



## General Purposes Committee

- Date: Monday, December 15<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003
- Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall
- Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair  
Councillor Linda Barnes  
Councillor Derek Dang  
Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt  
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt  
Councillor Rob Howard  
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Harold Steves
- Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

### MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded  
*That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2003 be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### PARKS, RECREATION & CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION

2. **FEEDBACK – IMPERIAL LANDING OPEN HOUSES**  
(Report: Dec. 11/03, File No.: 4060-05-03 ) (REDMS No. 1102673, 1105164, 1102944, 1104558)

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, December 15<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

The General Manager, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services, Cathy Volkering-Carlile, introduced Mr. Don Wuori, Principal, Don Wuori Design Consultant, and Mr. Michael von Hausen, President, MVH Urban Planning & Design Inc. Ms. Volkering-Carlile said that recommendation contained in the report included an endorsement of the proposed vision and an authorization to prepare an amendment to the area plan which would allow for the next level of public debate.

Mr. Don Wuori then used four illustrative boards to present the preferred vision and the results of the survey.

Discussion then ensued that included the following points:

- further information was requested regarding the open house feedback received;
- that the vision could change the makeup of Steveston village and/or create a second village;
- a signature restaurant over the water lot was favoured by staff due to the revenue created;
- the vision was cluttered;
- the location of specific elements within the vision was flexible;
- the Performing Arts Centre and library had been taken out of the vision and would be considered in the Parks Master Plan and corporate planning processes.
- a review of the information distributed by Cllr. Steves – a copy of which is on file in the City Clerks Office;
- a review, by the Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, of the process that had led to the alternative visions for the site being prepared and also the opportunity that was now presented of either verifying the existing plan and zoning vision, or choosing another vision;
- the new proposal was vibrant and exciting and provided an option for paying for some of the public amenities (wharves, docks and green space);
- the types of commercial/retail uses that would be allowed would predominantly deal with the fishing industry;
- the commercial and residential space contained in the vision could be modified to allow more open space;

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, December 15<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

- comment provided by Mr. Wozny which indicated that industrial supply and demand had not been investigated. Mr. Wozny also said that he thought it could prove difficult to fill industrial space with residential above meaning that the residential would have to be well done to offset the lower industrial revenue. The Mayor responded that the primary function was industrial which could be aided by residential;
- the green space and parkland contained in the existing 1998 area plan vision should be retained;
- the enforcement issues of maintaining the MMU;
- a request that a plastic overlay of the proposed vision should be layed over the Onni proposal to show where the City would gain amenity space, where open space may be lost, and where building and use changes would occur;
- a question as to whether the vision complemented or detracted from the City's Greenways program and the existing Steveston Waterfront area plan vision;
- the conceptual look that had been taken at parking. The parking was indicated to be sufficiently provided to accommodate the development.

At this point the Chair called for a recess of the meeting which was then scheduled to resume at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003 in the Anderson Room, at which time delegations from the public would be heard.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Chair reconvened the meeting on Tuesday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003 at 4:00 p.m. with all members of the Committee present with the exception of Cllr. Rob Howard who joined the meeting at a later point.

Mayor Brodie provided a brief summary of points put forth at the previous session of the meeting and then opened the meeting to public comment.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, December 15<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

Mr. Bob Ransford, 5071 Steveston Highway, said that he had been a member of the original citizens working group that had drafted options for the BC Packers site, and that the development of the lands had invoked a vigorous debate within the community. Mr. Ransford felt that today's discussion should be brought back to the fundamental issues and he spoke about the original vision for the waterfront, the reason for the Maritime Mixed Use designation and the reason for placing residential space above light industrial. Mr. Ransford said that he did not understand how the proposed vision got out of dealing with the applicable uses, and he questioned the viability of the new vision on the waterfront. Mr. Ransford also expressed concern that a closed meeting had been held during which a transfer of density had been discussed.

Mr. Ransford then spoke about the proposed vision being radically different than the adopted vision statement and also said it was a huge departure from the adopted planning principles. After questioning what would happen east of Phoenix Pond, and to the Phoenix Net Loft, Mr. Ransford spoke about the tram line not being included in the new plan. Mr. Ransford concluded his comments by noting the long public process that had resulted in the current plan, and the short public process of the new vision.

Ms. J. Turner said that Mr. Ransford had done a good job of outlining the work of the original committee, after which she spoke about the need for free access for the disabled on the promenade, which would be impeded by buildings and roads. Ms. Turner also spoke about the possible retail fish market including how the market would be policed and the possibility that access from the river could result in drugs being offloaded.

Ms. G. Nichols, a Britannia resident, expressed her concern about i) the lack of public notice for the new vision; ii) commercial buildings being located over the water; and, iii) the lack of sufficient space for a tram line, a road, and the number of pedestrians in the area.

Ms. T. Chan, 4600 Westwater Drive, indicated that a letter had been submitted to the City on behalf of the residents of Copper Sky East, which outlined their opinions about the tram and the proposed development on the water at Imperial Landing. Ms. Chan spoke about lack of proper notice for the open houses that were held, and her disappointment that no provision for receiving feedback had been made.

Mr. S. Matthews, 4600 Westwater Drive, said that although the Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe had done a fabulous job of presenting the 3 proposals, the tram proposal had been a shock. Mr. Matthews was not in favour of either of the two routes proposed for the tram. Mr. Matthews also expressed concern about the health and safety issues associated with a busy boardwalk and the governance over the waterway.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, December 15<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

Cllr. Howard joined the meeting – 4:38 p.m.

Mr. B. Plato, 6260 Riverdale Drive, a representative of the Pacific Sail Training Association, spoke about the Steveston Harbour having been a commercial harbour since 1879, and offered the opinion that the new vision destroyed a legacy that was over 100 years old. Mr. Plato thought that the Maritime Mixed Use zone should be preserved. Mr. Plato also spoke about a proposal he had submitted for use of the Phoenix Net Loft, and he asked for feedback on the proposal.

Mr. Mark Thompson, provided and spoke to a written submission, a copy of which is attached as Schedule 1 and forms a part of these minutes.

Mr. G. Kibble, said that he had been a part of Steveston for over 40 years and that he did not like the new vision. Mr. Kibble spoke about the Home Port strategy that had been adopted by the City, and said that he felt that the Maritime Mixed Use area should be kept as intact as possible and be limited to two storey. Mr. Kibble referred to the City's Trail Strategy and its reference to the interpretation of working river and marine life, and said that if the area were to be developed with residential there would not be much left for interpretation.

As a member of the Steveston Interurban Restoration Society Mr. Kibble expressed his concern that he had heard several comments of which the Society had not been informed. In response Mayor Brodie asked that staff attend the next meeting of the society.

Mr. Barry Rauten, distributed and spoke to a submission that identified his vision of the Imperial Landing site, a copy of which is attached as Schedule 2 and forms a part of these minutes. Mr. Rauten was of the opinion that the Performing Arts Cultural Centre would be better located on the lot at Moncton St. and Easthope Avenue. It was also felt that the vision was cluttered and did not address the real issues of the history and heritage of cannery row. Mr. Rauten said that the Imperial Cannery should be rebuilt for use as a public market and the docks rebuilt for use as fish market/cannery. Mr. Rauten also said that his company had proposed the design and build of a hotel at the west end of the site.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff that included the following:

- if the uses or densities for the area were to be substantially changed in the Official Community Plan, Onni Developments could continue their proposal under the current zoning as long as the proposal conformed to the applicable design guidelines;

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, December 15<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

- if the Maritime Mixed Use zone were to be amended to provide clarity any existing development would enjoy a non-conforming use status, but new development would be bound by the new zone requirements;
- the need for further definition and quantification of the marine related proportion of MMU businesses;
- the needs of the commercial fishing industry and the viability of the commercial fishing fleet;
- the timing issues involved in the process; and
- the suggestion that a fish auction be located at Paramount Pond.

Cllr. Barnes left the meeting during the above discussion – 6:00 p.m.

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

It was moved and seconded

*That the report 'Feedback – Imperial Landing Open Houses' (dated December 11, 2003 from the General Manager, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services) be referred to staff for further consideration of the following:*

- (1) *comment on the viability of the fishing industry;*
- (2) *assess the viability of the MMU;*
- (3) *assess the current need for industrial uses related to the Maritime industry;*
- (4) *review the maximum residential and/or commercial density wanted in the area;*
- (5) *identify the basic concept of the harbour as being commercial, pleasure or a combination thereof;*
- (6) *examine the current definition of Maritime Mixed Use;*
- (7) *review the enforcement implications of the current Maritime Mixed Use definition;*
- (8) *identify the Maritime Mixed Use designations of Granville Island; and,*
- (9) *on the Onni proposal show how the .5 acre of City public parking is to be provided;*
- (10) *confirm that public access agreements will be required for the Onni proposal and any other proposal;*
- (11) *clarify the status of the 25,000 sq. ft. of community space contained in the 1998 area plan vision for the site;*
- (12) *show the full Imperial landing waterfront vision and map – including possible tram routes and the Phoenix Net Loft;*

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, December 15<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

- (13) *keep green and open spaces;*
- (14) *keep the openness to the water;*
- (15) *identify the public amenities contained in the proposed vision;*
- (16) *describe the cantilevered walkway;*
- (17) *review whether or not residential uses in the MMU area would be better located in one building closer to No. 1 Road.*
- (18) *consult with Onni regarding their position;*
- (19) *consult with the Steveston Harbour Authority;*
- (20) *consult with other stakeholders;*

Prior to the question being called direction was given:

- i) *that a report indicating the extend of the work and the proposed timeline for completing the report be provided by February 15<sup>th</sup>, 2004;*
- ii) *that a memorandum be provided on the refining of the Maritime Mixed use definition; and*
- iii) *that discussion be undertaken with Onni as to their intent regarding their Development Permit application.*

Cllr. Dang left the meeting – 6:10 p.m. during the above discussion.

Cllr. S. Halsey-Brandt left the meeting during the above discussion. – 6:12 p.m.

The question was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

The Chair called a brief recess – 6:20 p.m. The meeting resumed at 6:24 p.m..

### 3. **RICHMOND 125 CELEBRATION OPPORTUNITIES**

(Report: Dec. 4/03, File No.: 7400-20-RQAC1) (REDMS No. 1099552, 1080676, 1080847)

The Director, Parks, Dave Semple, was present.

A brief discussion ensued among Committee members and Mr. Semple that included the following:

- the source of funds would be provided by the Council Provision account or any casino surpluses from 2003;
- that the Pioneer Tea should be expanded;
- that sponsorships would reduce the overall costs;

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, December 15<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

- a suggestion that the celebration be contained to a logo and a birthday party event to which seniors and pioneers would be invited; and
- a suggestion that 125 Redwood Trees be planted in the NW quadrant.

At this point the Chair suggested that the items contained in Attachment 1 of the report be reviewed, as a result of which:

It was moved and seconded

*(1) That staff address the expanded celebration opportunities for Richmond's 125th Anniversary as follows:*

- i) Develop information package – proceed as indicated;*
- ii) Creation of a Richmond 125 Logo – more information to be provided;*
- iii) Provide community instructions on how to be recognized as a 125<sup>th</sup> event – proceed as indicated;*
- iv) Develop poster – delete;*
- v) City of Richmond Festival Float – refer to the Grants Committee;*
- vi) Class A Sailing Ship Visit – a special report to be provided;*
- vii) Dedication and Opening of Community Garden on South Dyke – proceed as indicated;*
- viii) Re-enactment of the first Council meeting from November 10, 1879 and pioneer tea ceremony – proceed as indicated;*
- ix) Historic Re-enactment – delete;*
- x) Gateway Theatre 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Event – proceed as indicated;*
- xi) Waterfront Festival Celebration – a report is to be provided;*
- xii) Richmond Orchestra – a report is to be provided;*
- xiii) Opening of new Garden City Community Park – proceed as indicated;*
- xiv) The dedication of one public art initiative – proceed as indicated;*
- xv) The sponsorship of 125 trees – identify if there is community group interest;*
- xvi) Volunteer Recognition – proceed as indicated; and*



## General Purposes Committee

Monday, December 15<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003

---

- xvii) *125 Years of Arts and Events in Richmond Publication – refer to Museum staff for update.*

**CARRIED**

### ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded  
*That the meeting adjourn (6:44 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, December 15<sup>th</sup> and Tuesday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003.

---

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Chair

---

Deb MacLennan  
Administrative Assistant

SCHEDULE 1 TO THE MINUTES OF  
THE GENERAL PURPOSES  
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON  
MONDAY, DECEMBER 15<sup>TH</sup> AND  
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2003.

**Address To :      General Purposes Committee  
                         City of Richmond  
                         City Hall**

**Dec 16 2003**

**RE:      Vision Imperial Landing Waterfront**

**My name is Mark Thompson and I am a resident of the Imperial Landing area. I have considerable experience in municipal regulatory matters and I appreciate the opportunity to bring forward my comments.**

**I want to begin by saying that I am not here to fight change however I am here to suggest that reasonableness, fairness and due process are important principles. I did appreciate many of the well thought out comments that members of your committee have so far presented.**

**Changing a "Development Plan" is a very significant matter and should not be considered lightly and it should most definitely not be considered without adequate public input. There must be a process with an appropriate timeline for the opportunity to receive and consider genuine public input.**

**At yesterday's meeting apparent new concepts were presented and as you know not easily understood by either the public or by several councilors which are members of your committee as admitted during yesterday's meeting. I would submit that it is not reasonable to expect public input within hours of the first release of considerable new information.**

**We do however need to be aware of an apparent development permit before the City and hence acknowledge there is a legitimate reason to have reasonable timelines to serve good relations between developers and the City.**

**On an overall basis I would like to suggest that your administration has left you in a quandary. I quote your administration during your discussion On Dec 15<sup>th</sup> as saying " Any one of the Visions or Something in Between". I did not see the administration clearly defending their recommendations. The staff recommendation was that the vision (Attachment 7 to the report Dated Dec 11,2003 from the General Manager, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services), be endorsed. I can understand why they would not necessarily support the recommendation they have put before you. The "Vision Statement" is one page and the attached sketches are only illustrations. There is actually only one vision and numerous illustrations. The new sketch is still only a sketch not a vision. I would therefore respectfully submit that if there are more desirable features in say the latest sketch then the "Vision Statement" needs amendments to ensure that these more desirable features are required and the less desirable features that some other sketches have allowed need to be disallowed.**

**During discussions the comments were made that flexibility is required and that is a general principle of zoning which allows developers the opportunity to build the most appropriate facilities within a given zone. The Vision Statement does not seem to adequately refer specific zoning for specific components in the vision area.**

**The economics for the city in the adoption of this Vision Statement is not clear. There would appear to be a referral of this matter to some future discussion. Public capital dollars will be required to implement the vision and therefore an adoption of a vision needs to include a general understanding of the public dollars that may be required. What are the estimated budgetary impacts?**

**There are certainly private development dollars which can be negotiated for public amenities given that certain advantages are potentially being provided to the current land owner of undeveloped land.**

**With respect to the apparent proposal the following comments come to mind:**

- 1. A need to review the mass of the development on the waters edge and on the water. ( Example: It may be more desirable to allow a greater density of development closer to No 1 road and reduce going eastward. This would tend to maintain a better tie with the business centre.)**
- 2. A need to review inconsistencies with the current Steveston Area Plan Bylaw 7100. ( Examples: Steveston Downtown Node Encourage the development of the Business Centre as a vibrant commercial village. Assist property owners in developing and implementing area parking strategies that will ensure a sufficient parking supply to meet the areas needs. BC Packers Node Continuous and unobstructed public access to, and along, the waters edge will be a main feature of the redevelopment of this area. It will be important that these maritime related services complement rather than compete with the Business Centre.**
- 3. A cost benefit analysis of the proposed tram including a full disclosure of preferred routing, functionality and potential liability.**
- 4. Has a full review of the market for pleasure craft business associated amenities been completed? ( It is significant to note that there is a six month waiting list to obtain moorage from the Steveston Harbor Authority at this time and more than 50 on the waiting list. If you were to build a pleasure craft zone could the actual market be huge? Could this factor in to a long term Tall Ships master plan?)**

**The area east of the pond does not seem to be addressed in this Vision. In passing however I would suggest that a review of the old pillars in the water between the pond and the heritage properties need to be removed. They are dangerous, unsightly and inconsistent with the otherwise beauty of the area.**

**In summary it would appear that the MMU ( Maritime Mixed Use) requirement in the current Bylaw is considered too restrictive to encourage both public and private development. Certain proposals have been brought forward but are not fully**

**understood by either your committee or the public. The formal Public hearing stage has been proposed for March of 2004. I presume therefore that there is an opportunity to have additional public input.**

**I would submit to you with respect, the closing off the meeting of yesterday with no discussion with the public and the setting of a public opportunity for today is not consistent with the notion of allowing for public input. The provision of "Notice" is essential to any realistic public input opportunity and I would presume would be your normal intention.**

**I am further concerned about the apparent make up of this committee considering a matter that ultimately goes to a formal public hearing process is considered by the very same individuals that are members of this committee which is apparently a committee of the whole council discussing these matters at length. The fact that this committee was meeting in camera and holding the public at bay Dec 15<sup>th</sup> may give some folks additional reason to be concerned. These concerns further point to the need to ensure that public input is adequately sought and considered.**

**I therefore submit the following for your consideration.**

**Recommendations:**

- 1. That two additional dates for public input be established in Jan 2004 with at least two weeks notice being provided to the public.**
- 2. That your administration be requested to report further on this matter after these additional public meetings.**
- 3. That a more comprehensive vision statement be prepared as part of defining the vision to the public meetings and in the preparation of a new report to council.**
- 4. That the public be appropriately notified that this matter will appear on the agenda of the General Purposes committee and be invited to attend.**
- 5. That the public be provided an opportunity to receive a copy of the administrative report to the General Purposes Committee at least three business days in advance of further consideration by the General Purposes Committee.**
- 6. That the Public be given an opportunity to speak to this matter at the General Purposes Committee after any presentation by the administration but before the discussion of the committee.**


**Respectfully Presented,**

**Mark Thompson  
317-4600 Westwater Drive  
Richmond, BC.  
V7E 6S2  
Phone 604-271-2390**

SCHEDULE 2 TO THE MINUTES OF  
THE GENERAL PURPOSES  
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON  
MONDAY, DECEMBER 15<sup>TH</sup> AND  
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2003.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

# Draw Your Own Vision: Imperial Landing




City of Richmond  
November 17 / 20, 2003


# Draw Your Own Vision: Imperial Landing

Name: \_\_\_\_\_


*PERFORMING ARTS CENTRE*



City of Richmond  
November 17 / 20, 2003





FLOATING ECOLOGY + ESTUARIUM PIONEER - NET LOFT - TRAM STATION.



PHOENIX NET COY.









22 m / 736 ft.

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

BUILDING SHAPE  
BASED ON COPPER



5

COMMUNITY WING - FIRST FLOOR:

- 1. RETAIL STORES / OTHER
- 2. ATRIUM GALLERY / SHOPS / MULTIPURPOSE HALL
- 3. FAMILY-STYLE RESTAURANT
- 8. COFFEE SHOP
- 4. CULTURAL AFFAIRS OFFICES
- 5, / 6. PUBLIC FACILITIES / WASHROOMS / JANITOR / HOTEL HOUSEKEEPING

HOTEL WING - FIRST FLOOR:

- 1. RECEPTION
- 2. ADMINISTRATION OFFICES
- 3. GUESTROOMS
- 4. COURTYARD GARDEN
- 5. TO RECREATION FACILITIES

4

COMMUNITY WING - SECOND FLOOR

- 1. MEETING ROOMS
- 2. OPEN TO ATRIUM GALLERY / SHOPS / MULTI-PURPOSE HALL
- 3. BALLROOM / WEDDING HALL
- 4. LIBRARY / OTHER
- 5. WASHROOMS / JANITOR
- 6. COAT ROOM / STORAGE

HOTEL WING - SECOND FLOOR:

- 1. MEZZANINE LOUNGE AREA
- 2. GUESTROOMS
- 3. OPEN TO COURTYARD GARDEN
- 4. TO RECREATION FACILITIES

