligns with multiple City objectives around economic development, circular economy, food security and environmental and social sustainability.



Katie Ferland  
Acting Manager, Economic Development  
(604-247-4923)

KF:jt

Att. 1: Partnering Agreement Key Business Terms

**FoodMesh/City Partnering Agreement Key Business Terms**

<b>Key Business Term</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>1. Duration</b>	Term – the agreement is for a one (1) year term with a start date of November 15, 2019.
<b>2. FoodMesh's Role</b>	FoodMesh shall develop a supported virtual network for Richmond food businesses, charities, farmers and waste haulers to exchange, track and measure sustainability efforts for surplus/off spec food product.  This is limited to providing a technology platform and does not include transportation and other logistics.
<b>3. Communication Package</b>	FoodMesh shall provide to the City: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) One (1) press release</li> <li>b) Two (2) webinars</li> <li>c) Two (2) community events</li> <li>d) Monthly social media coverage</li> <li>e) One (1) blog post highlighting a Richmond business</li> <li>f) Co-host project completion celebration</li> <li>g) Richmond Recovery Network website</li> </ul>
<b>4. Network Results</b>	In accordance with FoodMesh's pilot project proposal, all program targets shall be met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Divert 225,000 KG of food from waste streams</li> <li>b) Create 300,000 meals</li> <li>c) Provide \$1.25 Million in savings to food brands and charities</li> <li>d) Provide 50,000 KG to local hobby farmers in feed savings</li> <li>e) Provide the City of Richmond with a year-end Sustainability Report</li> </ul>
<b>5. City Responsibilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Communications support with a joint press release</li> <li>b) Digital and Social Marketing support via City channels for community engagement</li> <li>c) Provision of a staff member from the Economic Development Department to liaise with for City events, marketing and reporting</li> <li>d) Recommendations for potential businesses/charities/farmers to participate</li> </ul>
<b>6. Compensation</b>	The City of Richmond shall pay FoodMesh \$25,000 + applicable taxes as full payment and reimbursement for performing the services described herein the Partnering Agreement.



# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

**To:** Planning Committee

**Date:** August 23, 2019

**From:** Kim Somerville  
Director, Community Social Development

**File:** 07-3400-01/2019-Vol  
01

**Re:** Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan

### Staff Recommendations

1. That the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan, as outlined in Attachment 1 of the staff report titled, "Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan", dated August 23, 2019, from the Director, Community Social Development, be adopted; and
2. That the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan be distributed to key stakeholders and posted on the City website.

Kim Somerville  
Director, Community Social Development  
(604-247-4671)

Att. 1

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
<b>ROUTED TO:</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER</b>
Arts, Culture & Heritage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Parks Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Public Works & Engineering	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Recreation & Sport Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE</b>	<b>INITIALS:</b> 	<b>APPROVED BY CAO</b> 

**CNCL - 100**

## Staff Report

### Origin

The City of Richmond received a \$25,000 Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) Age-Friendly Communities Grant in 2018 to create a Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan for Richmond. A Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan will ensure those living with dementia and their families/caregivers are connected, supported and valued through public awareness and understanding, responsive and inclusive programming and well designed, accessible and supportive built environments.

The Dementia-Friendly Communities Initiative is part of the Alzheimer Society of BC's campaign to implement Dementia-Friendly Communities across BC and supports municipalities to become dementia-friendly through tools, education and partnerships.

The City received Age-Friendly designation in 2015 for completion of an Age-Friendly Assessment and Action Plan and for their commitment to become more age friendly. Age-Friendly communities focus on its social and physical environments with respect to a mix of land-use, street connectivity, access to green spaces and neighbourhood aesthetics to promote healthy aging, as well as to support residents to maintain social ties to family and friends. Richmond's Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan builds upon Age-Friendly initiatives and aligns with several other City of Richmond plans and strategies.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018–2022 Strategy #4 An Active and Thriving Richmond:

*An active and thriving community characterized by diverse social and wellness programs, services and spaces that foster health and well-being for all.*

*4.1 Robust, affordable, and accessible sport, recreation, wellness and social programs for people of all ages and abilities.*

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018–2022 Strategy #6 Strategic and Well-Planned Growth:

*Leadership in effective and sustainable growth that supports Richmond's physical and social needs.*

*6.6 Growth includes supports and/or services for Richmond's vulnerable populations, including youth, seniors, individuals with health concerns, and residents experiencing homelessness.*

This report supports the 2013–2022 Social Development Strategy:

*Action #9: Support aging in place initiatives and the ongoing development of Richmond as an age-friendly community.*

This report supports the 2015–2020 Seniors Service Plan:

*Direction #3: Respect, Inclusion and Sense of Belonging*

- *Action 3.8 Launch an educational campaign to combat stereotypes and ageist attitudes.*

This report supports the 2015–2020 Age-Friendly Assessment and Action Plan:

*Direction #2.8 Community Support and Health Services: Exploring the Dementia-Friendly Communities initiative coordinated by the Alzheimer's Society of BC.*

## **Analysis**

An estimated 564,000 Canadians are living with dementia; 70,000 people are living with dementia in British Columbia and 1,657 were diagnosed with dementia in Richmond in 2014/2015. The number of Canadians living with dementia is expected to increase as the population of seniors continues to grow. There are significant impacts on the person living with dementia, their families and caregivers as well as local governments and the health system. Stigma remains an issue for those living with dementia increasing their risk of isolation which is detrimental to their health and well-being. City staff have increasingly been reporting challenges when dealing with patrons with dementia who access City and Community Association/Society programs and services. It is anticipated that this will continue to increase as the population living independently in the community continues to age.

The Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan (Attachment 1) project aimed at gathering feedback from the community through various engagement activities to create a plan to support people living with dementia. The project was guided by a Working Group and Stakeholder Committee including City staff, a person living with dementia and staff and representatives from Community Associations and Societies; Alzheimer Society of BC; Richmond Cares, Richmond Gives; Vancouver Coastal Health; and Richmond Public Library.

People living with dementia and those affected by dementia were invited to share their experiences and provide feedback through a series of activities including a survey on LetsTalkRichmond.ca, focus groups, a walking interview and a community forum to inform the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan. City and Community Association/Society staff as well as key stakeholders in Richmond were also invited to participate in the project activities. A number of methods were put in place to reduce barriers to participation including transportation, translation and mailed surveys upon request.

Community engagement activities reached 313 participants and resulted in over 800 insights that guided the development of a Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan. Highlights of project findings and key themes included programming for those living with dementia and their caregivers; supported transportation services; activation of outdoor spaces; programs and services to reduce isolation and support caregivers; and community awareness and staff training.

The creation of a Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan for Richmond aligns with the City's commitment to become more age-friendly by focusing on the inclusion and support of people living with dementia. Four strategic directions and 25 proposed actions with timelines have been developed to help guide staff and community members with the knowledge to respond

appropriately to patrons with dementia who access City and Community Association/Society programs and services. The four strategic directions are:

1. Awareness, Education and Stigma Reduction
2. Built Environment
3. Programs and Services
4. Support for those Living with Dementia and their Caregivers

The Action Plan will ensure the built environment and programs and services allow those living with dementia to continue to utilize the outdoors, be physically and socially active and connected. The Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan will also support programs and services for caregivers of those living with dementia that positively impact their health and well-being.

Should the Plan be adopted, the City will work with Community Associations/Societies and key stakeholders in the community on the implementation of the outlined actions over the next five years. The Dementia-Friendly Stakeholder Committee will continue to provide expertise, resources and guidance towards the implementation of the actions. Progress of actions will be monitored through the Seniors Services Plan Annual Update.

Promotional materials proposed in the Action Plan's recommended actions will be covered through existing grant funds. It is anticipated that most of the recommended actions will be supported through existing City resources. However, should additional funds be required to support the existing recommended actions, a request will be brought forward in the future.

### **Financial Impact**

None.

### **Conclusion**

The Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan for Richmond sets out four strategic directions with 25 recommended actions to be implemented over the next five years. The Action Plan provides a framework to support residents living with dementia and their families and caregivers. The number of people living with dementia who remain in the community is expected to increase making the creation of an Action Plan for Richmond an important factor in ensuring people living with dementia and their families and caregivers feel supported and are able to participate in their communities to the fullest extent. The actions outlined in the Plan also support community members and those working with seniors to become educated about dementia, reducing stigma and increasing understanding.

August 23, 2019

- 5 -

Developing a Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan will further Richmond's commitment to being an Age-Friendly community and ensuring all people living and working in Richmond, including those living with dementia, have the most inclusive, welcoming and supportive environment to age in place.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Debbie Hertha". The signature is stylized with a large, looped 'D' and a cursive 'Hertha'.

Debbie Hertha  
Seniors Coordinator  
(604-276-4175)

Att. 1: Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan

City of Richmond

# Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan

## 2019

Community Services Division





# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
1. INTRODUCTION .....	3
Defining Dementia.....	3
Importance of Becoming Dementia-Friendly .....	4
Impact of Dementia in City Facilities .....	5
Dementia-Friendly Communities Initiative.....	5
Alignment with Other City Plans and Strategies .....	6
2. BACKGROUND .....	7
Age-Friendly Communities Initiative .....	7
UBCM Age-Friendly Communities Grant Program .....	8
Specialized Programming .....	8
Partnerships .....	9
3. DEMENTIA-FRIENDLY COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN PROJECT .....	11
Working Group and Stakeholder Committee.....	11
Community Engagement .....	12
Project Findings and Key Themes.....	17
4. DEMENTIA-FRIENDLY COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN.....	21
5. NEXT STEPS, MONITORING AND EVALUATION .....	27
6. CONCLUSION .....	29



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Richmond's Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan is intended to guide the City, Community Associations/Societies and key stakeholders to support people living with dementia and their families and caregivers. The Action Plan was created based on research about dementia, impacts of dementia, current dementia-friendly activities and findings from the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan project engagement activities.

An estimated 564,000 Canadians are living with dementia; 70,000 people are living with dementia in British Columbia; and 1,730 were diagnosed with dementia in Richmond in 2016/2017. The number of Canadians living with dementia is expected to increase as the population of seniors continues to grow. Stigma remains an issue for those living with dementia increasing their risk of isolation which is detrimental to their health and well-being. City staff have increasingly been reporting challenges when interacting with patrons with dementia who access City and Community Partner programs and services. It is anticipated that this will continue to increase as the population continues to age and residents continue to live in the community.

Richmond received Age-Friendly designation in 2015 for completing an Assessment and Action Plan and for its commitment to become more age-friendly. Developing a Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan builds upon and complements age-friendly initiatives by addressing both physical and cognitive needs of people living with dementia. In 2018, the City received a \$25,000 Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) Age-Friendly Community Grant to complete a Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan for Richmond. The Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan project resulted in gathering feedback from the community through various engagement activities to create a plan to support people living with dementia.

The project was guided by a Working Group and Stakeholder Committee including City staff, a person living with dementia and representatives from Community Associations and Societies; Alzheimer Society of B.C.; Richmond Cares, Richmond Gives; Vancouver Coastal Health; and Richmond Public Library.

Community engagement activities reached 313 participants and resulted in over 800 insights that helped guide the development of a Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan for Richmond. Highlights of project findings included programming for those living with dementia and their caregivers; supported transportation services; activation of outdoor spaces; programs and services to reduce isolation and support caregivers; and community awareness and staff training.

The Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan for Richmond includes 25 actions categorized into four strategic directions that will be implemented over the next five years including: Awareness, Education and Stigma Reduction; Built Environment; Programs and Services; and Support for those Living with Dementia and their Caregivers.

A Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan for Richmond aligns with the City's commitment to become more age friendly.

The actions outlined in the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan will ensure all Richmond residents living with dementia and their families and caregivers are included, supported and valued and continue to be active and engaged with their community.



# 1. INTRODUCTION



The Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan is a plan intended to guide the City, Community Associations/Societies and Key Stakeholders in building a community that is inclusive and supportive of people living with dementia and their caregivers and families.

This Action Plan was developed based on:

- research on dementia and statistics;
- current Dementia-Friendly Community activities; and
- project findings from community engagement activities including a survey, focus groups, a walking interview and community forum

## Defining Dementia

Dementia is an umbrella term used to describe a set of symptoms that are caused by different disorders affecting the brain. Alzheimer's disease is just one type of dementia. Other types of dementia include vascular; Lewy body; frontotemporal; and mixed dementia, which is when a person is living with more than one type of dementia.

It is important to note that dementia is different than normal age-related memory loss. Dementia causes physical changes to the brain which can result in changes in behaviour, personality and judgment. For some individuals these changes can impact the person's ability to perform everyday familiar tasks and activities, such as remembering the steps needed to brew a pot of coffee or attending a class at the local library. As a chronic, progressive and terminal

condition, dementia can eventually interfere with a person's ability to maintain activities of daily living such as eating, bathing, using the washroom and dressing<sup>1</sup>.

## Importance of Becoming Dementia-Friendly

An estimated 564,000 Canadians are living with dementia and the number is expected to rise to 937,000 in 15 years. An estimated 70,000 people are living with Alzheimer's disease or another form of dementia in British Columbia. Approximately 5,000 people in BC under the age of 65 have received a dementia diagnosis. The number of people living with dementia in Richmond increased from 1,150 in 2007/2008 to 1,730 in 2016/2017.<sup>2</sup>

With a growing and aging population, the number of Canadians living with dementia is expected to increase in future decades. In Richmond, 32 per cent of the total population is 55 years and over and is expected to increase to 39 per cent in 2026<sup>3</sup>. Approximately 60 per cent of people living with dementia remain in their homes, either alone or with a caregiver. People living with dementia continue to work, take part in community activities and remain connected with family and friends. However, anxiety, stigma and frustration can make it difficult to sustain activities and relationships particularly as the disease progresses.

Stigma remains one of the largest barriers for people living with dementia and often increases their potential risk for isolation which may have a negative impact of their health and well-being. Stigma plays a role in discouraging families and caregivers from confiding in others and getting the help and support they need. According to an online survey conducted by the Alzheimer Society of Canada, 61 per cent of respondents felt they would face discrimination of

some kind if they were living with dementia and only 36 per cent said they would be comfortable interacting with a stranger who was living with dementia.

With support, people living with dementia can continue to live in their community safely and independently. Appropriate programs, services, training and education in the community will help to reduce stigma and increase awareness and understanding of dementia.

## Quick Facts

**16,000** The number of Canadians under the age of 65 living with dementia

**78,600** The number of new cases of dementia in Canada diagnosed every year among people aged 65 years of age and older

**9** The approximate number of seniors diagnosed with dementia every hour in Canada

**25,000** The number of new cases of dementia diagnosed every year

**564,000** Canadians are currently living with dementia

**937,000** The number of Canadians who will be living with the disease in 15 years

**26 hours** The average number of hours that family/friend caregivers spend per week supporting a person with dementia

**56,000** The number of Canadians with dementia being cared for in hospitals even though this is not an ideal location for care

**1.1 million** The number of Canadians affected directly or indirectly by the disease

**\$10.4 billion** The annual cost to Canadians to care for those living with dementia

<sup>1</sup> Alzheimer Society of B.C. and Government of Canada National Strategy on Dementia 2019

<sup>2</sup> Ministry of Health, Chronic Disease Information Registries, 2016/2017, Alzheimer's Disease and Other Dementia Measures Report

<sup>3</sup> BC Statistics

## Impact of Dementia in City Facilities

As the population continues to age and residents are encouraged to remain independent in their communities and age in place, the number of residents with chronic conditions including those living with dementia accessing programs and services in City facilities will increase.

City staff increasingly report challenges when interacting with patrons with dementia who access City and community partner programs and services. The challenges affect staff time and existing resources.

Challenges reported by City and Community Association/Society staff include not being equipped with how to best respond and interact with patrons living with dementia and:

- Patrons asking for assistance in locating a missing family member or they themselves are lost;
- Patrons arriving for classes that are not scheduled;
- Patrons not able to function on their own in the centre without reminders and wayfinding directions from staff;
- Patrons who repeatedly ask the same question;
- Patrons dropped off by family members who are unable to independently function without staff or volunteer support;
- Assisting long time patrons who are no longer able to function in regular programs (e.g. disruptive to other patrons or unable to keep up) who have little or no family support.

## Dementia-Friendly Communities Initiative

A dementia-friendly community focuses on the inclusion of people living with dementia and stigma reduction. In a dementia-friendly community, the community is educated about dementia and people living with dementia feel supported by their community.

In 2015, the Alzheimer Society of B.C. launched their Dementia-Friendly Communities initiative. By providing tools, education and forging strategic partnerships, the Society is enabling local governments, the professional sector, community groups and the general public to become dementia friendly. The aim of the initiative is to create inviting and supportive communities where people living with dementia feel comfortable and included, ensuring support and accessibility for all residents.

The Alzheimer Society of B.C. is currently working with approximately twelve BC municipalities including Richmond on Dementia-Friendly Community initiatives with five communities currently in the implementation phase of their Dementia-Friendly Action Plans. The five municipalities include Burnaby, New Westminster and the North Shore (a tri-municipal partnership between the City of North Vancouver, the District of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver). The Society, in partnership with the City of Vancouver, has also developed the Dementia-Friendly City Train the Trainer program to educate staff and volunteers in the workplace.

## Alignment with Other City Plans and Strategies

The Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan is a plan that aligns with and is supported by a range of City of Richmond plans and strategies. Key examples include the following:

*Building Our Social Future – A Social Development Strategy for Richmond 2013–2022:*

- Strategic Direction #3: Address the Needs of an Aging Population:
  - Action #9: Support aging in place initiatives and the ongoing development of Richmond as an age-friendly community.

*Seniors Service Plan 2015–2020:*

- Direction #2: Responsive and Relevant Services
  - Action 2.2: Review and Assess the proportion of outreach programming for seniors
- Direction #3: Respect, Inclusion and Sense of Belonging
  - Action 3.8: Launch an educational campaign to combat stereotypes and ageist attitudes

- Direction #5: Targeted Training and Professional Development
  - Action 5.4: Provide educational opportunities to staff, volunteers and partners to dispel myths and stereotypes of seniors and aging.

*Age-Friendly Action and Assessment Plan 2015–2020:*

- Direction 2.4: Social Participation: Supporting consistent outreach to seniors at risk of social isolation
- Direction 2.8: Community Support and Health Services: Exploring the Dementia-Friendly Communities initiative coordinated by the Alzheimer Society of B.C.

*Community Wellness Strategy 2018–2023:*

- Focus Area #3: Enhance the equitable access to amenities, services and programs within and among neighbourhoods including:
  - Action #4: Enhancing partner outreach to groups where barriers to access and participation in services and programs have been identified.

## 2. BACKGROUND



Richmond is well positioned to become a Dementia-Friendly community. Being an Age-Friendly Community provides the needed foundation to support those living with dementia and their caregivers and families to remain healthy, engaged and connected in the community.

### Age-Friendly Communities Initiative

The Age-Friendly Community initiative, developed by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2006, was designed to optimize the health, participation and security of seniors throughout the course of aging by encouraging communities to adapt structures and services to increase accessibility and inclusion. An Age-Friendly city focuses on its social and physical environments with respect to a mix of land-use,

street connectivity, access to green spaces and neighbourhood aesthetics to promote healthy aging, as well as to support residents to maintain social ties to family and friends. The Age-Friendly City is accessible, in that its features and services are easy to get to and can be used by all age groups including people who use assistive devices such as walkers and wheelchairs, those with visual and hearing impairments, as well as other groups such as parents with strollers.<sup>4</sup>

In 2015, the City of Richmond completed a 2015–2020 Age-Friendly Assessment and Action Plan as part of the Ministry of Health's Age-Friendly BC initiative to encourage communities to become Age-Friendly. The City received Age-Friendly designation in 2015

<sup>4</sup> World Health Organization. (2007). *Global Age-Friendly Cities: A Guide*.

for completion of the Action Plan and for the City's commitment to become more age-friendly. The development of a Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan for Richmond builds upon and complements age-friendly initiatives by addressing the physical and cognitive needs of people living with dementia.

## UBCM Age-Friendly Communities Grant Program

Funded by the Province of BC and administered by the Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM), the Age-Friendly Communities program assists local governments in BC to support and prepare for aging populations by developing and implementing policies and plans, undertaking projects that enable seniors to age in place, and facilitating the creation of age-friendly communities. Since 2005, the provincial government has provided \$6.25 million to support the program. To date, more than 148 local governments have completed 286 plans and projects have been completed or approved for funding. The Province of BC, in collaboration with key partners including health authorities, has advanced the age-friendly agenda since 2007 to engage and support local governments in preparing their communities for an aging population. The Ministry of Health committed an additional \$500,000 in funding for 2018 to support the Age-friendly Communities grant initiative program.

In 2018, through the Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) Age-Friendly Communities program, the City received a \$25,000 Age-Friendly Community grant to create a Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan for Richmond. A Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan for Richmond complements and builds upon existing City age-friendly actions and initiatives.

## Specialized Programming

City and Community Association/Society staff have created specialized outreach programs in response to the increasing number of patrons with changing physical and cognitive status attending programs. Outreach programs have additional supports put

in place to reduce barriers for participants who are at-risk, frail and isolated including reminder calls, transportation, volunteers, meals, social time and information and referral supports. Many referrals to the programs come from Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH) in addition to other community organizations serving seniors in Richmond.

Examples of programs currently offered by the City and community partners include:

- **Educational Workshops** on topics for those living with dementia and their caregivers and families including: Getting to Know Dementia; Introduction to Brain Health; Transition to Residential Care and Self-Care for Caregivers.
- **Minds in Motion® program** hosted at South Arm Community Centre and East Richmond Community Hall (Cambie) in partnership with Alzheimer Society of B.C.: participants enjoy light exercise, activities, social time and lunch in a relaxed atmosphere designed for people with early-stage memory loss. Participants are able to bring a friend, family member or care partner.
- **Music Works for Wellness Programs** at West Richmond Community Centre: offers participants opportunities to learn to drum or play the ukulele and discover the many benefits of playing and singing music including stress reduction, relaxation and support for overall health and well-being.
- **Iki Iki Social** at Japanese Canadian Cultural Centre (Steveston) in partnership with Tonari Gumi: a social program for mild to moderate participants living with dementia with easier-paced and culturally-familiar activities in a safe and engaging program. The program is conducted in Japanese and English.
- **Sit and Be Fit** at Minoru Centre for Active Living and East Richmond Community Hall: a seated basic fitness class delivered in English, Cantonese and Mandarin and designed for those with limited physical abilities including those managing pain and chronic conditions. Transportation is provided.

- **Wellness Connections** at Minoru Centre for Active Living: an outreach program conducted in English, Cantonese and Mandarin designed to reintegrate frail, at-risk and isolated seniors back into the community. Participants have access to one-on-one information and referral and health navigation.

## Partnerships

Partnerships are essential in creating a Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan for Richmond that will adequately address the needs of those living with dementia and their families and caregivers. A number of key partnerships involved in the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan project included the City, Community Associations/Societies as well as other key stakeholders.

## Community Associations/Societies

Community Associations and Societies are non-profit community organizations that work in partnership with the City of Richmond to provide a variety of recreational, cultural, educational and social opportunities to allow people of all ages to stay active and involved in the community. The City provides the facilities and core staffing, while the Community Associations/Societies fund and deliver programs and services.

Service and program delivery for Community Associations and Societies include:

- A Seniors Coordinator who plans and delivers programs and services specifically for those ages 55+ years;
- Delivery of specialized programming for seniors aged 55+ years who are vulnerable, at-risk and isolated in partnership with other community organizations;
- Information and referral for patrons and their families to healthcare and community programs and services

## Vancouver Coastal Health

Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH) provides health care services through a network of hospitals, primary care clinics, community health centres and residential care homes. In Richmond, VCH delivers programs and services for those living with dementia and their families and caregivers through the departments of Home and Community Care and Community Mental Health. VCH provides a range of support options designed to help people with ongoing health conditions to remain in their homes and to be as independent and safe as possible

Program and service delivery include:

- Adult Day Programs;
- Caregiver Support;
- Community Mental Health Team services including screening, assessment, access to activities and referrals to other services;
- Case Management;
- Geriatric Psychiatry Assessment and Treatment; and
- Home Support.

## Alzheimer Society of B.C.

The Alzheimer Society of B.C. is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to enhancing the quality of life and care for people living with Alzheimer's disease and other dementias, as well as their caregivers, families and friends. Their mission is to ensure people affected by dementia are not alone, by educating and mobilizing a broader community of care around them, and supporting valuable research into the disease and people living with it.

Service and program delivery include:

- First Link® dementia support is a program that connects people with dementia and their care partners to support services, education and information at any stage of the journey including support groups and one-on-one phone calls.
- Minds in Motion® programs for people with early-stage memory loss and their caregivers to enjoy light exercise, activities, social time and lunch in a relaxed atmosphere.



### 3. DEMENTIA-FRIENDLY COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN PROJECT



The Dementia Friendly Community Action Plan project identified a set of actions that will ensure those living with dementia and their caregivers and families are connected, supported and valued through awareness and understanding, responsive and inclusive programming and well designed, accessible and supportive built environments.

The following project activities took place in 2018 under the guidelines and conditions of the UBCM 2018 Age-Friendly Communities Grant Program. The project was led by the Seniors Coordinator, Community Social Development with the support of a project consultant and other City staff.

#### Working Group and Stakeholder Committee

A dementia-friendly working group was formed at the beginning of the project to help guide project activities and play an active role in planning and participating in the community engagement activities. Seven members included a person living with dementia, caregivers and family members of those living with dementia, City staff and representatives from the Alzheimer Society of B.C., Vancouver Coastal Health and Richmond Seniors Advisory Committee.

A larger stakeholder committee was also formed at the beginning of the project to support direction of the project, provide expertise, resources and guidance as well as participate in project activities. Members of the stakeholder committee included

the dementia-friendly working group as well as City staff from different departments, Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH) representatives including Falls Prevention and Older Adult Mental Health, and service and housing providers. Members attended five meetings throughout the year, which included education sessions about dementia and dementia-friendly communities by the Alzheimer Society of B.C. On average a total of 15 members attended the meetings.

Members of the stakeholder committee included:

- Alzheimer Society of B.C.;
- City of Richmond, Transportation Planning Department;
- City of Richmond, Coordinator, Seniors Services and Seniors Wellness Coordinator;
- Person Living with Dementia, Alzheimer Society of B.C. Leadership Group;
- Minoru Seniors Society;
- MetroVancouver Housing Corporation;
- RCMP;
- Richmond Addiction Services Society;
- Richmond Public Library;
- Richmond Seniors Advisory Committee;
- Richmond Food Bank;
- Richmond Cares, Richmond Gives;
- Vancouver Coastal Health;
- Verve Senior Living (Gilmore Gardens Independent Senior Living).

## Community Engagement

People living with dementia and those affected by dementia—including friends, family, caregivers, neighbours and coworkers were invited to share their experiences and provide feedback by participating in a number of community engagement activities including a survey posted on the City's online engagement platform, [LetsTalkRichmond.ca](https://letstalkrichmond.ca), community and staff focus groups, a walking interview and community forum. Several adaptations were used to reduce barriers to participation including the provision of

transportation and translation at focus groups, mailed surveys upon request, information by telephone, on-site support at various community centres throughout Richmond and copies hand delivered by several stakeholder committee members and other health professionals. Community engagement activities reached a total of 313 participants.

### 1. Survey

A public engagement survey was developed to gather feedback and ideas from those living with dementia on how to make Richmond more dementia-friendly. A total of 125 people participated.

The survey asked participants about the following:

- Places and Locations: they visit in Richmond including parks, trails and cycling paths, community centres, faith based organizations and arts and heritage locations;
- Programs, Activities and Events: they enjoy including fitness class, events and festivals, educational workshops and volunteer activities;
- Service Utilization: including program registration, recycling and garbage and library services;
- Changes in Lifestyle: how living with dementia has changed the places they visit, how they get around, the number of activities they engage in and time spent with friends;
- Ideas to make Richmond Dementia-Friendly: and to highlight services, activities or programs that have helped them in their journey living with dementia.

The survey was posted on [LetsTalkRichmond.ca](https://letstalkrichmond.ca), the City's online public engagement platform from June 4 to July 1, 2019.

The survey was also available in hard copy at multiple city locations (e.g. Minoru Place Activity Centre, Richmond Public Library – Brighthouse Branch and community centres) and was available upon request by calling the Registration Call Centre. Several members of the stakeholder group representing key community partner organizations made copies

available to clients. Some community centres also provided displays with boxes to collect completed surveys. Volunteers were available at some locations to help participants complete the surveys.

## 2. Community Focus Groups

People living with dementia and their caregivers were invited to participate in focus groups across the city. Participants were asked to share their experiences and insights about City-managed places, spaces, services, programs and activities that are important to them. They were also asked to share how dementia may have changed their connections to others as well as ideas to make the community more dementia friendly. A total of 70 participants attended the community focus groups.

The community focus groups offerings included:

- Six community focus groups were offered in a variety of neighbourhoods including City Centre, South Arm, Cambie, Blundell, West Richmond and Steveston; of the six focus groups, three were cancelled due to low registration;
- Two focus groups were designated specifically for caregivers to attend with one offered as an evening session to accommodate caregivers who worked during the day;
- Registration for community focus groups was available in three ways: internet, in person and through the Registration Call Centre;
- Some community focus groups provided translation in Cantonese, Mandarin and Punjabi;
- Bus Transportation was made available from select community centres to community focus groups. Transportation was available upon and suggested for participants who were identified as living with barriers to participation.

## 3. Staff Focus Groups

Thirty-one City, Community Association/Society and Vancouver Coastal Health staff participated in a total of five focus groups. Focus groups were organized based on their potential interaction with people living with dementia.

One of the key findings from the staff focus groups was that over 90 per cent of those who attended reported being directly or indirectly affected by someone living with dementia including caregiving for family members (e.g. parents, grandparents, spouses).

Participants shared experiences and insights about:

- Interactions and encounters with people living with dementia;
- What they do or say, or assistance they provide when needed;
- What would help them in their role;
- What kinds of support they think people living with dementia and their caregivers need; and
- What works well and what is transferable.

Of those who were caregiving many were unaware of services available for those living with dementia including services provided by the Alzheimer Society of B.C. Participants were also unaware of programs and services available to them from their employer including Employee Assistance Programs to help support employees caring for aging family including those living with dementia.

Participants voiced challenges with managing caregiving responsibilities while working full-time and taking care of their own families including:


- Taking vacation time and lunch hours to complete errands and accompany family to appointments;
- The inability to support those living with dementia to attend programs and services available during the day with no other family and supports available;
- Worrying about loved ones at home alone while they are at work;
- The stress and frustration navigating the health system to access services for those living with dementia;
- Having to schedule appointments during day time hours which often needs to be done from work and the stigma associated with disclosing personal information to colleagues.

\_\_\_\_\_



# WORLDLY COMMUNITY

## FORUM: SEPT 20, 2018



The composition of the focus groups included staff working directly with seniors and those working in frontline positions who may encounter people living with dementia.

#### 4. Walking Interview



A total of 15 people participated in a specialized focus group held to address elements in the built environment including 11 City staff, a staff representing Alzheimer Society of B.C., the project consultant and two people living with dementia. City staff included the following areas:

- Community Social Development – Accessibility and Seniors;
- Policy Planning;
- Roads and Construction Services;
- Transportation.

The session included a “walking interview” led by two people living with dementia. Participants walked the neighbourhood of Richmond City Hall and

identified and discussed features that worked well or needed improvement, including:

- Signage and landmarks used for navigation and orientation;
- Sidewalks, bus stops and other features;
- Safety (lighting, fall risk, benches);
- Social opportunities.

Staff were given an opportunity to learn how those living with dementia see and interpret various aspects of the built environment and how elements of the built environment impact their safety and well-being as they navigate around the community.

Staff reported how the activity was valuable in highlighting a new perspective of the built environment. This activity highlighted the importance of considering items in City planning including:

- Roads and sidewalks;
- Stairs;
- Interior flooring;
- Colour and signage;
- Seating areas;
- Wayfinding and orientation using existing landmarks in the City (e.g. public art, statues, monuments and prominent distinctive buildings);
- Incorporating “quiet” places into existing and new facilities.

#### 5. Community Forum

The final activity in the project was a Dementia-Friendly community forum open to the public, City and Community Association/Society staff, health professionals and the general public. This drop-in style event included presentations covering topics such as dementia-friendly communities, the Dementia-Friendly project, a keynote presentation by a person living with dementia, and descriptions of specific programs and services offered in the community for at-risk and vulnerable people living in the community including:

- Alzheimer Society of B.C. programs including First Link® and Minds in Motion®;

- Music Works For Wellness Programs at West Richmond Community Centre;
- Iki Iki Social at Steveston Community Centre;
- Wellness Connections at Minoru Centre for Active Living;
- Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH) Home and Community Care programs.

Community service providers also had information and resource tables, where they shared materials and

responded directly to questions and concerns from the public. It was estimated that 72 people attended the forum including people living with dementia, City and community partner staff, health professionals and the general public.

A highlight of the forum was the presence of a professional graphic illustrator who captured key themes and shared visions of participants and presenters that will be used in future Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan activities (*see pages 14–15 for illustration*).



## Project Findings and Key Themes

Data from all sources including surveys, focus groups, the walking interview and the community forum yielded more than 800 insights to make Richmond more dementia-friendly. Highlights of project findings include:

## Programs

The highest number of responses from all of the community engagement activities focused on programming for people living with dementia and the important role it plays in keeping them healthy, active

and connected to their communities. Respondents mentioned the desire for more programs and activities suitable for those living with dementia close to their neighbourhoods at community centres and Minoru Centre for Active Living. Other suggestions included a more dementia-friendly registration process, intergenerational programs, more adult day care programs and programs available through the Alzheimer Society of B.C.

### Built Environment

Responses around the built environment focused on transportation services, signage and facilities for those living with dementia. The majority of responses about transportation focused on the challenges experienced by those living with dementia including the dependence on others, increased risk for isolation and the lack of connection with the community. Respondents commented on the challenges using HandyDART services, issues with parking, training needs for bus drivers who may interact with those living with dementia and the need for more supported transportation services like the City's Community Leisure Transportation (CLT) program (City program providing affordable transportation with mainly to youth, seniors and those with disabilities).

Comments for signage included the need for clear signage to improve wayfinding around Richmond including the use of pictures, consistent fonts, more directional signage and using familiar monuments and pieces in the environment for navigation.

Caregivers commented that they will continue to utilize outdoor spaces in Richmond (e.g. parks and walking paths) often when their family member's physical health was good. Suggestions for improvements centred around pedestrian safety especially on bike paths and accessibility and location of public washrooms. Other suggestions included providing extra supports for outdoor programming to allow those living with dementia to continue to be outdoors including a group within existing programs such as the Walk Richmond program.

### Isolation

There were many responses from respondents commenting on isolation or the potential for isolation. The majority of feedback regarding isolation came from those living with dementia and their families and caregivers. Challenges shared included those living with dementia who have a very small or no network of support, lack of places to go where they felt comfortable, safe or supported and the inability to go places without a person accompanying them. Other comments included the frustration with the change in their previous lifestyle for those who had once enjoyed being active and social in their community and who were no longer able to do so due to barriers that prevented them from getting out or not being accepted in places they once visited.

**"I used to go out on my own every day. Now I can't go anywhere by myself. I have to wait for weekends when my family is free. I get stuck in the house all the time. It makes me depressed."**

Survey Respondent of person living with dementia, Female, 75+ years, Richmond Resident 10 years +

### Safety

The majority of responses about safety focused on the need for clear protocols or guidelines around missing persons. Comments focused on the need to develop clear guidelines to help support staff at all City facilities to locate missing participants and to help community members who are lost.



### Caregiver Support

Comments from respondents caregiving for someone living with dementia included the negative effects on their health and well-being including stress and burnout, isolation from family and friends and the challenge of juggling a full time job. Other comments included their lack of knowledge of programs and services for the person living with dementia as well as for themselves due to lack of time and/or resources. There were also comments about the need for more flexible respite programs and programs for those living with dementia where a caregiver could remain close by.

**"His circle gets smaller and smaller. These days it is just immediate family and caregivers."**

Survey Respondent, Friend of person living with dementia, Female, 45+ years, Richmond Resident 10 years+

### Community Awareness

Respondents identified the need to raise awareness of dementia in the larger community through delivery of information in various forms, awareness campaigns or other marketing and promotional activities. There were also suggestions to include private businesses and schools in Richmond when delivering information and education to raise awareness to those outside of City facilities and to teach the younger generation about dementia.

### Staff Training

Respondents identified the need for training and education specifically for staff in customer service and front desk roles who may encounter those living with dementia. Education would help support staff to feel more confident and know what to do when encountering patrons living with dementia as well as reduce the stigma and pre-existing stereotypes associated with dementia. Respondents suggested exploring ways to utilize existing systems and protocols that work at other City facilities.



## 4. DEMENTIA-FRIENDLY COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN



The Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan for Richmond sets out four strategic directions with 25 recommended actions to be implemented over the next five years. The recommended actions build upon ongoing initiatives and were prioritized based on frequency of response and fit with aligned City plans and strategies. Four key themes emerged from the findings and were categorized into four strategic directions:

1. Awareness, Education and Stigma Reduction
2. Built Environment
3. Programs and Services
4. Support for those Living with Dementia and their Caregivers

The implementation of the actions will be coordinated by the Seniors Coordinator in Community Social Development with support from other City departments, Community Associations/Societies and key stakeholders.

Actions have been identified with the following timelines:

- On-going
- Short Term (0–2 years)
- Medium Term (2–3 years)
- Long Term (4–5 years)

It is important to acknowledge that while the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan covers a five year period, some actions have timelines that, due to community context, may no longer be considered short, medium or long term and are better suited to be ongoing actions.

## 1. AWARENESS, EDUCATION AND STIGMA REDUCTION

Education and awareness is key to understanding and reducing the stigma associated with dementia. Everyone can play a role in ensuring people living with dementia continue to be a part of their community and supporting their safety, independence, value and inclusion. Staff and community members need to understand how to provide appropriate assistance and to feel confident in knowing how to respond to a person with dementia. Appropriate protocols and procedures also need to be in place to ensure efficient use of resources and communication is clear in responding to situations involving those living with dementia and their caregivers and families.

Proposed Actions	Timelines
1.1 Work with key stakeholders and Community Associations/Societies to provide dementia awareness training to frontline staff and those who work directly with seniors.	Short Term (0–2 years)
1.2 Explore opportunities to educate the community about dementia including public awareness campaigns and activities to reduce stigma and existing stereotypes.	Medium Term (2–3 years)
1.3 Research best practices on how to communicate to the public what programs are suitable for individuals living with dementia.	Medium Term (2–3 years)
1.4 Work with Richmond Public Library staff to raise awareness of existing materials and electronic resources available to support those living with dementia and their caregivers.	Short Term (0–2 years)
1.5 Distribute materials and resources on dementia to City and Community Association/Society staff, businesses, schools and the public.	Short Term (0–2 years)
1.6 Continue to engage the Dementia-Friendly Stakeholder Committee in monitoring the progress and implementation of the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan actions, as well as participation in any other Age-Friendly activities and initiatives in Richmond.	Short Term (0–2 years)
1.7 Continue to monitor available grants, research, statistics, current trends and best practices to increase awareness, education and training and reduce stigma.	Ongoing

## 2. BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Living in a safe and clean environment with green spaces that encourage physical activity, such as walking and cycling, and social interaction can have a major impact on mobility, independence, quality of life, and well-being. Long term studies show the quality of the environment near housing (e.g. trees, reduced noise, walkable streets and spaces) has a positive association with longevity. As a result of physical changes to the brain, people living with dementia may interact and see things differently in the built environment. Utilizing age-friendly and accessible design guidelines and incorporating safe, calm and welcoming spaces into neighbourhoods will help support people living with dementia to continue to utilize outdoor space on a regular basis.

Proposed Actions	Timelines
2.1 Investigate ways to identify and promote public washroom locations to increase accessibility and support users of outdoor spaces in Richmond.	Medium Term (2–3 years)
2.2 Explore opportunities to include quiet areas within City facilities and City and Community Association/Society events.	Medium Term (2–3 years)
2.3 Review existing guidelines (e.g. Enhanced Accessibility Design guidelines) to ensure they address the needs of those living with dementia and to make amendments accordingly.	Short Term (0–2 years)
2.4 Explore ways to increase awareness of the City's hazard reporting system (e.g. Richmond Works app).	Short Term (0–2 years)
2.5 Continue to improve transit crosswalks, stops and shelters in the community including age-friendly signage and addition of real-time bus arrival displays.	Ongoing
2.6 Research available technology applications (apps) and other tools and resources related to transportation services for improved navigation around Richmond.	Medium Term (2–3 years)
2.7 Continue to monitor available grants, research, statistics, current trends and best practices in order to find ways the built environment can support people living with dementia.	Ongoing

### 3. PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Community facilities are central to our neighbourhoods and can play a large role in supporting those living with dementia to continue being physically active, maintain cognitive function and stay engaged and connected to their peers and community. Key stakeholders in the community currently deliver programs and services for those living with dementia and their families and caregivers. Adding support to existing community centre programs and providing training for staff and volunteers can be effective ways to support those living with dementia. Working closely with community stakeholders (e.g. VCH and Alzheimer Society of B.C.) will also mitigate risk and ensure programming is relevant and appropriate.

Proposed Actions	Timelines
3.1 Research best practices from other communities on the activation of programming in parks and outdoor spaces to connect people of all ages and abilities.	Medium Term (2–3 years)
3.2 Explore options to utilize Community Leisure Transportation (CLT) services to support individuals living with dementia who otherwise could not attend programs and services due to transportation barriers.	Medium Term (2–3 years)
3.3 Work with Community Association/Society staff to identify ways to support existing outreach programs offered at Community facilities (e.g. Wellness Connections) to better support participants living with dementia and their caregivers and families.	Medium Term (2–3 years)
3.4 Identify guidelines and training initiatives for community facility staff to ensure a seamless and supportive transition for patrons with declining cognitive and physical abilities.	Medium Term (2–3 years)
3.5 Research best practices to support the creation of a Citywide 55+ years Missing Persons protocol to ensure staff and volunteers are aware and know what to do when a vulnerable/at-risk participant goes missing from a City facility or event.	Medium Term (2–3 years)
3.6 Research best practices on utilizing volunteers to support community facility programming for frail/vulnerable seniors and those living with dementia.	Medium Term (2–3 years)
3.7 Continue to monitor available grants, research, statistics, current trends and best practices to support programs and services for those living with dementia and their caregivers and families.	Ongoing

#### 4. SUPPORT FOR THOSE LIVING WITH DEMENTIA AND THEIR CAREGIVERS

Caring for someone with dementia can be a complex and demanding task and may impact the emotional and physical health of the caregiver. For those working while caregiving, the demands can be even more stressful and physically exhausting trying to juggle work while scheduling appointments and navigating services in the community. Connecting caregivers with information on programs and services available to support them will help to alleviate stress and frustration. Working with key stakeholders and Community Associations/Societies to make information accessible to caregivers will help to optimize resources as well as connect caregivers with community and health professionals that can best support them in their caregiving journey.

Proposed Actions	Timelines
4.1 Explore the creation of internal workshops (e.g. lunch and learn) to promote existing resources and tools to support City staff caring for family members living with dementia (e.g. Employee Assistance Program (EAP) services available to City and Community Association/Society staff to help support those caring for someone living with dementia).	Short Term (0–2 years)
4.2 Collaborate with key stakeholders (e.g. Vancouver Coastal Health and Alzheimer Society of B.C.) and Community Associations/Societies to support workshops, specialized programming and support groups for caregivers.	Medium Term (2–3 years)
4.3 Provide City and Community Association/Society staff and members of the Dementia-Friendly Stakeholder Committee with a set of key print materials and resources to share, distribute and promote to their networks, caregivers and clients living with dementia.	Short Term (0–2 years)
4.4 Continue to monitor available grants, research, statistics, current trends and best practices to support the health and well-being of caregivers of those living with dementia.	Ongoing



## 5. NEXT STEPS, MONITORING AND EVALUATION



The City will work with Community Associations/Societies and key stakeholders on the implementation of the outlined actions.

The Dementia-Friendly Stakeholder Committee will continue to provide expertise, resources and guidance towards the implementation of the actions.

Progress of actions outlined in the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan will be reported based on associated timelines and on a yearly basis in the Seniors Service Plan Yearly Update.

The Action Plan will be disseminated to the members of the Dementia-Friendly Stakeholder Committee, Community Associations/Societies and key stakeholder groups. The Action Plan will be posted on the City's website with printed copies available for the public.



## 6. CONCLUSION

The number of Canadians living with dementia is expected to increase with a growing and aging population. Many of those living with dementia continue to remain at home in the community with many experiencing stigma and at-risk of isolation and loneliness.

The City is committed to taking a proactive role in ensuring those living with dementia feel welcome and included in the community and continue to be active and engaged with their community. The Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan will be the guiding document to further support those living with dementia and their families and caregivers.

With the involvement of Community Associations/ Societies and stakeholders, the actions outlined in the

Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan will ensure all Richmond residents living with dementia and their families and caregivers are connected, supported and valued through public awareness and education, inclusive programs and services and well designed, accessible and supportive built environments.

**"People with dementia can, and should, be able to enjoy quality of life at every stage of their long and difficult journey. With the help of an accepting and inclusive community this is absolutely possible."**

Survey Respondent, Male Caregiver, 65+ years, 10+ years Richmond resident





Funding to create this plan was provided by the Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) Age-Friendly Communities Program in partnership with the Province of BC and BC Healthy Communities Society (BCHC).

The Age-friendly Communities program assists communities in BC to support aging populations by developing and implementing policies and plans, undertaking projects that enable seniors to age in place and facilitating the creation of age-friendly communities.





## City of Richmond

6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1  
Telephone: 604-276-4000  
[richmond.ca](http://richmond.ca)

**CNCL - 140**



# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

**To:** Planning Committee  
**From:** Wayne Craig  
Director, Development


**Date:** September 4, 2019

**File:** RZ 17-763712

**Re:** Application by CLO Ventures K2 Ltd. for Rezoning at 9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 Steveston Highway & 10831 Southdale Road from Single Detached (RS1/E) to Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)


### Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10082, for the rezoning of 9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 Steveston Highway & 10831 Southdale Road from the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" zone to the "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone, in order to permit the development of 20 townhouse units with vehicle access from Steveston Highway, be introduced and given first reading.



Wayne Craig  
Director, Development

WC:sds  
Att. 7

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

## **Staff Report**

### **Origin**

CLO Ventures K2 Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone the properties at 9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 Steveston Highway & 10831 Southdale Road from the “Single Detached (RS1/E)” zone to the “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)” zone, in order to permit the development of 20 townhouse units with right-in/right-out vehicle access from Steveston Highway. A location map and aerial photograph are provided in Attachment 1. The subject site is currently occupied by five single-family dwellings, which are proposed to be demolished.

### **Project Description**

The subject properties have a total combined frontage of approximately 96 m (315 ft.) and are required to be consolidated into one development parcel prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. The proposal includes 12 three-storey and eight two-storey townhouse units, in six buildings, with a proposed floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.6. Three secondary suites and two convertible units are also included in the proposal. The preliminary site plan, building elevations and landscape plan are provided in Attachment 2.

### **Findings of Fact**

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

#### Existing Housing Profile

The applicant has advised that the five existing single-family dwellings are currently tenanted with no existing secondary suites.

### **Surrounding Development**

To the North: Single-family dwellings on lots zoned “Single Detached (RS1/E)” fronting Mortfield Court and Southdale Road.

To the South: Across Steveston Highway, farm businesses on lots zoned “Agriculture (AG1)” located in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR).

To the East: Across Southdale Road, single-family dwellings on lots zoned “Compact Single Detached (RC1)” fronting Steveston Highway.

To the West: Single-family dwellings on lots zoned “Single Detached (RS1/E)” fronting Steveston Highway.

## **Related Policies & Studies**

### Official Community Plan

The Official Community Plan (OCP) land use designation for the subject site is “Neighbourhood Residential (NRES)”. The “Neighbourhood Residential” designation comprises of those areas where the principal uses are single-family, two-family and multiple family housing (specifically townhouses). The development proposal is consistent with this designation.

### Arterial Road Policy

The Arterial Road Land Use Policy supports densification along arterial roads on properties in close proximity to commercial services, public amenities, schools and transit service. Although the subject site is identified for “Arterial Road Compact Lot Coach House” on the Arterial Road Housing Development Map, the subject site is located within walking distance of the following sites (where townhouse development may be considered):

- 800 m (2,625 ft. or 10 minute walk) of a City Community Centre (i.e. South Arm Community Park, which includes South Arm Community Centre, Hugh McRoberts Secondary and James Whiteside Elementary Schools); and
- 400 m (1,312 ft. or 5 minute walk) of a Commercial Service use (i.e. northwest corner of Steveston Highway and No. 4 Road).

The Arterial Road Land Use Policy allows townhouse development to be considered where sites are located within walking distances of the above-noted sites identified on the Arterial Road Housing Development Map. As per the Policy, the map is a guiding map that does not require amendments to show re-designated development areas approved by Council.

Compact lot single detached development was originally proposed as part of a previous rezoning proposal at the subject site (RZ 16-725911 & RZ 16-725915) with a lane along the rear for vehicle access. However, a significant tree at the rear of the property was identified for retention (see “Tree Retention and Replacement” section of this report for more information). Due to the retention of this tree, lane development along the rear is not feasible without removing the tree. Townhouse development is being considered on the subject site because it allows the retention of the significant tree and is consistent with the guiding principles of the Arterial Road Land Use Policy. The previous rezoning applications for compact lot single detached development were withdrawn prior to moving forward to Council as the applicant was advised to submit a new application for townhouse development.

The development proposal is also consistent with the Arterial Road Townhouse Development Requirements, including:

- Involves a land assembly with at least 50 m (164 ft.) frontage on a major arterial road;
- Leaves a residual site for future townhouse development with at least 50 m (164 ft.) frontage on a major arterial road;
- Includes public consultation (see “Public Consultation” section of this report for more information);

- Access from the arterial road only and located a sufficient distance from the local road;
- Shared access is being provided through the development for adjacent townhouse development by means of a statutory right-of-way; and
- No additional density is being requested from the base density (0.6 FAR).

Should Council endorse the subject rezoning application, the remaining western portion of the block would also be considered for townhouses (currently identified for “Arterial Road Compact Lot Coach House”), subject to public feedback and Council’s decision, and consistency with the Arterial Road Townhouse Guidelines.

#### Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

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

#### **Public Consultation**

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

The applicant has advised that notification letters were delivered by the applicant to all adjacent neighbouring properties, which included information on density, height, preliminary site plan and developer contact information (Attachment 4). To date, no correspondence has been received.

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant 1<sup>st</sup> reading to the rezoning bylaw, the bylaw will be forwarded to a Public Hearing, where any area resident or interested party will have an opportunity to comment.

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

#### **Analysis**

##### Built Form and Architectural Character

The applicant is proposing to consolidate the subject properties into one development parcel, with a total frontage of approximately 96 m (315 ft.) and a site area of 3,546.2 m<sup>2</sup> (38,171 ft<sup>2</sup>), in order to construct 20 townhouse units. The proposed townhouse units are oriented around a single driveway providing right-in/right-out driveway access to the site from Steveston Highway and an east-west internal maneuvering drive aisle providing access to the garages of the units. The shared outdoor amenity space is proposed to be situated in an open area at the rear (north) of the site due to the retention of a significant tree.

The proposal consists of 12 three-storey and eight two-storey townhouse units, all with side-by-side double car garages, with a proposed FAR of 0.6. The three-storey units are proposed along

Steveston Highway, stepped down to two-storeys within 7.5 m (25 ft.) of the east and west property lines to minimize potential privacy concerns. The units are proposed to be setback 4.5 m (15 ft.) from Steveston Highway, which requires a variance (see “Variance Requested” section of this report for more information). Two-storey units and a 6.0 m (20 ft.) setback are proposed along the rear (north) to address the interface with the existing single-family dwellings. The proposed building forms, heights and setbacks are consistent with the design guidelines for arterial road townhouse development.

The proposal includes three secondary suites, each with one bedroom and floor area of 25.1 m<sup>2</sup> (270 ft<sup>2</sup>) to 28.3 m<sup>2</sup> (305 ft<sup>2</sup>), which complies with the minimum floor area for secondary suites in townhouses as per Zoning Bylaw 8500, which is 25 m<sup>2</sup> (269 ft<sup>2</sup>). The applicant has also demonstrated that the proposed secondary suite can accommodate a bed, and kitchen and washroom facilities. To ensure the secondary suites are built to the satisfaction of the City, the applicant is required to register a legal agreement on Title prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, stating that no final Building Permit inspection will be granted until the secondary suites are constructed to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the BC Building Code and Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500. In addition, prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant is required to register a legal agreement on Title to ensure the secondary suites will not be stratified.

#### Existing Legal Encumbrances

There is an existing 3.0 m wide Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) (Plan 36732 & 35912) along the rear (north) property line for sanitary sewer services. The existing SRW will not be impacted by the proposed development and the developer is aware that encroachment into the SRWs is not permitted.

#### Transportation and Site Access

Vehicular access to the subject site is proposed via one driveway from Steveston Highway, located in the middle of the subject development. The driveway will be designed to restrict vehicle movements to right-in/right-out only in order to mitigate traffic impact on Steveston Highway. The long-term objective is for the driveway access established on Steveston Highway to be utilized by adjacent properties to the west, if the properties redevelop. A Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) for Public Right-of-Passage (PROP) over the entire area of the proposed driveway and the internal maneuvering drive aisle is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, which will facilitate access for future adjacent development.

The proposal complies with the required number of vehicle and bicycle parking spaces as per Zoning Bylaw 8500.

Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant is required to provide a 4 m by 4 m corner cut road dedication at the southeast corner of the subject site.

#### Tree Retention and Replacement

The applicant has submitted a Certified Arborist’s Report, which identifies tree species, assesses tree structure and condition, and provides recommendations on tree retention and removal

relative to the proposed development. The Report assesses 17 trees located on the subject property, one shared tree with the adjacent property to the north, and four neighbouring trees.

The City's Tree Preservation Coordinator has reviewed the Arborist's Report and Tree Management Plan (Attachment 5), conducted an on-site visual tree assessment provides the following comments:

- The presence of a Ganoderma fungal conk was identified at the base of the significant Sycamore Maple (tag# 346) (130 cm dbh) located on the north property line (shared tree with the adjacent property to the north), which raises potential risks associated with retaining this tree. If the tree is to be retained, the following is recommended, which will be included in the Arborist Contract required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw:
  - no encroachment of buildings within the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ);
  - no grade changes within the TPZ;
  - crown reduction and/or thinning of the crown as needed;
  - on-site monitoring by the Project Arborist throughout the duration of construction;
  - site drainage mitigation may be required during preload within TPZ;
  - contract for watering as needed during summer dry months; and
  - evaluation of the tree by a Qualified Tree Risk Assessor on a yearly basis or after any major storm events.
- The Oak tree (tag# 347) (57 cm dbh) located on the neighbouring property beside the above-noted tree (tag# 346) has a torsion crack in the main stem, which is a major structural defect. Removal of this tree is recommended. A Letter of Authorization from the adjacent property owner for removal of this tree has been provided.
- Three trees (tag# 344(1-3)) located in the southeast portion of the development site have poor structure from historical poor pruning practice with dead sections in the crown and weak attachments in the stems. The row of trees is also in direct conflict with the new building foundation. Remove and replace.
- Two trees (tag# 343 & 345) located in the northeast portion of the development site are in poor condition and identified as not viable for retention. Remove and replace.
- Two trees (tag# 348 & 349) are undersized trees located on the development site. The trees are in fair condition with poor structure. These trees are identified as unsuitable for retention. Remove and replace.
- Two trees (tag# 351 & 352) located on the development site are in poor condition with presence of decay and poor structure. Tree #352 is undersized. The trees are identified as not viable for retention. Remove and replace.
- Three trees (tag# 350, 353 & 354) located on the development site are ornamental Pine trees. These trees are identified as not viable for retention due to poor structure and are in conflict with proposed development. Remove and replace.

- Three trees (tag# 355, 358 & 359) located in the northwest portion of the development site are in poor condition and identified as not viable for retention. Remove and replace.
- Two trees (tag# 356 & 357) are located on the development site are in poor condition with poor structures. They are in direct conflict with proposed building foundation. Remove and replace.
- Three neighbouring Pine trees (tag# 360, OS1 & OS2) are located on adjacent west property is recommended for removal in the Arborist report due to its existing poor condition and conflicts with new construction. Prior to removal for shared and off site trees, the applicant must obtain written permission from the adjacent property owner with whom the trees are shared or located (and obtain a valid tree removal permit). If permission to remove the trees is not granted, the trees should be protected as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.

### *Tree Replacement*

The applicant is proposing to remove 17 on-site trees (tag# 343-345, 348-359), however three trees (tag# 348, 349 & 352) are undersized. The OCP tree replacement ratio of 2:1 requires 28 replacement trees to be planted and maintained on-site. Based on the submitted preliminary Landscape Plan (Attachment 2), the developer is proposing to plant 29 new trees.

The size and species of replacement trees, and overall landscape design, will be reviewed in detail through the Development Permit application process. To ensure the replacement trees are planted and maintained on-site, the applicant is required to provide an acceptable Landscape Plan and Landscape Security based on 100% of the cost estimate provided by the Landscape Architect, prior to Development Permit issuance.

Securities will not be released until a landscaping inspection has been passed by City staff after construction and landscaping has been completed. The City may retain a portion of the security for a one year maintenance period from the date of the landscape inspection.

### *Tree Protection*

The proposed Tree Management Plan is provided in Attachment 5, which outlines the protection of the significant Sycamore Maple tree (tag# 346) (130 cm dbh). To ensure the protection of this tree, the applicant is required to provide the following, prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw:

- Submission to the City of a contract with a Certified Arborist for supervision of all works conducted within or in close proximity to tree protection zones and specific provisions as identified above.
- Submission of a Tree Survival Security in the amount of \$10,000 based on the size of the tree to be retained.
- Prior to demolition of the existing dwellings on the subject site, installation of tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained, in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Information Bulletin TREE-03, is required.

### Variance Requested

The proposed development is generally in compliance with the “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)” zone other than the variances noted below. Based on the review of the current plans for the project, the following variances are being requested:

- Reduce the exterior side yard setback (along the Steveston Highway frontage) from 6.0 m (20 ft.) to 4.5 m (15 ft.), in order to provide a 6.0 m rear yard setback to both the ground and second floors of the rear units.

*Staff are supportive of the proposed variance for the following reasons:*

- *The proposed variance is consistent with the Arterial Road Guidelines for Townhouses in the OCP. In this context, the exterior side yard functions as a front yard along Steveston Highway. The Arterial Road Guidelines are supportive of reduced front yard setbacks, provided an appropriate interface with neighbouring properties is provided. The reduced setback along Steveston Highway allows for an increased setback along the north property line, adjacent to existing single-family development. Balconies, bay windows, and porches are not permitted to project into the proposed 4.5 m front yard setback*
- *The proposed 6.0 m rear yard setback to both the ground and second floors of the rear units provides an improved rear yard interface with the existing single-family dwellings to the north and enhances solar access to the rear yards.*
- *The distance between the proposed building face and the back of curb on Steveston Highway would be approximately 8.45 m, in order to accommodate a new sidewalk and treed and grassed boulevard along Steveston Highway.*

The variance will be reviewed in the context of the overall detailed design of the project, including architectural form, site design and landscaping at the Development Permit stage.

### Affordable Housing Strategy

In addition to providing three secondary suites (one bedrooms), the applicant proposes to provide a cash contribution to the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund of \$8.50 per buildable square foot, in accordance with the City’s Affordable Housing Strategy, for a total cash contribution in the amount of \$194,672.

### Public Art

In response to the City’s Public Art Program (Policy 8703), the applicant will provide a voluntary contribution at a rate of \$0.83 per buildable square foot (2017 rate) to the City’s Public Art Reserve Fund, for a total contribution in the amount of \$19,009.15.

### Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) Buffer Zone

The OCP proposes specific land use considerations to protect the City’s agricultural land base in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). These include guidelines for providing landscaped setbacks on non-agricultural sites located in close proximity to ALR lands. The objective of the

landscaped setback is to establish a buffer which identifies the urban/rural interface. The details of the landscaped setback will be reviewed in the context of the overall detailed design of the project at the Development Permit stage.

The proposed development will provide a minimum 4 m-wide landscaped buffer along the south property line of the proposed lots. Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant is required to register a legal agreement on title to ensure that the ALR landscaped buffer planted along Steveston Highway is maintained and will not be abandoned or removed. The legal agreement would also indicate that the property is located adjacent to active agricultural operations and may be subject to potential agricultural impacts including noise, dust and odour.

#### Energy Efficiency

The applicant has committed to design the subject development to meet the City's Step Code requirements (Attachment 6). Details on how all units are to be built and maintained to the City's Step Code requirements will be reviewed at Building Permit stage.

#### Noise Management

To address potential noise impacts generated by traffic on Steveston Highway, a restrictive covenant is required to be registered on Title prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw to ensure that noise attenuation measures are incorporated into dwelling design and construction.

Prior to a Development Permit application being considered by the Development Permit Panel, the applicant is required to submit an acoustical and thermal report and recommendations, prepared by a registered professional, to comply with the requirements of the restrictive covenant.

#### Amenity Space

The applicant is proposing a cash contribution in-lieu of providing the required indoor amenity space on-site. As per the OCP, rezoning applications received prior to February 28, 2019 may choose to provide a cash contribution of \$1,600 per unit for the first 19 units and \$3,200 per unit for additional units. The total cash contribution required for this 20 unit townhouse development is \$33,600.

#### Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

Prior to Building Permit issuance, the developer is required to enter into a Servicing Agreement for the design and construction of required site servicing and frontage improvements, as described in Attachment 7. Site servicing and frontage improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Steveston Highway: construct a new 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk along the south property line and treed/grassed boulevard to the existing curb.
- Southdale Road: road widening, new curb and gutter, a 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk along the east property line and treed/grassed boulevard to the new curb.

- Upgrade approximately 140 m of storm sewer along Steveston Highway and 55 m of sanitary sewer along the rear of the subject site.

The developer is also required to pay Development Cost Charges (DCCs') (City & Metro Vancouver), School Site Acquisition Charge, Address Assignment Fees, and the costs associated with the completion of the required site servicing and frontage improvements as described in Attachment 7.

### Development Permit

A Development Permit application is required to be processed to a satisfactory level, prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. Further refinements to architectural, landscape and urban design will be completed as part of the Development Permit application review process, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Compliance with Development Permit Guidelines for multi-family developments and arterial road townhouses in the OCP;
- Refinement of the proposed building form and architectural features to achieve sufficient variety in design and create an interesting streetscape along Steveston Highway and Southdale Road;
- Refinement of the shared outdoor area design, including the choice of play equipment, to create a safe and vibrant environment for children's play and social interaction; and
- Review of the relevant accessibility features, including aging-in-place features in all units and proposed convertible units.

Additional issues may be identified as part of the Development Permit application review process.

### **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 application is to rezone the properties at 9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 Steveston Highway & 10831 Southdale Road from the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" zone to the "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone, in order to permit the development of 20 townhouse units.

The rezoning application complies with the land use designations and applicable policies contained within the OCP for the subject site. Further review of the project design will be completed at part of the Development Permit application review process.

The list of rezoning considerations is included in Attachment 7, which has been agreed to by the applicant (signed concurrence on file).

On this basis, it is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10082 be introduced and given first reading.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steven De Sousa', with a stylized, cursive script.



Steven De Sousa  
Planner 1

SDS:cas

- Attachment 1: Location Map
- Attachment 2: Conceptual Development Plans
- Attachment 3: Development Application Data Sheet
- Attachment 4: Notification Letter by Applicant
- Attachment 5: Tree Management Plan
- Attachment 6: Step Code Letter from Applicant
- Attachment 7: Rezoning Considerations



City of  
Richmond



RZ 17-763712

Original Date: 03/07/17

Revision Date: 08/14/19

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



# City of Richmond





RZ 17-763712

Original Date: 03/07/17

Revision Date: 08/14/19

Note: Dimensions are in METRES





IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE  
REGISTERED ARCHITECTS  
1000 SOUTHDALE ROAD, SUITE 100  
STEVESTON, BC V3H 1Y1  
TEL: 604.881.9071  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

Copyright Reserved  
This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture and is to be used only for the project and location specified. It is not to be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Imperial Architecture.


Discipline	Architectural
Project Name	STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT
Project Location	1000 SOUTHDALE ROAD, SUITE 100, STEVESTON, BC V3H 1Y1
Client	STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT
Scale	1/16" = 1'-0"
Date	2019-08-22

Author	Architectural
Checker	Architectural
Reviewer	Architectural
Approved	Architectural
Scale	1/16" = 1'-0"
Date	2019-08-22

ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
2019-08-22

STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT  
9371 5651, 9411, 9671 STEVESTON HWY &  
1001 SOUTHDALE ROAD, RICHMOND, BC

1111 SITE PLAN  
Project No. #6211  
Scale 1/16" = 1'-0"  
Drawing No. 1111  
Sheet 1 of 1  
A1.1



1 SITE / LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN  
A1.1 SCALE 1/16" = 1'-0"



CNCL - 155


VARIANCE REQUIRED:  
 1. EXTERIOR SIDE YARD (SOUTH): REDUCE REQUIRED SETBACK FROM 6.0M REQUIRED TO 4.56M PROVIDED MEET OCP DESIGN GUIDELINE REQUIREMENTS

A STATUARY RIGHT-OF-WAY OVER THE ENTIRE VEHICLE DRIVE AISLE IS TO BE REGISTERED FOR PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-PASSAGE

INTERNAL DRIVE AISLE TO BE ENGINEERED TO SUPPORT FIRE TRUCK @ 80,000 LBS



CNCL - 156



Average Grading Calculation			
Point	Location	Proposed Grade	Notes
1	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
2	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
3	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
4	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
5	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
6	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
7	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
8	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
9	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
10	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
11	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
12	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
13	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
14	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
15	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
16	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
17	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
18	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
19	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
20	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
Average Grade		1.00 Meter	

Ground Floor Interior Elevation Calculation

Point	Location	Proposed Grade	Notes
1	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
2	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
3	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
4	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
5	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
6	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
7	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
8	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
9	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
10	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
11	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
12	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
13	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
14	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
15	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
16	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
17	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
18	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
19	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
20	Top of Road	1.00 Meter	Adjacent to 20' Wide Right-of-Way
Average Grade		1.00 Meter	

1 SITE PLAN SCALE 1/16"=1'-0"

A STATUARY RIGHT-OF-WAY OVER THE ENTIRE VEHICLE DRIVE AISLE IS TO BE REGISTERED FOR PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-PASSAGE

PLAN #1

ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION

2019-08-22

STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT

9711 98th Ave S Steveston Hwy & 108th St Steveston, Richmond, BC

SITE PLAN

Scale 1/16"=1'-0"

Sheet A.1.2 of 1

IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE

REGISTERED ARCHITECTS OF PRACTICE

100-10101 101st Ave S Steveston, Richmond, BC

ARCHITECTURE

DESIGN

PLANNING

Copyright Reserved

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from Imperial Architecture.

Disclaimer

This plan is a preliminary design and is not to be used for construction or other purposes without the written consent of Imperial Architecture.

Item	Area (sq. ft.)	Volume (cu. ft.)	Weight (lbs.)
1. Concrete	1000	1000	15000
2. Steel	500	500	15000
3. Brick	1000	1000	15000
4. Lumber	1000	1000	15000
5. Glass	1000	1000	15000
6. Insulation	1000	1000	15000
7. Drywall	1000	1000	15000
8. Paint	1000	1000	15000
9. Flooring	1000	1000	15000
10. Other	1000	1000	15000
<b>Total</b>	<b>10000</b>	<b>10000</b>	<b>150000</b>



Project No. **#8211** Scale **3/32"=1'-0"**  
 Drawing No. \_\_\_\_\_ Sheet \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_

[illegible][illegible]

TRUCK TURNING DIAGRAM:  
SU-9 TRUCK TURNING DIAGRAM SIMULATION GENERATED BY AUTOTURN SOFTWARE



**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
 BUILDING OF AN AEC CERTIFICATE OF PRACTICE  
 1000 WEST 10TH AVENUE, SUITE 100  
 DENVER, CO 80202  
 TEL: 303.733.1111  
 FAX: 303.733.1112  
 WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

ARCHITECTS  
 INTERIOR  
 PLUMBERS

Copyright Reserved  
 No part of this drawing may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from Imperial Architecture, 1000 West 10th Avenue, Suite 100, Denver, CO 80202.


DISCLAIMER  
 This drawing is prepared for the purpose of zoning and building department review only. It is not to be used for construction or other purposes without the written consent of Imperial Architecture.

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

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

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

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



ARCHITECTURE  
PLANS  
FLOOR PLANS

Copyright Imperial  
Imperial Architecture of Practice  
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from Imperial Architecture of Practice.

Distributor  
Imperial Architecture of Practice, 10000 South 10th Avenue, Suite 100, Denver, CO 80231  
Imperial Architecture of Practice, 10000 South 10th Avenue, Suite 100, Denver, CO 80231

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


ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
2019-08-22

STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT  
9971 59th Ave, STEVESTON HWY &  
10831 SOUTHERLAND ROAD, RICHMOND, BC


BUILDING B  
FLOOR PLANS

Scale 1/8"=1'-0"


Sheet A2.2




1 BUILDING B LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



2 BUILDING B LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



3 BUILDING B LEVEL 3 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



**IMPERIAL  
ARCHITECTURE**  
REGISTERED ARCHITECTS OF PRACTICE  
ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, PLANNERS  
1001 SOUTHDALE ROAD, ARLINGTON, NC  
703.441.1111  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

ARCHITECT  
INTERIOR  
PLANNING

Copyright Reserved

This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture, Inc. and is to be used only for the project and location specified. It is not to be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Imperial Architecture, Inc.

Discussions: Discussions of this drawing should be held with the architect or architect-in-charge. No changes should be made without the prior written permission of Imperial Architecture, Inc.

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

ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
2019-08-22


STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT  
6571.951, 6611.941 STEVESTON HWY &  
1001 SOUTHDALE ROAD, ARLINGTON, NC

BUILDING C & D  
FLOOR PLANS


Page No.  
#6211

Scale  
1/8"=1'-0"


Sheet  
A 2.3




3 BUILDING D LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



4 BUILDING D LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




1 BUILDING C LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



2 BUILDING C LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"





**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
BUILDING OF AN ARCHITECTURE OF PRACTICE  
ARCHITECTS  
INTERIOR DESIGNERS  
PLANNERS

ARCHITECT  
INTERIOR DESIGNER  
PLANNER

Copyright Reserved

This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture, Inc. and is to be used only for the project and location indicated. No part of this drawing may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from Imperial Architecture, Inc.

Disclaimer

This drawing is not intended to be used for any purpose other than that for which it was prepared. It is not to be used for any other project, location, or purpose without the prior written consent of Imperial Architecture, Inc.

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

ISSUED FOR PERMITTING  
RESUBMISSION  
2019-08-22


STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT  
9771 59TH AVE. S.W. STEVESTON HWY. &  
10011 SOUTHDALE ROAD, RICHMOND, BC

BUILDING E & F  
FLOOR PLANS


Project No.  
#8211

Scale  
1/8"=1'-0"


Sheet  
A2.4




3 BUILDING F LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




4 BUILDING F LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



1 BUILDING E LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



2 BUILDING E LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
 ARCHITECTS  
 1001 STEVENSON HWY., SUITE 100  
 RICHMOND, VA 23220  
 (804) 781-1111  
 www.imperialarchitects.com

ARCHITECT  
 DESIGN  
 PLANNING

Copyright Reserved  
 No part of this document may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from Imperial Architecture.

Disclaimer  
 This document is the property of Imperial Architecture. It is to be used only for the project and site specified herein. It is not to be used for any other project or site without the written consent of Imperial Architecture.

ISSUED FOR REZONING  
 RESUBMISSION  
 2019-08-22


STEVENSON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT	1001 STEVENSON HWY., SUITE 100	RICHMOND, VA 23220
ARCHITECT	IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE	(804) 781-1111
DESIGNER	IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE	(804) 781-1111
PLANNER	IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE	(804) 781-1111
DATE	2019-08-22	
PROJECT	STEVENSON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT	
SITE	1001 STEVENSON HWY., SUITE 100	RICHMOND, VA 23220
SCALE	1/16" = 1'-0"	
SHEET	A 3.0	


STEVENSON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
 1001 STEVENSON HWY., SUITE 100  
 RICHMOND, VA 23220

CONTEXT / STREET ELEVATIONS

Scale 1/16" = 1'-0"

Sheet A 3.0





Copyright Reserved  
 No part of this drawing may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from the author.


NO.	REVISION	DATE
1	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
2	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
3	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
4	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
5	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
6	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
7	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
8	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
9	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
10	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22

ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION  
 2019-08-22


STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
 9711 59th, 9611 60th STEVESTON HWY &  
 11811 SOUTHDOWN ROAD, RICHMOND, BC

BUILDING A ELEVATIONS


Page No. #8211  
 Scale 1/8"=1'-0"  
 Drawing No. A 3.1




1 BUILDING A SOUTH ELEVATION (STEVESTON HWY)  
 SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



2 BUILDING A NORTH ELEVATION (INTERNAL DRIVEWAY)  
 SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



3 BUILDING A WEST ELEVATION  
 SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
 REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS  
 1001 STEVESTON AVENUE, SUITE 100  
 STEVESTON, BC V9A 1G1  
 TEL: (604) 261-1111  
 FAX: (604) 261-1112  
 WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

**Copyright Reserved**  
 No part of this drawing may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Imperial Architecture.


**Disclaimers**  
 This drawing is for informational purposes only and does not constitute a contract. The client is responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and approvals from the relevant authorities. The architect is not responsible for the accuracy of the information provided by the client or for the results of the construction.

NO.	REVISION	DATE	BY	CHKD.
1	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22		

**STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT**  
 9911 99th, 9911-99th STEVESTON HWY & 100th SOUTHDOWN ROAD, RICHMOND, BC

**BUILDING B ELEVATIONS**

Sheet: **A 3.2**  
 Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"  
 Date: 2019-08-22



IMPERIAL  
ARCHITECTURE  
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS  
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS  
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS  
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL INTERIOR DESIGNERS

ARCHITECT  
INTERIOR  
PLANNING

Copyright Reserved

This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture, Inc. and is not to be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Imperial Architecture, Inc.

Distributed by: Imperial Architecture, Inc. 1001 Southdale Road, Richmond, BC V6V 2G1  
Imperial Architecture, Inc. is a registered trademark of Imperial Architecture, Inc.

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


ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
2019-08-22

STEVENSON TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT  
5571, 5591, 5611, 5671 STEVENSON HWY &  
1001 SOUTHDALL ROAD, RICHMOND, BC


BUILDING C ELEVATIONS

Project No. #6211  
Scale 1/8"=1'-0"


Sheet  
A 3.3




2 BUILDING C EAST ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




4 BUILDING C WEST SIDE ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



1 BUILDING C SOUTH ELEVATION (INTERNAL DRIVEWAY)  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



3 BUILDING C NORTH SIDE ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



IMPERIAL  
ARCHITECTURE  
BUILDING OF AN LLC CERTIFICATE OF PRACTICE  
AMERICAN ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION  
REGISTERED ARCHITECT  
REGISTERED ARCHITECT  
REGISTERED ARCHITECT

ARCHITECT  
IMPERIAL  
ARCHITECTURE  
P.C.

Copyright Reserved

This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture, P.C. and is not to be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Imperial Architecture, P.C.

Imperial Architecture, P.C. is not responsible for the accuracy of the information provided in this drawing. The user of this drawing is responsible for the accuracy of the information provided in this drawing.

REVISION	DATE	BY	DESCRIPTION
1	08/22/2019	IMPERIAL	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION
2	08/22/2019	IMPERIAL	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION
3	08/22/2019	IMPERIAL	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION
4	08/22/2019	IMPERIAL	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION
5	08/22/2019	IMPERIAL	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION
6	08/22/2019	IMPERIAL	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION
7	08/22/2019	IMPERIAL	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION
8	08/22/2019	IMPERIAL	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION
9	08/22/2019	IMPERIAL	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION
10	08/22/2019	IMPERIAL	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION


ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
2019-08-22

STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT  
9511 99th, 9611 99th STEVESTON HWY &  
10411 SOUTHDIALE ROAD, RICHMOND, BC


BUILDING D ELEVATIONS

Page No. 48211  
Scale 1/8"=1'-0"  
Drawing No. 18-01-07


A 3.4




2 BUILDING D EAST SIDE ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




4 BUILDING D WEST SIDE ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




1 BUILDING D SOUTH ELEVATION (INTERNAL DRIVEWAY)  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




3 BUILDING D NORTH SIDE ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




2 BUILDING E EAST SIDE ELEVATION  
A3.5 SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




4 BUILDING E WEST SIDE ELEVATION  
A3.5 SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



1 BUILDING E SOUTH ELEVATION (INTERNAL DRIVEWAY)  
A3.5 SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



3 BUILDING E NORTH ELEVATION  
A3.5 SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**

REGISTERED ARCHITECTS

1001 SOUTHDALE ROAD, RICHMOND, NC 28801

TEL: 704.321.1111

WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

ARCHITECT: IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE

PROJECT: STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT


DATE: 2019-08-22

ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION

Copyright Reserved


No part of this drawing may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from Imperial Architecture.

This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture and is to be used only for the project and site specified herein.




1. BUILDING F SOUTH ELEVATION (INTERNAL DRIVEWAY)  
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"

2. BUILDING F EAST ELEVATION (SOUTHDALE)  
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"



3. BUILDING F NORTH SIDE ELEVATION  
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"



4. BUILDING F WEST SIDE ELEVATION  
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"

STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT

1001 SOUTHDALE ROAD, RICHMOND, NC 28801

TEL: 704.321.1111

WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM


ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION

2019-08-22

Copyright Reserved

No part of this drawing may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from Imperial Architecture.

This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture and is to be used only for the project and site specified herein.



**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
BUILDING OF AN ARCHITECTURE OF PRACTICE  
ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, PLANNERS, INTERIORS, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS, ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGNERS, AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGERS  
10000 WILLOW CREEK DRIVE, SUITE 100  
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23234  
TEL: 703.600.1000  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

ARCHITECT  
INTERIOR  
PLANNING

Copyright Reserved

This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture, Inc. and is to be used only for the project and location specified. It is not to be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Imperial Architecture, Inc.

DISCLAIMER

Imperial Architecture, Inc. is not responsible for the accuracy of the information provided by the client or for the results of the design. The client is responsible for the accuracy of the information provided and for the results of the design.

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE
1	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
2	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
3	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
4	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
5	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
6	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
7	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
8	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
9	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22
10	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION	2019-08-22


ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
2019-08-22

STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT  
9711 59th, 9411 59th STEVESTON HWY &  
1881 SCOTTSDALE ROAD, RICHMOND, BC

BUILDING SECTIONS


Sheet 18" x 11" 1/4"

A 4.1



1 BUILDING A SECTION (SIM. TO BUILDING B)

SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




2 BUILDING D CROSS SECTION

SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"

3 BUILDING A CROSS SECTION (SIM. TO BUILDING B)

SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



**IMPERIAL  
ARCHITECTURE**  
BRIAN L. LEE, ARCHITECT  
10000 W. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100  
DENVER, CO 80202  
TEL: 303.733.8888  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECT.COM

ARCHITECT  
INTERIOR  
DESIGN  
LANDSCAPE

**Copyright Reserved**

This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture and is to be used only for the project and site specified. It is not to be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Imperial Architecture.

**DISCLAIMER:**  
Imperial Architecture is not responsible for the accuracy of the information provided by the client or for the results of the design. The client is responsible for the accuracy of the information provided and for the results of the design.

Item	Quantity	Unit	Price	Total
1.00	1.00	Sq. Ft.	1.00	1.00
2.00	2.00	Sq. Ft.	2.00	2.00
3.00	3.00	Sq. Ft.	3.00	3.00
4.00	4.00	Sq. Ft.	4.00	4.00
5.00	5.00	Sq. Ft.	5.00	5.00
6.00	6.00	Sq. Ft.	6.00	6.00
7.00	7.00	Sq. Ft.	7.00	7.00
8.00	8.00	Sq. Ft.	8.00	8.00
9.00	9.00	Sq. Ft.	9.00	9.00
10.00	10.00	Sq. Ft.	10.00	10.00

**ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
2019-08-22**

**STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT**  
6511 JEFFERSON AVE. STEVESTON HWY. &  
10811 SOUTHDALE ROAD, RICHMOND, BC

**COLOR RENDERING**  
Project No. #9211  
Scale N.T.S.  
Drawing No. Sheet  
Revision


**A0.1**



Copyright reserved. The drawing and design is the property of M2 Landscape Architecture and is not to be reproduced or used for other projects without their permission.



M2 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE  
#R220 - 28 Lorne Mews  
New Westminster, British Columbia  
Tel: 604.553.0044  
Fax: 604.553.0045  
Email: office@m2la.com




CNCL - 171

SITE PLAN  
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"

PLANT SCHEDULE		MS FOR NUMBER: 18 039	
NO.	PLANT NAME	COMMON NAME	PLANT TO BE 7 REMOVED
1	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
2	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
3	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
4	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
5	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
6	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
7	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
8	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
9	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
10	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
11	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
12	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
13	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
14	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
15	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
16	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
17	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
18	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
19	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
20	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
21	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
22	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
23	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
24	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
25	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
26	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
27	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
28	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
29	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
30	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
31	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
32	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
33	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
34	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
35	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
36	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
37	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
38	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
39	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
40	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
41	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
42	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
43	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
44	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
45	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
46	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
47	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
48	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
49	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
50	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
51	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
52	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
53	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
54	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
55	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
56	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
57	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
58	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
59	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
60	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
61	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
62	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
63	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
64	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
65	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
66	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
67	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
68	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
69	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
70	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
71	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
72	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
73	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
74	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
75	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
76	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
77	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
78	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
79	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
80	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
81	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
82	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
83	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
84	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
85	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
86	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
87	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
88	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
89	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
90	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
91	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
92	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
93	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
94	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
95	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
96	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
97	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
98	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
99	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO
100	ACER CARMINE	RED BARKED MAPLE	NO

ALL PLANT MATERIAL MUST BE PROVIDED FROM CERTIFIED DISEASE FREE NURSERY. PROVIDE CERTIFICATION UPON REQUEST.

AMENITY AREA  
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"



PROJECT: STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
989-997 Steveston Hwy  
1201 Steveston Rd  
RICHMOND, BC

DRAWING TITLE: TREE PLAN


DATE: 04/11/2020  
SCALE: VARIOUS  
DRAWING NO: L1  
SHEET NO: 06 OF 6  
MSLA PROJECT NUMBER: 171-009-2019

NO.	DATE	REVISION DESCRIPTION	BY
1	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
2	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
3	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
4	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
5	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
6	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
7	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
8	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
9	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
10	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
11	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
12	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
13	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
14	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
15	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
16	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
17	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
18	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
19	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
20	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
21	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
22	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
23	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
24	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
25	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
26	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
27	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
28	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
29	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
30	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
31	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
32	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
33	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
34	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
35	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
36	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
37	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
38	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
39	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
40	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
41	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
42	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
43	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
44	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
45	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
46	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
47	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
48	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
49	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
50	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
51	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
52	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
53	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
54	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
55	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
56	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
57	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
58	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
59	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
60	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
61	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
62	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
63	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
64	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
65	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
66	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
67	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
68	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
69	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
70	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
71	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
72	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
73	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
74	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
75	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
76	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
77	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
78	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
79	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
80	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
81	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
82	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
83	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
84	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
85	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
86	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
87	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
88	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
89	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
90	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
91	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
92	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
93	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
94	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
95	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
96	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
97	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
98	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
99	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT
100	04/11/2020	REV AS PER CITY COMMENTS	DT

Copyright reserved. This drawing and design is the property of M2 Landscape Architecture and shall not be reproduced or used for other projects without their permission.



#230 - 26 Lorne Mews  
V6M 3L8, Westminster, British Columbia  
Tel: 604.553.0045  
Fax: 604.553.0045  
Email: office@m2la.com



SITE PLAN  
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"

PLANT SCHEDULE			M2 JOB NUMBER: 18-039	
SYMBOL	KEY	SYMBOL	PLANTED AREA / REMARKS	
1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9
10	10	10	10	10
11	11	11	11	11
12	12	12	12	12
13	13	13	13	13
14	14	14	14	14
15	15	15	15	15
16	16	16	16	16
17	17	17	17	17
18	18	18	18	18
19	19	19	19	19
20	20	20	20	20
21	21	21	21	21
22	22	22	22	22
23	23	23	23	23
24	24	24	24	24
25	25	25	25	25
26	26	26	26	26
27	27	27	27	27
28	28	28	28	28
29	29	29	29	29
30	30	30	30	30
31	31	31	31	31
32	32	32	32	32
33	33	33	33	33
34	34	34	34	34
35	35	35	35	35
36	36	36	36	36
37	37	37	37	37
38	38	38	38	38
39	39	39	39	39
40	40	40	40	40
41	41	41	41	41
42	42	42	42	42
43	43	43	43	43
44	44	44	44	44
45	45	45	45	45
46	46	46	46	46
47	47	47	47	47
48	48	48	48	48
49	49	49	49	49
50	50	50	50	50
51	51	51	51	51
52	52	52	52	52
53	53	53	53	53
54	54	54	54	54
55	55	55	55	55
56	56	56	56	56
57	57	57	57	57
58	58	58	58	58
59	59	59	59	59
60	60	60	60	60
61	61	61	61	61
62	62	62	62	62
63	63	63	63	63
64	64	64	64	64
65	65	65	65	65
66	66	66	66	66
67	67	67	67	67
68	68	68	68	68
69	69	69	69	69
70	70	70	70	70
71	71	71	71	71
72	72	72	72	72
73	73	73	73	73
74	74	74	74	74
75	75	75	75	75
76	76	76	76	76
77	77	77	77	77
78	78	78	78	78
79	79	79	79	79
80	80	80	80	80
81	81	81	81	81
82	82	82	82	82
83	83	83	83	83
84	84	84	84	84
85	85	85	85	85
86	86	86	86	86
87	87	87	87	87
88	88	88	88	88
89	89	89	89	89
90	90	90	90	90
91	91	91	91	91
92	92	92	92	92
93	93	93	93	93
94	94	94	94	94
95	95	95	95	95
96	96	96	96	96
97	97	97	97	97
98	98	98	98	98
99	99	99	99	99
100	100	100	100	100

NOTE: \* PLANT SIZES IN THIS LIST ARE SPECIFIED ACCORDING TO THE BC LANDSCAPE STANDARDS LATEST EDITION. CONFORMANCE SIZES SPECIFIED AS PER THE BC LANDSCAPE STANDARDS LATEST EDITION. \* PLANT MATERIAL MUST BE PROVIDED FROM CERTIFIED DISEASE FREE NURSERY. PROVIDE CERTIFICATION UPON REQUEST.

NO.	DATE	REVISION / DESCRIPTION
1	2018-03-09	ISSUED FOR PERMIT
2	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
3	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
4	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
5	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
6	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
7	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
8	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
9	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
10	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
11	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
12	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
13	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
14	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
15	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
16	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
17	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
18	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
19	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
20	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
21	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
22	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
23	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
24	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
25	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
26	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
27	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
28	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
29	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
30	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
31	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
32	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
33	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
34	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
35	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
36	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
37	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
38	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
39	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
40	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
41	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
42	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
43	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
44	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
45	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
46	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
47	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
48	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
49	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
50	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
51	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
52	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
53	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
54	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
55	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
56	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
57	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
58	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
59	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
60	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
61	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
62	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
63	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
64	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
65	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
66	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
67	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
68	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
69	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
70	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
71	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
72	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
73	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
74	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
75	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
76	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
77	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
78	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
79	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
80	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
81	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
82	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
83	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
84	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
85	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
86	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
87	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
88	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
89	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
90	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
91	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
92	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
93	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
94	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
95	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
96	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
97	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
98	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
99	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
100	2018-03-09	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS


PROJECT: STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
9581-9571 Steveston Hwy  
1087 Steveston Rd  
RICHMOND, BC

DRAWING TITLE: TREE PLAN

DATE: 2018-03-09  
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"  
DRAWING NO: 18-039  
DESIGN: M2  
CHECK: M2  
DATE: 2018-03-09

OF 8

18-039

[illegible]





**STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT**  
9591-9671 Steveston Hwy  
10831 Southdale Rd  
RICHMOND, BC

\_\_\_\_\_




## LANDSCAPE DETAILS

DATE: 10 MAY 79	DRAWING NUMBER:
SCALE: VARIES	<div style="text-align: center; font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold;">57</div> <div style="text-align: right; font-weight: bold;">OF 5</div>
DRAWN: DY	
SIGN: DY	
CHECKED: MTH	




0472-4400/95 \$07.00



2 5' WOOD PERIMETER FENCE  
L4 SCALE: 1/2"=1'-0"



WOOD FENCE AND GATE



**NOTE.**

1. ALL WOOD MEMBERS TO BE PRESERVE TREATED TO C.S.A. STANDARDS
2. ALL MASONRY TO BE UNGLAZED GALVANIZED
3. APPLY TWO COATS OF STAIN TO MATCH BUILDING TO BE APPROVED BY OWNER OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT







**RZ 17-763712**

**Attachment 3**

Address: 9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 Steveston Highway & 10831 Southdale Road

Applicant: CLO Ventures K2 Ltd.

Planning Area(s): Broadmoor

	Existing	Proposed
<b>Owner:</b>	CLO Ventures K2 Ltd.	To be determined
<b>Site Size:</b>	3554.2 m <sup>2</sup> (38,257 ft <sup>2</sup> )	3546.2 m <sup>2</sup> (38,171 ft <sup>2</sup> ) Corner cut: 8 m <sup>2</sup> (86 ft <sup>2</sup> )
<b>Land Uses:</b>	Single-family residential	Multiple-family residential
<b>OCP Designation:</b>	Neighbourhood Residential (NRES)	No change
<b>Zoning:</b>	Single Detached (RS1/E)	Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)
<b>Number of Units:</b>	5	20

	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.6	0.6	None permitted
Lot Coverage – Buildings:	Max. 40%	38%	None
Lot Coverage – Non-porous:	Max. 65%	56%	None
Lot Coverage – Live Landscaping:	Min. 25%	28%	None
Lot Size:	N/A	3546.2 m <sup>2</sup>	None
Lot Width:	Min. 50.0 m	96.0 m	None
Lot Depth:	Min. 35.0 m	36.6 m	None
Setbacks – Front (East):	Min. 6.0 m	6.0 m	None
Setbacks – Rear (West):	Min. 3.0 m	3.0 m	None
Setbacks – Exterior Side (South):	Min. 6.0 m	4.5 m	Variance requested
Setbacks – Interior Side (North):	Min. 3.0 m	6.0 m	None
Height:	Max. 12.0 m (3 storeys)	Front Buildings: 12.0 m (3 storeys) Rear Buildings: 9.0 m (2 storeys)	None
Off-street Parking Spaces – Regular (R) / Visitor (V):	Min. 2.0 (R) and 0.2 (V) per unit	2.0 (R) and 0.2 (V) per unit	None
Off-street Parking Spaces – Accessible:	Min. 2% where three or more visitor spaces required = 1	1	None

	<b>Bylaw Requirement</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Variance</b>
Off-street Parking Spaces – Total:	Min. 40 (R) and 4 (V)	40 (R) and 4 (V)	None
Tandem Parking Spaces:	Permitted – Maximum of 50% of required spaces	0	None
Small Car Spaces:	Max. 50%	50%	None
Bicycle Parking Spaces – Class 1:	Min. 1.25 per unit = 25	25	None
Bicycle Parking Spaces – Class 2:	Min. 0.2 per unit = 4	4	None
Amenity Space – Indoor:	Min. 70 m <sup>2</sup> or cash-in-lieu	Cash-in-lieu	None
Amenity Space – Outdoor:	Min. 6.0 m <sup>2</sup> per unit = 120 m <sup>2</sup>	134 m <sup>2</sup>	None

CLO Ventures K2 LTD

Add: 5731 No.3 Rd, Richmond, BC, V6X 2C9

Office: 604-285-9818 ext 303 Fax: 604-285-9816

---

July 11, 2019

HAND DELIVERED

To: Occupants

We are the developer to the south of your property developing townhouses located at 9671, 9611, 9591 & 9571 Steveston Highway and 10831 Southdale Road, Richmond. We are sending you information to notify and keep you informed of this upcoming project. Kindly find attached the current draft developing plans for your reference

(ATTACHMENT A).

The proposed development consists of approximately 20 townhouse units. The design of the proposal is in full compliance with various requirements with City of Richmond. The land use of the proposed development complies with Official Community Plan (OCP), the density and building height comply with Zoning Bylaw requirement. The front buildings are 3 storeys in height with both south and north end of buildings reduced to 2 storeys to adept our neighbour's single-family homes. The rear buildings are all proposed to be 2 storeys. We will have more information to communicate after Planning Committee.

Should there be any questions or concerns about the project, please do not hesitate to email me at [84welton@gmail.com](mailto:84welton@gmail.com) or contact my direct line at 604-760-6983. Thank you for your valuable time in reading this notice.

Yours Sincerely,



Welton Wu






Director

CLO VENTURES K2 LTD.

Development Project: 9671, 9611, 9591 & 9571 Steveston Highway and 10831 Southdale Road

I hand-delivered the Notification envelope containing a letter and site plan proposal(Attachment A) to the mail box of the following neighbors:

Neighboring Properties Notification Summary

	Neighbor's Address	Developer Representative	Date (DD-MM-YYYY)	Time	Feedback	Signature
1	9940 Mortfield , Richmond	Welton Wu	12/07/2019	6:00 pm	No comments	
2	9960 Mortfield , Richmond	Welton Wu	12/07/2019	6:05 pm	No comment	
3	9980 Mortfield , Richmond	Welton Wu	12/07/2019	6:08 pm	No comment	
4	10811 Southdale Rd , Richmond	Welton Wu	12/07/2019	6:15 pm	No comment	
5	9551 Steveston Hwy , Richmond	Welton Wu	12/07/2019	6:20 pm	Wait for Tree cut approve.	


EXISTING TREES:  
refer to the arborist report

Tree Number	Species	DBH cm
343	Prunus spp. Flowering cherry	22
344	Chaetachyparis pislifera	40 (average)
345	Sawara cypress	62
346	Betula pendula, European birch	130
347	Acer pseudoplatanus, Sycamore maple	57
348	Quercus robur, English oak	15 (average)
349	Acer pseudoplatanus, Sycamore maple	16 (average)
350	Pinus densifolia, Japanese red pine	38
351	Prunus cerasifera, Flowering plum	45
352	Acer palmatum, Japanese maple	10 (average)
353	Pinus densifolia, Japanese red pine	30
354	Pinus densifolia, Japanese red pine	26
355	Picea pungens, Blue colorado spruce	38
356	Prunus cerasifera, Flowering plum	26
357	Aesculus hippocastanum, Horsechestnut	100
358	Malus spp., Apple	30
359	Pyrus calleryana, Pear	20
OS1	Pinus nigra, Austrian pine	35
OS2	Pinus nigra, Austrian pine	30


CNCL - 179

REPLACEMENT TREES:

Tree Number	Species	DBH cm
OS1	Pinus nigra, Austrian pine	35
OS2	Pinus nigra, Austrian pine	30



SITE PLAN  
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"




COORDINATION WITH ARBORIST - NOTE:  
NO WORK IS TO BE DONE WITHIN 1.5M OF TREE PROTECTION FENCING. PREPARATORY WORK AND CONSTRUCTION WITHIN AND IN DIRECTLY ADJACENT AREAS MUST BE DONE WITHIN THE TREE PROTECTION FENCING. ALL WORKS ARE TO BE COORDINATED WITH THE PROJECT ARBORIST IN ADVANCE OF COMMENCING THEM AND SUPERVISED AT THE DISCRETION OF THE PROJECT ARBORIST IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARBORICULTURAL BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.

NO EXCAVATION IS TO OCCUR WITHIN THE TREE PROTECTION ZONE. NO GRADE CHANGES ARE TO OCCUR WITHIN THE TREE PROTECTION AREA. PROJECT ARBORIST TO COORDINATE WITH ARCHITECT FOR CANTILEVERED SLAB BUILDING FOOTPRINT WITHIN NO WORK ZONE. SEE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS FOR DETAILS.  
TREE REMOVALS AND RETENTION DEPICTED ON THIS PLAN ARE BASED ON THE MOST RECENT FORM OF DEVELOPMENT SUBMITTED TO MO.  
TREE #346 SYCAMORE MAPLE IS TO BE EVALUATED ON A YEARLY BASIS AND/OR AFTER ANY MAJOR STORM EVENT, BY A QUALIFIED TREE RISK ASSESSOR.

TREE PROTECTION FENCE TO BE PLACED AT MIN 65M FROM FACE OF TRUNK

NOTE: ALL TREES REGARDLESS OF SIZE ARE PROTECTED IN HIGH ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS



NO WORK WITHIN 1.5M OF TREE PROTECTION FENCING. ARBORIST REQUIRED ON SITE TO MONITOR ALL WORK WITHIN TPZ

MINIMUM REQUIRED PROTECTION RADIUS FOR TREES LARGER THAN 100CM DBH

TRUNK DIAMETER (CM)	MINIMUM REQUIRED PROTECTION RADIUS (M)
20	1.2
25	1.3
30	1.6
35	2.1
40	2.4
45	2.7
50	3
55	3.3
60	3.6
75	4.5
100	5
120	6.0

EXTRAPOLATE PROTECTION RADIUS FOR TREES LARGER THAN 100CM DBH  
101M AT BREAST HEIGHT OR 1.4M FROM GRADE.

SOLID 2x4 CONSTRUCTION WITH CROSS BRACING TOP AND BOTTOM RAILS  
PLASTIC MESH SCREENING

**M2**  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE  
#220 - 26 Lorne Mews  
Vancouver, British Columbia  
Tel: 604.553.0044  
Fax: 604.553.0045  
Email: office@m2la.com



NO.	DATE	REVISION DESCRIPTION	BY
1	2014.01.14	REVISED TREE PROTECTION FENCING	DP
2	2014.01.14	REVISED TREE PROTECTION FENCING	DP
3	2014.01.14	REVISED TREE PROTECTION FENCING	DP
4	2014.01.14	REVISED TREE PROTECTION FENCING	DP
5	2014.01.14	REVISED TREE PROTECTION FENCING	DP
6	2014.01.14	REVISED TREE PROTECTION FENCING	DP
7	2014.01.14	REVISED TREE PROTECTION FENCING	DP
8	2014.01.14	REVISED TREE PROTECTION FENCING	DP
9	2014.01.14	REVISED TREE PROTECTION FENCING	DP
10	2014.01.14	REVISED TREE PROTECTION FENCING	DP

STEVESTON TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
9591-9671 Steveston Hwy  
10871 Southside Rd  
RICHMOND, BC

**ATTACHMENT 5**  
DRAWING TITLE: TREE MANAGEMENT PLAN  
DATE: 2014.01.14  
SCALE: VARIOUS  
DRAWING BY: DP  
CHECKED BY: DP  
PROJECT NUMBER: 179



**JRS ENGINEERING**  
BUILDING ENVELOPE CONSULTANTS

Project: VR19008

August 13, 2019

City of Richmond  
Policy Planning Department  
T: 604-204-8529

Attention: Steven De Sousa

Dear Sir:

Re: Assurance Letter – Step Code Compliance  
• 9571 Steveston Townhouse Development

This project is currently in the conceptual design phase, which includes the building elevations and suite layouts. Mechanical, electrical, envelope, structural disciplines are still in the early phases, and various options are being considered and investigated.

This letter is to indicate that the project will be designed to meet the City's Step Code requirements (i.e. Step 3 of the Energy Step Code).

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

JRS ENGINEERING

Per:

Jack Cui, P.Eng., MSc, LEED® AP  
Sr Energy Modeling Specialist | Division Manager



**AUG 13 2019**



# City of Richmond

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

**Address:** 9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 Steveston Highway &  
10831 Southdale Road

**File No.:** RZ 17-763712

**Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10082, the developer is required to complete the following:**

1. Dedication of a 4 m x 4 m corner cut as road at the southeast corner of the subject site (at the intersection of Steveston Highway and Southdale Road).
2. Consolidation of all the lots into one development parcel (which will require the demolition of the existing dwellings).
3. Submission of a Contract entered into between the applicant and a Certified Arborist for supervision of any on-site works conducted within the tree protection zone of the trees to be retained. The Contract should include the scope of work to be undertaken, including: the proposed number of site monitoring inspections, and a provision for the Arborist to submit a post-construction assessment report to the City for review. The Contract should also include the following provisions for the retention of Sycamore Maple tree (tag# 346):
  - a) no encroachment of buildings within the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ);
  - b) no grade changes within the TPZ;
  - c) crown reduction and/or thinning of the crown as needed;
  - d) on-site monitoring by the Project Arborist throughout the duration of construction;
  - e) site drainage mitigation may be required during preload within TPZ;
  - f) contract for watering as needed during summer dry months; and
  - g) evaluation of the tree by a Qualified Tree Risk Assessor on a yearly basis or after any major storm events.
4. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of \$10,000 for Sycamore Maple tree (tag# 346) to be retained. The City will retain a portion of the security for a one year maintenance period from the date of the inspection.
5. Installation of appropriate tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained as part of the development prior to any construction activities, including building demolition, occurring on-site.
6. 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.
7. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
8. Registration of a cross-access easement, statutory right-of-way, property right-of-passage, and/or other legal agreements or measures, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, over the entry driveway to the site and entire length of all internal drive aisles, in favour of the future developments located to the west of the subject development, to permit shared use. The legal agreement is to include that the City will not be responsible for maintenance or liability, no permanent structures are to be placed at the west end of the east-west drive aisle, and the intent and existence of the legal agreements are to be made known to the purchasers of any unit(s) and the strata council of this development.

9. Registration of a legal agreement on title ensuring a 4.0 m wide landscaped buffer planted on-site along Steveston Highway (as measured from the south property line) is maintained and will not be abandoned or removed. The legal agreement is also to indicate that the property is potentially subject to impacts of noise, dust, and odour resulting from agricultural operations due to the subject site's proximity to properties in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR).
10. The submission and processing of a Development Permit\* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.
11. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$0.83 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$19,009.15) to the City's public art fund.
12. Contribution of \$1,600 per dwelling unit for the first 19 dwelling units and \$3,200 per dwelling unit for additional dwelling units (e.g. \$33,600) in-lieu of on-site indoor amenity space.
13. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$8.50 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$194,672) to the City's affordable housing fund.
14. Registration of a legal agreement on Title, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, to ensure that:
  - a) no final Building Permit inspection is granted until three secondary suites are constructed on-site, to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the BC Building Code and the City's Zoning Bylaw; and
  - b) the secondary suites cannot be stratified or otherwise held under separate title.

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

1. Submission of a Landscape Plan, prepared by Registered Landscape Architect, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development.
2. Complete an acoustical and thermal 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:

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 Development Permit\* issuance, the developer must complete the following requirements:**

1. Submission of a Landscape Security based on 100% of the cost estimate provided by the Landscape Architect, including all hard and soft materials, installation and a 10% contingency. The City will retain a portion of the security for a one year maintenance period from the date of the inspection.

**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 energy efficiency, CPTED, sustainability, and accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
3. Enter into a Servicing Agreement\* for the design and construction of required site servicing and frontage 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:

*Water Works:*

- Using the OCP Model, there is 314.0 L/s of water available at a 20 psi residual at the Southdale Rd frontage, and 1,048 L/s of water available at 20 psi residual at the Steveston Hwy frontage. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of 220 L/s.
- The Developer is required to:
  - Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm the development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage and Building designs.
- At the Developers cost, the City is to:
  - Cut and cap at main, the existing water service connections at the Steveston Hwy and Southdale Rd frontages.
  - Install a new fire hydrant along the Steveston Highway frontage.
  - Relocate to the ultimate location the existing fire hydrant on the Southdale Road frontage as required to facilitate the required curb, sidewalk, and road widening. Fire Department approval is required for all fire hydrant relocations.
  - Install a new service connection off of the existing 300mm PVC watermain on the south side of Steveston Hwy. Meter to be located onsite (e.g. in a mechanical room).

*Storm Sewer Works:*

- The Developer is required to:
  - Cut and cap, at main, all existing storm service connections serving the development site and remove inspection chambers.
  - Upgrade approximately 140 m of existing 200 mm & 450 mm storm sewer to 600mm along the entire Steveston Hwy frontage, from existing manhole STMH2786 to existing manhole STMH134896, complete with new manhole at the tie-in point to the existing 200 mm storm sewer to the east.
  - Remove the existing AC storm sewer to the extent of the storm sewer upgrades and legally dispose offsite, and reconnect all existing catch basins and service connections to the new 600 mm storm sewer.
  - Install a new storm service connection, complete with inspection chamber, and tie-in to the proposed 600 mm storm sewer.
  - Remove the existing 450 mm storm sewer and infill the existing ditch along the Southdale Road frontage and replace with a new 600 mm storm sewer, complete with a new manhole at the upstream tie-in point.
  - Review catch basin spacing along Steveston Highway and Southdale Road, and add catch basins as required to meet City spacing requirements.
- At the Developers cost, the City is to:
  - Perform all tie-ins for the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

*Sanitary Sewer Works:*

- The Developer is required to:
  - Cut and cap, at inspection chamber, all existing service connections serving the development site.
  - Upgrade approximately 55 m of existing 150 mm sanitary main to 200 mm along the north property line, from the west property line of 9571 Steveston Highway to existing manhole SMH2069. A new manhole will be required at the tie-in point to the west.
  - Install a new sanitary service connection, complete with inspection chamber, off of the proposed 200 mm sanitary main. A 1.5 x 3.0 m statutory right-of-way from the edge of the existing sanitary right-of-way along the north property line may be required for the inspection chamber, to be determined at the servicing agreement stage.
  - Due to the existing tree to be protected near existing manhole SMH2069, the manhole will not be required to be replaced. Depending on the condition of the manhole, restoration may be required, to the satisfaction of the City. The developer's Civil Engineer shall submit, within the first servicing agreement submission, a signed & sealed inspection report of the manhole complete with reparation recommendations. These recommendations shall be included within the servicing agreement scope.
  - Not start onsite excavation or foundation construction until completion of rear-yard sanitary works by City crews.

- Widen 43.0 m (measured from the east property line) of the existing sanitary right-of-way along the north property line to 3.0 m deep (measured from the north property line of 9671 Steveston Highway), at no cost to the City.
- At the Developers cost, the City is to:
  - Perform all tie-ins for the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

*Frontage Improvements:*

- Transportation requirements include, but are not limited to, the following
  - Vehicle access to the development is to be provided by a single driveway located on Steveston Highway.
  - The driveway width at the property line is to be designed to restrict vehicle movement to right-in/right-out only. A concrete median will be required in the driveway letdown to restrict vehicles from making a left turn into and out of the site. The taper from the wider driveway at the property line to the on-site drive aisle is to be a maximum of 5:1. Geometry wheel path analysis using AutoTurn software to illustrate SU9 trucks turning into and out of the site will be required to review the design of the driveway to the site.
  - Steveston Highway: design and construction of a 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk along the south property line and the remaining space to the existing curb to be landscaped/treed boulevard.
  - Southdale Road: design and construction of road widening to 5.6 m measured from the existing centreline of the road, new curb and gutter, a 1.5 m concrete sidewalk along the east property line and the remaining space to the new curb to be landscaped/treed boulevard. Curb return at southeast corner to have a 9 m radius.
  - There may be hydro/TELUS pole relocations required to maintain a free and clear path of 1.5 m for the new concrete sidewalk. Applicant to engage the appropriate third party utility companies early on in the process to assess hydro implications.
  - The developer is responsible for the removal of the existing driveway let-downs and the replacement with barrier curb/gutter, grass/treed boulevard and concrete sidewalk per standards described above.
- The Developer is required to:
  - Coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers:
    - To underground overhead service lines.
    - To underground or relocate outside of the proposed sidewalk the existing overhead poles along the Steveston Highway frontage. This may require a BC Hydro right-of-way on the development site for the relocated poles.
    - When relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the property frontages.
    - 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 development process design review. Please coordinate with the respective private utility companies and the project's lighting and traffic signal consultants to confirm the requirements (e.g., statutory right-of-way dimensions) and the locations for the aboveground structures. If a private utility company does not require an aboveground structure, that company shall confirm this via a letter to be submitted to the City. The following are examples of statutory right-of-ways that shall be shown in the functional plan and registered prior to servicing agreement design approval:
      - BC Hydro PMT – 4mW X 5m (deep)
      - BC Hydro LPT – 3.5mW X 3.5m (deep)
      - Street light kiosk – 1.5mW X 1.5m (deep)
      - Traffic signal kiosk – 2mW X 1.5m (deep)
      - Traffic signal UPS – 1mW X 1m (deep)
      - Shaw cable kiosk – 1mW X 1m (deep) show possible location in functional plan
      - Telus FDH cabinet-1.1 m W X 1 m (deep) show possible location in functional plan
  - Complete other frontage improvements as per Transportation's requirements.

*General Items:*

- a. The Developer is required to:
  - Not encroach into the sanitary statutory right-of-way along the north property line with proposed trees, retaining walls, fences, or other obstructions.

- Provide, prior to soil densification or installation of pre-load, a geotechnical assessment of pre-load and soil preparation impacts on the existing utilities fronting the development site, including but not limited to 150 mm FRP sanitary main along the north property line, and provide mitigation recommendations.
  - Enter into, if required, additional legal agreements, as determined via the subject development's Servicing Agreement(s) and/or Development Permit(s), and/or Building Permit(s) to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering, including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, de-watering, drilling, underpinning, anchoring, shoring, piling, pre-loading, ground densification or other activities that may result in settlement, displacement, subsidence, damage or nuisance to City and private utility infrastructure.
4. If applicable, payment of latecomer agreement charges, plus applicable interest associated with eligible latecomer works.
  5. If applicable, 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 10082 (RZ 17-763712)  
9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 Steveston Highway & 10831 Southdale Road**

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

1. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following area and by designating it **"LOW DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTL4)"**.

P.I.D. 003-885-208

Lot 138 Section 34 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 36731

P.I.D. 007-371-977

Lot 139 Section 34 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 36731

P.I.D. 007-371-985

Lot 140 Section 34 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 36731

P.I.D. 004-984-897

Lot 1 Section 34 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 15745

P.I.D. 004-113-934

Lot 2 Section 34 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 15745

2. This Bylaw may be cited as **"Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10082"**.

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

\_\_\_\_\_


\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER



# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee


**To:** Planning Committee  
**From:** Wayne Craig  
Director, Development


**Date:** September 4, 2019  
**File:** RZ 17-794300

**Re:** Application by Konic Development Ltd. for Rezoning at 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 and 10397 No. 2 Road from Single Detached (RS1/E) to Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)

### Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10088, for the rezoning of 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 and 10397 No. 2 Road from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)", be introduced and given first reading.

  
Wayne Craig  
Director, Development  
WC:el  
Att. 6

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

## Staff Report

### Origin

Konic Development Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 and 10397 No. 2 Road (Attachment 1) from “Single Detached (RS1/E)” zone to “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)” zone in order to permit the development of 22 townhouse units and four secondary suites with right-in/right-out vehicle access from No. 2 Road.

### Project Description

The seven properties under this application have a total combined frontage of approximately 110 m, and are required to be consolidated into one development parcel prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw. The proposed density is 0.60 floor area ratio (FAR). The site layout includes 10 two-storey units and 12 three-storey units in eight townhouse clusters. Four secondary suites and two convertible units are included in this proposal. Vehicle access is provided by a single right-in/right-out driveway access to No. 2 Road. A preliminary site plan, building elevations, and landscape plan are contained 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

There are seven houses on the development site. The applicant has advised that there is one secondary suite in one of the houses. All seven houses and the secondary suite are currently tenanted.

### Surrounding Development

To the North: Existing single family dwellings on lots zoned “Single Detached (RS1/E)” fronting No. 2 Road, which are all identified for townhouse development under the Arterial Road Land Use Policy..

To the South: Three existing single family dwellings on lots zoned “Single Detached (RS1/E)” fronting Wallace Road, which are all identified for townhouse development under the Arterial Road Land Use Policy.

To the East: Across No. 2 Road, existing single family dwellings on lots zoned “Single Detached (RS1/B)” fronting Goldsmith Drive, a childcare centre on a lot zoned “School & Institutional Use (SI)” and a 133-unit townhouse complex zoned “Town Housing (ZT72) – London / Steveston (No. 2 Road)”.

To the West: Existing single family dwellings on lots zoned “Single Detached (RS1/B)” fronting Sandiford Drive.

## **Related Policies & Studies**

### Official Community Plan/Steveston Area Plan

The 2041 Official Community Plan (OCP) Land Use Map designation for the subject site is “Neighbourhood Residential”. The Steveston Area Land Use Map designation for the subject site is “Multiple-Family”. This redevelopment proposal for 22 townhouses is consistent with these designations.

### Arterial Road Policy

The subject site is identified for “Arterial Road Townhouse” on the Arterial Road Housing Development Map and the proposal is largely in compliance with the Townhouse Development Requirements under the Arterial Road Policy.

### *Properties to the South*

The proposed site assembly will leave a residual development site to the south that will not meet the minimum 50 m site frontage requirement. The residual development site to the south at 5931, 5951 and 5971 Wallace Road, located between the subject site and Wallace Road, has a frontage of approximately 30 m along No. 2 Road.

The applicant advised staff in writing that they have made attempts to acquire adjacent properties, but cannot reach an agreement with the owners. The applicant has requested that this application proceed without the acquisition of the adjacent properties to the south.

While the proposed development would create an orphan site situation on the south side of the subject site, staff support the proposed development based on:

- the adjacent property owners are not interested in redeveloping their properties at this time;
- the proposed development will not restrict redevelopment of the adjacent site at 5931, 5951 and 5971 Wallace Road as the orphan site is located at the corner of No. 2 Road and Wallace Road, with a lot width of 30 m, a lot depth of 43.58m, and an overall site area of 1,310 m<sup>2</sup>; and
- a Public Rights-of-Passage (PROP) Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) over the entire internal drive aisle on the subject site will be registered on Title of the subject site as a condition of rezoning to provide vehicle access to future townhouse development on the adjacent site to the south.

### *Properties to the North*

A city owned site is located at 10191 No. 2 Road and this site is not envisioned to be redeveloped in the near future. The developer has explored the opportunity to include the property located between the subject site and the city owned site (i.e. 10211 No. 2 Road) into the proposed townhouse development; however, the acquisition attempt was not successful. To proceed with the subject development proposal, the developer has agreed to provide:

- vehicle access to future townhouse development on the adjacent site to the north; a Public Rights-of-Passage (PROP) Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) over the entire internal drive aisle on the subject site will be registered on Title of the subject site as a condition of rezoning to secure this arrangement;
- a development concept plan for the adjacent site to the north (on file); and
- shared use of outdoor amenity space and garbage/recycling collection facilities on-site with future townhouse development on the adjacent site to the north. A cross-access easement/agreement will be registered on Title of the subject site as a condition of rezoning to secure this arrangement.

#### Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

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

#### **Public Consultation**

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

The developers have also consulted with the owners/residents of the neighbouring properties on the proposed development; no concern was raised. A consultation summary package prepared by the developers and a map of the consultation area can be found in Attachment 4.

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant 1<sup>st</sup> reading to the rezoning bylaw, the bylaw will be forwarded to a Public Hearing, where any area resident or interested party will have an opportunity to comment.

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

#### **Analysis**

##### Built Form and Architectural Character

The applicant proposes to consolidate the seven properties into one development parcel, with a total net site area of approximately 4,857.6 m<sup>2</sup>. The proposal consists of 22 townhouses, in a mix of two-storey and three-storey townhouse units in eight clusters. The layout of the townhouse units is oriented around a single driveway providing access to the site from No. 2 Road and a north-south internal manoeuvring aisle providing access to the unit garages. The outdoor amenity area will be situated at the northwest corner of the site.

All three-storey units are proposed along No. 2 Road; a minimum 7.5 m side yard setback is provided to the third floor of these buildings to minimize potential privacy concerns. Two-storey duplexes are proposed along the rear (west) lot line to serve as a transition to the single family homes to the west. The proposed building forms, heights and setbacks are in compliance with the design guidelines for arterial road townhouse developments.

Four ground level secondary suites are proposed to be included in the development. These suites will be contained in four of the three-storey units (unit types “C1” & “C2”) proposed on site (see Attachment 2). The size of each secondary suite is approximately 26 m<sup>2</sup> (279 ft<sup>2</sup>) and the total net floor area of each of these “C1” and “C2” units is approximately 141 m<sup>2</sup> (1,520 ft<sup>2</sup>). Each secondary suite contains a bedroom, a kitchen and a bathroom. No additional residential parking spaces will be assigned to the secondary suites since a side-by-side double car garage is proposed to be included in each of the townhouse units containing a secondary suite.

To ensure that these secondary suites will not be stratified or otherwise held under separate title, registration of a legal agreement on Title is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

To ensure that the secondary suites are built, registration of a legal agreement on Title, stating that no final Building Permit inspection will be granted until the secondary suites are constructed to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the BC Building Code and the City’s Zoning Bylaw, is required prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

#### Amenity Space

The applicant is proposing a cash contribution in-lieu of providing the required indoor amenity space on site, as per the OCP. As the rezoning application was submitted prior to the Amenity Contribution rates were updated, this townhouse development application will have to comply with the previous Council’s Policy 5041 (Cash in Lieu of Indoor Amenity Space). The Policy requires that a cash contribution of \$1,000 per unit up to 19 units, plus \$2,000 per unit over 19 units, be provided in lieu of indoor amenity space. The total cash contribution required for this 22-unit townhouse development is \$25,000.00.

Outdoor amenity spaces will be provided on-site. Based on the preliminary design, the total area of the proposed outdoor amenity spaces complies with the Official Community Plan (OCP) requirements (i.e., 6 m<sup>2</sup> of outdoor space per unit). Staff will work with the applicant at the Development Permit stage to ensure the configurations and designs of the outdoor amenity spaces meet the Development Permit Guidelines in the OCP, including provision of children’s play equipment.

#### Existing Legal Encumbrances

There are existing utility Right-of-Ways (ROWs) along the west property line and south property lines of the site for existing sanitary sewer lines and connections. The developer is aware that no construction is permitted in these areas.

In addition, there is an existing utility Right-of-Ways along the north property line of 10351 No. 2 Road for an existing perimeter drain. The applicant is required to remove the existing perimeter drain along the common property line of 10251 and 10351 No. 2 Road and apply to the City to discharge the portion of Right-of-Way Plan 58634 that contained the removed drain prior to Building Permit issuance. The developer will be responsible to coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus, Shaw, Fortis BC, and other private utility companies to confirm that there are no existing private utilities within the right of way prior to the right of way discharge.

### Transportation and Site Access

One vehicular access from No. 2 Road is proposed, this access will be restricted to right-in/right-out traffic movements. The proposed vehicle access is envisioned to be utilized by adjacent properties to the north and south if they apply to redevelop. A Public Right-of-Passage (PROP) Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) over the entire area of the proposed entry driveway from No. 2 Road and the internal north-south manoeuvring aisle will be secured as a condition of rezoning.

Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the developer is required to dedicate an approximately 0.09 m wide road across the entire No. 2 Road frontage to accommodate the required frontage improvements including a new sidewalk and grass and treed boulevard. The developer is also required to contribute \$50,000 towards a future upgrade of the special crosswalk at the intersection of No.2 Road and Goldsmith Drive. Pre-ducting for future works will be also required as part of the Servicing Agreement.

### 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 28 bylaw-sized trees and one hedgerow on the subject property, six trees and three hedgerows on neighbouring properties, and one hedgerow that may be a shared property between 10397 No. 2 Road and 5971 Wallace Road.

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

- 26 trees (tag# 1-6, 11, 13-15, 18, 20-23, 27, 44, 51-59) located on the development site either dead, dying (sparse canopy foliage), have been previously topped or exhibit structural defects such as cavities at the main branch union and co-dominant stems with inclusions. As a result, these trees are not good candidates for retention and should be replaced.
- One (1) hedgerow comprised of six (6) trees (tag# 45-50) located on the development site is in poor condition with little landscape value, and should be removed.
- One (1) hedgerow comprised of 16 trees (tag# 28-43) located on the development site is in poor condition with little landscape value. This hedgerow may be removed; consent letter from the neighbouring property owner to the south is on file as this hedgerow may be a shared property between 10397 No. 2 Road and 5971 Wallace Road.
- One (1) tree (tag# 26) located onsite is proposed to be retained, this tree is to be protected as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.
- Seven (7) trees (tag# 7, 8, 10, 12, 16, 17 and 25) located on neighbouring properties to the west are to be protected as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.
- One (1) hedgerow (tag# 9) located on neighbouring property to the west is to be protected as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.

- Two (2) hedgerows (tag# 19 and 24) located on neighbouring properties to the west are in poor condition with little landscape value. These hedgerows may be removed but the developer is proposing to retain and protect them as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.

### *Tree Replacement*

The applicant wishes to remove 26 on-site trees (Tree tag# 1-6, 11, 13-15, 18, 20-23, 27, 44, 51-59). The 2:1 replacement ratio would require a total of 52 replacement trees. According to the Preliminary Landscape Plan provided by the applicant (Attachment 2), the developer is proposing to plant 37 new trees on-site. The size and species of replacement trees will be reviewed in detail through Development Permit and overall landscape design. The applicant has agreed to provide a voluntary contribution of \$7,500 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund in lieu of planting the remaining 15 replacement trees should they not be accommodated on the site.

### *Tree Protection*

One tree onsite (tag #26), seven trees (tag# 7, 8, 10, 12, 16, 17 and 25) and three hedgerows (tag# 9, 19 and 24) on neighbouring properties 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 5). 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, 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 final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, submission to the City of a Tree Survival Security in the amount of \$1,000 to ensure that the Mountain Ash tree (specifically tag# 26) located at the southwest corner of the site will be protected. No Tree Survival Security will be returned until the post-construction assessment report, confirming the protected trees survived the construction, prepared by the Arborist, is reviewed by staff.
- 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 standards 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.

### Variance Requested

The proposed development is generally in compliance with the “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)” zone; with one proposed variance to reduce the front yard setback from 6.0 m to 4.5 m. The resulting distance from the back of curb to the building face would be approximately 7.5 m. Staff support the requested variance recognizing that a minor road dedication (0.09 m) is required and that the Arterial Road Guidelines for Townhouses in the OCP support reduced front yard setback where a 6.0 rear yard setback is provided, on condition that there is an appropriate interface with neighbouring properties. The applicant is proposing a reduced front yard setback in order to provide a larger rear yard setback to facilitate a greater separation between the proposed townhouse development and the adjacent single family homes. The increased rear yard setback would also provide a larger protection buffer to the existing trees and hedges along the west property line that are to be retained as part of the development. This variance will be reviewed in the context of the overall detailed design of the project; including architectural form, site design and landscaping at the Development Permit stage.

### Affordable Housing Strategy

In addition to the provision of four secondary suites on site, the applicant proposes to make a cash contribution to the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund in accordance to the City’s Affordable Housing Strategy. As the proposal is for townhouses, the applicant will make a cash contribution of \$8.50 per buildable square foot as per the Strategy; for a contribution of \$266,662.53.

### Public Art

In response to the City’s Public Art Program (Policy 8703), the applicant will provide a voluntary contribution at a rate of \$0.85 per buildable square foot (2017’s rate) to the City’s Public Art Reserve fund; for a total contribution in the amount of \$26,666.25.

### Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy

The subject rezoning application and the associated Development Permit application were received prior to the introduction of the BC Energy Step Code (approved by Council on July 16, 2018). The subject development will have until December 31, 2019 to submit an acceptable Building Permit application in order to build under previous energy efficiency requirements. Should the deadline pass the proposed development would then be subject to the Energy Step Code.

The applicants have committed to achieving an EnerGuide Rating System (ERS) score of 82 and all units will be pre-ducted for solar hot water for the proposed development. Registration of a legal agreement on Title to ensure that all units are built and maintained to this commitment is required prior to rezoning bylaw adoption. As part of the Development Permit Application review process, the developers will be required to retain a certified energy advisor (CEA) to complete an Evaluation Report to confirm details of construction requirements needed to achieve the rating.

### Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant is required to enter into the City's standard Servicing Agreement to design and construct frontage beautification works and service connections (see Attachment 6 for details). All works are at the client's sole cost (i.e., no credits apply). The developer is also required to pay Development Cost Charges (DCC's) (City & GVS & DD), School Site Acquisition Charge and Address Assignment Fee.

### Development Permit

A Development Permit processed to a satisfactory level is a requirement of zoning approval. Through the Development Permit, the following issues are to be further examined:

- Compliance with Development Permit Guidelines for multiple-family projects in the 2041 Official Community Plan (OCP).
- Refinement of the proposed building form to achieve sufficient variety in design to create a desirable and interesting streetscape along No. 2 Road and along the internal drive aisles, to reduce visual massing of the three-storey units along No. 2 Road, and to address potential adjacency issues.
- Refinement of the proposed site grading to ensure survival of all proposed protected trees and appropriate transition between the proposed development to the public sidewalk on No. 2 Road, and to the adjacent existing developments.
- Refinement of the outdoor amenity area design, including the choice of play equipment, to create a safe and vibrant environment for children's play and social interaction.
- Review of size and species of on-site replacement trees to ensure bylaw compliance and to achieve an acceptable mix of conifer and deciduous trees on-site.
- Refinement of site layout and landscape design to maximize planting areas along internal drive aisles, to maximize permeable surface areas, and to better articulate hard surface treatments on site.
- Review of aging-in-place features in all units and the provision of convertible units.
- Review of the sustainability strategy for the development proposal, including measures to achieve an EnerGuide Rating System (ERS) score of 82 or Energy Step Code.

Additional issues may be identified as part of the Development Permit application review process.

### **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 proposed 22-unit townhouse development is generally consistent with the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the Arterial Road Policy in the OCP. Further review of the project design is required to ensure a high quality project and design consistency with the existing neighbourhood context, and this will be completed as part of the Development Permit application review process. The list of rezoning considerations is included as Attachment 6; which has been agreed to by the applicants (signed concurrence on file). On this basis, staff recommend support of the application.

It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10088 be introduced and given first reading.




Edwin Lee  
Planner 1

EL:rg

Attachment 1: Location Map  
Attachment 2: Conceptual Development Plans  
Attachment 3: Development Application Data Sheet  
Attachment 4: Consultation Summary  
Attachment 5: Tree Management Plan  
Attachment 6: Rezoning Considerations

City of  
Richmond



RZ 17-794300

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



# City of Richmond



RZ 17-794300

Original Date: 01/08/18

Revision Date: 09/03/19

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



## ARCHITECTURAL:

- | DRAWING LIST      |   | ELEVATIONS                            |
|-------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| ARCHITECTURAL:    |   | BUILDING ELEVATIONS                   |
| A0.0              | COVER SHEET                                     | BUILDING F ELEVATIONS                 |
| A0.1              | COLOR RENDERINGS                                | BUILDING G ELEVATIONS                 |
| A0.2              | PROJECT DATA & STATISTICS                       | BUILDING H ELEVATIONS                 |
| A0.3              | CONTEXT DATA & CONTEXT PLAN                     |                                       |
| A0.4              | SITE CONTEXT AERIAL IMAGE & CONTEXT PLAN        |                                       |
| A0.5              | SITE CONTEXT PLAN & STREET ELEVATIONS           |                                       |
| A0.6              | SURVEY PLAN                                     |                                       |
| BUILDING SECTIONS |   |                                       |
| A1.0              | SITE/ LEVEL PLAN                                | UNIT TYPE A1 PLANS                    |
| A1.1              | SITE/ LEVEL 1 PLAN                              | UNIT TYPE A1 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM |
| A1.1A             | 1:2111 NO. 2 ROAD DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL PLAN    | AS.1A                                 |
| A1.2              | SITE PLAN                                       | UNIT TYPE A2 PLANS                    |
| A1.3              | PARKING PLAN                                    | UNIT TYPE A2 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM |
| A1.4              | FIRE FIGHTING PLAN                              | AS.2A                                 |
| A1.5              | OUTDOOR AREA OVERLAY & CALCULATIONS             | UNIT TYPE A3 PLANS                    |
| A1.6              | SITE COVERAGE (BUILDING) OVERLAY & CALCULATIONS | UNIT TYPE A3 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM |
| A2.1              | BUDG A & D FLOOR PLANS                          | AS.3A                                 |
| A2.2              | BUDG B & E FLOOR PLANS                          | UNIT TYPE A4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM |
| A2.3              | BUDG C & F FLOOR PLANS                          | AS.4A                                 |
| A2.4              | BUDG G, H & J FLOOR PLANS                       | UNIT TYPE D1 PLANS                    |
| A3.0              | CONTEXT ELEVATIONS                              | AS.5A                                 |
| A3.1              | BUILDING A ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE D2 PLANS                    |
| A3.2              | BUILDING B ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE D2 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM |
| A3.3              | BUILDING C & J ELEVATIONS                       | AS.6A                                 |
| A3.4              | BUILDING D ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE D3 PLANS                    |
| A3.5              | BUILDING E ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE D3 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM |
| A3.6              | BUILDING F ELEVATIONS                           | AS.7A                                 |
| A3.7              | BUILDING G ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE D4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM |
| A3.8              | BUILDING H ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE D4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM |
| A3.9              | BUILDING I ELEVATIONS                           | AS.8A                                 |
| A3.10             | BUILDING J ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE D5 PLANS                    |
| A3.11             | BUILDING K ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE D5 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM |
| A3.12             | BUILDING L ELEVATIONS                           | AS.9A                                 |
| A3.13             | BUILDING M ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE H1 PLANS (CONVERTIBLE)      |
| A3.14             | BUILDING N ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE H1 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM |
| A3.15             | BUILDING O ELEVATIONS                           | AS.10A                                |
| A3.16             | BUILDING P ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE H2 PLANS (CONVERTIBLE)      |
| A3.17             | BUILDING Q ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE H2 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM |
| A3.18             | BUILDING R ELEVATIONS                           | AS.11A                                |
| A3.19             | BUILDING S ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE C2 PLANS (LOCK-OFF UNIT)    |
| A3.20             | BUILDING T ELEVATIONS                           | UNIT TYPE C2 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM |
| A3.21             | BUILDING U ELEVATIONS                           | AS.12A                                |
| A3.22             | BUILDING V ELEVATIONS                           |                                       |
| A3.23             | BUILDING W ELEVATIONS                           |                                       |
| A3.24             | BUILDING X ELEVATIONS                           |                                       |
| A3.25             | BUILDING Y ELEVATIONS                           |                                       |
| A3.26             | BUILDING Z ELEVATIONS                           |                                       |
| A3.27             | BUILDING AA ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.28             | BUILDING AB ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.29             | BUILDING AC ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.30             | BUILDING AD ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.31             | BUILDING AE ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.32             | BUILDING AF ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.33             | BUILDING AG ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.34             | BUILDING AH ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.35             | BUILDING AI ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.36             | BUILDING AJ ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.37             | BUILDING AK ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.38             | BUILDING AL ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.39             | BUILDING AM ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.40             | BUILDING AN ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.41             | BUILDING AO ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.42             | BUILDING AP ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.43             | BUILDING AQ ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.44             | BUILDING AR ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.45             | BUILDING AS ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.46             | BUILDING AT ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.47             | BUILDING AU ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.48             | BUILDING AV ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.49             | BUILDING AW ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.50             | BUILDING AX ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.51             | BUILDING AY ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.52             | BUILDING AZ ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.53             | BUILDING BA ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.54             | BUILDING BB ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.55             | BUILDING BC ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.56             | BUILDING BD ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.57             | BUILDING BE ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.58             | BUILDING BF ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.59             | BUILDING BG ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.60             | BUILDING BH ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.61             | BUILDING BI ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.62             | BUILDING BJ ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.63             | BUILDING BK ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.64             | BUILDING BL ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.65             | BUILDING BM ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.66             | BUILDING BN ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.67             | BUILDING BO ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.68             | BUILDING BP ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.69             | BUILDING BQ ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.70             | BUILDING BR ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.71             | BUILDING BS ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.72             | BUILDING BT ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.73             | BUILDING BU ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.74             | BUILDING BV ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.75             | BUILDING BW ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.76             | BUILDING BX ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.77             | BUILDING BY ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.78             | BUILDING BZ ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.79             | BUILDING CA ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.80             | BUILDING CB ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.81             | BUILDING CC ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.82             | BUILDING CD ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.83             | BUILDING CE ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.84             | BUILDING CF ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.85             | BUILDING CG ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.86             | BUILDING CH ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.87             | BUILDING CI ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.88             | BUILDING CJ ELEVATIONS                          |                                       |
| A3.89             | BUILDING CK ELEVATIONS</                        |                                       |

TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
AT 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391  
RICHMOND, BC (RZ - 17-79430)

ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION 2019-07-26

## CONTACT LIST

- CLIENT**  
KONIG DEVELOPMENT LTD.  
10000 BAYVIEW AVE.  
RICHMOND, BC V6Y 2S4  
CONTACT: KATH LEUNG  
PHONE: 604-268-5370 FAX: 604-265-3702  
EMAIL: INFO@KONIG.CA

**ARCHITECT**  
IMPACT ARCHITECTURE  
1000 BAYVIEW AVE.  
KIM VANDERBEEK, VP / A/S  
CONTACT: JANE ZHANG ARCHITECT ABC  
TEL: 778-939-8682  
EMAIL: IMPACTARCHITECTURE@GMAIL.COM


**LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT**  
WATSON ARCHITECTURE AND  
ASPECT CONSULTANTS LTD.  
4225-25 LORNE AVENUE  
NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C. V3M 3J7  
CONTACT: MEREDITH MITCHELL, PRINCIPAL  
TEL: 604-273-2522 FAX: 604-273-2522  
EMAIL: MEREDITH.MITCHELL@WATSONA.COM

**SURVEYOR**  
JAMES KAYNES  
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYORS  
#115-8825 OULIN CRESCENT,  
RICHMOND, BC V6X 3Z7  
CONTACT: JOHNNY TAN, B.C.L.S.,  
F.S.A.I.  
EMAIL: OFFICE@JKTAM.COM

**CIVIL**  
CORE CONCEPT CONSULTING LTD.  
CIVIL & MECHANICAL / SURVEY  
#209, 8238 INVERDON WAY  
DELTA BC V4L 1J3  
CONTACT: BILLY DUFFY, DIRECTOR  
TEL: 604-255-6566 FAX: 604-645-6561  
EMAIL: SCUFFY@CORECONCEPTCONSULTING.COM

**ELECTRICAL**  
NEW ENGINEERING LTD.  
ELECTRICAL CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
108-11217 HORSBURGH HWY., RICHMOND, BC V6V 3G7  
CONTACT: JOHN P. BELL, P. ENG.  
TEL: 604-277-1157  
EMAIL: RJB@NEWTEL.TS.BELL.NET

**ARBORIST**  
MOUNTAIN MAPLE GARDENS & TREE SERVICE LTD.  
#209, 8238 INVERDON WAY  
DELTA BC V4L 1J3  
CONTACT: JOHN P. BELL, P. ENG.  
TEL: 604-698-6568  
MOUNTAINMAPLE@TELUS.NET



IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE  
REGISTERED ARCHITECTS OF PRACTICE  
1000 WEST 10TH AVENUE, SUITE 100  
DENVER, COLORADO 80202  
TEL: 303.733.8888  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

ARCHITECT  
INTERIOR  
PLANNING

Copyright Reserved

The Client hereby warrants that the information provided in this plan is true and correct, and that the Client is responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and approvals from the appropriate authorities.

DISCLAIMER

The Client warrants that the information provided in this plan is true and correct, and that the Client is responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and approvals from the appropriate authorities.

NO. 2 ROAD  
NO. 2 ROAD  
NO. 2 ROAD



NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD
NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD
NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD
NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD
NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD
NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD
NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD
NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD
NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD
NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD	NO. 2 ROAD

2019-07-26  
ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RE-SUBMISSION

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
(KZ - 17-24500)

1000 WEST 10TH AVENUE, SUITE 100  
DENVER, COLORADO 80202  
TEL: 303.733.8888  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

COLOR RENDERINGS

Scale

N.T.S.

A0.1




CNCL - 200



CNCL - 201





**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
 REGISTERED ARCHITECTS OF PRACTICE  
 1001 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100  
 DENVER, CO 80202

ARCHITECTS  
 INTERIOR DESIGNERS  
 PLANNERS

Copyright Reserved  
 No. Copyright in this drawing and its contents is hereby acknowledged and reserved. It is illegal to reproduce or use in any form without the written consent of Imperial Architecture.

Dispositions  
 This drawing and its contents are the property of Imperial Architecture and shall remain the property of Imperial Architecture. It is not to be used for any other purpose without the written consent of Imperial Architecture.

BLOK 1 BLOK 2 BLOK 3 BLOK 4  
 BLOK 5 BLOK 6 BLOK 7 BLOK 8  
 BLOK 9 BLOK 10 BLOK 11 BLOK 12

NO. 2 ROAD

2019-07-26  
 ISSUED FOR REZONING  
 RE-SUBMISSION

Client: NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
 (82-1774300)

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
 1001 N. 10TH AVE., SUITE 100  
 DENVER, CO 80202


COLOR RENDERINGS

Scale: N.T.S.  
 Date: 7/26/19

Project: RS193  
 Drawing: 01

A 0.2

INTERNAL DRIVE AISLE TO BE ENGINEERED TO SUPPORT FIRE TRUCK @ 80,000 LBS



A STATUARY RIGHT-OF-WAY OVER THE ENTIRE VEHICLE DRIVE AISLE IS TO BE REGISTERED FOR PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-PASSAGE

INTERNAL DRIVE AISLE TO BE ENGINEERED TO SUPPORT FIRE TRUCK @ 80,000 LBS



VARIANCE REQUIRED: 4.5M FRONT YARD SETBACK AS PER ARTERIAL ROAD TOWNHOUSE DESIGN GUIDELINE IN OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN (OCP)

#### Average Grading Calculation

Area	Grading	Volume
1	Grading	1.00
2	Grading	1.00
3	Grading	1.00
4	Grading	1.00
5	Grading	1.00
6	Grading	1.00
7	Grading	1.00
8	Grading	1.00
9	Grading	1.00
10	Grading	1.00
11	Grading	1.00
12	Grading	1.00
13	Grading	1.00
14	Grading	1.00
15	Grading	1.00
16	Grading	1.00
17	Grading	1.00
18	Grading	1.00
19	Grading	1.00
20	Grading	1.00
21	Grading	1.00
22	Grading	1.00
23	Grading	1.00
24	Grading	1.00
25	Grading	1.00
26	Grading	1.00
27	Grading	1.00
28	Grading	1.00
29	Grading	1.00
30	Grading	1.00
31	Grading	1.00
32	Grading	1.00
33	Grading	1.00
34	Grading	1.00
35	Grading	1.00
36	Grading	1.00
37	Grading	1.00
38	Grading	1.00
39	Grading	1.00
40	Grading	1.00
41	Grading	1.00
42	Grading	1.00
43	Grading	1.00
44	Grading	1.00
45	Grading	1.00
46	Grading	1.00
47	Grading	1.00
48	Grading	1.00
49	Grading	1.00
50	Grading	1.00
51	Grading	1.00
52	Grading	1.00
53	Grading	1.00
54	Grading	1.00
55	Grading	1.00
56	Grading	1.00
57	Grading	1.00
58	Grading	1.00
59	Grading	1.00
60	Grading	1.00
61	Grading	1.00
62	Grading	1.00
63	Grading	1.00
64	Grading	1.00
65	Grading	1.00
66	Grading	1.00
67	Grading	1.00
68	Grading	1.00
69	Grading	1.00
70	Grading	1.00
71	Grading	1.00
72	Grading	1.00
73	Grading	1.00
74	Grading	1.00
75	Grading	1.00
76	Grading	1.00
77	Grading	1.00
78	Grading	1.00
79	Grading	1.00
80	Grading	1.00
81	Grading	1.00
82	Grading	1.00
83	Grading	1.00
84	Grading	1.00
85	Grading	1.00
86	Grading	1.00
87	Grading	1.00
88	Grading	1.00
89	Grading	1.00
90	Grading	1.00
91	Grading	1.00
92	Grading	1.00
93	Grading	1.00
94	Grading	1.00
95	Grading	1.00
96	Grading	1.00
97	Grading	1.00
98	Grading	1.00
99	Grading	1.00
100	Grading	1.00

#### Ground Floor Interior Elevation Calculation

Room	Area	Volume
1	Area	Volume
2	Area	Volume
3	Area	Volume
4	Area	Volume
5	Area	Volume
6	Area	Volume
7	Area	Volume
8	Area	Volume
9	Area	Volume
10	Area	Volume
11	Area	Volume
12	Area	Volume
13	Area	Volume
14	Area	Volume
15	Area	Volume
16	Area	Volume
17	Area	Volume
18	Area	Volume
19	Area	Volume
20	Area	Volume
21	Area	Volume
22	Area	Volume
23	Area	Volume
24	Area	Volume
25	Area	Volume
26	Area	Volume
27	Area	Volume
28	Area	Volume
29	Area	Volume
30	Area	Volume
31	Area	Volume
32	Area	Volume
33	Area	Volume
34	Area	Volume
35	Area	Volume
36	Area	Volume
37	Area	Volume
38	Area	Volume
39	Area	Volume
40	Area	Volume
41	Area	Volume
42	Area	Volume
43	Area	Volume
44	Area	Volume
45	Area	Volume
46	Area	Volume
47	Area	Volume
48	Area	Volume
49	Area	Volume
50	Area	Volume
51	Area	Volume
52	Area	Volume
53	Area	Volume
54	Area	Volume
55	Area	Volume
56	Area	Volume
57	Area	Volume
58	Area	Volume
59	Area	Volume
60	Area	Volume
61	Area	Volume
62	Area	Volume
63	Area	Volume
64	Area	Volume
65	Area	Volume
66	Area	Volume
67	Area	Volume
68	Area	Volume
69	Area	Volume
70	Area	Volume
71	Area	Volume
72	Area	Volume
73	Area	Volume
74	Area	Volume
75	Area	Volume
76	Area	Volume
77	Area	Volume
78	Area	Volume
79	Area	Volume
80	Area	Volume
81	Area	Volume
82	Area	Volume
83	Area	Volume
84	Area	Volume
85	Area	Volume
86	Area	Volume
87	Area	Volume
88	Area	Volume
89	Area	Volume
90	Area	Volume
91	Area	Volume
92	Area	Volume
93	Area	Volume
94	Area	Volume
95	Area	Volume
96	Area	Volume
97	Area	Volume
98	Area	Volume
99	Area	Volume
100	Area	Volume



EXISTING S.W. TO BE DISCHARGED AND REMOVED


EXISTING S.W. TO BE DISCHARGED AND REMOVED

EXISTING S.W. TO BE DISCHARGED AND REMOVED

EXISTING S.W. TO BE DISCHARGED AND REMOVED


EXISTING S.W. TO BE DISCHARGED AND REMOVED







### A3.1



**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
HOLDERS OF AN AIA CERTIFICATE OF PRACTICE  
1001 N. 10TH ST. SUITE 100  
RICHMOND, VA 23219  
(804) 781-1111

ARCHITECTS  
INTERIOR DESIGNERS  
PLANNERS

Copyright Reserved  
No. Copyright in this drawing and its contents is hereby acknowledged. All rights reserved. No part of this drawing may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from Imperial Architecture.

Disclosures  
This drawing and its contents are the property of Imperial Architecture. It is to be used only for the project and site identified herein. It is not to be used for any other project or site without the written consent of Imperial Architecture.

NO. 2 ROAD

BLDG A | BLDG B | BLDG C | BLDG D  
E | F | G | H | I | J

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	CHKD
1	NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT	07/26/2019	IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL
2	NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT	07/26/2019	IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL
3	NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT	07/26/2019	IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL
4	NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT	07/26/2019	IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL
5	NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT	07/26/2019	IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL
6	NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT	07/26/2019	IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL
7	NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT	07/26/2019	IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL
8	NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT	07/26/2019	IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL
9	NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT	07/26/2019	IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL
10	NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT	07/26/2019	IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL

2019-07-26  
ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RE-SUBMISSION




NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
(K2 - 17-24-360)


**KONIG**  
1001 N. 10TH ST. SUITE 100  
RICHMOND, VA 23219  
(804) 781-1111

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
(K2 - 17-24-360)

**BUILDING B ELEVATIONS**

Project: #8193  
Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"  
Sheet: A3.2





**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
 OFFICE OF AN ARCHITECTURAL FIRM  
 1000 N. 10TH STREET, SUITE 100  
 DENVER, CO 80202  
 (303) 733-1100  
 www.imperialarch.com

Architectural  
 Interior  
 Planning

Copyright Reserved  
 No reproduction or translation of this work in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, is permitted without the prior written permission of Imperial Architecture.

Drawings  
 The drawings and any other documents are the property of Imperial Architecture and shall remain the property of Imperial Architecture. No part of these drawings shall be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Imperial Architecture.

2019-07-26  
 ISSUED FOR REZONING  
 RE-SUBMISSION

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
 (REZ - 17-79450)

1000 N. 10TH STREET, SUITE 100  
 DENVER, CO 80202  
 (303) 733-1100  
 www.imperialarch.com




BUILDING D ELEVATIONS


Project No. #8193  
 Drawing No. 108-1-07  
 Scale 1/8"=1'-0"

**A 3.4**

NO. 2 ROAD

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	CHKD.
1	ISSUED FOR REZONING	07/26/19	IM	IM
2	ISSUED FOR REZONING	07/26/19	IM	IM
3	ISSUED FOR REZONING	07/26/19	IM	IM
4	ISSUED FOR REZONING	07/26/19	IM	IM
5	ISSUED FOR REZONING	07/26/19	IM	IM
6	ISSUED FOR REZONING	07/26/19	IM	IM
7	ISSUED FOR REZONING	07/26/19	IM	IM
8	ISSUED FOR REZONING	07/26/19	IM	IM
9	ISSUED FOR REZONING	07/26/19	IM	IM
10	ISSUED FOR REZONING	07/26/19	IM	IM





IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE  
BUILDERS IN AN ARCHITECTURE OF PRACTICE  
ARCHITECTS  
PLANNERS

Copyright Reserved  
The Copyright in this drawing is reserved by Imperial Architecture. No part of this drawing may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from Imperial Architecture.

NO. 2 ROAD  
NO. 2 ROAD

2019-07-26  
ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RE-SUBMISSION

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
(RZ-17-7945W)

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
(RZ-17-7945W)

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
(RZ-17-7945W)

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
(RZ-17-7945W)


NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
(RZ-17-7945W)

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
(RZ-17-7945W)

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
(RZ-17-7945W)

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
(RZ-17-7945W)

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
(RZ-17-7945W)



1 BUILDING H EAST ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



2 BUILDING H WEST ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"

3 BUILDING H NORTH ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



4 BUILDING H SOUTH ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




5 BUILDING H EAST ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




6 BUILDING H WEST ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



7 BUILDING H SOUTH ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



8 BUILDING H EAST ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
 OFFICE OF ARCHITECTURE AND INTERIOR DESIGN  
 1000 10TH STREET, N.W.  
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

ARCHITECTURE  
 INTERIOR DESIGN  
 PLANNING

Copyright Reserved  
 No Copyright in this drawing and no liability for any use of the drawing or any part thereof shall be accepted by the architect or the owner. The drawing is the property of the architect and shall not be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the architect.

Dimensions  
 The Contractor shall verify all dimensions and locations of existing structures, utilities, and other features shown on this drawing. The Contractor shall be responsible for any errors or omissions in the field.

NO. 2 ROAD

BLDG A | BLDG B | BLDG C | BLDG D  
 I D E F G J - H -

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	CHKD
1	PRELIMINARY DRAWING	10/10/18	MM	MM
2	REVISED DRAWING	11/15/18	MM	MM
3	REVISED DRAWING	12/10/18	MM	MM
4	REVISED DRAWING	01/10/19	MM	MM
5	REVISED DRAWING	02/10/19	MM	MM
6	REVISED DRAWING	03/10/19	MM	MM
7	REVISED DRAWING	04/10/19	MM	MM
8	REVISED DRAWING	05/10/19	MM	MM
9	REVISED DRAWING	06/10/19	MM	MM
10	REVISED DRAWING	07/10/19	MM	MM
11	REVISED DRAWING	08/10/19	MM	MM
12	REVISED DRAWING	09/10/19	MM	MM
13	REVISED DRAWING	10/10/19	MM	MM
14	REVISED DRAWING	11/10/19	MM	MM
15	REVISED DRAWING	12/10/19	MM	MM
16	REVISED DRAWING	01/10/20	MM	MM
17	REVISED DRAWING	02/10/20	MM	MM
18	REVISED DRAWING	03/10/20	MM	MM
19	REVISED DRAWING	04/10/20	MM	MM
20	REVISED DRAWING	05/10/20	MM	MM
21	REVISED DRAWING	06/10/20	MM	MM
22	REVISED DRAWING	07/10/20	MM	MM
23	REVISED DRAWING	08/10/20	MM	MM
24	REVISED DRAWING	09/10/20	MM	MM
25	REVISED DRAWING	10/10/20	MM	MM
26	REVISED DRAWING	11/10/20	MM	MM
27	REVISED DRAWING	12/10/20	MM	MM
28	REVISED DRAWING	01/10/21	MM	MM
29	REVISED DRAWING	02/10/21	MM	MM
30	REVISED DRAWING	03/10/21	MM	MM
31	REVISED DRAWING	04/10/21	MM	MM
32	REVISED DRAWING	05/10/21	MM	MM
33	REVISED DRAWING	06/10/21	MM	MM
34	REVISED DRAWING	07/10/21	MM	MM
35	REVISED DRAWING	08/10/21	MM	MM
36	REVISED DRAWING	09/10/21	MM	MM
37	REVISED DRAWING	10/10/21	MM	MM
38	REVISED DRAWING	11/10/21	MM	MM
39	REVISED DRAWING	12/10/21	MM	MM
40	REVISED DRAWING	01/10/22	MM	MM
41	REVISED DRAWING	02/10/22	MM	MM
42	REVISED DRAWING	03/10/22	MM	MM
43	REVISED DRAWING	04/10/22	MM	MM
44	REVISED DRAWING	05/10/22	MM	MM
45	REVISED DRAWING	06/10/22	MM	MM
46	REVISED DRAWING	07/10/22	MM	MM
47	REVISED DRAWING	08/10/22	MM	MM
48	REVISED DRAWING	09/10/22	MM	MM
49	REVISED DRAWING	10/10/22	MM	MM
50	REVISED DRAWING	11/10/22	MM	MM
51	REVISED DRAWING	12/10/22	MM	MM
52	REVISED DRAWING	01/10/23	MM	MM
53	REVISED DRAWING	02/10/23	MM	MM
54	REVISED DRAWING	03/10/23	MM	MM
55	REVISED DRAWING	04/10/23	MM	MM
56	REVISED DRAWING	05/10/23	MM	MM
57	REVISED DRAWING	06/10/23	MM	MM
58	REVISED DRAWING	07/10/23	MM	MM
59	REVISED DRAWING	08/10/23	MM	MM
60	REVISED DRAWING	09/10/23	MM	MM
61	REVISED DRAWING	10/10/23	MM	MM
62	REVISED DRAWING	11/10/23	MM	MM
63	REVISED DRAWING	12/10/23	MM	MM
64	REVISED DRAWING	01/10/24	MM	MM
65	REVISED DRAWING	02/10/24	MM	MM
66	REVISED DRAWING	03/10/24	MM	MM
67	REVISED DRAWING	04/10/24	MM	MM
68	REVISED DRAWING	05/10/24	MM	MM
69	REVISED DRAWING	06/10/24	MM	MM
70	REVISED DRAWING	07/10/24	MM	MM
71	REVISED DRAWING	08/10/24	MM	MM
72	REVISED DRAWING	09/10/24	MM	MM
73	REVISED DRAWING	10/10/24	MM	MM
74	REVISED DRAWING	11/10/24	MM	MM
75	REVISED DRAWING	12/10/24	MM	MM
76	REVISED DRAWING	01/10/25	MM	MM
77	REVISED DRAWING	02/10/25	MM	MM
78	REVISED DRAWING	03/10/25	MM	MM
79	REVISED DRAWING	04/10/25	MM	MM
80	REVISED DRAWING	05/10/25	MM	MM
81	REVISED DRAWING	06/10/25	MM	MM
82	REVISED DRAWING	07/10/25	MM	MM
83	REVISED DRAWING	08/10/25	MM	MM
84	REVISED DRAWING	09/10/25	MM	MM
85	REVISED DRAWING	10/10/25	MM	MM
86	REVISED DRAWING	11/10/25	MM	MM
87	REVISED DRAWING	12/10/25	MM	MM
88	REVISED DRAWING	01/10/26	MM	MM
89	REVISED DRAWING	02/10/26	MM	MM
90	REVISED DRAWING	03/10/26	MM	MM
91	REVISED DRAWING	04/10/26	MM	MM
92	REVISED DRAWING	05/10/26	MM	MM
93	REVISED DRAWING	06/10/26	MM	MM
94	REVISED DRAWING	07/10/26	MM	MM
95	REVISED DRAWING	08/10/26	MM	MM
96	REVISED DRAWING	09/10/26	MM	MM
97	REVISED DRAWING	10/10/26	MM	MM
98	REVISED DRAWING	11/10/26	MM	MM
99	REVISED DRAWING	12/10/26	MM	MM
100	REVISED DRAWING	01/10/27	MM	MM

2019-07-26  
 ISSUED FOR REZONING  
 RE-SUBMISSION


NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
 (DC - 17-2436)

**JK HOME**  
 1000 10TH STREET, N.W.  
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

NO. 2 ROAD TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
 BUILDING SECTIONS

Project: #8193  
 Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"  
 Date: 07/26/19

**A.4.1**




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


**SUBJECT:**  
**TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT**  
10231-10097 No. 2 Road  
Richmond, BC

DRAWING TITLE:

DATE: 2005-JULY-09	<div style="text-align: center;"> <h1>12</h1> </div>	<div style="text-align: right;"> <p>OF 8</p> </div>
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"		
DRAWN: DY		
DESIGN: DY		
CHECK: MH		

PROJECT NO.	OF 8
CHIEF: HEM	
PROJECT NUMBER: 1000	





**CNCL - 214**



**CNCL - 216**



**RZ 17-794300**

**Attachment 3**

Address: 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 and 10397 No. 2 Road

Applicant: Konic Development Ltd.

Planning Area(s): Steveston (Schedule 2.4)

	Existing	Proposed
<b>Owner:</b>	Forest International Real Estate Investment Company Ltd.	No Change
<b>Site Size (m<sup>2</sup>):</b>	4,868.0 m <sup>2</sup>	4,857.6 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Land Uses:</b>	Single-Family Residential	Multiple-Family Residential
<b>OCP Designation:</b>	Low-Density Residential	No Change
<b>Area Plan Designation:</b>	Steveston Area Plan: Multiple-Family	No Change
<b>702 Policy Designation:</b>	N/A	No Change
<b>Zoning:</b>	Single Detached (RS1/E)	Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)
<b>Number of Units:</b>	7	22
<b>Other Designations:</b>	N/A	No Change

On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.60	0.60 Max.	none permitted
Lot Coverage – Building:	Max. 40%	40% Max.	none
Lot Coverage – Non-porous Surfaces:	Max. 65%	65% Max.	none
Lot Coverage – Landscaping:	Min. 25%	25% Min.	none
Setback – Front Yard (m):	Min. 6.0 m	4.5 m Min.	<b>Variance Requested</b>
Setback – North Side Yard (m):	Min. 3.0 m	3.0 m Min.	none
Setback – South Side Yard (m):	Min. 3.0 m	3.0 m Min.	none
Setback – Rear Yard (m):	Min. 3.0 m	6.0 m Min.	none
Height (m):	Max. 12.0 m (3 storeys)	12.0 m (3 storeys) Max. along No. 2 Road and 9.0 m (2 storeys) Max. along west property line	none
Lot Width:	Min. 50.0 m	110.0 m	none
Lot Depth:	Min. 35.0 m	44.6 m	none

<b>On Future Subdivided Lots</b>	<b>Bylaw Requirement</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Variance</b>
Off-street Parking Spaces – Regular (R) / Visitor (V):	2 (R) and 0.2 (V) per unit	2 (R) and 0.2 (V)	none
Off-street Parking Spaces – Total:	44 (R) and 5 (V)	44 (R) and 7 (V)	none
Tandem Parking Spaces:	Max. 50% of proposed residential spaces in enclosed garages (44 x Max. 50% = 22)	0	none
Small Car Parking Spaces	Max. 50% when 31 or more spaces are provided on-site (51 x Max. 50% = 25)	16	none
Handicap Parking Spaces:	Min. 2% when 11 or more spaces are required (49 x 2% = 1 spaces)	1	none
Bicycle Parking Spaces – Class 1 / Class 2:	1.25 (Class 1) and 0.2 (Class 2) per unit	1.5 (Class 1) and 0.2 (Class 2) per unit	none
Off-street Parking Spaces – Total:	28 (Class 1) and 5 (Class 2)	33 (Class 1) and 5 (Class 2)	none
Amenity Space – Indoor:	Min. 70 m <sup>2</sup> or Cash-in-lieu	Cash-in-lieu	none
Amenity Space – Outdoor:	Min. 6 m <sup>2</sup> x 22 units = 132 m <sup>2</sup>	240 m <sup>2</sup>	none

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



10211 No.2 Road  
Richmond, BC V7E 5M6

Mar 6, 2019

**HAND DELIVERED**

To: Occupants of 10211 No.2 Road, Richmond.

We are the developer to the south of your property developing townhouses located at 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 and 10397 No.2 Road, Richmond. We are sending you information to notify and keep you informed of this upcoming project. Kindly find attached the current draft developing plans for your reference (ATTACHMENT A).

The proposed development consists of approximately 22 townhouse units. The design of the proposal is in full compliance with various requirements with City of Richmond. The land use of the proposed development complies with Official Community Plan (OCP); the density and building height comply with Zoning Bylaw requirement. The front buildings are 3 storeys in height with both south and north end of buildings reduced to 2 storeys to adapt our neighbour's single-family homes. The rear buildings are all proposed to be 2 storeys. We will have more information to communicate after Planning Committee.

Should there be any questions or concerns about the project, please do not hesitate to email me at [michelle@konic.ca](mailto:michelle@konic.ca) or contact my direct line at 604-242-1062. Thank you for your valuable time in reading this notice.


Sincerely,

---

Michelle Lee  
Development Director  
Konic Development Ltd.

**DRAFT**














10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395, 10397 No.2 Road, Richmond




Development project: 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 and 10397 No.2 Road, Richmond.


I hand-delivered the Notification envelope containing a letter and site plan proposal (Attachment A) to the mail box of the following neighbours:

# Neighbouring Properties Notification summary

	Neighbour Address	Developer Representative	Date	Time	Feedback	Signature
1	10211 No.2 Road, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	6:55 PM	No comments	
2	5971 Wallace Road, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	6:40 PM	No comments	
3	5951 Wallace Road, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	5:20 PM	No comments	
4	5931 Wallace Road, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	5:30 PM	No comments	
5	10380 Sandiford Dr, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	5:38 PM	No comments	
6	10366 Sandiford Dr, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	5:45 PM	met one of landlord, his name is Bill at the property of 10366 Sandiford Dr Richmond. He thanked for us to deliver the update project information and site plan to him for reference, as he knew that his house is located at the back of our project site; therefore, he cares what status of our project is now, and the est. time frame for construction.	
7	10360 Sandiford Dr, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	5:50 PM	No comments	
8	10346 Sandiford Dr, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	5:58 PM	No comments	
9	10340 Sandiford Dr, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	6:05 PM	No comments	
10	10326 Sandiford Dr, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	6:10 PM	No comments	
11	10320 Sandiford Dr, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	6:20 PM	No comments	
12	10286 Sandiford Dr, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	6:28 PM	No comments	
13	10280 Sandiford Dr, Richmond	Jenny Lau (Konic)	8-Mar-19	6:33 PM	No comments	



Absolutely no grade changes are to occur within any TPZ; the grade cannot be altered (raised or lowered). All pre-loading, retaining walls, perimeter drainage & silt fencing must be installed outside of these Zones.



If any existing fence within any TPZ is to be removed & replaced, removal must be performed manually. The new fence must be placed in the same footprint using the existing post holes. Any excavation for any proposed landscaping that encroaches into any TPZ must be performed manually; if large roots (1.5" diameter and larger) are encountered, then the plantings must be shifted to accommodate. No more than 3" of additional good quality landscape soil (not construction grade fill) may be added into these Zones.

TREE #	SPECIES	DBH (cm)	SPREAD (m est.)
1	Plum ( <i>Prunus sp.</i> )	21	7m
2	Cherry ( <i>Prunus sp.</i> )	52	8m
3	Cherry ( <i>Prunus sp.</i> )	27 combined	6m
4	Plum ( <i>Prunus sp.</i> )	47 per combined	6m
5	Curly Willow ( <i>Salix sp.</i> )	58 combined	6m
6	Fig ( <i>Ficus sp.</i> )	30 combined	6m
7	Cypress ( <i>Chamaecyparis sp.</i> )	40 per survey	5m
8	Pear ( <i>Pyrus sp.</i> )	32 est. combined	4m
9	Cedar ( <i>Thuja plicata</i> )	-	3m
10	Oak ( <i>Quercus sp.</i> )	67 per survey	15m
11	Plum ( <i>Prunus sp.</i> )	60 combined	6m
12	Walnut ( <i>Juglans sp.</i> )	18 per survey	6m
13	Fig ( <i>Ficus sp.</i> )	Over 100	6m
14	Cherry ( <i>Prunus sp.</i> )	55 combined	6m
15	Cherry ( <i>Prunus sp.</i> )	45 combined	5m
16	Pine ( <i>Pinus sp.</i> )	80 per survey	18m
17	Japanese Maple ( <i>Acer palmatum</i> )	25 per survey	10m
18	Plum ( <i>Prunus sp.</i> )	24 combined	3m
19	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	-	2.8m
20	Pear ( <i>Pyrus sp.</i> )	57 combined	6m
21	Apple ( <i>Malus sp.</i> )	40 combined	5m
22	Tanarisk ( <i>Tamarix sp.</i> )	22	4m
23	Magnolia ( <i>Magnolia sp.</i> )	34 combined	6m
24	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	-	1m
25	Japanese Maple ( <i>Acer palmatum</i> )	50 est. combined	3m
26	Mountain Ash ( <i>Sorbus sp.</i> )	26 combined	6m

CNCL 224

TREE #	SPECIES	DBH (cm)	SPREAD (m est.)
27	Cherry ( <i>Prunus sp.</i> )	23	7m
28	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	30 per survey	6m
29	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	28 per survey	5m
30	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	25 per survey	5m
31	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	21 per survey	5m
32	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	25 per survey	5m
33	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	26 per survey	5m
34	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	33 per survey	5m
35	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	22 per survey	5m
36	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	26 per survey	5m
37	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	21 per survey	5m
38	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	21 per survey	4.4m
39	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	24 per survey	4.4m
40	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	25 per survey	4.4m
41	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	25 per survey	4.4m
42	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	24 per survey	4.4m
43	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	33 per survey	4.4m
44	Smokebush ( <i>Cotinus sp.</i> )	22 combined	3.9m
45	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	34 combined	3m
46	Cedar ( <i>Thuja occidentalis</i> )	36 combined	5m
47	Cedar	41	3.6m

TREE #	SPECIES	DBH (cm)	SPREAD (m est.)
	<i>(Thuja occidentalis Italis)</i>	combined	
	Cedar		
48	<i>(Thuja occidentalis)</i>	18 combined	3m
	Cedar		
49	<i>(Thuja occidentalis)</i>	19 combined	3m
	Cedar		
50	<i>(Thuja occidentalis)</i>	18 combined	3m
	Cedar		
51	<i>(Thuja occidentalis)</i>	10	2m
	Cedar		
52	<i>(Thuja occidentalis)</i>	26 combined	4.4m
	Cedar		
53	<i>(Thuja occidentalis)</i>	66 combined	4.4m
	Fig	40	
54	<i>(Ficus sp.)</i>	combined	3m
	Windmill palm		
	<i>(Trachycarpus fortunei)</i>	21	3m
	Lilac	28	
	<i>(Syringa sp.)</i>	combined	5m
	Cherry	29	
	<i>(Prunus sp.)</i>	combined	5m
	Cedar		
	<i>(Thuja occidentalis)</i>	22 per survey	2m
	Cherry		
	<i>(Prunus sp.)</i>	27	4m
	Lilac	65 per survey	3m
60	<i>(Syringa sp.)</i>		

CONC - 225

Suitable Replacement Tree Species

- Purple Fountain European Beech (*Fagus sylvatica* 'Purple Fountain')
- Japanese Tree Lilac 'Ivory Silk' (*Syringa reticulata* 'Ivory Silk')
- Japanese maple (*Acer palmatum* sp.)
- Persian Ironwood (*Parrotia persica*)
- Stewartia (*Stewartia pseudocamellia*)
- Ginkgo 'Princeton Sentry' (*Ginkgo biloba* 'Princeton Sentry')
- Dik's Weeping Cypress (*Chamaecyparis lawsoniana* 'Dik's Weeping')
- Serviceberry (*Amelanchier x grandiflora* 'Autumn Brilliance')
- Oriental Dogwood (*Cornus kousa*)

- Paperbark maple (*Acer griseum*)
- Threadleaf Cypress (*Chamaecyparis pisifera* 'Filifera')
- Sentinel Columnar pine (*Pinus nigra* 'sentinel')
- Picea omorika (*Serbian spruce*)



**Address:** 10231,10251,10351,10371,10391,10395 and 10397 No. 2 Road    **File No.:** RZ 17-794300

**Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10088, the developer is required to complete the following:**

1. Consolidation of all the lots into one development parcel (which will require the demolition of the existing dwellings).
2. Approximately 0.09 m road dedication along the entire No. 2 Road frontage to accommodate a new 1.5 m wide treed/grassed boulevard and a new 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk; exact width is to be confirmed with survey information to be submitted by the applicant.
3. Registration of a statutory right-of-way (SRW), and/or other legal agreements or measures; as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, over the entire area of the proposed entry driveway from No. 2 Road and the internal north-south manoeuvring aisle, in favour of future residential developments to the north and south. Language should be included in the SRW document that the City will not be responsible for maintenance or liability within the SRW and that utility SRW under the drive aisle is not required.
4. Registration of a cross-access easement agreement over the garbage/recycling/organic waste collection facility (design as per Development Permit for 10231,10251,10351,10371,10391,10395 and 10397 No. 2 Road), in favour of the future residential (townhouse) development at 10211 No. 2 Road, allowing access to/from the garbage/recycling/organic waste collection facility at the development site.
5. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title.
6. Registration of a legal agreement on Title to ensure that Registration of a legal agreements on Title or other measures, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, to ensure that:
  - a) No final Building Permit inspection is granted until four secondary suites are constructed on site, to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with the BC Building Code and the City's Zoning Bylaw.
  - b) The secondary suites cannot be stratified or otherwise held under separate title.
7. Registration of a legal agreement on title identifying that the proposed development must be designed and constructed to meet or exceed EnerGuide 82 criteria for energy efficiency and that all dwellings are pre-ducted for solar hot water heating. Language should be included in the legal agreement that if an acceptable Building Permit application for the proposed development is not submitted to the City by December 31, 2019, the proposed development would be subject to the Energy Step Code requirements expected to be in place at the time of the proposed project's Building Permit application.
8. Submission of a Contract entered into between the applicant and a Certified Arborist for supervision of any on-site works conducted within the tree protection zone of the trees to be retained on the neighbouring properties. The Contract should include the scope of work to be undertaken, including: the proposed number of site monitoring inspections, and a provision for the Arborist to submit a post-construction assessment report to the City for review.
9. Submission of a Tree Survival Security to the City in the amount of \$1,000 for the Mountain Ash tree (specifically tag# 26) located at the southwest corner of the site to be retained on site. No Tree Survival Security will be returned until the post-construction assessment report, confirming the protected trees survived the construction, prepared by the Arborist, is reviewed by staff.
10. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$7,500.00 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of 15 replacement trees within the City. If additional replacement trees (over and beyond the 37 replacement trees as proposed at the rezoning stage) could be accommodated on-site (as determined at Development Permit stage), the above cash-in-lieu contribution would be reduced in the rate of \$500 per additional replacement trees to be planted on-site.
11. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$50,000.00 towards the future upgrade of the special crosswalk at the intersection of No.2 Road and Goldsmith Drive.
12. Contribution of \$25,000.00 in-lieu of on-site indoor amenity space.

13. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$8.50 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$266,662.53) to the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund.
14. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$0.85 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$26,666.25) to the City's Public Art fund.
15. Enter into a Servicing Agreement\* for the design and construction of frontage 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,

Water Works:

- a) Using the OCP Model, there is 334 L/s of water available at a 20 psi residual at the No 2 Road frontage. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of 220 L/s.
- b) The Developer is required to:
  - i. Submit Fire Underwriter Survey (FUS) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) fire flow calculations to confirm development has adequate fire flow for onsite fire protection. Calculations must be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and be based on Building Permit Stage building designs.
  - ii. Provide an additional hydrant north of the proposed driveway to meet City hydrant spacing requirements for multi-family land use.
  - iii. Provide a right-of-way for the water meter. Minimum right-of-way dimensions to be the size of the meter box (from the City of Richmond supplementary specifications) + any appurtenances (for example, the bypass on W2o-SD) + 0.5 m on all sides. Exact right-of-way dimensions to be finalized via the servicing agreement process.
- c) At Developer's cost, the City is to:
  - i. Cut, cap, and remove the existing water service connections and meters to the development site.
  - ii. Install a new water service connection off the water main on the east side of No 2 Road, complete with meter and meter box off. Meter to be located onsite in a right of way.

Storm Sewer Works:

- a) The Developer is required to:
  - i. 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.
  - ii. Provide a right-of-way for the proposed inspection chamber. Exact right of way dimensions to be finalized in the servicing agreement review process.
  - iii. Confirm, by video inspection, the location of the service connection for 10211 No 2 Road and reconnect to the box culvert per Richmond specifications following the removal of the connection serving 10231 No 2 Road. Connection to be done by City forces at Developer's cost.
  - iv. Remove the existing perimeter drain along the common property line of 10251 and 10351 No 2 Road. Following the removal of the perimeter drain, developer may apply to the City to discharge the portion of right-of-way plan 58634 that contained the removed drain. The Developer is responsible to coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus, Shaw, Fortis BC, and other private utility companies to confirm that there are no existing private utilities within the right of way prior to right of way discharge. Additional rights of ways may be required by those companies if private utilities exist within the City right of way.
- b) At Developer's cost, the City is to:
  - i. Cut, cap, and remove the existing storm service connections to the development site.
  - ii. Install a new storm service connection complete with inspection chamber to serve the proposed development. Inspection chamber to be located onsite in a right-of-way. Where possible, an existing hole in the box culvert shall be reused.

Sanitary Sewer Works:

- a) The Developer is required to not start on-site excavation or building construction prior to completion of rear-yard sanitary works by City crews.
- b) At Developer's cost, the City is to:
  - i. Cut, cap, and remove the existing sanitary connections to the development site. The existing inspection chamber at the northwest corner of the development site (SIC13826) shall be retained to serve 10211 No 2 Road.
  - ii. Install a new sanitary service connection complete with inspection chamber to serve the proposed development. Where possible, the connection shall be made to a manhole.

Frontage Improvements:

- a) No. 2 Road Frontage Improvements
  - i. Sidewalk, boulevard and curb/gutter:
    - Remove the existing sidewalk and construct a new 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk next to the new property line.
    - Construct a new 1.5 m wide grass/tree boulevard over the remaining width between the new sidewalk and the existing west curb of No. 2 Road.
    - The new sidewalk and boulevard are to transition to meet the existing frontage treatments to the north and south of the subject site.
  - ii. All existing driveways along the No. 2 Road 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, grass/tree boulevard and concrete sidewalk per standards described under Item 1 above.
  - iii. Consult Engineering on lighting and other utility requirements as part of the frontage works. There are utility poles that will need to be relocated.
  - iv. Vehicle Access
    - All existing driveways along the No. 2 Road development frontage are to be closed permanently. Vehicle access to the subject development is to be provided by a single driveway located on No. 2 Road directly across from Goldsmith Dr. and restricted to right-in/right-out movement only. As part of the functional road plan, the driveway design showing a raised centre median in the driveway with adequate width to allow for SU9 truck turning movements in and out of the site without crossing the lane lines on No. 2 Rd. is required.
    - City design standards for driveways are to be met; however, due to the turn restrictions, the driveway on No. 2 Rd. will be wider than 7.5m. From the PL the drive aisle width can reduce to 6.7m with a 5:1 taper.
  - v. The Developer is required to:
    - 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 relocate the existing Hydro poles in conflict with the proposed sidewalk into a right-of-way onsite along the back of the proposed sidewalk.
      - 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 location of all above ground structures. If a private utility company does

GNOL-1228

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_

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
- Review street lighting levels along the No 2 Road frontage and upgrade as required.

General Items:

a) The Developer is required to:

- (1) Not encroach into City rights-of-ways with proposed trees, retaining walls, non-removable fences, or other non-removable structures.
- (2) 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.
- (3) Provide a video inspection report of the existing sanitary sewer along the west property line 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.
- (4) 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.
- (5) 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..

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

1. Complete a proposed townhouse energy efficiency report and recommendations prepared by a Certified Energy Advisor which demonstrates how the proposed construction will meet or exceed the required townhouse energy efficiency standards (EnerGuide 82 or better), in compliance with the City's Official Community Plan.

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

1. Submission of a Landscaping Security based on 100% of the cost estimate provided by the landscape architect.

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

1. Installation of appropriate tree protection fencing around all trees to be retained as part of the development prior to any construction activities, including building demolition, occurring on-site.

Note: Should the applicant wish to begin site preparation work after third reading of the rezoning bylaw, but prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw and issuance of the Development Permit, the applicant will be required to obtain a Tree Permit and submit landscaping security (i.e. \$26,000 in total) to ensure the replacement planting will be provided.

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

1. Remove the existing perimeter drain along the common property line of 10251 and 10351 No. 2 Road and apply to the City to discharge the portion of Right-of-Way Plan 58634 that contained the removed drain prior to Building Permit issuance. The developer will be responsible to coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus, Shaw, Fortis BC, and other private utility companies to confirm that there are no existing private utilities within the right of way prior to the right of way discharge.
2. 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.
3. Incorporation of accessibility measures in Building Permit (BP) plans as determined via the Rezoning and/or Development Permit processes.
4. Obtain a Building Permit (BP) for any construction hoarding. If construction hoarding is required to temporarily occupy a public street, the air space above a public street, or any part thereof, additional City approvals and associated fees may be required as part of the Building Permit. For additional information, contact the Building Approvals 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.



---

**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500  
Amendment Bylaw 10088 (RZ 17-794300)  
10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 and 10397 No. 2 Road**

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

1. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following area and by designating it **“Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)”**.

P.I.D. 003-995-879

Lot 981 Section 36 Block 5 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 58183

and

P.I.D. 004-005-066

Lot 982 Section 36 Block 5 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 58183

and

P.I.D. 003-897-095

Lot 713 Section 36 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 58349

and

P.I.D. 004-536-339

Lot 712 Section 36 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 58349

and

P.I.D. 001-897-004

Lot 711 Section 36 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 58349

and

P.I.D. 003-881-261

Lot 211 Except: Part Subdivided by Plan 58349, Section 36 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 48291

and

P.I.D. 004-323-653

Lot 710 Section 36 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 58349

2. This Bylaw may be cited as **“Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10088”**.

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

---

---

---

---

---

---

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED by E-L
APPROVED by Director or Solicitor 

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER



# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

**To:** Planning Committee  
**From:** Wayne Craig  
Director of Development


**Date:** September 4, 2019

**File:** RZ 18-839945


**Re:** Application by Konic Development Ltd. for Rezoning at 4571, 4591, and 4611/4631 Steveston Highway from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" and "Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1)" to "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)"

### Staff Recommendation

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10081, for the rezoning of 4571, 4591, and 4611/4631 Steveston Highway from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" and "Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1)" to "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)," be introduced and given first reading.

  
Wayne Craig  
Director of Development

WC:jr  
Att. 6

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

## **Staff Report**

### **Origin**

Konic Development Ltd. has applied to the City of Richmond for permission to rezone 4571, 4591, and 4611/4631 Steveston Highway from the “Single Detached (RS1/E)” and “Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1)” zones to the “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)” zone, in order to develop 16 townhouse units and one secondary suite with vehicle access from Steveston Highway. A location map and an aerial photo are provided in Attachment 1.

### **Findings of Fact**

A Development Application Data Sheet providing details about the development proposal is provided in Attachment 2.

#### Subject Site Existing Housing Profile

The subject site contains two single family dwellings and one duplex, all of which would be demolished. The applicant has indicated that all four dwellings were previously owner-occupied.

### **Surrounding Development**

Development immediately surrounding the subject site is generally as follows:

- To the North: single family dwellings fronting Bonavista Drive on lots zoned “Single-Detached (RS1/B).”
- To the South, across Steveston Highway: single family dwellings on lots zoned “Single-Detached (RS1/B).”
- To the East: a single family dwelling on a lot zoned “Single Detached (RS1/E).”
- To the West: a single family dwelling on a lot zoned “Single Detached (RS1/E).”

### **Related Policies & Studies**

#### Official Community Plan/Steveston Area Plan

The subject site is located in the Steveston planning area, and has an Official Community Plan (OCP) designation of “Neighbourhood Residential.” The land use designation in the Steveston Area Plan is “Multiple Family” (Attachment 3). The proposed rezoning is consistent with these designations.

#### Arterial Road Policy

The subject site is located on an arterial road identified in the Arterial Road Land Use Policy, and has a land use designation of “Arterial Road Townhouses.” The proposed rezoning is consistent with this designation.

The proposed development involves three properties with a total frontage of 61.89 m on Steveston Highway, which is consistent with the minimum 50 m frontage suggested for major arterial roads in the Arterial Road Land Use Policy. Future lot consolidation to the east of the subject site would fall short of this minimum, at 48.47 m, however this should not be a barrier to future redevelopment.

Prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw, the applicant is required to grant a Statutory Right-of-Way for Public Rights-of-Passage across the entire drive aisle, which would allow future developments to the east and west the option to share the driveway access to Steveston Highway.

#### Affordable Housing Strategy

As per the City's Affordable Housing Strategy, townhouse rezoning applications are required to provide a cash-in-lieu contribution of \$8.50 per buildable square foot towards the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund. The applicant proposes to make a cash-in-lieu contribution of \$164,798, which is consistent with the Affordable Housing Strategy.

#### Public Art Program Policy

The applicant will be participating in the City's Public Art Program by making a voluntary contribution to the City's Public Art Reserve fund for City-wide projects on City lands. Since this rezoning was received in 2018, the applicable rate for the contribution is \$0.85 per buildable square foot; for a total contribution in the amount of \$16,480. This voluntary contribution is required to be submitted to the City prior to final adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

#### Floodplain Management Implementation Strategy

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

#### **Public Consultation**

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

Should the Planning Committee endorse this application and Council grant 1<sup>st</sup> reading to the rezoning bylaw, the bylaw will be forwarded to a Public Hearing, where any area resident or interested party will have an opportunity to comment. Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the *Local Government Act*.

#### **Analysis**

##### Built Form and Architectural Character

The applicant proposes nine three-storey townhouse units and seven two-storey townhouse units arranged on an L-shaped central drive aisle. Conceptual development plans are included in Attachment 4.

The proposed site layout consists of:

- two three-storey buildings, containing nine three-storey units and one two-storey unit, for a total of ten units, fronting Steveston Highway; and
- three two-storey buildings, containing a total of six units, along the north end of the site.

The two proposed buildings fronting Steveston Highway each contain five units. Secondary eaves break up the vertical massing on the first and second storeys, and projecting gable ends highlighting the unit entries. Roof gables framing the upper storey windows and decorative elements portray a strong traditional residential character. A secondary suite is proposed to be located in Unit 102.

The three proposed buildings at the rear of the site each contain two two-storey townhouse units in order to present a gradual transition to the adjacent single family neighbourhood. These buildings include similar architectural details as those on Steveston Highway, including secondary eaves above the first storey and use of gable ends to frame upper storey windows. Unit 111 is proposed to be a convertible unit. The provision of a second convertible unit will be included in the Development Permit review process.

Further refinement of the site plan, architectural character, and accessibility features will occur through the Development Permit process.

#### Variance Requested

The proposed development is generally in compliance with the “Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)” zone in Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, with the exception of a variance to decrease the front yard setback from 6.0 m to 4.92 m. The building face would be approximately 8.72 m from back of curb.

Staff is supportive of this variance as the shift in building massing towards Steveston Highway is a direct result of providing a 6.0 m rear yard setback to the adjacent single family properties. In addition to providing a sensitive interface with the adjacent properties, the deeper setback allows for an existing row of off-site trees to be retained.

#### Amenity Space

The applicant is proposing a cash contribution in-lieu of providing the required indoor amenity space on site, at the applicable rate established in the OCP (i.e. \$1,600/unit for applications received prior to February 28, 2019). The total cash contribution for this 16-unit townhouse development is \$25,600.

A common outdoor amenity space is proposed at the northwest end of the site, directly across from the entry drive aisle. The size and dimensions of the proposed outdoor amenity space are consistent with the OCP. The proposal includes landscaping, seating, and a large play structure suitable for children. Further refinement of the common outdoor amenity space will occur through the Development Permit process.

### Transportation and Site Access

Vehicle access is proposed from Steveston Highway, via a driveway located at the western edge of the subject site. The driveway crossing will be designed to restrict vehicle movements to a “right in, right out” turning pattern. The applicant is required to register a statutory right-of-way across the entire drive aisle in order to accommodate access to future developments to the east and west of the subject site.

Two parking spaces are provided for each unit consistent with the Zoning Bylaw. Seven of the sixteen units have parking in a tandem arrangement. The applicant is required to register a legal agreement on Title ensuring that the areas used for tandem parking are not converted to habitable space.

The applicant has agreed to provide a \$5,700 cash-in-lieu contribution for upgrades to the existing special crosswalk at the Steveston Highway and Bonavista Gate intersection. Upgrades will include LED street light luminaire, intersection lighting, and Audio Pedestrian Signals.

### 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 four bylaw-sized trees on the subject property, six trees on a neighbouring property, and two 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:

- Four trees (Tag # 927, 928, 929, and 930) located on the development site have either been historically topped, or exhibit structural defects such as cavities at the main branch union and co-dominant stems with inclusions. As a result these trees are in poor condition and are not good candidate for retention. Remove and replace.
- One Cedar windrow (Tag # N01) comprised of six trees located on an adjacent property to the north of the development site is to be retained and protected. Provide tree protection as per City of Richmond Tree Protection Information Bulletin Tree-03.
- Replacement trees should be specified at 2:1 ratio as per the OCP.

Parks staff have reviewed the Arborist’s Report and support the Arborist’s finding, with the following comments:

- One Black locust tree (Tag # C01) and one Western red cedar tree (Tag # C02) are in poor condition and have been topped to accommodate the overhead hydro lines. Removal is recommended. Replacement boulevard trees to be planted through the Servicing Agreement for frontage works.
- In addition to new trees planted through the Servicing Agreement, the developer is required to contribute \$2,600 to the City’s Tree Compensation Fund for the removal of these two trees.

### *Tree Protection*

Six trees (Tag # N01) on a neighbouring property are to be retained and protected. In addition, a Cedar hedge located on a neighbouring property to the west of the subject site will 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 (Attachment 5). 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, 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 is completed.

### *Tree Replacement*

The applicant wishes to remove four on-site trees (Trees # 927-930). The 2:1 replacement ratio would require a total of eight replacement trees. The applicant has proposed to plant 21 trees on the development 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
6	11 cm	5.5 m
2	10 cm	6 m

In addition to the replacement trees planted on-site, the applicant will contribute \$2,600 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the two City-owned trees being removed.

### BC Energy Step Code

On July 26, 2018, Council adopted BC Energy Step Code requirements for all new residential developments. The proposed development consists of townhouses that staff anticipates would be designed and built in accordance with Part 9 of the BC Building Code. As such, this development would be expected to achieve Step 3 of the Energy Step Code for Part 9 construction (Climate Zone 4).

### Existing Legal Encumbrances

There are two restrictive covenants registered on Title of 4611/4631 Steveston Highway. One covenant (RD85670) reserves a portion of the property for future lane construction by the City. This covenant was secured as a condition of the development of several properties in 1979, and it was the intent at the time for a rear lane to be established from Ransford Gate and Bonavista Gate. However, the land use designation was revised on December 19, 2016, to allow Arterial Road Townhouses with vehicle access from Steveston Highway. As the City is no longer pursuing a rear lane in this location the covenant should be discharged prior to adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

The second covenant (BF506485) restricts the property to a two-unit dwelling only. This covenant must be discharged prior to adoption of the rezoning bylaw.

In addition, there are several statutory rights-of-ways (SRW) for utilities registered on the Titles of each property. These SRWs will not be impacted by the proposed rezoning, and the applicant is aware that encroachment into the SRW areas is not permitted.

### Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

The applicant is required to enter into a Servicing Agreement at Building Permit stage for the design and construction of the required site servicing and frontage improvements, as described in Attachment 6. Frontage improvements include, but may not be limited to, the following:

- Removal of existing sidewalk and replacement with a new 1.5 m concrete sidewalk at the property line and minimum 1.5 m wide landscaped boulevard with street trees behind the existing curb;
- Removal of the existing driveway crossings and replacement with the frontage works described above; and
- Construction of a new driveway crossing designed to provide “right in, right out” access to the site.

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

- Compliance with the Development Permit Guidelines for multi-family developments and arterial road townhouses in the OCP.
- Refinement of the proposed building form and architectural character to achieve an engaging streetscape along Steveston Highway.

- Review of the size and species of on-site trees to ensure bylaw compliance and to achieve a mix of coniferous and deciduous species.
- Design of the common outdoor amenity space, including choice of play equipment and other features to ensure a safe and vibrant environment for children's play and social interaction.
- Review of accessibility features, including aging-in-place features in all units, and the provision of two convertible units.
- Review of a sustainability strategy for the development proposal, including steps to achieve Step 3 of the Energy Step Code for Part 9 construction (Climate Zone 4).

### **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**

The purpose of this application is to rezone 4571, 4591, and 4611/4631 Steveston Highway from the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" and "Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1)" zones to the "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone, in order to develop 16 townhouse units and one secondary suite with vehicle access from Steveston Highway.

The rezoning application complies with the land use designations and applicable policies contained within the OCP for the subject site. Further review of the project design will be completed as part of the Development Permit application review process.

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

It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10081 be introduced and given first reading.



Jordan Rockerbie  
Planning Technician – Design  
(604-276-4092)

JR:rg

Attachment 1: Location Map and Aerial Photo  
Attachment 2: Development Application Data Sheet  
Attachment 3: Steveston Area Plan Land Use Map



Attachment 4: Conceptual Development Plans

Attachment 5: Tree Management Plan

Attachment 6: Rezoning Considerations



# City of Richmond



## RZ 18-839945

CNCL - 242


Original Date: 11/21/18

Revision Date: 11/21/18

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



City of  
Richmond



RZ 18-839945

Original Date: 11/21/18

Revision Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES

CNCL - 243



**RZ 18-839945**

**Attachment 2**

Address: 4571, 4591, and 4611/4631 Steveston Highway

Applicant: Konic Development Ltd.

Planning Area(s): Steveston

	Existing	Proposed
<b>Owner:</b>	Luxor Homes & Developments, Ltd. 0780012 BC Ltd. 2517294 Ontario Inc. Gurpreet Mann Narinder Mann	To be determined
<b>Site Size (m<sup>2</sup>):</b>	3,002 m <sup>2</sup>	No change
<b>Land Uses:</b>	Single-family and duplex dwellings	Townhouse dwellings
<b>OCP Designation:</b>	Neighbourhood Residential	No change
<b>Area Plan Designation:</b>	Multiple-Family	No change
<b>Zoning:</b>	Single Detached (RS1/E) Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1)	Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)
<b>Number of Units:</b>	2 single-family dwellings 1 duplex dwelling	16 townhouse dwellings 1 secondary suite
<b>Other Designations:</b>	Arterial Road Townhouses	No change


On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Floor Area Ratio:	Max. 0.60 FAR	0.60 FAR	none permitted
Buildable Floor Area (m <sup>2</sup> ):*	Max. 1,801 m <sup>2</sup> (19,388 ft <sup>2</sup> )	1,799 m <sup>2</sup> (19,373 ft <sup>2</sup> )	none permitted
Lot Coverage (% of lot area):	Building: Max. 40% Non-porous Surfaces: Max. 65% Live Landscaping: Min. 25%	Building: Max. 40% Non-porous Surfaces: Max. 65% Live Landscaping: Min. 25%	none
Lot Size:	N/A	3,000 m <sup>2</sup>	none
Lot Dimensions (m):	Width: 50.0 m Depth: 35.0 m	Width: 61.89 m Depth: 45.70 m	none
Setbacks (m):	Front: Min. 6.0 m Rear: Min. 3.0 m Side: Min. 3.0 m	Front: 4.9 m Rear: 6.01 m Side (West): 7.05 m Side (East): 3.05 m	<b>Vary front yard setback</b>
Height (m):	12.0 m	11.97 m	none











On Future Subdivided Lots	Bylaw Requirement	Proposed	Variance
Off-street Parking Spaces – Regular (R) / Visitor (V):	2 (R) and 0.2 (V) per unit	2 (R) and 0.25 (V) per unit	none
Off-street Parking Spaces – Total:	36 (up to 50% small car)	36 (8 small car)	none
Tandem Parking Spaces:	Permitted – Maximum of 50% of required spaces	14, i.e. 38%	none
Amenity Space – Indoor:	Min. 50 m <sup>2</sup> or cash-in-lieu	Cash-in-lieu (\$25,600)	none
Amenity Space – Outdoor:	Min. 96 m <sup>2</sup>	198.5 m <sup>2</sup>	none

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

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

City of Richmond

**Steveston Area Land Use Map**Bylaw 9604  
2016/12/19

	Single-Family		Institutional
	Single-Detached/Duplex/Triplex		Conservation Area
	Multiple-Family		Trail
	Commercial		Steveston Area Boundary
	Public Open Space		Steveston Waterfront Neighbourhood Boundary



ARCHITECTURE  
INTERIOR  
PLANNING

Copyright Reserved  
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from Imperial Architecture.

DISCLAIMER  
Imperial Architecture is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of the information provided in this document. The user of this document is advised to verify the information provided in this document with the appropriate authorities.

Imperial Architecture  
4571, 4591 & 4611 STEVESTON HWY.  
RICHMOND, BC V6X 1A9  
TEL: 604-275-3157 FAX: 604-275-3157  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
(2019-08-16)

Client: STEVESTON HWY. TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT FOR  
J.H. KONGE

4571, 4591 & 4611 STEVESTON HWY.  
RICHMOND, BC V6X 1A9  
COVER PAGE

Page No. 1 of 1  
Sheet N.T.S.  
Drawing No. A0.0



CNCL - 247

### CONTACT LIST

## TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT (RZ 18-839945) 4571, 4591, 4611 STEVESTON HIGHWAY, RICHMOND, BC


ISSUED FOR REZONING RE-SUBMISSION 2019-08-16

### DRAWING LIST

- ARCHITECTURAL:
- A0.0 COVER SHEET
  - A0.1 COLOR RENDERING - EYE LEVEL STREETSCAPE VIEWS
  - A0.2 COLOR RENDERING - BIRD-EYE VIEWS
  - A0.3 PROJECT DATA & STATISTICS
  - A0.4 SITE CONTEXT AERIAL IMAGE
  - A0.5 SITE CONTEXT PLANTSCAPE ELEVATION
  - A0.6 SITE SURVEY PLAN
  - A1.1 SITE / LEVEL 1 PLAN
  - A1.2 SITE PLAN
  - A1.3 FIRE FIGHTING PLAN
  - A1.4 PARKING PLAN
  - A1.5 PRIVATE OUTDOOR ARE & OUTDOOR AMENITY AREA OVERLAY
  - A1.6 SITE COVERAGE AREA OVERLAY (BUILDING & PORCH)
  - A1.7 DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL PLAN

- A2.1 BUILDING A FLOOR PLANS
- A2.2 BUILDING B FLOOR PLANS
- A2.3 BUILDING C, D, E FLOOR PLANS
- A3.1 CONTEXT / RUNNING ELEVATIONS
- A3.2 BUILDING A ELEVATIONS
- A3.3 BUILDING B ELEVATIONS
- A3.4 BUILDING C ELEVATIONS
- A3.5 BUILDING D & E ELEVATIONS
- A4.1 BUILDING SECTIONS
- A5.1 UNIT TYPE A1-A4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.2 UNIT TYPE B1-B4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.3 UNIT TYPE C1-C4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.4 UNIT TYPE D1-D4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.5 UNIT TYPE E1-E4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.6 UNIT TYPE F1-F4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.7 UNIT TYPE G1-G4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.8 UNIT TYPE H1-H4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.9 UNIT TYPE I1-I4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.10 UNIT TYPE J1-J4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.11 UNIT TYPE K1-K4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.12 UNIT TYPE L1-L4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.13 UNIT TYPE M1-M4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.14 UNIT TYPE N1-N4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.15 UNIT TYPE O1-O4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.16 UNIT TYPE P1-P4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.17 UNIT TYPE Q1-Q4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.18 UNIT TYPE R1-R4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.19 UNIT TYPE S1-S4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.20 UNIT TYPE T1-T4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.21 UNIT TYPE U1-U4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.22 UNIT TYPE V1-V4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.23 UNIT TYPE W1-W4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.24 UNIT TYPE X1-X4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.25 UNIT TYPE Y1-Y4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM
- A5.26 UNIT TYPE Z1-Z4 AREA CALCULATION DIAGRAM

- ARCHITECT  
IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE  
7705 FRANK STREET  
VANCOUVER, BC V6P 4V5  
CONTACT: JANG ZHU, ARCHITECT ABC  
TEL: 778-839-8532  
EMAIL: IMPERIALARCHITECTURE@GMAIL.COM
- SURVEYOR  
J.C. TAM & ASSOCIATES  
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYORS  
115-1151 HORSeshoe WAY, RICHMOND, BC V6X 3C9  
CONTACT: JOHNSON TAM, B.C.L.S.  
TEL: 604-214-4228  
EMAIL: OFFICE@JCTAM.COM
- ELECTRICAL  
ELECTRICAL CONSULTING LTD.  
108-1121 HORSeshoe WAY, RICHMOND, BC V6X 3B7  
CONTACT: RICHARD V. LEW, P. ENG.  
TEL: 604-275-3157  
EMAIL: RLEW@ELECTCONSULTING.COM
- LANDSCAPE  
PMD LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS  
115-1151 HORSeshoe WAY, RICHMOND, BC V6X 3C9  
CONTACT: MARY CHAN YIP, MCLSA | MCLSA  
TEL: 604-234-0011  
EMAIL: MARY@PMDLANDSCAPE.COM
- ARBORIST  
A2L GROUP ARBORIST CONSULTING  
115-1151 HORSeshoe WAY, RICHMOND, BC V6X 3C9  
CONTACT: JACQUELYN OTTO, ARBORIST  
TEL: 604-413-5911  
P: 604-275-3484  
EMAIL: AELIC@A2LGROUP.CA
- CIVIL  
CORE CONCEPT CONSULTING LTD.  
CIVIL & MECHANICAL & SURVEY  
229-5033 VIKING WAY, RICHMOND, BC V6X 3B7  
CONTACT: BRUCE DUFFY, DIRECTOR  
TEL: 604-269-5064, FAX: 604-269-5061  
EMAIL: BRUCE@CORECONCEPTCONSULTING.COM



**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
BOLLEAS OF AN ARCHITECTURE OF PRACTICE  
ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS  
1000 WEST 10TH AVENUE, SUITE 100  
DENVER, CO 80202  
TEL: 303.733.1111  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

ARCHITECT  
INTERIOR  
PLANNING

Copyright Reserved

This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture, Inc. and is not to be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Imperial Architecture, Inc.

DISCLAIMER

This drawing is a conceptual rendering and is not intended to represent a final design. It is for informational purposes only and should not be used for any other purpose without the prior written permission of Imperial Architecture, Inc.

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	CHKD.
1	ISSUED FOR REZONING	08/16/2019	JK	JK
2	RESUBMISSION	08/16/2019	JK	JK
3	COLOR RENDERING	08/16/2019	JK	JK
4	FINAL	08/16/2019	JK	JK

ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
(2019-08-16)

CLIENT  
STEVENSON HWY TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT FOR

KSAC  
4011, 4011 & 4011 STEVENSON HWY,  
RICHMOND, NC 28217 (34.59945)

COLOR RENDERING

Project No.  
#8217

Scale  
N.T.S.

Sheet  
A 0.1



CNCL - 248

**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
 ARCHITECTS  
 4571 45th AVE STEVENSON, MD 21154  
 410.481.1111  
 www.imperialarchitect.com

ARCHITECTURE  
 INTERIOR  
 PLANNING

Copyright © 2019 Imperial Architecture, LLC  
 All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from Imperial Architecture, LLC.

DISCLAIMER  
 This drawing is a conceptual site plan and is not intended to be used for construction. It is the responsibility of the client to ensure that all necessary permits and approvals are obtained from the appropriate authorities.

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	CHKD
1	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)	08/16/2019	JD	JD
2	REVISION			
3	REVISION			
4	REVISION			
5	REVISION			
6	REVISION			
7	REVISION			
8	REVISION			
9	REVISION			
10	REVISION			


ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)

OWNER: STEVENSON HWY TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT FOR  
 4571 45th AVE STEVENSON, MD 21154  
 410.481.1111  
 www.imperialarchitect.com


TITLE: SITE CONTEXT PLAN / STREETScape ELEVATION

Project No: #8217  
 Date: 08/16/2019  
 Scale: 1"=20'-0"


Sheet: A0.5 of 1



CNCL - 249







**ChasPriced**  
STEVESTON HWY TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT FOR

**KONIC**  
ALUMINUM

4571, 4591 & 4611 STEVESTON HWY,  
RICHMOND, BC (R2 18-R30945)

SITE PLAN

Project No.	Scale	3/32"=1'-0"	Revision
#8217			
Drawing No.	Sheet		of
A12			

 LANDSCAPE BUFFER[illegible]

**GENERAL NOTES:**


1. KLEIN PLACE FEATURES SUCH AS "SWEETWALL" HANDRAILS, SOLID BLOCKING IN WASHROOM WALLS TO FACILITATE FUTURE GRAB BAR INSTALLATION BESIDE TOILET, BATHUB AND SHOWER AND "LEVER-TYPE" HANDLES FOR PLUMBING FIXTURES AND OTHER MATERIALS WILL BE PROVIDED IN ALL DIVISIONS.

3. UNIT 02 (TYPE C) IS THE CONVERTIBLE
4. THE PROJECT WILL PROVIDE AIR SOURCE VENTILATION SYSTEM TO ACHIEVE STRIKE CODE REQUIREMENTS. FOLLOWING SUSTAINABLE FEATURES WILL ALSO BE PROVIDED IN THE BUILDING:
  - A) SOLAR HOT WATER REPAIR AND LIGHT BATTERY TOP APPLIANCES AND EQUIPMENT
  - B) ENERGY DOUBLE GLAZING WINDOWS
  - C) POWER OUTLET IN PRIVATE GARAGE FOR CHARGING ELECTRIC CAR
5. THE MECHANICAL HEATING AND COOLING SYSTEMS WILL BE DESIGNED TO COMPLY WITH RELATIVE REQUIREMENTS IN ICC-2017 AND ASHRAE AS REGARDING THE STANDARDS OF THERMAL COMFORT.
6. AN AUTOMATED IRRIGATION SYSTEM FOR FUTURE ON-GOING MAINTENANCE WILL BE INSTALLED, SEE LANDSCAPE



# PLAN #1

1 SITE PLAN  
A1.2 SCALE 3/32"=1'-0"



**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**

ARCHITECTS OF RECORD

10000 WILLOW CREEK DRIVE, SUITE 100  
DALLAS, TEXAS 75243-1000

PH: 214.416.1000  
FAX: 214.416.1001  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

**Copyright Reserved**

No part of this drawing may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from Imperial Architecture.

**Disclaimer:**

This drawing is prepared for the use of the client and is not to be used for any other purpose without the written consent of Imperial Architecture.

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

**ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION**

**(2019-08-16)**

STEVESTON HWY TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT FOR

**KONIE**


ATTORNEY

4011 40TH AVENUE, SUITE 100  
RICHMOND, BC V6X 4A9

**BUILDING A FLOOR PLANS**

Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"

Sheet: A2.1




**2. BUILDING A LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN**

SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"

A2.1

**GENERAL NOTES:**


- AGING IN PLACE FEATURES SUCH AS "STAIRWELL HANDRAILS, SOLID BLOCKING IN WASHROOM WALLS TO FACILITATE FUTURE GRAB BAR INSTALLATION BESIDE TOILET, BATHUB AND SHOWER" AND "LEVER-TYPE HANDLES FOR PLUMBING FIXTURES AND DOOR HANDLES" WILL BE PROVIDED IN ALL UNITS.
- UNIT 111 (TYPE C1) IS THE CONVERTIBLE UNIT.
- UNIT 102 (TYPE A2) IS THE LOCK-OFF UNIT.
- THE PROJECT WILL PROVIDE AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP/AC UNIT WITH HRA MECHANICAL VENTILATION SYSTEM TO ACHIEVE STEP CODE REQUIREMENTS. FOLLOWING SUSTAINABLE FEATURES WILL ALSO BE PROVIDED IN THE PROJECT:
  - (A): SOLAR HOT WATER READY REQUIREMENT
  - (B): ENERGY STAR APPLIANCES AND LIGHT BULBS
  - (C): POWER OUTLET IN PRIVATE GARAGE FOR CHARGING ELECTRIC CARS
- THE MECHANICAL HEATING AND COOLING SYSTEM (AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP SYSTEM) TO COMPLY WITH RELATIVE REQUIREMENTS IN BCBC-2018 AND ASHRAE 55 REGARDING THE STANDARDS OF THERMAL COMFORT.
- AN AUTOMATED IRRIGATION SYSTEM FOR FUTURE ON-GOING MAINTENANCE WILL BE INSTALLED. SEE LANDSCAPE.



**1. BUILDING A LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN**

SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"


A2.1



**3. BUILDING A LEVEL 3 FLOOR PLAN**

SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"

A2.1



**IMPERIAL  
ARCHITECTURE**  
BOLLEGE OF AN ARCHITECTURE OF PRACTICE  
ARCHITECTS  
1000 WEST 10TH AVENUE, SUITE 100  
DENVER, CO 80202  
TEL: 303.733.1111  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

ARCHITECT  
INTERIOR  
PLANNING

Copyright Imperial

This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture, Inc. and is to be used only for the project and location specified. It is not to be reproduced, copied, or otherwise used without the written consent of Imperial Architecture, Inc.

Revisions: 1. Change room layout and furniture placement as per owner's request. 2. Change room layout and furniture placement as per owner's request. 3. Change room layout and furniture placement as per owner's request.

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	CHKD.
1	10/1/18	ISSUED FOR REZONING	JK	JK
2	10/1/18	REVISION	JK	JK
3	10/1/18	REVISION	JK	JK
4	10/1/18	REVISION	JK	JK
5	10/1/18	REVISION	JK	JK
6	10/1/18	REVISION	JK	JK
7	10/1/18	REVISION	JK	JK
8	10/1/18	REVISION	JK	JK
9	10/1/18	REVISION	JK	JK
10	10/1/18	REVISION	JK	JK


ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
(2019-08-16)

OWNER:  
STYVESTON HWY TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT FOR

**JK KONG**  
4571 40TH AVE STE 100  
DENVER, CO 80212

BUILDING B FLOOR PLANS


Project No. #8217  
Scale 1/8"=1'-0"  
Sheet A2.2




2 BUILDING B LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"

GENERAL NOTES:


- AGING IN PLACE FEATURES SUCH AS "STAIRWELL HANDRAILS", "SOLID BLOCKING IN WASHROOM WALLS TO FACILITATE FUTURE GRAB BAR INSTALLATION BESIDE TOILET, BATH TUB AND SHOWER AND LEVER-TYPE HANDLES FOR PLUMBING FIXTURES AND DOOR HANDLES" WILL BE PROVIDED IN ALL UNITS.
- UNIT 111 (TYPE C1) IS THE CONVERTIBLE UNIT.
- UNIT 102 (TYPE A2) IS THE LOCK-OFF UNIT.
- THE PROJECT WILL PROVIDE AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP AC UNIT WITH HRY MECHANICAL VENTILATION SYSTEM TO ACHIEVE STEP CODE REQUIREMENTS. FOLLOWING SUSTAINABLE FEATURES WILL ALSO BE PROVIDED IN THE PROJECT:  
(A): SOLAR HOT WATER READY REQUIREMENT  
(B): ENERGY STAR APPLIANCES AND LIGHT BULBS  
(C): LOW E DOUBLE GLAZING WINDOWS  
(D): POWER OUTLET IN PRIVATE GARAGE FOR CHARGING ELECTRIC CARS
- THE MECHANICAL HEATING AND COOLING SYSTEM (AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP SYSTEM) TO COMPLY WITH RELATIVE REQUIREMENTS IN CBC 2018 AND ASHRAE 55 REGARDING THE STANDARDS OF THERMAL COMFORT.
- A/N AUTOMATED IRRIGATION SYSTEM FOR FUTURE ON-GOING MAINTENANCE WILL BE INSTALLED. SEE LANDSCAPE



1 BUILDING B LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



3 BUILDING B LEVEL 3 FLOOR PLAN  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**

BUILDERS OF AN ARCHITECTURE OF PRACTICE

ARCHITECTS • INTERIORS • PLANNING • LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

Architectural  
INTERIORS  
PLANNING

Copyright Reserved

No part of this document may be reproduced without written permission from Imperial Architecture, Inc.

Imperial Architecture, Inc. is a registered professional architectural firm in the State of Maryland.

Imperial Architecture, Inc. is a registered professional architectural firm in the State of Maryland.

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	CHKD.
1	ISSUED FOR REZONING	08/16/2019	JK	JK
2	REVISION	08/16/2019	JK	JK
3	REVISION	08/16/2019	JK	JK
4	REVISION	08/16/2019	JK	JK
5	REVISION	08/16/2019	JK	JK
6	REVISION	08/16/2019	JK	JK
7	REVISION	08/16/2019	JK	JK
8	REVISION	08/16/2019	JK	JK
9	REVISION	08/16/2019	JK	JK
10	REVISION	08/16/2019	JK	JK

ISSUED FOR REZONING

RESUBMISSION

(2019-08-16)

Client:

STEVESON HWY TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT FOR

Architect:

IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE

4011 4TH AVE STEVENSON HWY, RICHMOND, BC B2C 1A3 (9045)

Project No.

#8217

Scale

1/8"=1'-0"

Sheet

A 2.3

Client:

STEVESON HWY TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT FOR

Architect:

IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE

4011 4TH AVE STEVENSON HWY, RICHMOND, BC B2C 1A3 (9045)

Project No.


#8217

Scale

1/8"=1'-0"


Sheet

A 2.3




2. BUILDING C LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN

SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




4. BUILDING D & E LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN

SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




1. BUILDING C LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN

SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



3. BUILDING D & E LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN

SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



**IMPERIAL  
ARCHITECTURE**  
BUREAU OF ARCHITECTURE OF PRACTICE  
ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, PLANNERS, INTERIORS  
10000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, SUITE 100  
REDMOND, BC V4V 1V9  
TEL: 604.273.1111 FAX: 604.273.1112  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

ARCHITECTURE  
INTERIORS  
PLANNING

Copyright Reserved

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from Imperial Architecture.

Director/Owner

All dimensions are in metric units. All measurements are to the center of the wall unless otherwise specified.

DATE	10/15/19
BY	IMPERIAL
REVISION	
DATE	10/15/19
BY	IMPERIAL
REVISION	
DATE	10/15/19
BY	IMPERIAL
REVISION	
DATE	10/15/19
BY	IMPERIAL
REVISION	

ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
(2019-08-16)


Client/Owner  
STEVENSON HWY TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT FOR


**IMPERIAL**  
ARCHITECTURE  
4071, 4081 & 4091 STEVENSON HWY,  
REDMOND, BC V4V 1V9

1/16"=1'-0"

Scale  
1/16"=1'-0"

Sheet  
A 3.1





**IMPERIAL  
ARCHITECTURE**  
BUILDER OF AN ARCHITECTURE OF PRACTICE  
ARCHITECTS  
LARCHER  
PLANNERS

ARCHITECTS  
LARCHER  
PLANNERS

**Copyright Reserved**

No part of this drawing may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from the architect.

**Disclaimers**

This drawing is prepared for the purpose of illustrating the proposed design and is not to be used for any other purpose without the prior written consent of the architect.

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	08/15/19	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)
2	08/15/19	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)
3	08/15/19	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)
4	08/15/19	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)
5	08/15/19	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)
6	08/15/19	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)
7	08/15/19	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)
8	08/15/19	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)
9	08/15/19	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)
10	08/15/19	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)

ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
(2019-08-16)




STEVENSON HWY TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT FOR


**IMPERIAL  
ARCHITECTURE**  
4811 STEVENSON HWY.  
RICHMOND, VA 23234

BUILDING A ELEVATIONS

Scale: 1/8"=1'-0"

Sheet: A3.2





IMPERIAL  
ARCHITECTURE  
BUILDERS BY AIA CERTIFICATE OF PRACTICE  
JAMES H. HARRIS, ARCHITECT, AIA, LEED  
GREEN ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL  
ARCHITECT

ARCHITECTURE  
INTERIOR  
PLANNING

Copyright Reserved  
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from Imperial Architecture.

Distribution  
This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture. It is to be used only for the project and site for which it was prepared. It is not to be used for any other project or site without the written consent of Imperial Architecture.

Revisions  
Revisions to this drawing shall be indicated by a revision number and description in the revision block.

Notes  
Notes to this drawing shall be indicated by a note number and description in the notes block.

Legend  
Legend to this drawing shall be indicated by a legend number and description in the legend block.

Scale  
Scale to this drawing shall be indicated by a scale number and description in the scale block.

Sheet  
Sheet to this drawing shall be indicated by a sheet number and description in the sheet block.

Project  
Project to this drawing shall be indicated by a project number and description in the project block.

Date  
Date to this drawing shall be indicated by a date number and description in the date block.

Drawn By  
Drawn By to this drawing shall be indicated by a drawn by number and description in the drawn by block.

Checked By  
Checked By to this drawing shall be indicated by a checked by number and description in the checked by block.

Approved By  
Approved By to this drawing shall be indicated by an approved by number and description in the approved by block.

Project No.  
Project No. to this drawing shall be indicated by a project no. number and description in the project no. block.

Sheet No.  
Sheet No. to this drawing shall be indicated by a sheet no. number and description in the sheet no. block.

Date  
Date to this drawing shall be indicated by a date number and description in the date block.

Drawn By  
Drawn By to this drawing shall be indicated by a drawn by number and description in the drawn by block.

Checked By  
Checked By to this drawing shall be indicated by a checked by number and description in the checked by block.

Approved By  
Approved By to this drawing shall be indicated by an approved by number and description in the approved by block.

Project No.  
Project No. to this drawing shall be indicated by a project no. number and description in the project no. block.

Sheet No.  
Sheet No. to this drawing shall be indicated by a sheet no. number and description in the sheet no. block.

Date  
Date to this drawing shall be indicated by a date number and description in the date block.

Drawn By  
Drawn By to this drawing shall be indicated by a drawn by number and description in the drawn by block.

Checked By  
Checked By to this drawing shall be indicated by a checked by number and description in the checked by block.

Approved By  
Approved By to this drawing shall be indicated by an approved by number and description in the approved by block.

Project No.  
Project No. to this drawing shall be indicated by a project no. number and description in the project no. block.

Sheet No.  
Sheet No. to this drawing shall be indicated by a sheet no. number and description in the sheet no. block.

Date  
Date to this drawing shall be indicated by a date number and description in the date block.

Drawn By  
Drawn By to this drawing shall be indicated by a drawn by number and description in the drawn by block.

Checked By  
Checked By to this drawing shall be indicated by a checked by number and description in the checked by block.


Approved By  
Approved By to this drawing shall be indicated by an approved by number and description in the approved by block.

Project No.  
Project No. to this drawing shall be indicated by a project no. number and description in the project no. block.


Sheet No.  
Sheet No. to this drawing shall be indicated by a sheet no. number and description in the sheet no. block.

Date  
Date to this drawing shall be indicated by a date number and description in the date block.


Drawn By  
Drawn By to this drawing shall be indicated by a drawn by number and description in the drawn by block.




1. BUILDING B SOUTH ELEVATION  
SCALE: 1/8\"/>




2. BUILDING B NORTH ELEVATION  
SCALE: 1/8\"/>



3. BUILDING B WEST ELEVATION  
SCALE: 1/8\"/>



4. BUILDING B EAST ELEVATION  
SCALE: 1/8\"/>



IMPERIAL  
ARCHITECTURE  
BOLIVAR OF AN ARCHITECTURE OF PRACTICE  
ARCHITECTS  
1000 N. 10TH ST. SUITE 100  
RICHMOND, VA 23217  
TEL: 804.781.1111  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

ARCHITECT  
INTERIOR  
PLANNING

Copyright Reserved

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from Imperial Architecture.

Imperial Architecture is not responsible for the accuracy of the information contained herein. The user assumes all liability for the use of the information contained herein.

REVISION	DATE	BY	APP
1	08/16/2019	JL	JL
2	08/16/2019	JL	JL
3	08/16/2019	JL	JL
4	08/16/2019	JL	JL
5	08/16/2019	JL	JL
6	08/16/2019	JL	JL
7	08/16/2019	JL	JL
8	08/16/2019	JL	JL
9	08/16/2019	JL	JL
10	08/16/2019	JL	JL


ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
(2019-08-16)

Client: STEVENSON HWY. TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT FOR


**JK**  
J. K. KENNE  
4011 40th St. Suite 100  
RICHMOND, VA 23217

PROJECT  
BUILDING C ELEVATIONS


Project No. #8217  
Scale 1/8"=1'-0"  
Drawing No. A3.4




3 BUILDING C EAST ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




4 BUILDING C WEST ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



1 BUILDING C SOUTH ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



2 BUILDING C NORTH ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
BUREAU OF ARCHITECTURE OF PRACTICE  
ARCHITECTS

ARCHITECTURE  
INTERIOR  
PLANNING

Copyright Reserved

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Dimensions

Vertical dimensions are in feet and inches. Horizontal dimensions are in feet and inches. All dimensions are approximate and subject to change without notice.

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

ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
(2019-08-16)


STEVENSON HWY TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT FOR

**IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE**  
4011 40th Avenue, Suite 100  
Richmond, BC V6X 2A5 (604) 271-1111


BUILDING D & E ELEVATIONS

Project No. 100  
Sheet 1 of 1  
Scale 1/8"=1'-0"


A 3.5




3 BUILDING D & E EAST ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"




4 BUILDING D & E WEST ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



1 BUILDING D & E SOUTH ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



2 BUILDING D & E NORTH ELEVATION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



**IMPERIAL  
ARCHITECTURE**  
OFFICE OF ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN  
4011 4TH ST. STEVENSON HWY.,  
BETHESDA, MD 20814  
TEL: 301.221.1111  
WWW.IMPERIALARCHITECTURE.COM

ARCHITECT  
INTERIOR  
PLANNING

Copyright Reserved

This drawing is the property of Imperial Architecture and is not to be reproduced or used in any manner without the written consent of Imperial Architecture.

Disclaimers  
Imperial Architecture is not responsible for the accuracy of the information provided in this drawing. The user of this drawing is advised to verify the information provided in this drawing with the appropriate authorities.

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	CHKD.
1	ISSUED FOR REZONING RESUBMISSION (2019-08-16)	8/16/19	AK	AK
2	REVISION			
3	REVISION			
4	REVISION			
5	REVISION			
6	REVISION			
7	REVISION			
8	REVISION			
9	REVISION			
10	REVISION			


ISSUED FOR REZONING  
RESUBMISSION  
(2019-08-16)

STEVENSON HWY. TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT FOR

**AK KONIG**  
4011 4TH ST. STEVENSON HWY.,  
BETHESDA, MD 20814  
TEL: 301.221.1111  
WWW.AK-KONIG.COM


**BUILDING SECTIONS**

Project No. #8217  
Scale 1/8"=1'-0"  
Drawing No. A4.1



1 BUILDING B SECTION #1  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"

2 BUILDING D SECTION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"



3 BUILDING B SECTION #2  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"

4 BUILDING AE SECTION  
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"

SEAL:

PLANT SCHEDULE			COMMON NAME		PLANTED SIZE (FEET/INCH)		PLANT PROJECT NUMBER: 14-01	
TREE	QTY	BOTANICAL NAME						
1		ACER BURMANIENSE	NIKE CURVE MAPLE		100 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
2		AMORCHINER GANDOGI	ORA AUTUMN BRILLANCE		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
3		CONIUS KOSIA	DOUGLASS		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
4		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
5		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
6		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
7		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
8		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
9		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
10		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
11		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
12		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
13		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
14		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
15		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
16		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
17		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
18		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
19		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
20		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
21		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
22		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
23		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
24		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
25		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
26		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
27		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
28		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
29		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
30		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
31		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
32		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
33		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
34		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
35		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
36		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
37		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
38		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
39		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
40		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
41		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
42		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
43		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
44		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
45		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
46		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
47		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
48		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
49		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
50		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
51		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
52		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
53		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
54		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
55		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
56		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
57		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
58		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
59		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
60		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
61		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
62		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
63		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
64		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
65		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
66		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
67		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
68		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
69		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
70		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
71		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
72		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
73		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
74		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
75		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
76		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
77		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
78		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
79		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
80		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
81		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
82		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
83		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
84		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
85		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
86		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
87		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
88		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
89		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
90		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
91		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
92		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
93		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
94		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
95		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
96		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
97		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
98		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
99		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			
100		PRINCE OF WALES	WINDLORD		200 CM DIA. x 17.0' HIG			

NO.	DATE	REVISION DESCRIPTION	DR.
1	19.08.12	REVISED PLAN	DR.
2	19.08.12	REVISED PLAN	DR.

PROJECT:

**16 UNIT TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT**  
4611 STEVESTON HIGHWAY  
RICHMOND

DRAWING TITLE:  
**LANDSCAPE  
PLAN**


1

OF 2

19-091



199911-27 PM





© Copyright reserved. The drawings and design is the property of P&M Landscape Architects and may not be reproduced or used for other projects without their permission.


**p&m**  
LANDSCAPE  
ARCHITECTS  
P&M LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS  
10000 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1000  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210  
P 310.204.6011 • F 310.204.6022

SEAL:

- NOTES:
1. ALL WOOD POSTS TO BE PRESURE TREATED TO C.A.A. STANDARDS
  2. ALL HARDWARE TO BE HOT-DIPPED GALVANIZED
  3. ALL HARDWARE TO BE HOT-DIPPED GALVANIZED
  4. ALL HARDWARE TO BE HOT-DIPPED GALVANIZED
  5. ALL HARDWARE TO BE HOT-DIPPED GALVANIZED
  6. ALL HARDWARE TO BE HOT-DIPPED GALVANIZED



1 6' HT. WOOD PRIVACY FENCE  
10'-0" x 10'-0"



CNCL - 262



- NOTES:
1. ALL POSTS PRESURE TREATED TO C.A.A. STANDARDS AND END CUTS TREATED WITH PRESERVATIVE
  2. ALL HARDWARE TO BE HOT-DIPPED GALVANIZED
  3. ALL HARDWARE TO BE HOT-DIPPED GALVANIZED
  4. ALL HARDWARE TO BE HOT-DIPPED GALVANIZED
  5. ALL HARDWARE TO BE HOT-DIPPED GALVANIZED

3 6' HEIGHT SOLID WOOD FENCE  
10'-0" x 10'-0"

4 PLAYGROUND SAFETY SURFACE  
10'-0" x 10'-0"



5 ALLAN BLOCK WALL  
10'-0" x 10'-0"

6 TRELLIS  
10'-0" x 10'-0"



WAGGIN BRICK BLOCK

WAGGIN MOUNTAIN CLASSIC PARK BENCH MCB-8



- NOTES:
1. ALL POSTS PRESURE TREATED TO C.A.A. STANDARDS AND END CUTS TREATED WITH PRESERVATIVE
  2. ALL HARDWARE TO BE HOT-DIPPED GALVANIZED
  3. ALL HARDWARE TO BE HOT-DIPPED GALVANIZED
  4. ALL HARDWARE TO BE HOT-DIPPED GALVANIZED

6 TRELLIS  
10'-0" x 10'-0"

PROJECT:  
**16 UNIT TOWNHOUSE  
DEVELOPMENT**  
4633 STEVENSON HIGHWAY  
RICHMOND

DRAWING TITLE:  
**LANDSCAPE  
DETAILS**

DATE: 13 JUN 10  
SCALE: AS SHOWN  
DRAWN: RJ  
DESIGN: RJ  
CHECK: MCT  
P&M PROJECT NUMBER: 19-091

L2

OF 2



0 23 3

APPENDIX C: TREE MANAGEMENT DRAWING - SHEET 2

TREE MANAGEMENT DETAIL

PROJECT:	PROPOSED TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT
----------	--------------------------------

PROJECT: 4571, 4591, 4611 STEVESTON HIGHWAY

[illegible]

CITY REC:	ACI FILE:	18284
-----------	-----------	-------

CITY REF:	REV #:	DATE:	ACCL FILE:
	1		18284
PLOT SIZE:	11"X17"		JUN 20,

aci/group.ca

00:40:18.150

# FCH

# CON

604 275 3484



**Address:** 4571, 4591, and 4611/4631 Steveston Highway

**File No.:** RZ 18-839945

**Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10081, the developer is required to complete the following:**

1. The submission and processing of a Development Permit\* completed to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.
2. Consolidation of all the lots into one development parcel (which will require the demolition of the existing dwellings).
3. Discharge of restrictive covenant RD85670, which reserves a portion of the property for future road construction.
4. Discharge of covenant BF506485, which restricts the property to a two-unit dwelling only.
5. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$2,600 to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for the planting of replacement trees within the City.
6. 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.
7. Registration of a flood indemnity covenant on title (Area A).
8. Registration of a statutory right-of-way (SRW), and/or other legal agreements or measures, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Development, over the entire area of the proposed driveway entry from Steveston Highway and the interior drive aisle, in favour of future residential development to the east and west. Language should be included in the SRW document that is City will not be responsible for maintenance or liability within the SRW area.
9. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$0.85 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$16,480) to the City's public art fund.
10. Contribution of \$1,600 per dwelling unit (e.g. \$25,600) in-lieu of on-site indoor amenity space to go towards development of City facilities.
11. City acceptance of the developer's offer to voluntarily contribute \$8.50 per buildable square foot (e.g. \$164,798) to the City's affordable housing fund.
12. Registration of a legal agreement on Title prohibiting the conversion of the tandem parking area into habitable space.
13. Registration of a legal agreement on Title to ensure that the secondary suite cannot be stratified or otherwise held under separate title.
14. City acceptance of a \$5,700 cash contribution towards the upgrade of the existing special crosswalk at the Steveston Highway and Bonavista Gate intersection.

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

1. Submission of a 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 8 required replacement trees with the following minimum sizes:

No. of Replacement Trees	Minimum Caliper of Deciduous Tree	Minimum Height of Coniferous Tree
6	11 cm	5.5 m
2	10 cm	6 m

If required replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site, a cash-in-lieu contribution in the amount of \$500/tree to the City's Tree Compensation Fund for off-site planting is required.

2. Complete a proposed townhouse energy efficiency report and recommendations prepared by a Certified Energy Advisor which demonstrates how the proposed construction will meet or exceed Step 3 of the Energy Step Code for Part 9 construction (Climate Zone 4), in compliance with the Richmond Building Regulation Bylaw 7230.

**Prior to Development Permit\* being forwarded to Council for issuance, the developer is required to:**

1. Deposit of a Landscaping Security based on 100% of the cost estimate provided by the Landscape Architect, including installation costs and a 10% contingency.
2. 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.

**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.
4. 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:

*Water Works:*

- a) Using the OCP Model, there is 714.0 L/s of water available at a 20 psi residual at the Steveston Highway frontage. Based on your proposed development, your site requires a minimum fire flow of 220 L/s.
- b) At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:
  - (1) 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.
  - (2) Review hydrant spacing on Steveston Highway frontage and install new fire hydrants as required to meet City spacing requirements for the proposed land use.
  - (3) Provide a right-of-way on site for the water meter. Exact right-of-way dimensions to be finalized via the servicing agreement process.
- c) At Developer's cost, the City will:
  - (1) Cut, cap, and remove existing water service connections along Steveston Highway frontage.
  - (2) Complete all tie-ins for the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

*Storm Sewer Works:*

- a) At Developer's cost, the City will:
  - (1) Cut, cap, and remove existing storm connections at Steveston Highway frontage.

- (2) Install a new storm service connection to serve the proposed development.

*Sanitary Sewer Works:*

- a) At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:
  - (1) Not start onsite excavation or foundation construction until completion of rear-yard sanitary works by City crews.
  - (2) Install a new sanitary service connection, location to be determined through the Servicing Agreement review process.
- b) At Developer's cost, the City will:
  - (1) Cut and cap at main all existing sanitary connections along property's rear-yard.
  - (2) Complete all tie-ins for the proposed works to existing City infrastructure.

*Frontage Improvements:*

- a) At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:
  - (1) Coordinate with BC Hydro, Telus and other private communication service providers:
    - (a) To pre-duct for future hydro, telephone and cable utilities along all road frontages.
    - (b) Before relocating/modifying any of the existing power poles and/or guy wires within the property frontages.
    - (c) To underground overhead service lines.
  - (2) 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:
    - (a) BC Hydro PMT – 4.0 x 5.0 m
    - (b) BC Hydro LPT – 3.5 x 3.5 m
    - (c) Street light kiosk – 1.5 x 1.5 m
    - (d) Traffic signal kiosk – 2.0 x 1.5 m
    - (e) Traffic signal UPS – 1.0 x 1.0 m
    - (f) Shaw cable kiosk – 1.0 x 1.0 m
    - (g) Telus FDH cabinet – 1.1 x 1.0 m
  - (3) Review street lighting levels along all road and lane frontages, and upgrade as required.
  - (4) Complete the following frontage improvements as per Transportation's requirements:
    - (a) Remove existing sidewalk and replace with a new 1.5 m wide concrete sidewalk at the property line and a new minimum 1.5 m wide boulevard with street trees;
    - (b) Removal of existing driveways and replacement with concrete barrier curb/gutter and frontage works as described above; and
    - (c) Construct a new driveway crossing to the development site to provide right-in/right-out access only.

*General Items:*

a) At Developer's cost, the Developer is required to:

- (1) 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.
- (2) Provide a video inspection report of the adjacent existing storm and sanitary sewers 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.
- (3) 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.
- (4) 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.
- (5) 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.
- (6) Not encroach into City rights-of-ways with any proposed trees, retaining walls, or other non-removable structures.
- (7) Coordinate the servicing agreement design for this development with the servicing agreement(s) for the adjacent development(s), both existing and in-stream (if applicable). 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:
  - (a) Corridors for City utilities (existing and proposed water, storm sewer, sanitary and DEU) and private utilities.
  - (b) Pipe sizes, material and slopes.
  - (c) Location of manholes and fire hydrants.
  - (d) Road grades, high points and low points.
  - (e) Alignment of ultimate and interim curbs.
  - (f) Proposed street lights design.
- (8) 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.

**Note:**

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

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

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

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

[signed concurrence on file]

---

Signed

---

Date



**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500  
Amendment Bylaw 10081 (RZ 18-839945)  
4571, 4591, and 4611/4631 Steveston Highway**

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. 002-088-665

The East Half of Lot 69 Section 35 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District  
Plan 30342

P.I.D. 003-790-355

Lot 72 Section 35 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 32545

P.I.D. 003-752-119

Lot 582 Section 35 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 56263

2. This Bylaw may be cited as **“Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10081”**.

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING


THIRD READING

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER





# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

**To:** Planning Committee  
**From:** Claudia Jesson  
Director, City Clerk's Office

**Date:** August 23, 2019  
**File:** 12-8060-01/2019-Vol 01

**Re:** Housekeeping Request - Abandonment of Unadopted Bylaws

### Staff Recommendation

That the unadopted Zoning Amendment Bylaws, as outlined in Attachment 1, of the staff report titled "Housekeeping Request – Abandonment of Unadopted Bylaws" dated August 23, 2019 form the Director, City Clerk's Office, be abandoned.

Claudia Jesson  
Director, City Clerk's Office  
(604-276-4006)

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
<b>ROUTED TO:</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER</b>
Development Applications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE</b>	<b>INITIALS:</b> 	<b>APPROVED BY CAO</b> 

## **Staff Report**

### **Origin**

Council Policy No. 5017 states that the City Clerk may bring forward to Council any Zoning or Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw where one year or more has elapsed from the conclusion of the relevant Public Hearing with a recommendation to abandon the bylaw; to require another Public Hearing if the bylaw is not to be abandoned; or another recommendation if warranted.

The last time Council considered a report requesting the abandonment of unadopted bylaws was back in October 2009. As a housekeeping matter to clean up the files, this report presents 30 unadopted bylaws for abandonment where the associated rezoning application has either been withdrawn at the applicant's request or closed by City staff due to inactivity.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #8 An Engaged and Informed Community:

*Ensure that the citizenry of Richmond is well-informed and engaged about City business and decision-making.*

### **Analysis**

Upon reviewing the Zoning Bylaws which have been to a Public Hearing but have not yet been adopted, planning staff identified a number of applications that are several years old and have had little or no activity since their respective Public Hearings. In some instances, applications have been closed due to inactivity or withdrawn but the bylaws have not been officially abandoned.

A letter was provided to applicants where there was no activity on a rezoning application to advise staff of their intentions with respect to the outstanding bylaw. The results of this survey indicate that applicants expressed no objection to their respective bylaw being abandoned, or the applicant specifically does not wish to proceed with their application.

### **Financial Impact**

None.

## **Conclusion**

The report and Attachment 1 identifies unadopted Zoning Amendment Bylaws that are no longer applicable because the related application has been withdrawn; the applicant does not wish to proceed; or the applicant has not made contact with staff for the purpose of proceeding with the requirements of the application, for a number of years. Staff therefore recommend that the noted unadopted bylaws be abandoned.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Claudia Jesson', with a stylized, cursive script.

Claudia Jesson  
Director, City Clerk's Office  
(604-276-4006)

CJ:eb

Att. 1: List of Bylaws to be abandoned

## Attachment 1

<b>Bylaw No</b>	<b>File No</b>	<b>Bylaw Title</b>	<b>First Reading</b>	<b>Public Hearing Date</b>	<b>Status of Other Development</b>	<b>Reason for Action Taken</b>	<b>Bylaw Action Recommendation</b>
<b>9183</b>	14-657378	RZ-2080/2100 No 4 Rd	April 13/15	May 19/15		Withdrawn by new owners	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>9128</b>	13-646115	RZ -7100 Marrington Rd	Apr 14/14	May 20/14	SD 13-646116 Cancelled	Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8928</b>	11-585154	RZ -7520 Ash St	Oct 22/12	Nov 19/12		Closed due to inactivity  Letter Sent No Response	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8851</b>	11-581922	RZ- 9271 Francis Rd	Jan 23/12	Feb 20/12	SD 11-592015 Closed	Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8835</b>	11-583027	RZ - 9040 Railway Ave	Nov 28/11	Dec 20/11		Closed due to inactivity  Letter Sent No Response	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8833</b>	11-582017	RZ 4911/4931 McLure Avenue	Dec 19/11	Jan 16/12		Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8732</b>	10-546023	RZ-7320 & 7340 Lindsay Rd	Mar 28/11	Apr 18/11	SD 10-546024 Cancelled	Closed due to inactivity  Letter Sent No Response	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8610</b>	09-453123	RZ- 9340,9360,9600 Odlin Rd	June 28/10	July 19/10	DP 09-453125 Issued  SA 10-530751 Pending Final	Bylaw 8610 was replaced by Bylaw 8715 and adopted	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8247</b>	07-366344	ZT- 1231 Burdette St	June 11/07	Sept 05/07		Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8099</b>	05-303677	RZ- 11251 and 11295 Mellis Dr	July 24/06	Sept 6/06	DP 07-392652 Withdrawn	Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>7773</b>	04-272170	RZ- 9131 Williams Rd	July 26/04	Aug 23/04	SD 04-272171 Closed	Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned

<b>Bylaw No</b>	<b>File No</b>	<b>Bylaw Title</b>	<b>First Reading</b>	<b>Public Hearing Date</b>	<b>Status of Other Development</b>	<b>Reason for Action Taken</b>	<b>Bylaw Action Recommendation</b>
<b>7351</b>	01-192664	RZ- 7500 Garden City Rd	Apr 22/02	May 21/02	DP 02-218738 Withdrawn SA 03-244592 Completed	Closed due to inactivity Letter Sent No Response	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>7114</b>	98-140477	RZ- 11511,11531,11 535 Steveston Hwy	Sept 13/99	Mar 20/00	DP 01-189551 Withdrawn	Closed due to inactivity Letter Sent No Response	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>6838</b>	97-116511	RZ- 8580 Cambie Rd	Dec 8/97	Jan 19/98	DP 98-141132 Withdrawn SD 04-270232 Completed	Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>6834</b>	97-116511	RZ- 8580 Cambie Rd	Dec 8/97	Jan 19/98	DP 98-141132 Withdrawn SD 04-270232 Completed	Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>6814</b>	97-117407	RZ- 7680 Blundell Rd	Oct 14/97	Nov 17/97	DP 97-117406 Withdrawn	Closed due to inactivity Letter Sent No Response	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>7843</b>	04-274416	RZ- 20471,20491,20 511,20531,2055 1,20571,20591 Westminster Hwy	Oct 25/04	Nov 15/04	SA 03-223042 Completed DP 05-319300 Completed	Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8274</b>	06-330060	RZ-12751 Rice Mill Rd	July 23/07	Sept 5/07	SA 04-453210 Closed SD 06-330061 Cancelled DP 06-340150 Withdrawn	Closed due to inactivity Letter Sent No Response	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>9518</b>	14-670731	RZ- 6740 & 6780 Francis Rd	Mar 14/16	Apr 18/16	SA 15-699579 Closed SD 14-670732 Cancelled	Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned

<b>Bylaw No</b>	<b>File No</b>	<b>Bylaw Title</b>	<b>First Reading</b>	<b>Public Hearing Date</b>	<b>Status of Other Development</b>	<b>Reason for Action Taken</b>	<b>Bylaw Action Recommendation</b>
<b>8558</b>	07-401012	RZ 8140 Heather Street	Dec 22/09	Jan 18/10		Closed due to inactivity  Letter Sent No Response	This bylaw should be abandoned.
<b>8389</b>	07-389580	RZ 9211 No 1 Rd	June 23/08	July 21/08	SD 07-389582 Closed	Closed due to inactivity  Letter Sent No Response	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8098</b>	05-301611	RZ 11295 Mellia Drive	July 27/09	Sept 9/09	DP 07-392652 Withdrawn	Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8941</b>	11-585154	RZ 7520 Ash St	Oct 22/12	Feb 20/12		Closed due to inactivity  Letter Sent No Response	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8272</b>	07-370649	RZ 9571 Williams Rd	July 23/07	Sept 05/07	SD 07-370650 Closed  SA 09-462752 Closed	Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>9601</b>	16-726011	RZ 4280 Tyson Place	Oct 24/16	Nov 21/16		Closed due to inactivity  Letter Sent No Response	This bylaw should be abandoned.
<b>9547</b>	14-676714	RZ 7260 Westminster Hwy	July 25/16	Sept 06/16		Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>9287</b>	14-670779	RZ 10551 No 1 Road	Oct 6/15	Nov 16/ 15	SD 14-670780 Closed	Closed due to inactivity  Letter Sent Confirmation Received from Owner	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>9685</b>	16-743867	RZ 9680 Aquila Rd	March 27/17	April 18/17		Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned

<b>Bylaw No</b>	<b>File No</b>	<b>Bylaw Title</b>	<b>First Reading</b>	<b>Public Hearing Date</b>	<b>Status of Other Development</b>	<b>Reason for Action Taken</b>	<b>Bylaw Action Recommendation</b>
<b>9784</b>	16-738953	RZ 7320/40/60 Ash St	Jan 15/18	Feb 19/18		Withdrawn by applicant	This bylaw should be abandoned
<b>8729</b>	08-423207	RZ 8540 Alexandra Rd	July 11/11	July 26/11	DP 10-551958 Withdrawn  SA 11-594223 Closed	Closed due to inactivity  Letter Sent No Response	This bylaw should be abandoned



# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

**To:** Public Works and Transportation Committee  
**From:** Lloyd Bie, P.Eng.  
Director, Transportation  
**Re:** Transport 2050 - Phase 1 Consultation

**Date:** August 22, 2019  
**File:** 01-0154-04/2019-Vol  
01

### Staff Recommendation

That the attached report titled "Transport 2050 – Phase 1 Consultation" dated August 22, 2019 from the Director, Transportation be forwarded to TransLink for consideration as part of its Phase 1 consultation for the development of Transport 2050.

Lloyd Bie, P.Eng.  
Director, Transportation  
(604-276-4131)

Att. 3

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
<b>ROUTED TO:</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER</b>
Parks Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Engineering	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sustainability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Policy Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Project Development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE</b>	<b>INITIALS:</b> 	<b>APPROVED BY GAO</b> 

## Staff Report

### Origin

TransLink is leading the phased development of Transport 2050, an update of the current Regional Transportation Strategy (Transport 2040) for Metro Vancouver. At the same time, Metro Vancouver is developing Metro 2050, an update to the regional growth strategy. Together, these strategies will shape the region over the next 30 years.

For Phase 1, TransLink is seeking “big ideas” that will make Metro Vancouver’s transportation system work better for everyone today and into the future. As TransLink is responsible for transit service in the region, the Phase 1 consultation provides an opportunity for the City to identify desired outcomes, particularly with respect to new rapid transit routes. As such, this report also responds to the following referrals arising from discussion of the staff report titled “Potential Transit Exchange as part of Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement Project” at the July 2, 2019 meeting of the General Purposes Committee:

*That staff comment on possible LRT terminus options and potential routes in Steveston.*

*That staff prepare options for LRT across Richmond to an LRT Transit Tunnel at Massey Tunnel utilizing the Shell Road Railway Line from Bridgeport, or a connection to the Canada Line, or a combination of both.*

This report supports Council’s Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #5 Sound Financial Management:

- 5.4 *Work cooperatively and respectfully with all levels of government and stakeholders while advocating for the best interests of Richmond.*

This report supports Council’s Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #6 Strategic and Well-Planned Growth:

- 6.3 *Build on transportation and active mobility networks.*

### Analysis

#### Transport 2050

Transport 2050 is an opportunity for the region to prepare for potential factors that will fundamentally change how residents move around, such as climate change and increased automation, and ensure that the benefits of new mobility options are both sustainable and equitable. Development of Transport 2050 will be in three phases and will be completed in Fall 2020 prior to the completion of Metro 2050, which is anticipated in 2022.

*Phase 1: Share values and ideas, develop vision (Spring-Summer 2019)*

In May 2019, TransLink launched the first phase of public engagement seeking input on residents’ values, transportation priorities and ideas for the future of transportation in the region. As of early August 2019, over 14,000 surveys have been completed and over 1,600 ideas shared at [transport2050.ca](https://transport2050.ca). Phase 1 consultation ends in September 2019.

*Phase 2: Consider ideas and trade-offs (Spring 2020)*

During Phase 2 engagement, TransLink will present different options for future transportation. These options will include projects, policies and programs drawn from Phase 1 feedback. As the options will offer different benefits and costs, input will be sought on how to weigh the choices.

*Phase 3: Draft new Regional Transportation Strategy (Fall 2020)*

In Phase 3, TransLink will share the draft strategy. Following Phase 3 engagement, TransLink will take the strategy to the Mayors' Council on Regional Transportation for approval.

**Phase 1 Ideas for Richmond**

For the Phase 1 consultation, staff have developed a number of ideas and concepts for transportation improvements in Richmond (Attachment 1). The concepts generated provide a transportation system that accommodates a growing regional population and economy with modes and policies that are sustainable, equitable, safe, and reliable. The City's paramount objective is to achieve mode shifts such that at least 50% of all trips in Richmond are by transit and active transportation by 2050, consistent with the goals of the following key City plans:

- Official Community Plan (OCP): in addition to the afore-mentioned mode shift targets, the OCP and the City Centre Area Plan identify higher density development along Frequent Transit Network<sup>1</sup> (FTN) corridors, reinforcing the land use-transportation link.
- Community Energy and Emissions Plan (CEEP): the existing CEEP and the current CEEP renewal focus on a wide range of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction initiatives. Given that light duty vehicle gasoline use contributed 42.6% of total GHG emissions in Richmond in 2015, new and upgraded low carbon travel options are necessary to help the City achieve its GHG emission reduction targets.

**Rapid Transit**

The transit-related ideas are grounded in three principles of transit network design and management:

1. maximize ridership,
2. encourage long-term ridership growth, and
3. provide access to transit service across the region.

Rapid transit technologies can range from bus- to rail-based (Attachment 2). Given the higher cost of rail- or bus-based rapid transit relative to conventional bus services, ridership is a key consideration to ensure an effective and productive service. Thus, the deployment of rapid transit service typically follows a progression over time from conventional bus, conventional bus with FTN service levels, bus rapid transit, and rail rapid transit (LRT or ALRT/SkyTrain) as ridership grows.

---

<sup>1</sup> Frequent Transit Network (FTN) denotes transit service that operates at least every 15 minutes in both directions throughout the day and into the evening, every day of the week.

To that end, higher density and active areas with a mix of uses generate greater transit demand and justify higher levels of service. Bus rapid transit services could potentially be upgraded to rail rapid transit as population and employment densities increase along the corridors.

Transport 2040 identifies a future FTN concept where the proposed rapid transit routes can be either bus or rail (Attachment 3). The FTN concept shown in Richmond is consistent with the Mobility and Access chapter of the OCP. The proposed ideas below go beyond Transport 2040 and TransLink's Southwest Area Transport Plan (SWATP).<sup>2</sup>

### *Connection to South of the Fraser River*

Consistent with Transport 2040, a new rapid transit service is needed that will connect the Canada Line to the south of the Fraser River region via the planned new Massey Crossing. Staff have identified three potential alignment options through Richmond (Table 1). All alignment options will have implications for adjacent land use to better support rapid transit.

**Table 1: Preliminary Comments on Rapid Transit Alignment Options  
from Richmond to South of the Fraser River**

<b>Option</b>	<b>Alignment</b>	<b>Land Use &amp; Ridership</b>	<b>Current Transit Use</b>
Bridgeport Station via Highway 99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reallocation of shoulder bus lanes to operation in centre median</li> <li>• Use of existing Ministry of Transportation &amp; Infrastructure right-of-way (ROW)</li> <li>• Relatively low impact to road users</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corridor has relatively lower density and mixed uses</li> <li>• Primarily serves regional trips</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 bus routes currently operate on Highway 99</li> <li>• Combined average daily weekday boardings of 15,900 passengers</li> </ul>
Bridgeport Station via CN Rail Lulu Island Spur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primarily use of existing CN Rail ROW that currently has 4 trains per day</li> <li>• Notice on CN Rail website identifies section between Steveston Highway and Vulcan Way-Viking Way to be dismantled but timing is unclear</li> <li>• Relatively low impact to road users</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corridor lacks higher density and mixed uses</li> <li>• Primarily serves regional trips</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Richmond-Brighouse Station via No. 3 Road-Steveston Highway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OCP and SWATP identify FTN service levels along these corridors</li> <li>• Given existing ROW widths, alignment will likely require change in the use of travel lanes, median treatments and/or additional property for stations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corridor has relatively higher density and mixed uses including Broadmoor and Ironwood future neighbourhood centres<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• Primarily serves local trips</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 403 bus ranked #44 out of 213 bus routes in region for ridership (2018)</li> <li>• Average daily weekday boardings of 6,360 passengers</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> The Southwest Area Transport Plan, developed by TransLink in partnership with the City and endorsed by Council in March 2018, serves as a blueprint for how resources can best be allocated over the next decade to improve transit and transportation in the area.

<sup>3</sup> Per the OCP, future neighbourhood service centres are densified shopping centres that accommodate the retail, restaurant, office, personal service, business, arts, culture, entertainment, recreational, institutional and community facility and service needs of area residents and may include residential uses.

### Connections to North of the Fraser River

- Upgrade of Canada Line: As part of the fully funded Phases 1 and 2 of the Mayors' Council's 10-Year Vision, Canada Line capacity will increase by up to 30% with the deployment of 24 new cars starting in 2021. Further upgrades are required to meet continued growing demand and maximize the quality of experience so that riding the train is a comfortable and convenient option. Improvements include lengthening the platforms to accommodate longer trains, complementary station upgrades to improve passenger circulation and provide public washrooms, and doubling the single track south of Lansdowne Station to increase capacity.

Phase 3 (Years 6-10) of the 10-Year Vision, which is currently unfunded, identifies Canada Line station upgrades to "improve capacity, accessibility, and customer amenities" (total of \$52.4 million in 2015\$) but does not provide any details of the scope of improvements.

- City Centre-Vancouver via Granville Street: This alignment mirrors the former 98 B-Line service and provides a complementary service to the Canada Line along a high demand corridor<sup>4</sup> that improves access to/from Vancouver while also enhancing resiliency in the transit network. The existing #10 bus route that operates along Granville Street provides FTN level service and in 2018 ranked #17 out of 213 bus routes in the region in terms of average daily weekday boardings (15,860 passengers).
- City Centre-New Westminster via Highway 91A: Upgrade of the existing #410 bus service that connects to the Expo Line at 22<sup>nd</sup> Street Station. The #410 currently provides FTN level service and in 2018 ranked #12 out of a total of 213 bus routes in terms of average daily weekday boardings (18,510 passengers).

### Connections within Richmond

Consistent with Transport 2040, the existing bus service linking the City Centre and Steveston is proposed to be upgraded to a higher tier of bus- or rail-based rapid transit. Staff have identified two potential alignment options (Table 2). Both alignment options will have implications for adjacent land use to better support rapid transit.

Table 2: Preliminary Comments on Rapid Transit Alignment Options  
from City Centre to Steveston

Option	Alignment	Land Use	Current Transit Use
Westminster Highway-No. 1 Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with current RTS and SWATP that identify corridors for FTN service</li> <li>• Given existing ROW widths, alignment will likely require change in the use of travel lanes, median treatments and/or additional property for stations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serves area with relatively higher residential density and employment including Terra Nova and Seafair future neighbourhood centres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 401 bus ranked #33 out of 213 bus routes in region for ridership (2018)</li> <li>• Average daily weekday boardings of 9,130 passengers</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> Per TransLink, the corridor served by the #10 bus route has a population of 101,000 and employment of 135,000.

Option	Alignment	Land Use	Current Transit Use
Granville Avenue-Railway Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of existing ROW (road and former interurban corridor)</li> <li>• Relatively low impact to road users</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corridor has relatively lower density and mixed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 406 bus ranked #46 out of 213 bus routes in region for ridership (2018)</li> <li>• Average daily weekday boardings of 6,020 passengers</li> </ul>

Should transit ridership between the City Centre and Steveston continue to grow and warrant the progression of higher orders of transit service from bus rapid transit to rail rapid transit, the location of a rail terminus in Steveston depends upon the rapid transit alignment and the ultimate site of the planned transit exchange upgrade (identified in Phase 3 of the Mayors' Council's 10-Year Vision).

### New Forms of Transit Service

- On-Demand Transit: This service can be seen as a hybrid of regular public transit services (fixed route, fixed schedule) and personalized taxi services (flexible route, flexible schedule). TransLink recently completed a pilot program on Bowen Island in July-August 2019 that involved passengers using a smartphone app, web browser, or phone to book a seat on the on-demand shuttles servicing the island. This type of service may be appropriate in low density areas of Richmond that are underserved by transit such as residential areas within the Agricultural Land Reserve and/or industrial areas such as Mitchell Island and Fraserport.
- Water-based Services: Increasing residential, commercial and industrial development along both sides of the north arm of the Fraser River presents an opportunity for fixed route ferries or on-demand water taxis to serve both commuter and recreational trips. The City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) identifies water taxi access at a number of locations along the Middle Arm of the Fraser River between Oval Village and Bridgeport Village. Seamless links to transit services at each stop will be critical to ensure first-/last-mile connectivity.

### Active Transportation

- New and Upgraded Crossings: As an island city, water crossings designed for cyclists and pedestrians are a necessary component of an active transportation network to support local and regional trips. As the Massey Crossing project team has confirmed that pedestrian and cycling facilities will be part of the planned new Massey Crossing, additional proposed new and upgraded links include:
  - Richmond-Vancouver via Sea Island: Pedestrians are not permitted on the existing Arthur Laing Bridge, which is under the jurisdiction of the Vancouver Airport Authority (VAA), and the existing shoulder bike lanes do not provide any physical protection from adjacent vehicle traffic. A new separate pedestrian-cyclist crossing in this corridor will increase the safety and comfort level of users and provide a more direct connection to the Arbutus Greenway in Vancouver. The YVR 2037 Master Plan does not identify this connection.
  - City Centre-Sea Island: The CCAP identifies a new pedestrian-cycling bridge at Aberdeen Village in the vicinity of the west end of Cambie Road to Sea Island across the Middle Arm of the Fraser River near BCIT. If built, the planned new bridge will enhance

connectivity to the City Centre and the Canada Line for Burkeville residents and BCIT students who currently have relatively limited transit access.

- Dinsmore Bridge: Gilbert Road on either side of the Dinsmore Bridge has bike lanes but the bridge itself has no cycling facilities and a sidewalk on the south side only. The bridge is under the jurisdiction of VAA and while the YVR 2037 Master Plan identifies “replace or upgrade the Dinsmore Bridge to seismic standards while maintaining a two lane structure with the addition of separated cycling and pedestrian pathways,” the YVR Master Plan does not indicate a timeline for this work.
- Knight Street Bridge: The existing sidewalks are relatively narrow and cannot comfortably accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists. The bridge is under the jurisdiction of TransLink; to date the agency has not identified any upgrades to the structure to better serve active transportation modes. Improved cycling connections to/from the bridge on the Richmond side will be a necessary complement.
- Micro Mobility: New and emerging micro mobility services such as dockless bike sharing and electric-assist bicycles and scooters (both private and shared) offer alternative options to complete the first-/last-mile to transit stations while also promoting safe, healthy, clean, and compact communities. In July 2019, TransLink released “Micromobility Guidelines” that were developed in collaboration with local municipalities including the City. The Guidelines provide a framework for regional coordination to ensure a unified and efficient system. Within this framework, there is an opportunity for TransLink to examine the need for consistent regulation by municipalities of micro mobility devices on different types of active transportation infrastructure given the speed and weight differentials of these devices compared to pedestrians and pedal cyclists.

### Goods Movement

- Urban Freight Delivery: Given the increased use of home-delivery services, new methods of goods movement should be considered such as encouraging the electrification of urban freight vehicles that travel relatively shorter distances and the development of new distribution centres with electric vehicle charging stations.
- Short Sea Shipping: This concept would enable the movement of containers from existing marine container terminals by barge to a central logistics facility on the Fraser River for distribution. These operations would benefit businesses and communities across the region by minimizing truck traffic on roads and decreasing the environmental impacts of cargo movement. The Port of Vancouver recently secured grant funding from the federal government towards the development of a viable short sea shipping concept for the region.

### New Technology

- Mobility as a Service: This concept (MaaS) is the integration of a range of public and private shared use transportation modes (e.g., public transit, ride-share, car-share, bike-share, taxi) into one application platform that allows the user to plan, book and pay for a trip through a single channel. Key to the development and deployment of a MaaS application is ensuring

that the application is an open platform that offers all information and mobility options available to a user.

- *Smart Transportation Systems*: The application of technologies (computers, electronic sensors and communication devices) in transportation to can improve safety and save time, money and energy. New developments in the convergence of automation, connectivity, electrification, and shared use mobility will provide opportunities to create a regional network of “smart” corridors that improve safety and reliability through the use of technology such as automated incident detection systems, vehicle-to-roadside communication systems, intersection cameras and real-time information on road conditions, real-time bus arrival times, and transit signal priority.
- *Regional Road Safety Plan*: Development of a coordinated regional approach to enhance road safety for all road users. For example, based on results in other jurisdictions, an aggressive expansion of intersection safety cameras for both red light and speed enforcement across the region would achieve a significant reduction in casualty crashes.<sup>5</sup> Coordination would be required with the Province, as the current red light camera and automated speed enforcement programs are within provincial jurisdiction.

### Funding

- *Mobility Pricing*: This concept refers to a suite of fees for using transportation services such as transit fares and road usage charges. The City’s OCP supports a shift to a more equitable user-pay system to manage travel demand at its source to reduce private vehicle trips. Mobility pricing on the road network would help generate funding to implement transportation improvements across the region, incentivize behaviour change and shift taxation away from the fuel sales tax, which is a declining revenue source due to increased vehicle efficiency and growing electric vehicle sales.

In May 2018, the Mobility Pricing Independent Commission released a report that suggested principles for formulating a mobility pricing policy and descriptions of two high-level concepts: point charge and distance-based charge. As the City would be concerned with a point charge system at crossings, further assessment is required regarding affordability and equity impacts.

- *Ride-Hailing*: A number of studies conducted in US cities have found that ride-hailing services have led to increased congestion, higher traffic fatalities and declines in transit ridership.<sup>6</sup> The City of Vancouver’s feedback to the Province regarding ride-hailing legislation includes exploration of a regional per trip levy to help minimize congestion that would be directed back towards transit and active transportation improvements. Such a fee should become part of a future larger mobility pricing framework within the region.

<sup>5</sup> An automated speed enforcement pilot program in Saskatchewan reduced vehicle speeds by 17% and speed related casualty collisions by 63%. Quebec reported reduced average speeds by 13.3 km/h and crashes by 15% to 42%.

<sup>6</sup> Disruptive Transportation: The Adoption, Utilization, and Impacts of Ride-Hailing in the United States, University of California Davis, October 2017. The New Automobility: Lyft, Uber and the Future of American Cities, Schaller Consulting, July 2018.

## **Financial Impact**

None.

## **Conclusion**

TransLink is seeking input from local municipalities for Phase 1 of the development of Transport 2050, which is the update of the current Regional Transportation Strategy (Transport 2040). This report identifies a number of ideas and concepts to improve Metro Vancouver's transportation system in line with local and regional goals to increase sustainable travel modes. Staff recommend that this report be forwarded to TransLink for consideration. With Council endorsement, staff will promote the ideas and concepts throughout the multi-phase Transport 2050 process.



Joan Caravan  
Transportation Planner  
(604-276-4035)  
JC:jc

- Att. 1: Transport 2050 Phase 1 Consultation – Ideas for Richmond
- Att. 2: Types of Rapid Transit Technologies
- Att. 3: Transport 2040 – Concept of Future Frequent Transit Network

# Transport 2050 Phase 1 Consultation - Ideas for Richmond



## Types of Rapid Transit Technologies



## Bus Rapid Transit

## About BRT

Driver-operated bus technology that provides faster, more frequent and more reliable service than conventional bus service such as B-Line or even frequent bus service. Unique branding sets BRT apart, making the system easy to identify and reflecting community character.

Power source: Diesel, compressed natural gas (CNG) or hybrid diesel-electric. Electric trolley buses can be used with overhead lines.


Right of way: Typically operates in the street but in separate lanes from other traffic at an average speed of 30 km/h. Most BRT systems run on the surface; however, they can also run in tunnels or on elevated structures.

Frequency: Typically high; as frequent as every 2 minutes. Dedicated lanes, moderately spaced stops and signal priority at intersections improve travel time and reliability.

Capacity: Typically medium; up to 3,500 passengers per hour per direction.

Vehicles: Typically 18 meter-long articulated buses. Vehicles use low-floor, kneeling technology and/or ramps for easy and universal accessibility.

## Typical Operating Environments



## BRT examples from around the world

BRT systems are in operation around the world in cities such as Ottawa, Toronto, Curitiba and Lyon.



## Light Rail Transit

## About LRT

Driver-operated rail technology using trains that utilize unique vehicle and station design to help the system integrate into the communities it serves.

Power source: Electric power from overhead lines.

Right of way: Typically operates in the street, but in separate lanes from other traffic at an average speed of 30 km/h. Most LRT systems run on the surface; however, they can also run in tunnels or on elevated structures.

Frequency: Typically high; as frequent as every 2 minutes. Dedicated rights of way, widely-spaced stops in lower-density areas and signal priority at intersections improve travel time and reliability.

Capacity: Typically high; up to 15,000 passengers per hour per direction.

Vehicles: Light Rail Vehicles (LRVs) range in size from 25 - 80 m long and can operate singly or in trains of up to four cars. Vehicles and platforms are designed to allow level boarding for easy and universal accessibility.

## Typical Operating Environments



## LRT examples from around the world

LRT systems are in operation around the world in cities such as Portland, Houston, Paris, Berlin and Lyon.



## Rail Rapid Transit

## About RRT

Driver-operated or driverless rail technology that has a high passenger capacity. RRT operates completely separated from other traffic, which improves travel time and reliability.

Power source: Electric power from a rail beside the track.


Right of way: Typically operates in a tunnel or on an elevated structure at an average speed of 40 km/h. Surface level operation is possible, however, it must be fully segregated for safety.

Frequency: Typically high; as frequent as every 2 minutes. Complete segregation from other traffic provides fast and reliable journeys.

Capacity: Typically high; Metro Vancouver's SkyTrain system is built to carry up to 25,000 passengers per hour per direction. Other systems around the world use different vehicles and operations to accommodate more passengers.

Vehicles: Mark II SkyTrain vehicles are 17 m long per car and can operate in 2- or 4-car trains. 3- and 5-car trains are possible in the future. Vehicles and platforms are designed to allow level boarding for easy and universal accessibility.

## Typical Operating Environments




## RRT examples from around the world

Metro Vancouver's Canada Line and SkyTrain are smaller examples. Large-scale RRT systems are found in major cities worldwide, including Toronto, New York, London, Tokyo, and Beijing.



## Common features of rapid transit systems



Some examples of common features include:

- Stations are sheltered and feature ticket vending machines, closed circuit TV for security, real-time information and wayfinding.
- Tickets or electronic fare media are purchased off the vehicle and before, rather than after, boarding.
- Multiple doors and level boarding make getting on and off rapid transit vehicles faster, more efficient, and universally accessible.
- Systems can be designed to integrate with the communities they serve, including station locations and how the entrance and vehicle look.

# Transport 2040: Concept of Potential Frequent Transit Network



Concept of Potential Frequent Transit Network




# City of Richmond




## Report to Committee

**To:** Public Works and Transportation Committee **Date:** August 6, 2019  
**From:** Lloyd Bie, P.Eng.  
Director, Transportation **File:** 10-6450-19-01/2019-  
Vol 01  
**Re:** **Amendment to Traffic Bylaw No. 5870 to Establish a Fee for Issuance of  
Permits related to Use of City Streets**

### Staff Recommendation

1. That Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, Amendment Bylaw No. 10076, to establish a fee for the issuance of permits to external agencies for the processing of traffic management plans and lane closure requests, be introduced and given first, second and third reading.
2. That Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636, Amendment Bylaw No. 10079, which quantifies the fee for the issuance of various permits established in Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, be introduced and given first, second and third reading.

  
Lloyd Bie, P.Eng.  
Director, Transportation  
(604-276-4131)

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
<b>ROUTED TO:</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER</b>
Law	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Engineering	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Finance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Community Bylaws	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE</b>	<b>INITIALS:</b> 	<b>APPROVED BY CAO</b> 

## Staff Report

### Origin

This report proposes an amendment to Traffic Bylaw No. 5870 to enable cost recovery to the City pursuant to the issuance of permits to external agencies for the processing of traffic management plans and lane closure requests.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #5 Sound Financial Management:

*5.1 Maintain a strong and robust financial position.*

### Analysis

#### Proposed New Fee for Issuance of Permits for Use of City Streets

The City regularly receives requests from external agencies such as developers and utility contractors to accommodate work within City road rights-of-way. As Section 6.2 of the Traffic Bylaw requires the issuance of a City permit for such work, considerable staff resources are expended related to the review and processing of traffic management plans and lane closure requests to support issuance of the permit. Over the 2015-2018 period, staff processed an annual average of 1,090 applications, each requiring approximately one to two hours of staff time. The trend is increasing and based on applications received to date, staff project a total of approximately 1,400 requests for 2019.

Currently, the City does not charge a fee for this service, resulting in significant impacts to staff resources by limiting the ability to address other customer concerns and City priorities. A review of the City's peer municipalities indicates that all surveyed cities charge a fee towards permit processing and administration costs (Table 1).

**Table 1: Lane Closure Permit Fees in Peer Municipalities**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Permit Fee</b>
Surrey	\$85.00
Vancouver	\$62.30
Coquitlam	\$75.00
Burnaby	\$103.00
Delta	\$101.00

Based on the average staff time to process an application and the average permit fee of other surveyed municipalities, staff propose a fee of \$100.00. The proposed fee will apply to permits issued pursuant to all works undertaken by external agencies for private or utility works that require traffic control on City road rights-of-way, which account for an average of 96% of all applications. The proposed fee will not apply to the balance of the applications related to City capital works projects that are conducted by either City forces or contractors hired by the City to perform the works for the City.

The proposed fee will allow an expanded and appropriate allocation of staff resources thereby improving customer service related to the processing of traffic management plans and lane closure requests.

### Implementation of Proposed New Fee

The permit fee is proposed to be effective the first day of the first month following final adoption of the Amendment Bylaw. Staff will update on-line forms and post an information bulletin on the City's website to advise of the new fee. Staff recommend adding the fee as a schedule to the Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8363 to enable the fee to be adjusted annually based on projected Vancouver Consumer Price Index increases.

### Existing Permit Fees for Use of City Streets

The City currently collects fees for the issuance of the following permits for the use of City roads per Traffic Bylaw No. 5870:

- Containers: \$30.00 per day for the temporary placement of a container.
- Shared Vehicle Parking: \$300.00 annual fee for the reserved use of an on-street parking space for a shared vehicle (i.e., car-share vehicle).
- Oversize/Overweight Vehicle Trips: \$25.00 per vehicle for a single trip permit and \$100.00 per vehicle for a multiple trip permit.
- Building Moves: \$50.00 per building move plus \$25.00 for any re-issuance of the permit required as a result of requested changes to the original permit.
- Construction Loading Zones: \$300.00 plus \$30.00 per day and \$0.25 per metre of roadway to which the permit applies per day for the duration of the permit.

As the fees for existing permits issued by the City reflect cost recovery and are generally consistent with other municipalities in the region for the same services, staff do not propose any revisions to the existing fees. Staff recommend removing the existing fees described above from Traffic Bylaw No. 5870 and adding them as a schedule to the Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636 to enable the fees to be adjusted annually based on projected Vancouver Consumer Price Index increases.

### Housekeeping

The amendment bylaw will also address the following two housekeeping items for Traffic Bylaw No. 5870:

- Misspelling of "Highway": Correction of spelling error found in the title of Part V (Traffic Under Special Highway Conditions) and the title of Section 27 (Spilling of Vehicle Loads on Highways; Securing of Loads); and
- Update of Provincial Traffic Control Manual: Section 18.4 references the Ministry of Transportation and Highway's "Traffic Control Manual for Work on Roadways – June 1991." This clause will be revised to reference the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure's updated "2015 Interim Traffic Management Manual for Work on Roadways."

## **Financial Impact**

For the proposed new fee, an annual average of approximately \$110,000 could be recovered given the proposed permit fee of \$100.00 and the processing of the estimated annual average of 1,100 total applications (2015 to 2019) for lane closure requests from external agencies. The Operating Budget will be adjusted to reflect this accordingly.

## **Conclusion**

The processing of applications and issuance of permits to external agencies to conduct works in City road rights-of-way is time-consuming and projected to increase year-over-year. The proposed bylaw amendments enable cost recovery to the City for the issuance of permits related to the processing of traffic management plans and lane closure requests, which in turn will allow an expanded and more efficient allocation of staff resources to better support the City's vision.



Joan Caravan  
Transportation Planner  
(604-276-4035)



Cameron Robertson  
Traffic Technician 2  
(604-276-4388)

JC:jc



**Traffic Bylaw No. 5870  
Amendment Bylaw No. 10076**

The Council of the City of Richmond enacts as follows:

1. **Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**, as amended, is further amended by adding a new Section 6.3 as follows, and renumbering subsequent sections accordingly:

6.3 The **General Manager, Engineering & Public Works** is hereby authorized to charge a fee for permits issued pursuant to Section 6.2 above in the amount set out from time to time in the *Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636*.

2. **Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**, as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 9A.3(c) and replacing it with the following:

9A.3(c) The **General Manager, Engineering & Public Works** is hereby authorized to charge a fee for permits issued pursuant to Section 9A above in the amount set out from time to time in the *Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636*.

3. **Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**, as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 12C.4 and replacing it with the following:

12C.4 The **General Manager, Engineering & Public Works** is hereby authorized to charge a fee for permits issued pursuant to Section 12C.1 above in the amount set out from time to time in the *Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636*.

4. **Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**, as amended, is further amended by deleting the title of PART V and replacing it with the following:

**PART V – TRAFFIC UNDER SPECIAL HIGHWAY CONDITIONS**

5. **Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**, as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 18.4 and replacing it with the following:

18.4 The Council hereby approves the appropriate designs set out in the “2015 Interim Traffic Management Manual for Work on Roadways,” as published by the Provincial Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, as signs to be used by the **General Manager, Engineering & Public Works** when acting pursuant to Subsections 18.1 and 18.2 of this Bylaw.

6. **Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**, as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 25.1 and replacing it with the following:

25.1 The **General Manager, Engineering & Public Works** is hereby authorized to charge a fee for permits issued pursuant to Section 24 above in the amount set out from time to time in the *Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636*.

7. **Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**, as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 27 and replacing it with the following:

**27. SPILLING OF VEHICLE LOADS ON HIGHWAYS; SECURING OF LOADS**

8. **Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**, as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 42.2(b) and replacing it with the following:

42.2(b) The **General Manager, Engineering & Public Works** is hereby authorized to charge a fee for permits issued pursuant to Section 42.1 above in the amount set out from time to time in the *Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636*.

9. This Bylaw is cited as "**Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, Amendment Bylaw No. 10076.**"

FIRST READING

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

ADOPTED

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED for content by originating dept. <i>U3</i>
APPROVED for legality by Solicitor <i>LB</i>



**Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636  
Amendment Bylaw No. 10079**

The Council of the City of Richmond enacts as follows:

1. The **Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636**, as amended, is further amended by adding Schedule A attached to and forming part of this bylaw as a schedule to Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8638, in alphabetical order.
2. This Bylaw is cited as "**Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636, Amendment Bylaw No. 10079.**"

FIRST READING

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

ADOPTED

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED for content by originating dept. <i>CS</i>
APPROVED for legality by Solicitor <i>Ac</i>

**SCHEDULE – USE OF CITY STREETS****Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**

Obstruction of Traffic – Traffic Management Plan Review and Lane Closure Permit  
Section 6.3

Description	Fee
Application Review Fee	\$100.00

**Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**

Containers – Temporary Placement Permit  
Section 9A

Description	Fee
Permit Fee	\$30.00 per day

**Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**

Shared Vehicle Parking Space – Permit  
Section 12C

Description	Fee
Permit Fee	\$300.00 per year

**Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**

Oversize Vehicles and Building Moves – Permit  
Section 25.1

Description	Fee
Individual Vehicle Trip	\$25.00
One Vehicle for More than One Trip	\$100.00
One Building Move	\$50.00
Re-issuance of Building Move Permit as a Result of Changes Requested to Original Permit	\$25.00

**Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**

Construction Zones – Permit  
Section 42.1

Description	Fee
Permit Fee	\$300.00
* per day	*Plus \$30.00
** per metre of roadway to which permit applies, per day	**Plus \$0.25



# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee

**To:** Public Works and Transportation Committee **Date:** August 16, 2019  
**From:** Jason Ho, P.Eng.  
Manager, Engineering Planning **File:** 10-6060-01/2019-Vol  
01  
**Re:** **Ageing Utility and Road Infrastructure Planning – 2019 Update**

### Staff Recommendation

That the staff report titled, "Ageing Utility and Road Infrastructure Planning – 2019 Update", dated August 16, 2019, from the Manager, Engineering Planning be utilized as input in the annual utility rate review and budget process.

Jason Ho, P.Eng.  
Manager, Engineering Planning  
(604-244-1281)

Att. 6

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
<b>ROUTED TO:</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER</b>
Finance Department	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Roads & Construction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sewerage & Drainage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Water Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE</b>	<b>INITIALS:</b> 	<b>APPROVED BY CAO</b> 

## Staff Report

### Origin

Staff have previously reported to Council on the estimated long-term capital requirements for age-related infrastructure renewal on a biennial basis. The last report was brought forward in 2017. This report updates those estimates to reflect current inventory, new inspection data, evolving theory on infrastructure service life, and changing infrastructure replacement pricing.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #1 A Safe and Resilient City:

*Enhance and protect the safety and well-being of Richmond.*

*1.2 Future-proof and maintain city infrastructure to keep the community safe.*

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #4 An Active and Thriving Richmond:

*An active and thriving community characterized by diverse social and wellness programs, services and spaces that foster health and well-being for all.*

*4.2 Ensure infrastructure meets changing community needs, current trends and best practices.*

### Background

This report outlines the current and long-term financial requirements for maintaining and replacing the City's ageing infrastructure. The goal is to ensure the City has the capacity to meet the financial challenges of today and the future, while maintaining current levels of service.

The ageing utilities and roads infrastructure analysis is based on typical or standard service life for specific types of infrastructure, modified based on the City's experience. There are a number of local factors that can impact the actual useful life of a piece of infrastructure, such as soil type and quality of original installation. The long-term analysis is essential for long-term budget projections, but has limited use for identifying exact replacement dates for specific pieces of infrastructure. The 5-year capital plan identifies near-term infrastructure requirements through field observation and inspection results and is a better gauge of short-term infrastructure needs. The graphs that predict long-term infrastructure requirements are basic guides on what the City should anticipate for long-term infrastructure costs, while the 5-year capital plans more accurately identify short-term budget requirements.

### Existing Infrastructure

In managing the City's extensive network of infrastructure services, staff have developed sanitary, drainage, water and pavement management computer models to predict infrastructure performance, upgrade needs, replacement cycles, and replacement costs. Coupled with field-verified condition inspection and performance review, model data plays a key role in determining the City's infrastructure replacement and upgrade programs.

Table 1 is a summary of the City's inventory of water, sanitary, drainage, diking, and roads infrastructure. The replacement value assumes that infrastructure will be replaced to meet the respective service level defined by Council. For example, the defined service level for drainage infrastructure is the 10-year storm. With climate change, the rainfall volume and intensity of the 10-year storm is increasing; therefore, replacement infrastructure typically needs to be larger to maintain the service levels. Table 2 identifies current capital funding levels, funding sources, and reserve balances.

Staff have reported ageing infrastructure assessments to Council in 2001, 2006, 2011, 2013, 2015 and 2017. The 2001 and 2006 reports to Council identified that infrastructure replacement funding levels were insufficient to maintain existing service levels over the long term. The 2006 report proposed a number of strategies to address funding shortfalls, and a strategy of gradual rate increases to close the identified funding gaps was adopted. Substantial progress has been made since 2006.

Long-term funding requirements have been updated to reflect changes in infrastructure replacement pricing, inventory changes through growth or capacity improvements, new inspection data, and evolving estimates of infrastructure service life.

Table 1. Infrastructure Inventory

Infrastructure	Components	Funding Source	Replacement Value (2019 Dollars)
Water	634 km Pipes 13 PRV Chambers 56 Valve Chambers	Water Utility	\$800M
Sanitary	569 km Pipes 153 Pump Stations	Sanitary Utility	\$705M
Drainage and Diking	585 km Pipes 39 Pump Stations 61 km Culverts 165 km Watercourses 49 km Dikes	Drainage & Diking Utility	\$1,748M <sup>1</sup>
Roads and Road Assets (Non-MRN)	1285 lane km asphalt 12 Bridges <sup>2</sup> 11,551 street lights <sup>3</sup>	General Revenue	\$796M
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$4,049M</b>

<sup>1</sup> Includes the cost to upgrade the City's perimeter dike to maintain flood protection service levels with sea level rise.

<sup>2</sup> Includes only bridge structures managed by the City's Engineering & Public Works department outside of the Major Road Network (MRN). Structures maintained by the City's Parks department are excluded.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes BC Hydro lease lights not maintained by the City.

Table 2. Annual Capital Infrastructure Funding and Reserves

Infrastructure Type	2019 Funding	Funding Source	Uncommitted Reserve Balance (July 31, 2019)
Water	\$7.5M	Water Utility	\$44.9M
Sanitary	\$5.3M	Sanitary Utility	\$33.5M
Drainage and Diking	\$12.1M <sup>1</sup>	Drainage & Diking Utility	\$25.7M
Road and Road Assets (non-MRN)	\$5.0M	General Revenue	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$29.9M</b>		<b>\$104.1M</b>

<sup>1</sup> \$12.1 million is collected from the Drainage and Diking Utility. \$11.6 million is directed towards drainage and diking capital works while \$500,000 is directed towards provision accounts to fund the dyke repair and box culvert maintenance programs.

Water, sanitary, and drainage and diking assets have independent utility funding streams. Required funding levels are assessed as part of this report and achieved through the annual utility rate review process. Going forward, staff will continue to present annual budget options to close existing funding gaps and, ultimately, maintain utility funding within the identified target range.

Road and road assets (paving, street lighting and bridges) are not part of a utility and are funded from the City's General Revenue.

## Analysis

### Total Replacement Value and Schedule

Infrastructure replacement costs for the City's water, sanitary, drainage and road infrastructure over the next 100 years have been estimated and graphed in Attachments 1 to 4. The charts also show current funding levels as well as the estimated long-term average annual funding levels (in 2019 dollars, excluding inflation) that are required to perpetually replace assets. Given the volatility of construction costs, infrastructure projects do not always follow general inflation trends. Therefore, inflation has not been included in the analysis and staff recommend the analysis be reviewed every two years to identify and integrate changes in construction costs.

The current analysis indicates that construction cost increases have been significant in recent years. Recent iterations of ageing infrastructure analysis utilized the consumer price index (CPI) to account for construction cost increases; however, construction cost inflation has been well above CPI and this trend has persisted for several years. As a result, replacement values have been updated to account for this continuing trend.

The funding requirement range represents the estimated level of uncertainty in the long-term annual funding levels, which is due to a number of variables, including:

- potential overlap between capacity-based improvements due to development or climate change;

- variability in the potential service life of the infrastructure;
- variability in the economy and the cost of infrastructure replacement; and
- unanticipated or emergency events that initiate early infrastructure replacement or repairs in excess of operating budget provisions.

### Water

Staff estimate a long-term annual funding requirement of \$9.2 million (Attachment 1) for the City's water infrastructure. Since 2001, Council has endorsed increases in annual Water Utility funding from \$3.0 million to its current level of \$7.5 million. Achieving the long-term annual funding requirement will facilitate proactive management of the City's water assets, reducing overall costs while reaching a high level of service. Proactive replacement programs have mitigated ageing infrastructure issues and maintained a low watermain break rate, minimizing service disruptions and property damage from broken watermain.

The primary focus of the City's watermain replacement program is the replacement of ageing asbestos cement (AC) water pipes with new PVC or HDPE pipes, which offer longer service lives, better seismic resilience, and higher chemical resistance in Richmond's aggressive soil conditions. Approximately 38% of the City's watermain are AC pipes. Since 2011, the watermain replacement program has replaced 59 km of AC pipes, which is approximately 19% of the AC pipe inventory. Replacement of ageing AC pipes will remain the primary focus of the City's watermain replacement programs for approximately the next 30 years. Between 2060 and 2080, replacement costs may exceed the long-term required funding level and, as a result, may require utilization of reserves and borrowing. In the long term, reaching the required funding level will repay debts incurred and allow for continued water infrastructure renewal.

Water pressure management extends the service life of AC watermain. The City introduced a pressure management program in 2014. The program has resulted in a 7% decrease in water losses through reduced pipe cracking and leakage in the water distribution system. This reduction in water losses results in approximately \$1.5 million in cost savings to the City each year through reduced Metro Vancouver water purchase costs. Staff will continue to review costs and benefits of additional pressure management strategies to maximize system efficiency.


The City's water meter program is funded through the Water Utility and has been very successful. To date, 100% of single-family, 46% of multi-family, and 100% of industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) properties have been metered. One of the benefits of water metering is the ability to identify property-side water leakage and provide incentives for leak repair. Since 2015, 573 properties have repaired leaks and applied for leak rebates, totalling approximately 940,000 m<sup>3</sup> in annual leak reduction. This represents \$683,000 in annual savings on Metro Vancouver water purchases. The fixed base meter reading network will be universally deployed this year to read and gather real-time consumption data from 97% of the City's water meters, further improving the City's ability to detect private-side leakage.

Figure 1 shows the total consumption per capita, excluding ICI, for Richmond and neighbouring (mainly unmetered) municipalities since 2006. ICI consumption has a significant effect on total consumption per capita, typically accounting for one-third of a municipality's total consumption.

An ICI property that reduces or shuts down its production would artificially give the perception that individual water consumption has decreased. The analysis shown in Figure 1 removes the variability of ICI consumption and provides a more accurate illustration of residential consumption and water savings from residential water metering.

As illustrated, Richmond is reducing consumption at a much greater rate than unmetered municipalities. This is strong evidence that water metering is effective for reducing consumption, likely through leak identification and reduction, as well as behavioural changes and conservation.

Figure 1. Comparison of Total Consumption Per Capita, Excluding ICI



As illustrated in Figure 1, Richmond is reducing consumption at a much greater rate than unmetered municipalities. This is strong evidence that water metering is effective for reducing consumption, likely through leak identification and reduction, as well as behavioural changes and conservation.

### Sanitary

Staff estimate a long-term annual funding requirement of \$8.4 million for the Sanitary Utility (Attachment 2). Sanitary Utility funding has increased from \$0.5 million annually in 2001 to a current funding level of \$5.3 million annually. While current funding levels are adequate for short- to medium-term sanitary infrastructure replacement needs, the funding shortfall defers the

financial obligation to future years, which will place additional burden on future rate payers. As such, bridging the funding gap will be an important consideration for future utility budgets.

Inflow and infiltration (I&I) of rainwater and groundwater into the sanitary system reduces available system capacity for domestic sewage and municipal growth. I&I management is an important strategy for deferring or avoiding capacity-based system upgrades. The City maintains one of the lowest rates of I&I in Metro Vancouver, and this is a result of proactive sanitary sewer assessment and rehabilitation programs. The City assessed its complete gravity sewer inventory between 2002 and 2015. The assessment indicated the City's gravity sewers are in excellent condition and identified defects that have been addressed proactively through the capital program. The next cycle of assessments will begin in the next few years.

In the past 15 years, the City has constructed seven new sanitary pump stations, rebuilt four sanitary pump stations, performed upgrades on 13 sanitary pump stations and installed new pumps at 69 pump stations.

The impact of grease on municipal sanitary sewer collection systems is an on-going concern for the City. Following the Lansdowne Road sanitary forcemain failure due to a grease blockage in 2011, pressure sensors were installed throughout the sanitary system to identify grease build-up. Identifying grease build-up before it becomes critical facilitates a proactive grease maintenance program for forcemains and maintains a high level of service. Staff are currently reviewing opportunities for implementing grease extraction facilities in the City's sanitary sewer system to address the issues of grease build-up.

### Drainage and Diking

#### *Drainage*

The required drainage funding level has increased due to inflation, emerging early box culvert deterioration issues, and improved understanding of drainage pump station costs.

The City has approximately 61 km of box culverts, the majority of which are 40 to 50 years in age. The concrete box culverts have a design life of 100 years; however, some joints are failing prematurely which has led to the development of sinkholes, often in highly travelled routes. Failed joints, if left unrepaired, ultimately lead to box culvert and roadway failure. Staff are proactively managing the condition of box culverts by identifying and repairing deteriorating joints early on to extend the lifecycle of the culverts and minimize long-term replacement costs. Council has supported a number of capital projects related to box culvert repairs. Over the past four years, approximately \$7.4 million have been allocated to repairs of failed box culverts.

As part of the 2017 Utility Budgets and Rates, Council supported the implementation of a box culvert preventative maintenance program that inspects the box culverts on a 7-year cycle. Through this program, staff perform minor repairs and identify culverts that require significant repair, lining or replacement. Information collected through this program is used to inform future capital programs and update funding levels required to maintain the City's box culverts.

In October 2017, the City was awarded grant funding to be used for flood mitigation planning, which involved a condition assessment for its 39 drainage pump stations. The estimated replacement costs have increased due to increased seismic mitigation and regulatory requirements, along with significant increases in construction costs due to market conditions.

Over the past 15 years, the City has rebuilt and performed significant upgrades for 11 of 39 drainage pump stations. The Horseshoe Slough pump station is currently under construction and is expected to be complete by the end of 2019. The City's capital program includes six additional pump station replacements proposed over the next five years. The remaining Lulu Island drainage pump stations will be rebuilt or receive significant upgrades over the next 20 years provided that funding levels are maintained or improved. Pumping capacity upgrades and requirements are identified using the City's drainage system computer hydraulic model.

The City continues to adapt and mitigate the impacts of climate change through pump station upgrades, storm sewer maintenance and upgrades, laneway drainage, agricultural drainage, agricultural irrigation and implementation of stormwater retention infrastructure.

### *Diking*

The City is on average one meter above mean sea level and protected by 49 km of dike. Climate change scientists estimate that sea levels will rise by 1.0 m by 2100 and 0.2 m of subsidence is expected over the same time period. To accommodate climate change-induced sea level rise and ground subsidence, the Dike Master Plans are used to guide the City's dike raising efforts. The City's target dike elevation for 2100 is 4.7 m geodetic (approximately 1.2 m above current elevations) with the ability to increase to 5.5 m geodetic.

The Flood Protection Management Strategy 2019 (FPMS 2019), endorsed by Council on June 24, 2019, provides updated information on climate change science and strategies to further improve Richmond's flood protection program. A key action in the FPMS 2019 implementation program is to continue upgrades to the City's perimeter diking system. Dike Master Plan Phases 1, 2, 3 and 5 have been completed, and Dike Master Plan Phase 4 is anticipated to be completed and presented for Council consideration within the next year.

Following the recommendations from Dike Master Plan Phase 1, staff utilized grant funding to complete preliminary geotechnical and concept assessments to inform the Steveston Island dike alignment. Findings from this assessment were presented to Council for information and staff will continue to work on acquiring land tenure, completing detailed assessments and establishing strategic partnerships.

The FPMS 2019 addresses anticipated climate change impacts and further indicates that Richmond will need to improve its dike network in advance of sea level rise. There is considerable variability in climate change science on the rate of sea level rise. Latest information from the United States Department of Commerce National Ocean Service Center indicates that there is a 17% probability of 1.0 m of sea level rise by 2100 in the business-as-usual scenario (continued greenhouse gas generation) and a 96% chance that 0.5 m of sea level

rise will be realized under the same scenario. It also indicates that significantly lower levels of sea level rise can be facilitated through global reductions in greenhouse gas production.

The Ministry of Forest, Lands and Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development identifies a range of 0.5 m to 1.4 m of sea level rise by 2100 in their 2011 Climate Change Adaptation Guidelines for Sea Dikes and Coastal Flood Hazard Land Use. Forecasts generally agree that the City can expect a minimum of 0.5 m of sea level rise by 2100 but have less certainty regarding more rapid levels of sea level rise.

Climate change science also indicates that while snow packs may decrease in the future, there is uncertainty in the melting rates and subsequent impact on river flows. The high water design event for 80% of Richmond's dikes is based on king tide and storm surge, while the remaining 20% (eastern end of Lulu Island) is based on freshet; therefore, the City's long-term dike raising strategy will largely be based on sea level rise. The current strategy to address this risk is based on raising the dikes by 1.2 m, and the specific timing and scope of work will adjust as climate change science advances and new information becomes available.

#### *Drainage and Diking Funding*

In 2003, Council endorsed the introduction of the Drainage and Diking Utility. Since 2003, Council has approved increasing annual funding levels for Drainage and Diking from \$0.6 million to its current level of \$12.1 million in 2019. However, climate change-induced sea level rise is an emerging issue and implementation of the Dike Master Plan will require additional allocations to dike improvements. Drainage and diking improvements are interconnected and, while there are synergies, additional funding to meet long-term needs is required.

The high-level estimated cost to upgrade the dike to address the predicted 2100 sea level rise scenario is \$420 million. This value is higher than previously noted, as more detailed assessments have been completed, and reflects increased seismic mitigation and regulatory requirements, as well as construction cost inflation due to current market conditions. Consistent with previous reports and the current funding strategy, a minimum of 50% in funding assistance from senior government grants and partnerships is being pursued to perform the upgrades in the required timespan.

Provided senior government grants can be obtained, the City's share of dike raising costs will be \$2.5 million to \$7.6 million per year, depending on the realized rate of sea level rise. In 2019, the City received \$13.8 million in grant funding from the Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund for multi-year drainage and diking improvements. Staff will continue to look for opportunities to secure additional funding sources for flood protection work.

Historically, the City has seen significant cost savings and effective dike improvements through development along the dike corridor. An estimated 10% of dike improvements through development has been included in the funding calculations, and increasing the amount of development-assisted dike upgrades would reduce the required funding from the City.

Staff estimate a long-term annual funding requirement of \$19.5 million for drainage and diking infrastructure and the City currently allocates \$12.1 million from the Drainage and Diking

Utility, which is below the target range. Based on the above, it is recommended that the Drainage and Diking Utility be increased gradually over the long term. Future Ageing Utilities Infrastructure reporting will continue to update Council on the progress of grant funding, developments and their impact on overall diking improvement funding requirements.

As identified in Attachment 3, the forecasted drainage and diking improvement requirement over the next ten years is approximately \$14.2 million. Within this timeframe, the City will gain more certainty regarding the rate of sea level rise. However, Council should consider incremental increases to the Drainage and Diking Utility Rate to prepare for sea level rise scenarios beyond the minimum and meet the long-term drainage and diking needs. This would correspond with strong feedback received through the public consultation process for the FPMS 2019, where there was strong support for increasing flood protection fees to accelerate the flood protection program. Staff will bring forward funding options and capital projects for Council's consideration as part of the utility rates process and capital planning process that address the long-term dike funding gap and facilitate implementation of the Dike Master Plan ahead of predicted sea level rise.

#### Road and Road Assets

##### *Road Pavement*

The City's Asphalt Re-Paving Capital Program re-paves sections of City-owned non-MRN roads on an annual basis. The long-term annual re-paving funding requirement for the City's non-MRN roads is estimated at \$5.0 million, using average paving prices and predictions of road re-paving needs from the City's computerized Pavement Management System. Paving prices are heavily influenced by oil prices, which have had significant fluctuations over the past years. The fluctuating price of paving has a significant impact on the long-term funding requirements of the City's road network. Attachment 5 shows the fluctuating cost of asphalt paving between 2008 and 2018.

As identified in the March 29, 2017 report to Council titled "Post Winter Roads and Paving Program Update", harsh winter conditions can have significant impacts on the condition of the City's roadways. Staff will continue to monitor on-going climate change weather trends and incorporate the impacts of any identified trends in subsequent infrastructure reporting. The results from the road condition data collected in 2017 have been used to refine both projections of annual funding levels and paving program priorities for capital planning.

##### *Street Lighting*

The City's street lighting system consists of approximately 11,500 streetlights and continues to grow with new development. In 2017, approximately 200 street light poles in the Seafair and Richmond Gardens subdivisions were found to have reached the end of their 40-50 year service life and were replaced through phases 1 and 2 of the LED Replacement Capital Program. Phase 3 of the program was approved by Council in 2018 and Phase 4 is scheduled to be brought forward for Council's consideration in the 2020 – 2024 Roads Capital Plan. Staff note that there is currently no significant backlog of poles that require replacement.

Since the 2017 Ageing Infrastructure Report, staff have completed an evaluation on the City's street lighting inventory. The long-term annual funding requirement is approximately \$2.4 million for the replacement of street lighting systems, based on a service life consistent with the age of the deteriorated poles at Seafair and Richmond Gardens. Staff note that there could be significant variability in the deterioration of street lighting infrastructure and that the current analysis based on identified deterioration may be conservative. Additionally, decorative street lighting replacement is significantly more expensive than standard street lighting and adding decorative street lighting to the City's inventory will increase the cost associated with the replacement program. Going forward, the condition of street lighting systems nearing the end of their service life will be assessed to refine the recommended replacement strategy. Replacement projects will be brought forward through the capital program when poles requiring replacement are identified. Results of this assessment will be incorporated into future ageing infrastructure reporting.

### *Overpasses and Bridges*

The City owns 12 overpasses and bridges, maintained by Engineering and Public Works that are non-MRN. These include:

- 5 roadway overpasses or bridges; and
- 7 pedestrian bridges.

A table listing of overpasses and bridges is included as Attachment 6.

Staff completed inspections on six of the City's non-MRN overpasses and bridges in 2013. Results of the inspection were used to update the City's capital program. In 2015, Council endorsed capital projects to rehabilitate the Bridgeport Road Overpass, Fraserside Gate Bridge and Woodward's Slough Bridge. Inspection of the remaining structures, which consists primarily of smaller pedestrian bridges, was completed in 2017. Results of the inspection have been used to update projections of annual funding requirements. Following this inspection cycle, it is recommended that bridge structures be inspected every one to five years, depending on the material, age and condition of the bridge. The completion of regular inspection and maintenance will extend the lifespan of the structure, thereby reducing overall lifecycle costs, as well as enhancing safety and comfort for users.

The No. 2 Road Bridge, Bridgeport Road Overpass, and Cambie Road Overpass at Knight Street are significant pieces of municipal infrastructure with a total replacement value of approximately \$88 million. These structures are situated within the region's MRN, which is designed to connect provincial highway systems with local road networks, and are eligible for regional maintenance and replacement funding. The City receives regional funding for the operation, maintenance and rehabilitation of pavement and bridge decks within the MRN. TransLink has approved the MRN Structures Funding Program for the rehabilitation and seismic retrofit of structures for 2017 to 2019. City staff are participating on Translink's Operation, Maintenance and Rehabilitation Sub-Committee and will continue to work with TransLink to secure adequate bridge maintenance and rehabilitation funding.

Distributed assets, such as roadway paving and street lighting, require annual funding from General Revenue, which allows a percentage of the asset to be replaced each year. The bridge assets, however, are point assets that require short, intense rehabilitation or replacement and are better completed on a one-time basis as required. Attachment 6 outlines an overpass and bridge maintenance strategy that highlights the one-time nature of bridge upgrades or replacement projects. Staff predict that a long-term annual funding of \$0.1 million is required for routine maintenance and inspection of bridge assets, and a total of \$63 million will be required over the next 100 years for major bridge rehabilitation and replacements.

#### *Road and Road Asset Funding*

The total long-term annual funding requirement for road and road assets is currently estimated to be \$8.4 million, as identified in Attachment 4.

Based on typical roadway design life information, significant road paving will be required over the next five years. Area-specific verification will be completed as part of the 5-year capital planning process. The results from the City-wide asphalt surface condition assessment in 2017 have been utilized by staff to confirm and inform paving recommendations for the City's existing and future capital paving programs. Staff will continue to bring forward paving program funding recommendations that will include on-going funding combined with one-time allocation of surpluses to meet the five year capital needs of the roadway paving program.

Private development servicing agreements contributes significantly to the City's re-paving needs. Over the past five years, the City has secured an average of approximately \$9 million per year in roadway assets through servicing agreements. While parts of this involve the introduction of new assets through new road construction, some of this work rebuilds or expands existing roadways that would otherwise require repaving through the City's annual paving program. Unlike utility infrastructure where development-driven replacement work does not typically coincide with infrastructure that is beyond its useful life and hence does not significantly impact long term funding requirements, road pavement has a much shorter lifespan of 15 to 35 years. As such, paving completed through development activities has notable impacts on ageing infrastructure replacement plans.

The overpasses, bridges and street lighting assets have begun to require re-investment as they are starting to show signs of deterioration and have been the focus of recent capital upgrade and replacement programs. These re-investments include a \$1.1 million Bridgeport Road Overpass renovation project and two years of a five-year street light replacement program totaling \$252,000 for the first two years. The asset deterioration model indicates that these projects are the beginning of upgrade and replacement projects for overpasses bridges and street lighting assets.

Road and road assets are not part of a utility and are funded from the City's General Revenue. Since 2006, Council has endorsed increases in annual roadway funding levels from \$2.6 million to its current value of \$4.3 million. With the inclusion of in-kind contributions to roadway repaving programs through development, 2019 funding levels for road and road asset replacements is estimated at \$5.0 million. Roadway paving and street lighting assets are distributed assets that require ongoing dedicated funding, while bridge asset replacements are

best funded through one-time expenditures. On this basis, roads and road assets will ultimately be funded through a combination of annual funding and one-time funding. Both on-going repaving and street lighting programs, and one-time bridge repair projects will be included in capital and operating programs for Council's consideration.

### Required Funding Levels

Table 3 summarizes current and required annual infrastructure replacement funding levels, in 2019 dollars, as well as the current ageing infrastructure funding gaps. The City has made considerable infrastructure funding gains since initiating its strategy to close the funding gap in 2006.

Table 3: Infrastructure Funding Levels

<b>Infrastructure Type</b>	<b>2019 Funding Level</b>	<b>Required Annual Funding Level</b>	<b>Funding Range</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Estimated Additional Funding Required</b>
Water	\$7.5M	\$9.2M	\$8.6M - \$10.4M	Water Utility	\$1.7M
Sanitary	\$5.3M	\$8.4M	\$7.8M - \$9.1M	Sanitary Utility	\$3.1M
Drainage & Diking	\$12.1M	\$19.5M <sup>1</sup>	\$17.3M - \$20.4M	Drainage & Diking Utility	\$7.4M
Road and Road Assets (non-MRN)	\$5.0M	\$8.4M	\$7.5M - \$9.5M	General Revenue	\$3.4M
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$29.9M</b>	<b>\$45.5M</b>			<b>\$15.6M</b>

<sup>1</sup>Required funding may decrease upon the award of senior government grant funding.

### Funding Strategies

Adequate annual funding levels will allow the City to implement proactive and sustainable infrastructure replacement programs. The proactive replacement of infrastructure enables the City to sequence utility replacement and use competitive bidding to ensure the best value for money. Replacing failed infrastructure has proven to be considerably more expensive and disruptive to residents and City services than proactive replacement.

Staff have pursued available federal and provincial grants from programs such as the Community Emergency Preparedness Fund and National Disaster Mitigation Program and will continue to do so. While grant funding has been helpful over the last few years, as a funding source, grants will always be unpredictable and therefore non-sustainable.

Development also facilitates significant infrastructure replacement that has a positive impact on the City's overall ageing infrastructure picture. However, development is subject to external forces such as the economy and does not always coincide with infrastructure that is beyond its

useful life. Therefore, development is not considered as a sustainable resource for ageing utility infrastructure replacement.

Staff will present funding options and make a recommendation to Council as part of the annual utility rate review and budget process. Significant progress has been made over the last decade in closing the funding gap, and continuation on this path will allow the City to effectively mitigate the challenge of ageing infrastructure.

### **Financial Impact**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Staff will continue to gather information to further refine and update infrastructure replacement requirements and will continue to explore new technologies and best practices that will positively impact lifecycle infrastructure costs. Staff will continue to address utility funding gaps through annual budgeting processes. The rate of increase and timeframe to close the funding gaps will be impacted by Metro Vancouver's regional charges for water and sewer, which are non-discretionary costs imposed on the City. The funding shortfalls outlined in this report should be considered in conjunction with the City's Long-Term Financial Management Strategy.




Jason Ho, P.Eng.  
Manager, Engineering Planning  
(604-244-1281)


JH:cc/jc

- Att.1: 2019 Ageing Infrastructure Report – Water Assets
- Att.2: 2019 Ageing Infrastructure Report – Sanitary Assets
- Att.3: 2019 Ageing Infrastructure Report – Drainage & Diking Assets
- Att.4: 2019 Ageing Infrastructure Report – Road and Road Assets (non-MRN)
- Att.5: Historical Costs for Capital Paving Program (2008 – 2018)
- Att.6: Overpasses and Bridges


2019 Ageing Infrastructure Report - Water Assets



## 2019 Ageing Infrastructure Report - Sanitary Assets





## 2019 Ageing Infrastructure Report - Drainage & Diking Assets



\*Annualized Required Funding level may decrease upon the award of senior government grant funding.

## 2019 Ageing Infrastructure Report - Road and Road Assets (non-MRN)





## Overpasses and Bridges

### Listing of Non-MRN Overpass and Bridge Inventory

<b>Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Feature Crossed</b>	<b>Type</b>
Fraserside Gate Bridge	Fraserside Gate & Westminster Hwy	Watercourse	Roadway
Horseshoe Place Bridge	Horseshoe Place south of Horseshoe Way	Watercourse	Roadway
Woodward Slough Bridge	No. 4 Rd and Finn Rd	Watercourse	Roadway
Finn Road East Bridge	13020 Gilbert Rd	Watercourse	Roadway
Hollybridge Way Bridge	River Rd & Hollybridge Way	Watercourse	Roadway
Chatsworth Road Bridge	6380 Chatsworth Rd	Watercourse	Pedestrian
Bird Road Bridge	11040 Bird Road & Shell Road rail crossing	Watercourse	Pedestrian
Lancing Road Bridge	5440 Lancing Rd	Watercourse	Pedestrian
Princess Street Bridge	Dyke Rd fronting Princess St	Watercourse	Pedestrian
West Dyke Trail Bridge 1	West end of Francis Rd (West Dyke Trail)	Watercourse	Pedestrian
West Dyke Trail Bridge 2	West end of Williams Rd (West Dyke Trail)	Watercourse	Pedestrian
West Dyke Trail Bridge 3	10431 Springhill Cres	Watercourse	Pedestrian


### Bridges and Overpasses Maintenance Strategy

The table below illustrates a high-level rehabilitation and replacement strategy for the City's bridge inventory over the next 100 years. The strategy involves routine inspection and maintenance of the structures at an annualized cost of \$38,000 each year, replacement of the structure at the end of its service life, and a major rehabilitation to extend the service life for larger bridges.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Estimated Replacement Cost</b>	<b>Estimated Rehabilitation Cost</b>	<b>Replacement Year</b>	<b>Rehabilitation Year</b>
Fraserside Gate Bridge	\$1,270,500	\$137,500	2040	2080
Horseshoe Place Bridge	\$1,003,200	\$200,640	2030	2065
Woodward Slough Bridge	\$374,330	\$74,866	2020	2060
Finn Road East Bridge	\$602,855	\$120,571	2030	2080
Hollybridge Way Bridge	\$2,871,000	\$574,200	2085	2065
Chatsworth Road Bridge	\$49,500	-	2020	N/A
Bird Road Bridge	\$126,720	\$44,000	2035	2060
Lancing Road Bridge	\$35,640	-	2020	N/A
Princess Street Bridge	\$99,000	\$22,000	2080	2030
West Dyke Trail Bridge 1	\$693,000	\$138,600	2085	2065
West Dyke Trail Bridge 2	\$184,470	\$36,894	2065	2045
West Dyke Trail Bridge 3	\$125,510	-	2025	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,435,725</b>	<b>\$1,349,271</b>		

The annual funding level requirement of \$160,000 for bridges and overpasses is calculated as the total rehabilitation and replacement cost averaged over each asset's service life. This value presents an average annual expenditure only and does not reflect actual recommended annual funding levels. Unlike linear infrastructure such as piping or road pavement, replacement of each bridge structure must occur as a singular project and cannot be divided into annual components. For example, replacement of the Hollybridge Way Bridge must be carried out as a one-time expenditure of approximately \$2.8 million. The delivery of the replacement program over 100 years is illustrated in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1. Delivery of the replacement program over 100 years



Based on the high level strategy established, annualized funding of approximately \$38,000 should be allocated towards routine inspection and maintenance of bridge assets, and requests for one-time expenditures for rehabilitation or replacement of bridge structures would come forward in 2020, 2030, 2040, 2060, 2075, 2080, 2085. Where replacement of multiple structures is required within the same year, such as in 2080, staff will review the potential to distribute work over several years. The maintenance strategy will continue to be refined as ongoing inspection work is completed to assess the remaining lifespan of the structures.



**Housing Agreement (5333 No. 3 Road) Bylaw No. 9933, Amendment  
Bylaw No. 10037**

The Council of the City of Richmond enacts as follows:

1. The Mayor and City Clerk for the City of Richmond are authorized to execute and deliver a Housing Agreement modification, substantially in the form set out as Schedule A to this Bylaw, with the owner of the lands legally described as:

PID: 030-721-733      Lot 1 Section 5 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster  
District Plan EPP86098

2. The Mayor and City Clerk for the City of Richmond are authorized to execute for filing in the Land Title Office a release of Housing Agreement dated October 22, 2018, a notation of which is filed in the Land Title Office under number CA7160625, from title to the lands legally described as:

PID: 003-587-100      Lot 46 Section 5 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster  
District Plan 34468 Except Part in Plan EPP87559

This Bylaw is cited as **Housing Agreement (5333 No. 3 Road) Bylaw No. 9933, Amendment  
Bylaw No. 10037**

FIRST READING

SEP 09 2019

SECOND READING

SEP 09 2019

THIRD READING

SEP 09 2019

ADOPTED

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED for content by originating dept. CS
APPROVED for legality by Solicitor

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER

Schedule A

To Housing Agreement (5333 No. 3 Road) Bylaw No. 9933, Amendment Bylaw No. 10037

HOUSING AGREEMENT MODIFICATION BETWEEN ALDERBRIDGE WAY LIMITED  
PARTNERSHIP AND THE CITY OF RICHMOND

**HOUSING AGREEMENT – AFFORDABLE AND MARKET RENTAL HOUSING  
MODIFICATION  
(Section 483 *Local Government Act*)**

**THIS AGREEMENT** is dated for reference \_\_\_\_\_, 2019,

**AMONG:**

**ALDERBRIDGE WAY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**, a limited partnership duly formed under the laws of the Province of British Columbia and having its registered office at 2000 – 250 Howe Street, Vancouver BC V6C 3R6, by its general partner **ALDERBRIDGE WAY GP LTD.**, a corporation duly incorporated under the laws of the Province of British Columbia and having its registered office at 2000 – 250 Howe Street, Vancouver BC V6C 3R6

(the “**Beneficiary**”)

**AND:**

**0989705 B.C. LTD. (INC. NO. BC0989705)**, a company duly incorporated under the laws of the Province of British Columbia and having its registered office at 1600 – 925 West Georgia Street, Vancouver British Columbia V6C 3L2

(the “**Nominee**”)

(the Beneficiary and the Nominee are, together, the “**Owner**” as more fully defined in section 1.1 of this Agreement)

**AND:**

**CITY OF RICHMOND**, a municipal corporation pursuant to the *Local Government Act* and having its offices at 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, British Columbia, V6Y 2C1

(the “**City**” as more fully defined in section 1.1 of this Agreement)

**WHEREAS:**

A. On October 22, 2018, the City, the Nominee and the Beneficiary entered into a Housing Agreement (the “**Housing Agreement**”) pursuant to section 483 of the *Local Government Act* in respect to certain lands and premises legally described as:

- (i) Parcel Identifier: 003-583-902, Lot 80 Section 5 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 37118;

- (ii) Parcel Identifier: 003-587-100, Lot 46 Section 5 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 34468; and
- (iii) Parcel Identifier: 003-582-663, Lot 79 Section 5 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 37118; and

B. The parties wish to modify the Housing Agreement as set out herein.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of \$10.00 and other good and valuable consideration (the receipt and sufficiency of which is acknowledged by both parties), and in consideration of the promises exchanged below, the Owner and the City covenant and agree as follows:

1. All capitalized terms in this Agreement have the same meaning as in the Housing Agreement, unless expressly stated otherwise.
2. Section 1.1(s) is hereby deleted and the following is substituted:

“**Lands**” means the lands and premises legally described as follows:

Parcel Identifier: 030-721-733

Lot 1 Section 5 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan EPP86098

3. Except as set out in this Agreement, the Housing Agreement remains in full force and effect.

**[SIGNATURE BLOCKS FOLLOW]**

**ALDERBRIDGE WAY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP,**  
by its general partner

**ALDERBRIDGE WAY GP LTD.,**  
by its authorized signatory(ies):

Per:   
Name: Samuel Hanson

Per: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name:

**0989705 B.C. LTD.,**  
by its authorized signatory(ies):

Per:   
Name: Samuel Hanson

Per: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name:


**CITY OF RICHMOND**  
by its authorized signatory(ies):

Per: \_\_\_\_\_  
Malcolm D. Brodie, Mayor

Per: \_\_\_\_\_  
David Weber, Corporate Officer



City of  
Richmond



5333 and 5411 No. 3 Road

CNCL - 324

Original Date: 05/28/19

Revision Date:

Note: Dimensions are in METRES



**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500  
Amendment Bylaw 9713 (RZ 16-743741)  
7000/7002/7020 Williams Road & 10060 Gilbert Road**

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

1. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following area and by designating it **"MEDIUM DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTM3)"**.

P.I.D. 004-514-572

Lot 84 Section 32 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 31625

P.I.D. 000-896-748

Lot 85 Section 32 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 31625

P.I.D. 003-986-055

Lot 87 Section 32 Block 4 North Range 6 West New Westminster District Plan 31625

2. This Bylaw may be cited as **"Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9713"**.

FIRST READING

APR 10 2017

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

MAY 15 2017

SECOND READING

MAY 15 2017

THIRD READING

MAY 15 2017

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

SEP 11 2019

ADOPTED

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER







**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500  
Amendment Bylaw 9905 (RZ 18-810261)  
10320 Lassam Road**

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

1. The Zoning Map of the City of Richmond, which accompanies and forms part of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, is amended by repealing the existing zoning designation of the following area and by designating it **"SINGLE DETACHED (RS2/B)"**.

P.I.D. 007-244-665

Lot 120 Section 36 Block 4 North Range 7 West New Westminster District Plan 35792

2. This Bylaw may be cited as **"Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9905"**.

FIRST READING

A PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD ON

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED

ADOPTED

SEP 10 2018

OCT 15 2018

OCT 15 2018

OCT 15 2018

SEP 09 2019



\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER





# City of Richmond

## Report to Council

---

<b>To:</b>	Richmond City Council	<b>Date:</b>	September 10, 2019
<b>From:</b>	Joe Erceg Chair, Development Permit Panel	<b>File:</b>	01-0100-20-DPER1- 01/2019-Vol 01
<b>Re:</b>	<b>Development Permit Panel Meetings Held on May 29, 2019 and August 28, 2019</b>		

---

### Staff Recommendation

1. That the recommendation of the Panel to authorize the issuance of:
  - a) a Development Permit (DP 17-776441) for the property at 7000/7002, 7020 Williams Road and 10060 Gilbert Road; and
  - b) a Development Permit (DP 19-858887) and Heritage Alteration Permit (HA 19-858886) for the property at 12551 No. 1 Road;be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.



Joe Erceg  
Chair, Development Permit Panel  
(604-276-4083)

## **Panel Report**

The Development Permit Panel considered the following items at its meetings held on May 29, 2019 and August 28, 2019.

DP 17-776441 – BISMARCK CONSULTING LTD. – 7000/7002, 7020 WILLIAMS ROAD AND 10060 GILBERT ROAD  
(May 29, 2019)

The Panel considered a Development Permit (DP) application to permit the construction of 15 townhouse units with two secondary suites on a site zoned "Medium Density Townhouses (RTM3)". A variance is included in the proposal for a reduced setback to Gilbert Road.

Applicant Stanford Siu, of Bismark Consulting Ltd., Architect Xuedong Zhao, of Zhao XD Architect Ltd., and Landscape Architect Denitsa Dimitrova, of PMG Landscape Architects, provided a brief presentation, noting that:

- The townhouse project has a modern architectural style and complies with Official Community Plan (OCP) guidelines.
- Rooftop decks are provided on townhouse units.
- Simplified materials and colours are proposed, and a variety of entry door colours.
- A wood deck structure will be constructed around the retained Norway Maple tree over existing grade in the outdoor amenity area.
- The overall landscape design is consistent with the proposed modern architectural style, provides pedestrian-oriented landscaping along street frontages and private yards for all rear units along the rear.
- The outdoor amenity area provides different play opportunities for children and includes a table, seating area, and an open space that could be used by adults.
- Permeable pavers in different colours are proposed on the driveway entrance, ends of drive-aisles, and surface parking areas.
- Bicycle racks and address signage will be installed on the site.

In reply to Panel queries, the design team noted that (i) the wood deck structure around the retained tree is wheelchair accessible, (ii) a playhouse equipment and natural play elements are provided in the children's play area, (iii) landscaping in the outdoor amenity area has been enhanced in response to comments from the Advisory Design Panel, (iv) irrigation is provided for the whole site, (v) the setback variance was requested due to the required two-meter wide road dedication along Gilbert Road, (vi) the setback variance was identified at rezoning, (vii) electric vehicle charging will be provided for all residential parking stalls, and (viii) the two secondary suites located within the two convertible units are also convertible.

Staff noted that (i) the proposed setback variance is a function of the two-meter wide road dedication along Gilbert Road, (ii) the distance between the building face and the back of curb on Gilbert Road is 8.8 meters, and (iii) the proposed setback variance was identified at the rezoning stage and no concerns from the public were noted.

In reply to Panel queries, staff acknowledged that (i) the redesign of the project's architectural style occurred after the Public Hearing, (ii) the new project design proposed by the applicant complies with City guidelines, (iii) the rooftop decks are part of the redesign of the project and are designed to minimize overlook to adjacent properties, and (iv) the height of the rooftop decks' access hatches has been minimized and complies with BC Building Code requirements.

No correspondence was submitted to the Panel regarding the application.

The Panel expressed support for the project, noting that (i) the project is attractive and well thought out, and (ii) the retention of the existing tree in the outdoor amenity area is a positive feature of the project.

The Panel recommends the Permits be issued.

DP 19-858887 AND HA 19-858886 – GORDON CHAN – 12551 NO.1 ROAD  
(August 28, 2019)

The Panel considered a Development Permit (DP) application and Heritage Alteration Permit (HA) application to permit the replacement of existing wooden ramp, stairs and deck with new aluminum ramp, stairs, and deck around the existing building and the installation of a new aluminum ramp on the rear (south) elevation on a site zoned "Light Industrial (IL)" and "Steveston Commercial (CS2)". No variances are included in the proposal.

Andrew Leonard and Gordon Chan, of McCuaig and Associates Engineering Ltd., provided a brief presentation, noting that:

- The existing wooden ramps, stairs and decks around the existing office building for Fisheries and Oceans Canada have deteriorated and needed to be repaired and replaced.
- The proposed repair and replacement of identified parts of the existing building are intended to enhance accessibility and to introduce more durable materials to the building.

In reply to Panel queries, Mr. Leonard advised that (i) the existing wooden decks are in an advanced stage of deterioration, (ii) proposed materials include powder coated aluminum with matte finish, (iii) a flow- through aluminum deck material is proposed to allow water to flow through, and (iv) the delineated pedestrian pathway extends far enough eastward to allow for an unobstructed connection to the sidewalk.

In reply to a Panel query, staff confirmed that the existing building is not an identified heritage resource and is therefore not eligible for a grant.

Staff noted that the Richmond Heritage Commission recommended that the aluminum material be powder-coated and supported the application.

No correspondence was submitted to the Panel regarding the applications.

The Panel recommends the Permits be issued.



## General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, September 16, 2019

Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair  
Councillor Chak Au  
Councillor Carol Day  
Councillor Kelly Greene  
Councillor Alexa Loo  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Linda McPhail  
Councillor Harold Steves  
Councillor Michael Wolfe

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

### MINUTES

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on September 3, 2019; and*
  - (2) *That the minutes of the special meeting of the General Purposes Committee meeting held on September 9, 2019;*
- be adopted as circulated*

**CARRIED**

### COUNCILLOR KELLY GREENE

1. **MICROPLASTICS FILTERS FOR WASHING MACHINES**  
(File Ref. No.)

A product description of a microplastics filter was distributed (Copy on-file, City Clerk's Office).

**General Purposes Committee**  
**Monday, September 16, 2019**

---

It was moved and seconded

*For staff to conduct research into microplastics filters for washing machines including consideration of:*

- (1) The effectiveness of the filters, potential logistics, estimated resource impacts, and other issues that may arise; and*
- (2) If desirable, potential options to encourage the after-market installation of such filters including the granting of rebates to users, sales of filters by the City, educational programs and otherwise.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to the impact of microplastics and engaging Metro Vancouver and other levels of government on initiatives to reduce levels of microplastics in the water supply.

As a result of the discussion, it was suggested that staff seek more information from Metro Vancouver on options to reduce microplastics in the water system.

The question on the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

## COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION

### 2. **RICK HANSEN FOUNDATION ACCESSIBILITY CERTIFICATION PROGRAM**

(File Ref. No. 07-3190-01) (REDMS No. 6205828 v. 20)

Discussion ensued with regard to consulting with the Richmond Centre for Disability (RCD) on Richmond's proposed participation in the Certification Program.

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that the City works with the RCD on various initiatives and meets with the group on a regular basis.

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

It was moved and seconded

*That the staff report titled "Rick Hansen Foundation Accessibility Certification Program," dated August 15, 2019 from the Director, Community Social Development and Acting Senior Manager, Capital Buildings Project Development, be referred back to staff to allow for consultation with the Richmond Centre for Disability.*

**CARRIED**

**General Purposes Committee**  
**Monday, September 16, 2019**

---

**3. STEVESTON COMMUNITY CENTRE AND BRANCH LIBRARY  
PROPOSED PROGRAM AND SITE AREA**

(File Ref. No. 06-2052-25-SCCR1) (REDMS No. 6209212 v. 65)

Staff reviewed the proposal, noting that (i) the City is working with the Steveston Community Centre Concept Design Building Committee and the Steveston Community Society on preliminary programming and siting, (ii) the estimated floor area of the proposed community centre and library is approximately 60,000 ft<sup>2</sup>, and (iii) should the programming proceed, staff can commence with developing conceptual designs, community consultation and provide refined cost estimates.

Discussion ensued with regard to (i) the escalated estimated construction costs and current real estate market forces, (ii) including child care space in the programming, (iii) engaging TransLink on bus loop development in the Steveston area, (iv) options to refurbish the existing community centre, (v) options to locate the proposed community centre outside of the proposed area, (vi) options to minimize the proposed building's footprint and preserve park space, (vii) options to demolish the existing facility and develop a new community centre on the same site, and (viii) maintaining programming levels during the construction period.

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that (i) the current community centre does not meet current program standards, (ii) the proposed site is in proximity to existing community amenities such as the playground and the martial arts centre and would allow for accessibility to those sites, (iii) the estimated costs includes the demolition of existing facilities and construction of the new facility, and (iv) construction timelines are estimated to be approximately between two to two-and-a-half years.

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

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the program totaling 60,350 sq. ft, (Table 2, page 5) for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library be approved, as outlined in the staff report titled, "Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Proposed Program and Site Area," dated August 22, 2019, from the Director, Recreation and Sport Services and the Acting Director, Facilities; and*
- (2) *That staff be directed to:*
  - (a) *provide specific project cost estimates;*
  - (b) *review options to mitigate project costs;*
  - (c) *provide information on potential building sites and formations;*  
*and*

**General Purposes Committee**  
**Monday, September 16, 2019**

---

- (d) provide information on the transition of programming from the existing facility to the new facility.*
- and report back.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion took place on developing affordable seniors housing in the area and incorporating larger multipurpose rooms in the proposed programming.

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

It was moved and seconded

*That Part (1) of the motion on the proposed Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Proposed Program and Site Area be amended to include provisions to expand the proposed area of the multipurpose rooms by 750 ft<sup>2</sup>.*

The question on the amendment motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to the cost estimates for expanded multipurpose rooms in the new facility and staff estimated that such an expansion would cost approximately \$750,000.

As a result of the discussion, it was suggested that the amendment motion be added to the main motion, and there was agreement from the mover, the seconder and all members present to add the amendment motion to the main motion as Part (2)(e).

Cllr. Steves moved a motion to include options for affordable senior housing as part of Part (2) of the motion on the proposed Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library and Mayor Brodie ruled that the proposed motion was out of order as the matter would be considered in a closed meeting.

Cllr. Steves called for a Point of Order and challenged the Chair's ruling.

In accordance with procedure, the Mayor put the following question to Committee – ***“Is the Chair to be sustained?”***

The question as to whether the Chair is to be sustained was called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Day, Greene, Steves and Wolfe opposed.

The question on the main motion, as amended, which reads as follows:

- (1) *That the program totaling 60,350 sq. ft, (Table 2, page 5) for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library be approved, as outlined in the staff report titled, “Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Proposed Program and Site Area,” dated August 22, 2019, from the Director, Recreation and Sport Services and the Acting Director, Facilities; and*

**General Purposes Committee**  
**Monday, September 16, 2019**

---

- (2) *That staff be directed to:*
- (a) *provide specific project cost estimates;*
  - (b) *review options to mitigate project costs;*
  - (c) *provide information on potential building sites and formations;*
  - (d) *provide information on the transition of programming from the existing facility to the new facility; and*
  - (e) *review options to expand the size of the proposed multipurpose rooms by 750ft<sup>2</sup>;*
- and report back.*

was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Day and Steves opposed.

## FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

4. **PROPOSED RICHMOND FOOD RECOVERY NETWORK PROGRAM**

(File Ref. No. 08-4150-01) (REDMS No. 6266216 v. 2)

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that (i) FoodMesh is a private for-profit company and that the City can include provisions to secure performance targets in the proposed partnering agreement, (ii) there is an indemnity clause and liability insurance included in the proposed partnering agreement, and (iii) the Food Security and Agricultural Advisory Committee was briefed on the proposed initiative.

It was moved and seconded

*That the Chief Administrative Officer and General Manager of Finance and Corporate Services be authorized to enter into a partnering agreement with FoodMesh for the delivery of the proposed Richmond Food Recovery Network Program as outlined in the staff report from the Director, Corporate Business Service Solutions dated August 30, 2019 entitled "Proposed Richmond Food Recovery Network Program".*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to including a cap on the amount of City staff time allocated for the program

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

It was moved and seconded

*That the following be included in the motion on the proposed Richmond Food Recovery Network Program:*

*That staff be directed to include a cap of City staff time in the proposed partnering agreement with FoodMesh.*

**General Purposes Committee**  
**Monday, September 16, 2019**

---

The question on the amendment motion was not called as direction was given to staff to provide more information on staff's participation in the program with respect to (i) the specific staff involved, (ii) staff's specific roles, and (iii) the amount of staff time required.

As a result of the staff direction, there was agreement from the mover, the seconder and all members present to withdraw the amendment motion, and the amendment motion was **WITHDRAWN**.

The question on the main motion was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

**ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (5:18 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**

Certified a true and correct copy of the  
Minutes of the meeting of the General  
Purposes Committee of the Council of the  
City of Richmond held on Monday,  
September 16, 2019.

---

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Chair

---

Evangel Biason  
Legislative Services Coordinator



## Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, September 17, 2019

Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Linda McPhail, Chair  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Carol Day  
Councillor Alexa Loo  
Councillor Harold Steves

Also Present: Councillor Chak Au  
Councillor Michael Wolfe

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

### MINUTES

It was moved and seconded

*That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on September 4, 2019, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

October 2, 2019, (tentative date) at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room

## COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION

1. **DEMENTIA-FRIENDLY COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN**

(File Ref. No. 07-3400-01) (REDMS No. 6201288 v 4)

In reply to queries from Committee, Debbie Hertha, Seniors Coordinator, advised that (i) there was no feedback received from the community regarding the need for housing specifically for people living with dementia during the consultation process, (ii) the Action Plan includes specific proposed actions to support families and caregivers of people living with dementia through the community centres and partnerships with key stakeholders, and (iii) there are currently two adult day care centres in the City operated by the Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH).

Kim Somerville, Director, Community Social Development, noted that VCH is currently looking for additional adult day care sites in the City for short-term and long-term programming and staff are following up this initiative.

In reply to a further query from Committee, Ms. Hertha noted that the proposed dementia awareness training to frontline staff providing services to people living with dementia could include conducting workshops suitable to their needs.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan, as outlined in Attachment 1 of the staff report titled, "Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan", dated August 23, 2019, from the Director, Community Social Development, be adopted; and*
- (2) *That the Dementia-Friendly Community Action Plan be distributed to key stakeholders and posted on the City website.*

**CARRIED**

## PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

2. **APPLICATION BY CLO VENTURES K2 LTD. FOR REZONING AT 9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 STEVESTON HIGHWAY & 10831 SOUTHDAL ROAD FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E) TO LOW DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTL4)**

(File Ref. No. RZ 17-763712) (REDMS No. 6177240)

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, September 17, 2019**

---

Steven De Souza, Planner 1, reviewed the application, noting that (i) two convertible units and three secondary suites will be provided, (ii) a significant tree will be retained at the rear of the site, (iii) the applicant will provide a cash-in-lieu contribution to the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund, and (iv) there will be frontage improvements along Steveston Highway and Southdale Road.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. De Souza noted that on-site trees to be removed are in poor condition and the specific species of replacement trees to be planted will be reviewed at the Development Permit process.

In reply to a query from Committee regarding the lack of vehicle access from Southdale Road, Wayne Craig, Director, Development, advised that vehicle access to townhouse developments should be from arterial roads and not from side streets as indicated in the Arterial Road Land Use Policy.

Discussion ensued with regard to (i) the potential for utilizing sustainable energy sources for arterial road developments with medium densities, (ii) existing locations and priorities of the City's Energy Utility (DEU) facilities, and (iii) financial implications of installing district energy systems for arterial road developments.

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

It was moved and seconded

*That staff investigate the potential for installing City- and privately-operated sustainable district energy utility systems for arterial road developments, and report back.*

**CARRIED**

It was moved and seconded

*That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10082, for the rezoning of 9571, 9591, 9611, 9671 Steveston Highway & 10831 Southdale Road from the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" zone to the "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone, in order to permit the development of 20 townhouse units with vehicle access from Steveston Highway, be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, September 17, 2019**

---

3. **APPLICATION BY KONIC DEVELOPMENT LTD. FOR REZONING AT 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 AND 10397 NO. 2 ROAD FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E) TO LOW DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTL4)**

(File Ref. No. RZ 17-794300) (REDMS No. 6245187)

Edwin Lee, Planner 1, reviewed the proposed development, highlighting that (i) a right-in/right-out vehicle access is provided from No. 2 Road, (ii) four secondary suites are proposed, (iii) the number of residential parking spaces to be provided is in compliance with City regulations, (iv) visitor parking stalls in the development exceed the City's requirements, and (v) one on-site tree, seven off-site trees and one hedgerow will be retained and protected.

In reply to a query from Committee, Mr. Lee noted that two additional visitor parking spaces will be provided in the proposed development.

It was moved and seconded

*That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10088, for the rezoning of 10231, 10251, 10351, 10371, 10391, 10395 and 10397 No. 2 Road from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

4. **APPLICATION BY KONIC DEVELOPMENT LTD. FOR REZONING AT 4571, 4591, AND 4611/4631 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM "SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E)" AND "TWO-UNIT DWELLINGS (RD1)" TO "LOW DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTL4)"**

(File Ref. No. RZ 18-839945) (REDMS No. 6246089)

Jordan Rockerbie, Planning Technician – Design, reviewed the application, noting that (i) cash-in-lieu contributions will be provided to the City's Affordable Housing Reserve Fund and Public Art Reserve Fund, (ii) four on-site trees and two street trees on City property are in poor condition and will be removed, (iii) 21 new trees will be planted on-site, and (iv) the existing crosswalk at the Steveston Highway and Bonavista Gate intersection will be upgraded.

In reply to queries from Committee, staff advised that four visitor parking stalls will be provided and the proposed number of parking stalls in tandem arrangement is in compliance with the Zoning Bylaw.

It was moved and seconded

*That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10081, for the rezoning of 4571, 4591, and 4611/4631 Steveston Highway from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" and "Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1)" to "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

Opposed: Cllr. Day

4.

## FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

5. **HOUSEKEEPING REQUEST - ABANDONMENT OF UNADOPTED BYLAWS**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-01) (REDMS No. 6106697)

It was moved and seconded

*That the unadopted Zoning Amendment Bylaws, as outlined in Attachment 1, of the staff report titled "Housekeeping Request – Abandonment of Unadopted Bylaws" dated August 23, 2019 from the Director, City Clerk's Office, be abandoned.*

**CARRIED**

6. **MANAGER'S REPORT**

***Grant Workshop and Pathways Clubhouse Affordable Housing Project***

Ms. Somerville noted that a grant workshop with 35 stakeholder participants will take place on September 18, 2019 through the partnership of the City and Richmond Foundation. She added that the workshop will enable applicants for City and Richmond Foundation grants to improve their writing skills for grants applications and enhance their awareness of grant opportunities, including those provided by the Vancouver Foundation.

Also, Ms. Somerville provided an update on community engagement for the Pathways Clubhouse Affordable Housing Project, noting that (i) the open house at the Thompson Community Centre last week was well attended, (ii) staff had sent out 900 letters to the neighbourhood, and (iii) staff had met with and will continue meeting with members of the local community for further engagement.

***Steveston Village Heritage Conservation Grant Program***

Barry Konkin, Manager, Policy Planning, provided an update on the Steveston Village Heritage Conservation Grant Program, noting that a public consultation will take place on September 26, 2019. Mr. Konkin further noted that Council has approved a grant for a thrift store and bicycle shop.

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (4:25 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**

5.

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, September 17, 2019**

---

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Tuesday, September 17, 2019.

---

Councillor Linda McPhail  
Chair

---

Rustico Agawin  
Committee Clerk



## Public Works and Transportation Committee

Date: Wednesday, September 18, 2019

Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Chak Au, Chair  
Councillor Linda McPhail  
Councillor Kelly Greene  
Councillor Alexa Loo  
Councillor Michael Wolfe

Also Present: Councillor Carol Day (entered the meeting at 4:02 p.m.)  
Councillor Harold Steves

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

### MINUTES

It was moved and seconded

*That the minutes of the meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee held on July 17, 2019, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### AGENDA ADDITION

It was moved and seconded

*That Diabetes Canada and York University National Textile Diversion Research and Pilot Program for the City of Richmond be added to the agenda as Item No. 3A, Parking at Bayview Street and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue be added to the agenda as Item No. 3B and Nelson Road and Blundell Road traffic light be added to the agenda as Item No. 3C.*

**CARRIED**

**Public Works & Transportation Committee**  
**Wednesday, September 18, 2019**

---

**NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE**

October 23, 2019, (tentative date) at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**

**1. TRANSPORT 2050 - PHASE 1 CONSULTATION**

(File Ref. No. 01-0154-04) (REDMS No. 6236611 v. 10)

In response to queries from Committee, staff advised that all options noted in the staff report are ideas being presented to TransLink for consideration as part of its phase 1 consultation for the development of Transport 2050.

*Councillor Day entered the meeting (4:02 p.m.)*

Materials were distributed (Copy on File, City Clerk's Office) and discussion ensued with regard to outstanding referrals related to transit exchange at Steveston Community Park, rapid transit link to Steveston, rapid transit to Steveston and Ladner/White Rock via an LRT Tunnel at Massey tunnel, and urban centre and FTDA policy review background paper, and it was suggested that Committee consider the staff recommendation once staff report back on the referrals. It was also suggested that the option for a rail-based transit along No. 1 Road be removed from the report.

In response to the discussion staff noted that the recommendation for a rail-based transit along No. 1 Road can be excluded from the report. Staff stated that the intent was to have rapid transit all the way to Steveston Village; however it's a matter of designating a rail station.

Staff further noted that (i) should Committee refer this report back to staff, the opportunity for input will be missed, (ii) the outstanding referrals will take time before staff can report back as they are complex, and (iii) Council approved a certain type of density along Railway Avenue.

Discussion further took place on (i) changing the Brighthouse Station name to Richmond City Centre Station, (ii) the potential for express buses at peak times, (iii) electrifying the bus fleet, and (iv) more washroom facilities at transit stops.

In reply to the discussion staff noted that many of those concerns are already in TransLinks plan and those that are not can be forwarded to them for their consideration.

2.

**Public Works & Transportation Committee**  
**Wednesday, September 18, 2019**

---

Discussion then took place on the timing of the staff report and it was suggested for future consultations that Council be provided more time to consider the options and be more involved.

In response to queries from Committee, staff advised that (i) should Council wish to be more involved in consultations it can be arranged, (ii) an extension can be requested; however there is no guarantee it will be granted, (iii) the rest of the consultation will allow for opportunities for discussion and workshops, (iv) TransLink will review all suggestions and integrate them into one cohesive plan, (v) recommendations will be forwarded to the Mayors Council, and (vi) this is a high level exercise that will eventually form the 2050 plan.

Discussion ensued regarding removing reference to No. 1 Road from the staff report and as result of the discussion the following **motion** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the attached report titled "Transport 2050 – Phase 1 Consultation" dated August 22, 2019 from the Director, Transportation be forwarded to TransLink for consideration as part of its Phase 1 consultation for the development of Transport 2050; and*
- (2) *That No. 1 Road be removed as an option for rapid transit as outlined in the staff report titled "Transport 2050 – Phase 1 Consultation" dated August 22, 2019 from the Director, Transportation.*

**CARRIED**

**2. AMENDMENT TO TRAFFIC BYLAW NO. 5870 TO ESTABLISH A FEE FOR ISSUANCE OF PERMITS RELATED TO USE OF CITY STREETS**

(File Ref. No. 10-6450-19-01) (REDMS No. 6247261)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, Amendment Bylaw No. 10076, to establish a fee for the issuance of permits to external agencies for the processing of traffic management plans and lane closure requests, be introduced and given first, second and third reading.*
- (2) *That Consolidated Fees Bylaw No. 8636, Amendment Bylaw No. 10079, which quantifies the fee for the issuance of various permits established in Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, be introduced and given first, second and third reading.*

**CARRIED**

3.

## ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

**3. AGEING UTILITY AND ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING – 2019 UPDATE**

(File Ref. No. 10-6060-01) (REDMS No. 6203674)

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that (i) as part of the flood protection management strategy staff are exploring higher density along the waterfront to help fund dike management with no additional cost to the taxpayers, (ii) the long-term requirements looks at a 100-year horizon depending on the asset and their various life expectancies, (iii) annual funding is looking at replacement values and the expected life of the assets, (iv) currently the City's drainage system allows for farmers to draw water from the ditches to irrigate their land; however to due high costs of infrastructure it is not currently available to all properties, and (v) this funding will be reviewed through the Utilities Rates process.

It was moved and seconded

*That the staff report titled, "Ageing Utility and Road Infrastructure Planning – 2019 Update", dated August 16, 2019, from the Manager, Engineering Planning be utilized as input in the annual utility rate review and budget process.*

**CARRIED**

**3A. DIABETES CANADA AND YORK UNIVERSITY NATIONAL TEXTILE DIVERSION RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAM FOR THE CITY OF RICHMOND**

(File Ref. No.)

Materials were distributed (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as Schedule 1) and discussion took place on ways to divert items from going into waste.

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

It was moved and seconded

*That staff examine the Diabetes Canada and York University National Textile Diversion Research and Pilot Program and report back.*

**CARRIED**

**3B. PARKING AT BAYVIEW STREET AND 1ST AVENUE**

(File Ref. No.)

Discussion took place on the parking lot at Bayview Street and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue noting that signage is not clear to inform individuals where the pay parking begins and ends.

4.

**Public Works & Transportation Committee**  
**Wednesday, September 18, 2019**

---

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

It was moved and seconded

***That staff examine clarifying signage for the City parking lot on Bayview Street and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and report back.***

The question on the referral motion was not called as discussion took place on moving the parking meter to the other side of the driveway and staff noted that the private property owner advised that the meter was moved due to the solar panel for the meter and additional signage was installed to inform individuals about the pay parking. It was suggested that the City install additional markings on the parking lot to avoid confusion.

The question on the referral motion was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

**3C. NELSON ROAD AND BLUNDELL ROAD TRAFFIC LIGHT**

(File Ref. No.)

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that CN Rail has installed some of their infrastructure; however it is in a location that is different from the approved drawings and now conflict with the City's signals. Staff then advised that they are in the process of a re-design which requires the approval of CN Rail and are looking to expedite the process.

**4. MANAGER'S REPORT**

***(i) Manager of Facility Services***

Jim V. Young, Acting Director, Facilities, introduced Jeff Lee as the new Manager of Facility Services.

***(ii) Update on Speed Camera at Garden City Road and Cambie Road***

Lloyd Bie, Director, Transportation, advised that the speed camera was estimated to be operational this summer; however, due to an overload of ICBC's servers it has been delayed. He noted that it should be operational within the next 6 months.

***(iii) Granville Avenue Construction***

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that Metro Vancouver has scheduled the completion of construction for 2020; however, no definitive date has been set.

***(iv) Bike Lane on Westminster Highway***

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that to widen the road at the Railway line requires various approvals and that staff are working with CN Rail.

**Public Works & Transportation Committee**  
**Wednesday, September 18, 2019**

---

**(v) *Bowen Island Smartphone App Pilot Program***

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that the program involves an app that helps people book a seat on the on-demand shuttles servicing the island and that staff will report back to Committee once the results have been compiled.

**(vi) *Street Cleaning on Iona Drive***

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that they will speak with YVR to determine who is responsible for that area on Iona Drive with regard to maintenance and resolve the issue.

**ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded

***That the meeting adjourn (4:58 p.m.).***

**CARRIED**

Certified a true and correct copy of the  
Minutes of the meeting of the Public  
Works and Transportation Committee of  
the Council of the City of Richmond held  
on Wednesday, September 18, 2019.

---

Councillor Chak Au  
Chair

---

Sarah Goddard  
Legislative Services Coordinator

---

**From:** McPhail, Linda  
**Sent:** Thursday, 19 September 2019 08:53  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Fwd: Diabetes Canada and York University National Textile Diversion Study and Pilot Program for the City of Richmond

**From:** Simon Langer <[Simon.Langer@diabetes.ca](mailto:Simon.Langer@diabetes.ca)>  
**Date:** September 18, 2019 at 12:49:48 PM PDT  
**To:** "Linda.McPhail@richmond.ca" <[Linda.McPhail@richmond.ca](mailto:Linda.McPhail@richmond.ca)>  
**Cc:** Beata Tymoszejko <[beata.tymoszejko@diabetes.ca](mailto:beata.tymoszejko@diabetes.ca)>, Ryan Michaels <[Ryan.Michaels@diabetes.ca](mailto:Ryan.Michaels@diabetes.ca)>  
**Subject:** **Diabetes Canada and York University National Textile Diversion Study and Pilot Program for the City of Richmond**

*Dear Councillor McPhail,*

***Re: Diabetes Canada and York University National Textile Diversion Research and Pilot Program for the City of Richmond***

**Following our conversation, please see the below link where you will find the following documents for your review:**

- Diabetes Canada and York University National Textile Diversion Study and Pilot Program Proposal for the City of Richmond
- Sample Municipal Textile Diversion agreement between Diabetes Canada and the City of Richmond (and we can add other charities to this agreement as well, as discussed - this research and program offering is also supported by the **Developmental Disabilities Association and Big Brothers/Big Sisters**)
- <https://1drv.ms/f/s!AIOX0TXFACq81Vnae9SRCy2aLKuU>

We are confident that this model is a proven solution to deal with all of the issues/concerns that have been brought up regarding clothing donation bins including service issues, insurance/liability, safety, and textile waste diversion. This model is currently being utilized by the Region of Peel, City of Markham, King Township, Town of Aurora, Town of Newmarket, City of Oshawa, City of Brandon, City of Winnipeg, Niagara Region, Durham Region, **City of Kamloops** and our newest municipal partner in BC - the **City of Vancouver** to name a few. This program and national research study also has the support of the **Recycling Council of British Columbia** and the **Coast Waste Management Association** (please see the proposal for testimonials/references from these organizations).

By implementing a municipal program in the City of Richmond, the city would be joining our municipal partners across the country in supporting Canada's first national textile diversion research study and pilot program, as well as support the 11 million Canadians (1 in 3

individuals, or approximately **73,000 residents** in the City of Richmond) that are affected by Diabetes or pre-diabetes.

After you have had the opportunity to review these documents, please let us know when would be a convenient time for us to reconnect. Dr. Lakhan from York University and I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to discuss our research and program offering with you in greater detail.

Thank you again for your time and consideration.

Warm regards,

Simon.

**Simon Langer**  
National Manager, Government and Strategic Partnerships  
National Diabetes Trust

Diabetes Canada  
1400-522 University Avenue  
Toronto, ON M5G 2R5  
M: 905-751-6889

[diabetes.ca](http://diabetes.ca) | 1-800-banting | Leading the fight to [end diabetes](#)



# City of Richmond

## Report to Council

**To:** Richmond City Council  
**From:** Jim V. Young, P.Eng.  
Acting Director, Facilities


**Date:** September 18, 2019  
**File:** 06-2052-25-  
SCCR1/Vol 01


Elizabeth Ayers  
Director, Recreation and Sport Services

**Re:** **Housing Options Associated with the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement**



### Staff Recommendation

1. That staff proceed with the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project without the use of the airspace parcel on the Steveston Community Park as outlined in the report titled "Housing Options Associated with the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement," dated September 18, 2019, from the Acting Director, Facilities, and the Director, Recreation and Sport Services; and
2. That staff pursue affordable housing options and a potential transit exchange for the future use of 4320 Moncton Street as outlined in the report titled "Housing Options Associated with the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement," dated September 18, 2019, from the Acting Director, Facilities and the Director, Recreation and Sport Services.

  
Jim V. Young, P.Eng.  
Acting Director, Facilities  
(604-247-4610)

  
per Elizabeth Ayers  
Director, Recreation and Sport Services  
(604-247-4669)

Att. 2

REPORT CONCURRENCE		
<b>ROUTED TO:</b> Community Social Development Law Real Estate Services Policy Planning Development Applications Transportation	<b>CONCURRENCE</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER</b> 
<b>REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE</b>	<b>INITIALS:</b> CS	<b>APPROVED BY CAO</b> 

## Staff Report

### Origin

At the November 19, 2018 General Purposes Committee meeting, staff received the following referrals in response to the report titled “Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Program Update” which outlined the recommended program for the proposed facility:

**November 19, 2018 - Referral 1** – *That the staff report titled “Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Program Update” dated November 1, 2018 be referred back to staff to work with the Steveston Community Centre Concept Design Building Committee to examine:*

- (1) options for meeting rooms;*
- (2) options for child care space;*
- (3) potential uses of the airspace parcel;*
- (4) a bus exchange;*
- (5) multipurpose room space;*
- (6) changerooms and washrooms for the Park; and*
- (7) potential impacts on the Community Police Station.*

**November 19, 2018 - Referral 2** – *That staff examine the City-owned lot on the south side of Moncton Street and options for its development, disposal or incorporation into the proposed new Steveston Community Centre and Library Branch project.*

The purpose of this report is to respond to the November 19, 2018 - Referral 1, Item (3), potential uses of the airspace parcel, considering housing options. Other potential uses of the airspace parcel such as commercial, industrial, etc., have not been considered in this report.

This report also responds to the November 19, 2018 - Referral 2, regarding the south side of Moncton Street (4320 Moncton Street) and the feasibility of incorporating the site into the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project.

Separate reports will be prepared to discuss the remaining items in the November 19, 2018 - Referral 1.

At the July 2, 2019 General Purposes Committee meeting, staff received the following referrals in response to the report titled “Potential Transit Exchange as part of Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement Project” with respect to TransLink’s planned upgrade of the Steveston Transit Exchange as identified in Phase Three of The Mayors’ Council 10-Year Investment Plan:

**July 2, 2019 - Referral 3** – *TransLink be advised that the City does not support a location within Steveston Community Park as part of the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement Project; and*

**July 2, 2019 - Referral 4** – *That staff be directed to review other possible locations for the Steveston Transit Exchange including at 4320 Moncton Street or elsewhere in Steveston; and*

*That staff consider rejection of a Chatham Street bus exchange and related Frequent Transit Network Corridor that would require densification 400 metres on each side of a route from Railway Avenue along Williams Road, Springmount Drive, Seventh Avenue, and Chatham Street west of Third Avenue.*

In consideration of the July 2, 2019 - Referral 3 – TransLink has been made aware of the Council referral and the direction received by staff from Council.

In consideration of the July 2, 2019 - Referral 4 – any potential use of 4320 Moncton Street for residential purposes will need to consider a potential transit exchange. A separate report will be provided in Q1 2020 to outline the viability of a potential transit exchange on the site.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #3 One Community Together:

*Vibrant and diverse arts and cultural activities and opportunities for community engagement and connection.*

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #4 An Active and Thriving Richmond:

*An active and thriving community characterized by diverse social and wellness programs, services and spaces that foster health and well-being for all.*

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #6 Strategic and Well-Planned Growth:

*Leadership in effective and sustainable growth that supports Richmond's physical and social needs.*

## **Background**

The Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement project has been identified by Council as one of the City's priority capital projects. To ensure successful delivery of the City of Richmond's major facility project, a six-stage process was developed, as outlined in Attachment 1. The Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement project is currently at the first stage in the process, Advanced Planning/Program Development.

On July 22, 2019, Council endorsed a process whereby staff are to analyze the potential co-location of affordable housing in conjunction with City Projects. The process begins with a review of the subject property's zoning, completion of a financial analysis and exploration of potential funding sources.

This project is at a key juncture where Council approval of the proposed program and direction regarding the potential use of the airspace parcel for housing as part of the project is required. A separate report seeking Council approval of the program is being brought forward in conjunction with this report.

As part of its investigation in preparing this report, staff have not been able to identify any examples where housing has been included in parks. Staff contacted several Metro Vancouver municipalities that are subject to the *Community Charter* (Burnaby, Coquitlam and Surrey) and found that they had neither previous experience building housing in parks nor had they heard of other municipalities that may have done so.

## Analysis

### November 19, 2018 - Referral 1 - Legal Requirements with Respect to Land Use

The first steps in analyzing the potential addition of housing in conjunction with the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library are to analyze the property acquisition records, relevant policies, property suitability, and associated legal implications with using the park properties shown in Figure 1 below. This has been undertaken and legal advice has been provided to Council.

**Figure 1: Analyzed properties within the Steveston Community Park**



Should Council wish to pursue the use of one or more properties that compose Steveston Community Park for housing, staff recommend that an extensive consultation process be developed and implemented.

November 19, 2018 - Referral 1 - Other Required Bylaw Amendments and Public Hearings (OCP, Area Plan, Zoning)

Steveston Community Park and the surrounding site is designated in the OCP as Park and intended for continued use as a Public Open Space, and zoned as SI – School and Institutional Use. Thus development of housing on the site would require, at a minimum, an amendment to the OCP, the Steveston Area Plan, and the applicable Zoning. Such amendments would require public hearings and various consultations. Additionally, any proposed disposition (sale or lease) of the housing component would require public notice as described under section 26 of the *Community Charter*.

*OCP, Area Plan, and Zoning Amendment Process and Timelines*

An OCP and Area Plan amendment requires Council consideration and amending bylaws. This process involves a number of steps, including the following:

- Staff review: the proposed amendment is distributed to the appropriate City departments for review and comment;
- Consultation: the *Local Government Act* requires opportunities be provided for consultation with persons, organizations and authorities that may be impacted by the proposed amendment;
- Preparation of a staff report and bylaw amendment: a staff report and amending bylaw is prepared and presented to Council with a recommendation;
- Public Hearing: if the application and amending bylaw are referred to a Public Hearing, notification to the public is provided as per the *Local Government Act* and applicable City Bylaws;
- Development Permit: typically required for all forms of multiple family residential. The Development Permit could be processed concurrently with the rezoning application but could not be advanced to Development Permit Panel for consideration until after the Public Hearing; and
- Final adoption and Development Permit issuance would be considered subject to all conditions associated with the development being addressed.

The timeline for this process can vary depending on the complexity of the proposal; however, typically an application with an OCP or Area Plan amendment can take approximately 8 to 12 months from application submission to Public Hearing. The building design would need to be submitted for rezoning and to process a Development Permit application. Therefore, staff would not be able to proceed with the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project concept level design until it is known whether housing is to be included and the OCP/Area Plan amendment and rezoning process is complete.

November 19, 2018 - Referral 1 - Potential Use of Airspace Parcel(s) for Housing

As work regarding the use of the airspace parcel preceded Council's adoption of the process for evaluating the feasibility of affordable housing with City projects, four housing types were identified:

- Market-rate rental housing;
- Affordable rental housing;
- Congregate Care Housing (seniors housing and services at market rental rates); and
- For Sale Housing condominiums.

A range of scenarios for each building type was considered, with affordable housing being the focus. The key finding was that market rental and for sale housing condominium units are financially profitable. The financial feasibility depends on construction method (concrete or wood frame) and the size of the development. It was also found that affordable housing development is not financially profitable and would require significant sources of capital funding from the other orders of government in order to be viable.

*Affordable Housing – Financial Options*

Increasing the supply of affordable housing requires dedicated sources of capital funding, which must be provided by all levels of government. Accordingly, the City works to provide land and capital contributions, which are intended to leverage significant sources of funding from the provincial and federal governments. Staff continue to work with BC Housing and staff from the Government of Canada to advocate for sources of funding for affordable housing developments in Richmond. Current funding programs delivered by the other levels of government include BC Housing's Community Housing Fund and the Federal Government's National Housing Co-Investment Fund.

Staff have initiated conversations with BC Housing and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) to advocate for specific funding commitments to respond to existing Council direction regarding permanent supportive housing in Richmond.

Should Council direct staff to pursue affordable housing development within Steveston Community Park, staff would work with the Provincial and Federal Governments to advocate for dedicated project funding.

November 19, 2018 - Referral 1 - Park Impacts and Opportunities

A high level assessment of the potential impacts and/or opportunities to Steveston Community Park with the inclusion of housing in addition to the expansion of the library and community centre follows below. A more comprehensive impacts and/or opportunities review would be completed should Council direct staff to pursue incorporation of housing with the community centre and branch library replacement project.

*Increased Building Footprint*

The addition of housing to the community centre and branch library replacement project may require a larger ground floor space thereby creating a larger building footprint. This would mean a greater loss of park space compared to a community centre and library with no housing. Steveston has experienced rapid growth over the past decade and is expected to continue for the foreseeable future according to the OCP. Currently, there is no park land acquisition planned for the Steveston Planning Area. Instead, the planned approach is to more intensively develop the existing parks, especially Steveston Community Park, to accommodate the growth. Loss of park land to building footprints and adding a resident population in the park may result in the need to acquire additional land for Steveston Community Park.

*Increased Parking Requirements and Increased Traffic within the Park*

Housing will trigger a requirement for resident and visitor parking. This may require an increase to the building footprint where parking is accommodated within the building envelope or through an increase in surface parking or both. Alternatively, a more expensive option may be to construct parking under the building footprint and/or under park space. This possibility would not occupy park space outside the building footprint and the park surface could be returned to original condition if desired but would be a costly option to pursue.

Further parking analyses would be required as consideration of the site to transit and nearby services may minimize the on-site impacts of the parking.

*Conflicts Between Residents and Park Users*

Direct adjacencies between residential uses and parks, even at the neighbourhood park level, commonly result in increased noise and other complaints from residents. Community parks are intended to be more intensively programmed and accommodate larger group functions than neighbourhood parks making residential uses less compatible at that level. Managing the conflicts could mean limiting the type and size of activities in the vicinity of a residential use in Steveston Community Park, but may also create the opportunity for new types of activities appropriate for this area of the park.

November 19, 2018 - Referral 2 - 4320 Moncton Street

The City-owned 4320 Moncton Street property (Site 2), as outlined in Attachment 2, is currently zoned SI – School and Institutional Use and designated as residential on the OCP land use map and within the Steveston Area Plan. The lot currently functions as a parking lot, seasonally accommodates the Steveston Farmers Market and provides space for other community events. An appraisal completed in January 2018 valued the property at \$10.32 million.

Staff reviewed the site as an option for incorporation into the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project. From a practical perspective, the 4320 Moncton Street site is of insufficient size for the new facility based on a space requirement for the building in the range of 60,000 sq. ft. A high-level review considering the use of the 4320 Moncton Street site for the replacement community centre and branch library follows below:

- The recommended program is based on co-locating the community centre and branch library as a single, integrated facility with shared spaces; splitting the building into two standalone facilities would require additional square footage and increased cost;
- Programs such as licensed preschool require adjacent and secure outdoor play space which 4320 Moncton Street cannot provide;
- Program spaces are enhanced by direct connections to outdoor space which 4320 Moncton Street cannot provide; and
- Parking and event space are intended to be incorporated within the replacement Community Centre and Branch Library, freeing 4320 Moncton Street for other uses.

Staff recommend that the sale or use of the 4320 Moncton Street site for the development of housing be considered from a strategic perspective. As a strategic land holding, residential development on this site represents better value and more efficient land use relative to its current use. The size of the site is also more suitable for residential uses rather than for the Community Centre and Branch Library. Any potential use of the site for residential purposes will need to consider a potential transit exchange as directed by Council for staff's review.

### **Options and Next Steps**

There are legal and process-related items that need to be addressed before housing can be included as part of the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project. Accordingly, options for moving forward with the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project are noted as follows.

Following are three options considered in response to the November 19, 2018 - Referral 1, Item (3), potential uses of the airspace parcel.

#### **Housing Option 1 – Do Not Include Use of the Airspace Parcel (Recommended)**

Under this option, the project would proceed without the inclusion of housing as part of the project. This option has the benefit of allowing staff to proceed with Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project concept level design and site selection for Council consideration, but precludes the opportunity for the benefits associated with the provision of affordable housing.

It should be noted that staff are pursuing other site options within the city for additional affordable housing with a report to Council anticipated in early Fall 2019.

Housing Option 2 – Conduct Public Consultation Regarding Affordable Housing on Park land (Not Recommended)

Council to direct staff to begin consultation and come back with a consultation plan to ascertain the level of public support for inclusion of affordable housing on Steveston Community Park.

It is anticipated that public consultation will be challenging and lengthy due to the complexity of the issues and the impact on the park. From a practical perspective, staff will not be able to advance the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project concept level design until the consultation process is complete and direction from Council has been received. If housing is included in the project, additional time to complete the OCP amendment and rezoning will be required, and consideration must also be given to the legal advice provided.

Funding to complete consultation is available through Advanced Planning and Design for Major Facilities Projects approved by Council as part of the 2017 Capital Budget.

Housing Option 3 – Construct the Community Centre and Branch Library for the Potential Future Addition of Housing (Not Recommended)

Under this option, additional structural upgrades and installations would be added to the building's structure to accommodate future potential housing construction. The extent of these measures depend on the potential housing floor area and number of units which would need to be confirmed prior to design development.

Following are three options considered in response to the November 19, 2018 - Referral 2 for staff to examine options for the use of 4320 Moncton Street.

4320 Moncton Street Option 1 – Sell 4320 Moncton Street (Not Recommended)

A 2018 appraisal valued the property at \$10.32 million. Council could direct staff to pursue a purchaser for the site. The proceeds of the sale could be used to offset the capital cost of the replacement Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library.

4320 Moncton Street Option 2 – Status Quo (Not Recommended)

Leave the site in its current state until the replacement Community Centre and Branch Library is complete and at that time re-evaluate the site for sale.

4320 Moncton Street Option 3 – Pursue Housing on 4320 Moncton Street (Recommended)

The 4320 Moncton Street site is City-owned, and designated as residential on the OCP land use map and within the Steveston Area Plan, therefore Council could direct staff to pursue utilizing this site for housing. However, further financial analysis is required to refine a development concept for housing, and to explore partnership opportunities for affordable housing. The 4320 Moncton Street site would also need to be analyzed relative to other sites suitable for affordable housing development in Richmond and in consideration of Council's July 2, 2019 - Referral 4 of a potential transit exchange on this parcel. Should Council direct staff to pursue housing development at 4320 Moncton Street, staff would complete additional analyses and report back with further details. This work will be done in conjunction with staff's review of the site for a potential transit exchange.

**Financial Impact**

None.

**Conclusion**

Staff have considered pursuing housing options in the airspace parcel above the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project and on the 4320 Moncton Street site. The work completed indicates that, subject to the outcome of staff's review of a potential transit exchange on the property, and funding being available, including housing development is possible with a number of legal and administrative processes required to deliver this outcome. The inclusion of housing within the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project will result in extended timelines and cost escalation to the project. Public response associated with housing is not known, but could be ascertained through a public consultation process. The 4320 Moncton Street site should be evaluated relative to other suitable sites.



Jim V. Young, P.Eng.  
Acting Director, Facilities  
(604-247-4610)



per Elizabeth Ayers  
Director, Recreation and Sport Services  
(604-247-4669)

- Att. 1: Process to Complete Major Facility Projects in Relation to the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement Project  
2: Re-Development Site Options Reviewed

**Process to Complete Major Facility Projects in Relation to the  
Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement Project**


The purpose of this document is to outline the City of Richmond's process to complete major facilities, and to provide a status update for the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project.

**Process to Complete Major Facilities**

From project initiation through to occupancy, the best practice process to deliver a major facility project, such as the Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project, involves six distinct stages. As illustrated in Table 1 below, the stages are sequential; for example, Concept Design cannot proceed until Advanced Planning/Program Development is complete. The timeline for the development and delivery of a major facility project varies from project to project, but typically takes between three to seven years to complete.

Each of the stages and their associated tasks are further described below and on the following pages.

**Table 1: Stages to Deliver Major Facilities**



### Stage 1: Advanced Planning/Program Development

During this first stage in the delivery of a major facility project, an architectural firm is engaged to work with staff to develop and implement a public engagement plan. This stage involves thorough consultation with subject matter experts, stakeholders and the public to gain an understanding of their needs, values and priorities in order to develop the program, facility size and high level capital and operating costs for the new facility, all of which are presented to Council for approval before moving forward.

The Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project is currently at the Advanced Planning/Program Development stage of the process to complete major facilities.

### Stage 2: Concept Design

Following completion of the Advanced Planning/Program Development stage, the main tasks at the Concept Design stage include:

- Continuation of public engagement;
- Development of preliminary floor plans;
- Development of building form and character;
- Site evaluation and selection; and
- Further refinement of the capital and preliminary operating budgets.

Once the Concept Design stage is complete and approved by Council, the Enabling Works and Detailed Design stages can commence.

### Stage 3: Enabling Works

Enabling Works are site-specific tasks that must be completed before building construction can commence. For example, the following tasks were required to enable construction for the Minoru Centre for Active Living to proceed:

- Relocation of the Minoru 2 fields;
- Relocation of a water main;
- Construction of temporary change room and washroom facilities;
- Demolition of the Minoru Pavilion;
- Construction of temporary electrical services and controls; and
- Preload.

Enabling Works are typically completed while the detailed design of the facility is in progress, assuming the specific building footprint and site specific location have been confirmed. Public engagement continues as needed.

#### Stage 4: Detailed Design

To begin this step, an architectural detailed design team is hired to take the Council-approved concept design through to completion of construction drawings. There is generally significant stakeholder input and some public engagement throughout this stage, as well as consultation with an advisory committee(s) as necessary. There may be key Council decision points during the detailed design process and/or progress updates from staff as the design advances.

#### Stage 5: Construction Implementation

Once construction drawings are complete, they are issued for formal pricing and compared with the budget approved by Council. Adjustments to the scope or budget may be required depending on pricing received, before proceeding with construction. At this point, construction can commence through to completion. Public engagement and progress update reports or memos to Council are implemented as needed.

#### Stage 6: Occupancy

The Occupancy stage triggers a staff training period for building operations and program implementation. Once training is complete, the building is ready to be open to the public. There is generally a period of approximately one year following occupancy to correct post occupancy deficiencies. There may also be warranty repairs/replacements completed after several years of the building being in service.

### **Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library Replacement Project Status Update**

The Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project is currently at the Advanced Planning/Program Development stage. In order to address the November 19, 2018 referrals that represent complex issues and involvement of multiple departments, Council approval of the proposed program and direction on potential use of the airspace parcel are required before the project can proceed to Concept Design, as this information will impact site selection, facility layout, and form/character. In addition to the report addressing the potential uses of the airspace parcel, a Report to General Purposes Committee is forthcoming to address the referral items pertaining to meeting and multipurpose room space, child care space, changerooms and washrooms for Steveston Community Park, and potential impacts on the Community Police Station.

There are risks associated with decisions that will delay progression to subsequent stages. For example, a delay in construction start may be subject to cost escalations. Schedule delay will also impact public perception as well as the City's relationship with the Steveston Community Centre Concept Design Building Committee, which includes representatives from the Steveston Community Society and the Richmond Public Library Board.

### **Summary**

Delivery of major facility projects is generally a six-stage process that takes approximately three to seven years to complete. The Steveston Community Centre and Branch Library replacement project is currently at the first stage, Advanced Planning/Program Development. A number of items were referred to staff from the November 19, 2018 General Purposes Committee meeting that need to be addressed so that the project can progress to Concept Design and beyond.

## Re-Development Site Options Reviewed



**Site 1** – Steveston Community Park including 4111, 4251, 4311, 4391, 4431, and 4471 Moncton Street

**Site 2** – 4320 Moncton Street



**Development Permit Panel  
Wednesday, September 11, 2019**

Time: 3:30 p.m.  
Place: Council Chambers  
Richmond City Hall  
Present: Cecilia Achiam, Chair  
Milton Chan, Acting Director, Engineering  
Laurie Bachynski, Director, Corporate Business Service Solutions

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

**Minutes**

It was moved and seconded

*That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on August 28, 2019 be adopted.*

**CARRIED**

**1. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 18-829140**  
(REDMS No. 6144436)

APPLICANT: PLLR 228 Holdings

PROPERTY LOCATION: 8820, 8840, 8860, 8880, 8900, 8911 and 8931 Spires Road and the surplus portion of the Spires Road road allowance

INTENT OF PERMIT:

1. Permit the construction of 64 townhouse units and two secondary suites at 8820, 8840, 8860, 8880, 8900, 8911 and 8931 Spires Road and the surplus portion of the Spires Road road allowance on a site zoned "Parking Structure Townhouses (RTP4)"; and
2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to reduce the minimum setback from the north-south public walkway adjacent to the site driveway from 3.0 m to 0.0 m to accommodate the proposed building footprints and an elevated second storey walkway connecting the two buildings.

## Development Permit Panel

### Wednesday, September 11, 2019

---

#### Applicant's Comments

Jim Bussey, Formwerks Architectural, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as Schedule 1) provided background information on the proposed development and highlighted the following:

- the development includes multi-level townhouse units and ground level suites providing a mix of one- to four-bedroom units, majority of which are three-bedroom units;
- six convertible units, one Basic Universal Housing (BUH) unit with an associated parking stall, and two secondary suites are provided;
- the two common parking structures are hidden under the podium, which is a unique feature of the proposed townhouse development;
- sidewalks will be provided along the side and rear property lines to provide pedestrian connection to future lanes adjacent to the west and south sides of the subject site;
- parkade walls along the west and south sides of the development will be articulated and planted to enhance pedestrian experience and in consideration of adjacent residential developments;
- townhouse units adjacent to existing single-family houses to the north and east are stepped down from four to three storeys;
- the proposed north-south public walkway that will be located adjacent to the site driveway bisects the site and an elevated walkway will be installed above the walkway to connect the two portions of the site;
- the areas covered by the proposed setback variance from the public walkway are within the subject site;
- a large tree by the driveway entry will be retained and its surrounding spaces will be landscaped to provide a passive recreation space;
- pedestrian access to the podium level is provided through stairs and a centrally located elevator close to the indoor and outdoor amenity spaces;
- the project is designed to achieve an EnerGuide rating of 82 and LEED Silver equivalency;
- each unit is provided with at least one parking stall; however, some units are provided with two parking stalls in a tandem arrangement; and
- outlets for electric vehicle charging will be provided for all parking stalls.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Bussey confirmed that the two parking structures are at ground level and accessed from either side of the driveway.

## **Development Permit Panel**

### **Wednesday, September 11, 2019**

---

Caelan Griffiths, PMG Landscape Architects, briefed the Panel on the main landscape features of the project, noting that (i) the proposed landscape treatment for the front yards of units along Spires Road is consistent with the townhouse architectural expression of the units, (ii) seating will be provided underneath the large existing tree which will serve as a landmark for the site, (iii) intensive planting is proposed on the podium level to mitigate potential heat island effect, (iv) bicycle racks, seating, and potential public art are proposed to be installed on the west entry plaza, (v) structural soil will be used for back of boulevard trees to enhance their resiliency, and (vi) the children's play areas are located on podium level adjacent to indoor amenity areas and seating and provide a wide range of play opportunities for various age groups of young children.

In reply to queries from the Panel, Mr. Griffiths acknowledged that (i) trees on ground and podium levels will be irrigated, (ii) permeable paving on the podium allows for stormwater to run quickly to the drains, and (iii) concrete sidewalks along the west and south property lines will be installed.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Wayne Craig, Director, Development, noted that (i) construction of the west and south lanes are part of the long-term goals of the City's transportation network and lane dedications were secured through the rezoning application, (ii) the subject lanes will not be constructed at this time, (iii) existing fence lines will remain in their existing locations, and (iv) there will be a legal agreement registered on title requiring the site's strata to maintain the site's lane dedication areas until such time that the lane will be installed.

#### **Staff Comments**

Mr. Craig advised that (i) there is a Servicing Agreement associated with the project for frontage beautification and road works along Spires Road, (ii) the large retained tree by the driveway entry along Spires Road is a key focal point of the development, (iii) the overall size of proposed indoor amenity spaces meets the City's requirements, which is unique for the size of the development, (iv) the proposed setback variance associated with the public walkway adjacent to the site driveway is a result of the installation of the elevated walkway that connects the two building structures, (v) the public walkway itself will have generous building setbacks and access to daylight, and (vi) there is minor aerial encroachment where the two podium levels are connected.

#### **Gallery Comments**

Paige Robertson, 8571 Spires Road, expressed concern regarding the potential shortage of parking stalls in the proposed development, noting that on-street parking is not feasible as vehicle parking on Spires Road is limited to three-hour parking from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Also, she noted that parents of Cook Elementary School students park on Spires Road to drop off and pick up their children.

In addition, Ms. Robertson noted that the proposed setback variance from the public walkway could possibly impact the livability of the proposed development and the neighbourhood as well as the safety of pedestrians in the area.

## **Development Permit Panel**

### **Wednesday, September 11, 2019**

---

In reply to Ms. Robertson's concerns, Mr. Craig commented that (i) the project complies with the parking requirements in the Zoning Bylaw and even exceeds the minimum requirement for the number of parking stalls to be provided on site, (ii) staff believe that the proposed number of parking stalls for the project is appropriate given the project's location in the City Centre, and (iii) the proposed public walkway is three meters wide and the intention of the proposed variance is to allow for the installation of the overhead footbridge that will connect the two buildings.

#### **Correspondence**

Jose Gonzalez, 8935 Cook Crescent (Schedule 2)

In reply to Mr. Gonzalez's concerns regarding the proposed setback variance associated with the north-south public walkway, Mr. Craig noted that (i) the proposed variance is necessary as ultimately, the public walkway will provide pedestrian access from Spires Road to the rear lane, and (ii) the rear lane is a long-term City objective and will not be implemented through the proposed development.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Craig further noted that (i) the applicant is required to produce a Construction Traffic and Parking Management Plan prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, (ii) approval by the Transportation Department of the Plan is needed prior to Building Permit issuance, and (iii) Transportation staff is involved in ongoing discussions with Cook Elementary School through the School Board regarding ongoing construction management issues as per direction from Council.

#### **Panel Discussion**

The Panel expressed support for the project, noting that (i) the project is well designed, (ii) the ground level parking hidden below the podium is a unique and significant feature of the proposed townhouse development, (iii) the colour scheme for the exterior of the buildings is appreciated, and (iv) the retention of the large on-site tree is supported as it enhances the project and maintains the character of the neighbourhood.

In addition, the Chair noted the public's concerns regarding parking violations in school zones and adjacent areas and advised that the Bylaw Department will readily respond to reported parking violations.

**Development Permit Panel**  
**Wednesday, September 11, 2019**

---

**Panel Decision**

It was moved and seconded

*That a Development Permit be issued which would:*

1. *permit the construction of 64 townhouse units and two secondary suites at 8820, 8840, 8860, 8880, 8900, 8911 and 8931 Spires Road and the surplus portion of the Spires Road road allowance on a site zoned "Parking Structure Townhouses (RTP4)"; and*
2. *vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to reduce the minimum setback from the north-south public walkway adjacent to the site driveway from 3.0 m to 0.0 m to accommodate the proposed building footprints and an elevated second storey walkway connecting the two buildings.*

**CARRIED**

**2. Date of Next Meeting: September 25, 2019**

**3. Adjournment**

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting be adjourned at 4:14 p.m.*

**CARRIED**


Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Wednesday, September 11, 2019.

---

Cecilia Achiam  
Chair

---

Rustico Agawin  
Committee Clerk




## CONTEXT ANALYSIS

### SPIRES GATE

8820 - 8931 SPIRES ROAD  
ALABASTER RICHMOND, BC  
HOMES






CNCL - 372

# STATISTICS

DATA	EXISTING ZONING	PROPOSED ZONING	LOT AREA	LOT COVERAGE	# OF BUILDINGS	# OF STOREYS
	RS1/E	RTPA	62,722 SF	50%	8	4
UNIT SUMMARY	TOTAL	1 BEDROOM	2 BEDROOM	3 BEDROOM	4 BEDROOM	LOCK-OFF UNITS
	64	4	6	51	3	2
						6
						1
						9
PARKING	CAR SPACES	BICYCLE SPACES	TOTAL BUILDING AREA	TOTAL SITE AREA	TOTAL DENSITY	
	96	82	75604	42,992 SF	1,20 FSR	



LEGEND	LOCK-OFF UNIT	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE
	LOCK-OFF UNIT	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE
	LOCK-OFF UNIT	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE
	LOCK-OFF UNIT	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE
	LOCK-OFF UNIT	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE
	LOCK-OFF UNIT	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE
	LOCK-OFF UNIT	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE	LOCK-OFF SUITE

UNIT LEGEND	4 BEDROOM TOWNHOUSE	1 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	2 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	3 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT
	4 BEDROOM TOWNHOUSE	1 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	2 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	3 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT
	4 BEDROOM TOWNHOUSE	1 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	2 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	3 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT
	4 BEDROOM TOWNHOUSE	1 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	2 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	3 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT
	4 BEDROOM TOWNHOUSE	1 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	2 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	3 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT
	4 BEDROOM TOWNHOUSE	1 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	2 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	3 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT
	4 BEDROOM TOWNHOUSE	1 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	2 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT	3 BEDROOM GARDEN UNIT


## SPIRES GATE

8820 - 8931 SPIRES ROAD  
ALABASTER RICHMOND, BC  
HOMES

**FORMWERKS ARCHITECTURAL**  
102 West 5th Ave. Vancouver BC V6T 1T3  
Tel: 604-681-1111  
www.fwk.ca

# GROUND LEVEL





# SPIRES GATE

8820 - 8931 SPIRES ROAD


ALABASTER  
RICHMOND, BCBAST  
HOMES

## CHARACTER



CNCL - 375

RAY PROJECTIONS TO CREATE  
PROHIBIT SIDEWALK CLADDING  
AT STREET LEVEL



REDUCED MASSING TO PROVIDE  
GRITILE TRANSITION TO EXISTING  
SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES

LOWER ENTRY ROOFS TO  
RELATE TO PEDESTRIAN SCALE


BASED YARD TO CREATE  
PRIVACY & SECURITY



# SPIRES GATE

8820 - 8931 SPIRES ROAD  
ALABASTER RICHMOND, BC  
HOMES

## DESIGN RATIONALE & PRECEDENT PHOTOS



CNCL - 376

FORMWORKS  
ARCHITECTURAL

**SPIRES GATE**

8820 - 8931 SPIRES ROAD

ALABASTER RICHMOND, BC

HOMES

**SITE SECTION A - A**



**Lee, Edwin**

---

**From:** PlanningDevelopment  
**Sent:** Monday, 9 September 2019 08:35  
**To:** Lee, Edwin; Lussier, Cynthia  
**Subject:** FW: Feedback for Sept. 11, 2019 Development Permit Panel Meeting

**Categories:** To Do

---

**From:** J G [[mailto:corvette\\_racer@hotmail.com](mailto:corvette_racer@hotmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Sunday, 8 September 2019 11:50  
**To:** PlanningDevelopment  
**Cc:** [joe.erceg@richmond.ca](mailto:joe.erceg@richmond.ca); Irving, John; Achiam, Cecilia  
**Subject:** Feedback for Sept. 11, 2019 Development Permit Panel Meeting

Please accept this written submission to the Development Permit Panel Meeting of September 11, 2019 regarding Development Permit application 18-829140 (Spires Road 66 unit development). I will be out of town so I cannot attend in person.

I have concerns with the applicant's proposal to reduce the setback of the proposed public north-south walkway below the standard of 3.0m to 0m to "accommodate the proposed buildings footprints". The reduced setback will create a very intimidating and darkly shaded walkway which contravenes the City's design principles for livability as well as detract from the area's design as the applicant had previously committed in the rezoning application. The standard 3m. setback should be only compromised when it improves the neighborhood, not at the convenience of the developer. This reduction may pose a safety hazard – with large numbers of children & families walking and cycling to Cook School every day (especially concerning on dark winter mornings).

Here are specific facts supporting the rejection of the 0m setback based on Wayne Craig's report of August 24, 2018 to the Planning Committee, which stated:

1. "site planning and building design improvements" would "include larger and more functional habitable space on the ground level to improve livability and animate the streetscape" (page 5-6).
2. The development would include "walkways along the back of development sites to create additional unit frontages and enhance pedestrian circulation within the neighborhood" (page 6).
3. There would be "provision of the future north-south lane parallel to Cooney Road" (page 6)
4. There would be three SRW's ranging from 1.5m to 6.0m to enhance pedestrian circulation (page 9).

The approval of narrowing and partial closure of Spires Road was supposed to include benefits to the neighborhood according to the August 24 report.

How did this development proposal go from these designs and underlying principles supporting neighborhood livability to now proposing to completely remove the 3m setback? I am horrified to imagine what this and future developments will do to our neighborhood's livability, as well as to bicycle and pedestrian circulation based on the many developers' variance requests that will come forward in our neighborhood. Now is the time reject this proposal to send a message that neighborhood design principles and livability come ahead of developer profits.

Sincerely,  
... Jose Gonzalez  
Resident of 8935 Cook Crescent, Richmond