

Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, February 22, 2000

Place: W.H. Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Malcolm Brodie, Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Lyn Greenhill
Councillor Harold Steves

Absent: Councillor Bill McNulty

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

1. **MINUTES**

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday, February 8, 2000 be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. **NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE**

The next committee meeting will take place on **Tuesday, March 7th, 2000** at 4:00 p.m. in the W. H. Anderson Room.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **UNSIGHTLY PREMISES – 7040 NO. 5 ROAD**

(Report: Feb. 10/00, File: 8075-20-26, REDMS 132543)

Sandy Tokarczyk, Manager, Property Use and Administration provided a background history. She advised that the tenant had been notified of the date and time of the Planning Committee meeting, by letter and by telephone. It was noted that Mr. Roy Uzelac, tenant, was not in attendance. The Chair confirmed that Mr. Uzelac would still be able to address this issue at Council.

Mr. J. Puymon, Property Use Inspector, presented colour photographs of various views of the property for the information of Committee members.

Upon query, Ms. Tokarczyk advised that staff were currently working at addressing tender requirements. She clarified that Mr. Uzelac had removed the equipment from the driveway and further clarified that there were no environmental concerns from city's perspective.

Mr. Uzelac will be contacted regarding the date of the Council Meeting.

The Chair suggested that staff submit photocopies of the colour photographs to provide further clarification to Council.

It was moved and seconded

That Council authorise Staff (or designates) to undertake the clean-up of 7040 No. 5 Road, at an estimated cost of \$3900.00, as detailed in the "Order to Comply" attached to the staff report dated February 10, 2000 from the Manager, Property Use & Administration.

CARRIED

4. **CHILD CARE IN RICHMOND TODAY – AN INFORMATION REPORT FROM THE CHILD CARE DEVELOPMENT BOARD**

(Report: Feb. 8/00, File No: 0100-20-CCDE1-01, REDMS 135339, 121998, 116633, 124025)

Terry Crowe, Manager, Urban Development, reviewed the staff report. He referred to the summary of the existing policy and further referred to the summary of the "Vision for the Future" produced by the Child Care Think Tank. He drew attention to the conclusion that there was a lack of affordable child care resources within the City of Richmond. He noted that the federal and provincial governments may consider funding child care. He then introduced members of the Richmond Child Care Development Board: Agnes Thompson, Nicki Byres, Maria Ressel.

Ms. Thompson drew attention to the part of the Vision for the Future which focused on the provincial report. She commented that the core funding of programs was a preferable way to provide stability for child care as opposed to subsidy funding. She advised that cost of child care was a major concern. It was noted that the community is stating that schools are the logical places for child care services.

Ms. Riessen further emphasized the problems introduced by funding through subsidy and stated that child care should be funded similar to education or health, where every family has access to child care regardless of income.

Nicki Byres answered question of Committee members regarding children with special needs and child care for non-traditional hours or infant care, and commented on the difficulties in these areas. She noted that the Richmond programs were not well funded enough to provide adequate support.

Ms. Thompson commented on the difficulties of finding space for child care within the City and encouraged City staff to negotiate for sites which were centrally situated, and accessible to public transportation.

It was moved and seconded

That:

- (1) ***The report from the Child Care Development Board, entitled Community Consultation – Child Care Think Tank, November 5, 1999, be received for information.***

- (2) ***The Board requests that copies of this report be sent to Richmond's Federal MP and Provincial MLAs.***

CARRIED

5. **PROVINCIAL DISCUSSION PAPER ON CHILD CARE**

(Report: Feb. 7/00, File No: 3070-00, REDMS 132009)

Terry Crowe, Manager, Urban Development, reviewed the staff report. He referenced the Richmond Child Care Development Board response to the provincial report and noted that the staff report presented short and long term options. He commented on the necessity of having a partnership with both federal and provincial governments. He then referenced the existing 1992 School Board child care policy as well as correspondence from the School Board indicating support for child care. It was felt that the idea of having child care co-located to schools should be pursued.

Ms. Byers concluded that the provincial discussion paper suggested some short term options but neglected to address affordability and accessibility. She commended the City for the work they have done and noted that the Ministry has received eight and a half thousand responses to the paper.

Councillor Steves commented that the idea of utilizing portables in schools works, should be reviewed, and referenced instances in the past where this had been utilized. He advised that this idea should be developed in elementary schools. He expressed his approval of the concept and noted there would be no parking problems and the advantage of generational assistance.

It was moved and seconded

That the City of Richmond respond to the Province's request for comments on the child care discussion paper, Building a Better Future for British Columbia's Kids, (Fall 1999), as follows:

1. ***That the province be commended for initiating discussion on child care options. A copy of the Richmond Child Care Development Board Community Consultation (Child Care Think Tank, November 5, 1999) outlining the problems facing Richmond parents and operators should be attached.***
2. ***That the proposed short term actions should be undertaken as quickly as possible. These should:***
 - ***be implemented in a way that balances parent subsidy and operator funding so as not to result in higher fees or a destabilized system***
 - ***be implemented, to as great an extent as possible, regardless of federal actions.***
3. ***Recognizing that:***
 - ***the actions above should be considered interim measures to address the most immediate problems***
 - ***more comprehensive and far reaching changes need to be made in the system***
 - ***these changes will involve major interministerial policy, mandate and funding changes.***

The Province should also be encouraged to begin working toward a more effective approach to child care in the longer term. This should include serious consideration of core funding to replace current programs and incorporation of dedicated child care space at school sites.

Prior to the question being called, staff were directed to study the use of casino funds for child care facilities or purchase of land for child care facilities, capital as opposed to operating funds.

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

6. **APPLICATION BY VIRDI PACIFIC HOLDINGS LTD. FOR REZONING AT 16540 RIVER ROAD FROM AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT (AG1) TO LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT (I2)**

APPLICATION BY CITY OF RICHMOND FOR BLOCK AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE EXCLUSION OF 16360 RIVER ROAD TO 17360 RIVER ROAD

REQUEST BY PROPERTY OWNERS TO CONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE EXCLUSION OF 17340 RIVER ROAD TO 17740 RIVER ROAD

(Report: Jan. 31/00, File 8060-20-7085, REDMS 132014)

Chairperson, Councillor Brodie, in accordance with Section 231 of the Municipal Act, advised that he was in a potential conflict of interest as his firm acts for one of the landowners on this issue, and he then left the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Vice-Chairperson, Councillor Steves, assumed the chair.

Joe Erceg, Manager, Development Applications, reviewed the staff report. He advised that rezoning the north portion of the site will accommodate relocation of an existing business cabinet-making business from Smith Street. It was noted that the rezoning was consistent with the Official Community Plan, however, the area is not serviced with sanitary sewer. The applicant will be required to dedicate a 20 m right of way for the future extension of Knox Way and obtain health department approval for an on-site effluent disposal system. Staff has also recommended the block extension of 16360 River Road to 17360 River Road (which includes the subject site), from the Agricultural Land Reserve. Mr. Erceg noted that staff does not support exclusion of properties located at 17340 to 17740 River Road from the Agricultural Land Reserve.

Holger Burke, Development Co-ordinator, referred to a display board noting the location of the various properties and provided contextual information. He noted the long term intent of reducing industrial traffic on River Road by providing an extension of Knox Way. It was advised that the Agricultural Land Commission continues to support the proposed Agricultural Land Reserve extension.

The applicant was available to answer questions.

Councillor Steves commented on the potential for agri-industrial use of these areas. Terry Crowe, Manager, Urban Development, advised that the first draft of the Agricultural Viability Survey and profile will be brought forward in March, 2001.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7085, for the rezoning of a portion of 16540 River Road from "Agricultural District (AG1)" to "Light Industrial District (I2)", be introduced and given first reading.

That authorization for the City of Richmond to apply to the Agricultural Land Commission for the block exclusion of 16360 River Road to 17360 River Road be approved.

That the request to exclude 17340 River Road to 17740 River Road from the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) be received and that the property owners of these properties and unaddressed Lot 17, Plan 65002 and Lot 3, Plan 4212 be advised that such an exclusion application would not be initiated or supported by the City of Richmond because it is contrary to the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the Agricultural Land Commission's position with regard to this area.

CARRIED

Councillor Brodie returned to the meeting at 4:42 p.m. and assumed the chair.

7. **APPLICATION BY CAPE DEVELOPMENT CORP. TO REZONE PROPERTIES AT 9611, 9631, 9711, 9751, 9771 BRIDGEPORT ROAD, 9540, 9560 BECKWITH ROAD AND 2691, 2711, 2731, 2751, 2771 NO. 4 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1/F AND R1/D) AND ROADSIDE STAND (CLASS C) DISTRICT (RSC) TO AUTOMOBILE-ORIENTED COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C6).**

(Report: Feb. 3/00, File: 4105-20-99-171337, REDMS 135050)

Joe Erceg, Manager, Development Applications, reviewed the staff report. He advised that the purpose of the rezoning was to accommodate a 70,000 sq. ft. commercial development consisting of retail uses and restaurants. It was noted that an OCP amendment from 'Neighbourhood Residential' to 'Mixed Use' was required for the lots fronting No. 4 Road to enable development of the entire site. It was also noted that the site will be serviced by a new municipal road which would line up at Bridgeport Road with the new Highway 99 off-ramp. Staff have recommended that the application proceed.

Architect, Patrick Cotter, gave a brief overview of the site and the proposed development. He noted the location of the site, including the location of intersection on Bridgeport Road

Utilizing site plans, artistic renderings, and colour photographs, the architect reviewed the location of the proposed development and roadways. He noted the footprints/elevation of the buildings and the intention to encourage all truck traffic to access the site via the new intersection. He indicated that a 1 ½ m berm would be installed along No. 4 Road and further indicated that they were working with residents to provide less dense screening along the property line to the north. Bill Wright of Cape Developments provided background information regarding the proposal.

Letters of support have been received and are on file in the City Clerk's Office.

Mr. Ward provided an explanation of the road configuration, a traffic study which had been prepared, interim provision for area residents to turn left on Bridgeport Road via the subject site.

Councillor Greenhill expressed safety concerns associated with area residents accessing Bridgeport Road via the proposed development.

In response to an enquiry, Mr. Erceg clarified that the location of the buildings will be finalized through the development permit process. He then provided clarification of traffic movement along Bridgeport Road and noted that there was a 5 ton weight limit for trucks on No. 4 Road.

Mr. Ward provided further explanation of traffic circulation associated with the proposed development.

The Chair called for comment from the gallery.

Vera Sobkowicz Smart, advised that she was raised in this area and noted the history of the site. She read a letter encouraging the Committee to carefully consider the rezoning. She referred to a photograph of her family farm which is adjacent to the proposed development. She noted the location of her father's home as well as recent relocation of a heritage home to a site on No. 4 Road. She referenced past incidents and difficulties with traffic on No. 4 Road.

Sheryl Sutherland, of 2640 No. 4 Road, referenced the staff report and requested clarification regarding the C-6 Zone. She expressed concern regarding the following: lack of notification of public meetings by the developer; increase in traffic; potential for congestion at the proposed intersection; upkeep of the proposed berm on No. 4 Road.

Councillor Greenhill left the meeting at 5:35 p.m.

Larry Walsh, of 9520 Beckwith Road, stated that he was against the proposal. He comment that he would like to see a larger complex due to the difficulty of being able to develop the area to the west.

Branko Popazivanov, of 9531 Beckwith Road, was in attendance to express his concern regarding the proposed project. He advised that the development is situated in front of the entrance to this property. He referred to the "traffic nightmare" of No. 3 and Bridgeport Roads, adding that the development will cause more traffic. He noted the lack of a right turn lane along Bridgeport into the proposed development and the traffic difficulties at Gage and Bridgeport Roads. He suggested further traffic planning be undertaken.

The Chair expressed concern regarding forcing the flow of traffic through this area and suggested that further review was necessary.

It was moved and seconded

That the application by Cape Development Corp. to rezone properties at 9611, 9631, 9711, 9751, 9771 Bridgeport Road, 9540, 9560 Beckwith Road and 2691, 2711, 2731, 2751, 2771 No. 4 Road from Single-Family Housing District (R1/F and R1/D) and Roadside Stand (Class C) District (Rsc) to Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6) be referred back to staff for review to address traffic issues, including:

1. ***Provision of a more direct connection of the proposed municipal road to Beckwith Road;***
2. ***Review of the design of the new municipal road and need for a right turn lane on Bridgeport Road;***
3. ***Review of the need for the proposed driveway on No. 4 Road;***
4. ***Provision of further details for proposed modifications associated with the Airport Connector Project to the intersection of No. 4 Road and Bridgeport Road; and***
5. ***The need for a traffic signal at the corner of Bridgeport Road and Gage Road.***

CARRIED

8. **APPLICATION BY CEDAR DEVELOPMENT (WESTWYND LANE) CORP. FOR REZONING AT 11160, 11180, 11188 RAILWAY AVENUE AND 5193, 5195 HUMMINGBIRD DRIVE FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREAS A/B/C (R1/A; R1/B; R1/C) TO TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT (R2)**

(Report: Feb. 8/00, File:8060-20-7119, REDMS 131703, 134208)

Joe Erceg, Manager, Development Applications, reviewed the staff report. He advised that the rezoning was to accommodate an eleven unit townhouse project with two accesses, one onto Hummingbird Drive, the other onto Railway Avenue. It was noted that the applicant had had an informational meeting with neighbours and had incorporated some concerns that were raised. The City would require an additional 10 m to facilitate widening of Railway Avenue. Staff have recommended approval of the rezoning.

Dana Westermarck, et al were present to answer questions of Committee. He referred to the good consultation with neighbours and the lower than average density of the proposed development, (a FAR of .5 versus .55) of the surrounding neighbourhood. The neighbourhood survey included residents from Hummingbird Drive, Chickadee Court, and Woodpecker Drive.

It was moved and seconded

1. ***That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 7118, to redesignate 11160, 11180, 11188 Railway Avenue and 5193, 5195 Hummingbird Drive from "Single Family" to "Multiple Family" in Attachment 1 to Schedule 2.4 of Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100 (Steveston Area Plan), be introduced and given first reading.***
2. ***That Bylaw No. 7118, having been examined in conjunction with the Capital Expenditure Program, the Waste Management Plan, and the Economic Strategy Plan, is hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3) of the Municipal Act.***

3. ***That Bylaw No. 7118, having been examined in accordance with the City Policy No. 5002 on referral of Official Community Plan Amendments, is hereby deemed to have no effect upon an adjoining Municipality nor function or area of the Greater Vancouver Regional District, in accordance with Section 882(3)(d) and (e) of the Municipal Act.***
4. ***That Bylaw No. 7118, having been examined in accordance with the requirement in the Accord between the City and the Vancouver International Airport Authority, is hereby deemed to be outside the areas affected by aeronautical operations.***
5. ***That Bylaw No. 7119, for the rezoning of 11160, 11180, 11188 Railway Avenue and 5193, 5195 Hummingbird Drive from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Areas A; B; C (R1/A; R1/B; R1/C)" to "Townhouse District (R2)", be introduced and given first reading.***

CARRIED

9. **APPLICATION BY DAYHU INVESTMENTS LTD. FOR REZONING AT 8060 GRANVILLE AVENUE AND 7080 NO. 3 ROAD FROM AUTOMOBILE-ORIENTED COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C6) TO DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C7)**

(Report: Feb. 8/00, File: 8060-20-7086, REDMS 133466, 133472)

Joe Erceg, Manager, Development Applications, reviewed the staff report. He advised that the purpose of the rezoning was to allow construction of a 11 storey office development fronting Granville Avenue. It was noted that this project had been referred back to staff for review of lane access. The applicant has recently acquired the property fronting No. 3 Road.

Architect, Sheldon Chandler, of Chandler Associates Architects, Marco Ciriello Architect, Jonathan Barnett, Dayhu Investments were in attendance.

Mr. Chandler provided a brief presentation of the project. Artistic renderings, site plan and landscape plans were utilized. He advised that this project had started ten years ago and that the property had been acquired on a contiguous basis. He referred to the location and the size of the site. He reviewed the required conditions including the idea of having the entire area planned in order to facilitate development of the project. He further reviewed the design of the building as well as the building materials. Upon query, Mr. Chandler advised that although the demographics of the area showed a preference towards residential, the market forecast was unclear.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7086, for the rezoning of 8060 Granville Avenue and 7080 No. 3 Road from "Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6)" to "Downtown Commercial District (C7)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

10. **APPLICATION BY MR. MARK SAKAI (FRASERVIEW CONSTRUCTION CO. LTD.), ON BEHALF OF TERUO AND MARGARET SAKAI, FOR REZONING AT 5091 MONCTON STREET AND 5131 MONCTON STREET FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA C (R1/C)**

(Report: Feb. 10/00, File: 8060-20-7089, REDMS 133953, 135918)

Joe Erceg, Manager, Development Applications, reviewed the staff report. He advised that the intention was to demolish the eastern most residence, and build new house, ultimately to create three more lots. He referenced the site plan, noting phase 1 and phase 2 aspects to the proposal which would result in four lots to the property. It was noted that as part of the rezoning, a covenant would be required to set houses back on Moncton Street to ensure vehicles could turn around.

Mark Sakai provided further explanation of the proposal and further clarified the location.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7089, for the rezoning of 5091 Moncton Street and 5131 Moncton Street from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area C (R1/C)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

11. **MANAGER'S REPORT**

None.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (6:35 p.m.).

CARRIED

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, February 22, 2000.

Councillor Malcolm Brodie
(Chair)

Susan Kopeschny
(Administrative Assistant)