City of Richmond **Minutes**

Planning Committee

Date:	Wednesday, April 19th, 2006
Place:	Anderson Room Richmond City Hall
Present:	Councillor Harold Steves, Chair Councillor Bill McNulty, Vice-Chair Councillor Rob Howard
Absent:	Councillor Linda Barnes Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt
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 Planning Committee held on Tuesday, April 4th, 2006, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, **May 2nd, 2006**, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **APPLICATION BY RANJIT SINGH FOR REZONING AT 10400 ARAGON ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (1-0.6)**
(**RZ 06-326332**: Report: March 27, 2006, File No.:12-8060-20-8053) (REDMS No. 1780813, 1780834, 1780720)

Mr. Jean Lamontagne, Director of Development, explained that the proposed rezoning was a fast track application which was in line with the subdivision plan for the neighbourhood.

In response to a Committee query, Mr. Lamontagne indicated that technically other lots could go to 10 metres.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 8053, for the rezoning of 10400 Aragon Road from "Single-Family Housing District, subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

4. **APPLICATION BY 578547 BC LTD. FOR REZONING AT 4520 AND 4522 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1-0.6)**

(**RZ 06-328453:** Report: March 27, 2006 , File No.:12-8060-20-8056) (REDMS No. 1782498, 1782503, 1782514)

Mr. Lamontagne provided an overview of the rezoning application, with note that it was a similar subdivision to an adjacent property to the west, but in this case was single family homes.

In response to queries from Committee staff advised that:

- Page 25 of the agenda package showed the proposed landscape plan. Trees proposed were subspecies of Dogwood and Maple and were considered sturdy plant material;
- Landscape security was required for implementation as intended for a better streetscape;
- Professionally prepared landscape plans are proposed to be imbedded as a requirement in the OCP at the point of rezoning for single family homes on arterial roads in order to improve the standard of landscaping along arterial roads;
- Staff would prefer that the landscape plan not come at fourth reading, and discretion could be executed relative to the approved direction for single family dwellings on arterial roads;
- Surveys were done of areas prepared to entertain development on arterial roads. Pros and cons of each approach were considered and a balance was sought; and
- There was a desire to work with landscape architects and consultants to certify that quality work was implemented. Six or seven similar projects are currently underway.

It was moved and seconded
That Bylaw No. 8056, for the rezoning of 4520 and 4522 Steveston Highway from "Single-Family Housing District, subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

5. **APPLICATION BY CONWAY RICHMOND LTD. TO AMEND THE COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C3) IN ORDER TO PERMIT A PRIVATE LIQUOR STORE [LICENSEE RETAIL STORE (TYPE 2)] WITH A MAXIMUM GROSS FLOOR AREA OF 560 M^2 (6,000 FT^2) ON A SITE SPECIFIC BASIS**
(**RZ 05-319170** - Report: March 29, 2006, File No.: 12-8060-20-8061) (REDMS No. 1765094, 1505481, 1729441, 1765091, 1765074)

Mr. Lamontagne provided an overview of the application noting that the request was untypical but similar to a presentation made at Public Hearing April 18, 2006.

In response to a Committee query, Mr. Lamontagne clarified the location of the private liquor retail store as displayed on a color map.

It was moved and seconded
That Bylaw No. 8061, to amend Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300 by amending the "Community Commercial District (C3)" to permit a "Licensee Retail Store (Type 2)" with a maximum gross floor area of 560 m^2 (6,000 ft^2) at 8120 No. 2 Road only, be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

6. **APPLICATION BY SAL BHULLAR FOR REZONING AT 6611, 6631, 6671, AND 6691 BLUNDELL ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1-0.6)**
(**RZ 06-326949**: Report: April 7, 2006, File No.: 12-8060-20-8059) (REDMS No. 1795631, 179879, 1746935, 1776563, 1800223, 1800217, 1798925, 1798930)

Mr. Lamontagne noted that the application required an amendment to the lot size policy.

In discussion, Committee asked if prior commitment for the north side of Blundell Road had been made to mirror what was done on the south side from Gilbert west along Blundell. Staff responded by providing a brief history of both areas as it related to the review of the Lane Establishment and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policies.

The importance of adequate notice being provided for area residents to speak to the Committee on issues related to applications was noted. It was suggested that additional correspondence be sent out on both sides of Blundell prior to Public Hearing to ensure that all residents had an opportunity to comment.

In response to queries from Committee staff advised that:

- 300 letters were distributed to the immediate neighbourhood and that 20 responses were received with 50% being in support;
- There had previously been townhouse applications on both sides of the road;
- In September 2005 an application came forward to amend the existing lot size policy as currently proposed and to not approve townhouses;
- Development on the north side of Blundell was postponed so that the applicants could do community consultation;
- The current lot size in the area is 40 ft width;
- Items ii and iii (agenda page 40) followed the arterial policy;
- The subdivision would be restricted to R1/E and R1/D on the south side of Blundell. The lot size policy was adopted in 2005 and would be in effect for a minimum of five years; and
- The application was increasing the subdivision potential from eight to 11 lots.

Ms. Maryann Williams, 8166 Mirabel Court, shared that residents of Mirabel Court had requested the Planning Department to keep them informed. She specified that she had not received the February 15, 2006 correspondence; and had only received correspondence on April 18, 2006 relative to the application. The short notice may have impacted residents' opportunity to comment.

Mr. Terry Nibett, 6691 Blundell, indicated that the City had previously promoted townhouses in the area, and that the neighbourhood had been in opposition. He expressed support for the smaller lots proposed; thereby allowing for more affordable housing; and indicated that he did not see that five extra lots would significantly impact with extra traffic.

Mr. Edward Shale, 6671 Blundell, noted that he had lived at that location for 53 years. He shared that some time ago he had received a letter from the City suggesting that the property on the north side of Blundell would be in the area of 30 ft frontages (R1/A) and queried whether that was still in existence. He expressed support for the application.

Mr. Glen Shale, former resident of 6671 Blundell Road, commented on the lane access available on the north side of the proposed development which did not mirror or reflect what was available on the south side. With the rezoning going to a 30 ft lot, he queried how many houses and additional cars the increase would allow. He considered that with the lane access there were various options for egress from the area.

In response to queries from Committee and the public, Ms. Sal Bhallar, Applicant, advised that:

- Within the present policy there could be 8 new homes, however, within the proposed application there were 11;
- The patience of the developer should be considered in that originally the City preferred town homes for the area, but the south side of Blundell residents did not want town homes;
- The current application could have been presented last year during the public hearing, as it responded to the community interest; and
- No additional feedback was received from the south side residents.

It was moved and seconded

(1) That the following recommendations be forwarded to Public Hearing

(a) That Single-Family Lot Size Policy 5408 for the area bounded by Comstock Road, Blundell Road, Gilbert Road, and No. 2 Road, be amended to:

(i) Permit rezoning and subdivision to Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6) or Coach House District (R9) along Blundell Road and Gilbert Road, provided that access is to a constructed lane and not to either arterial road;

(ii) Restrict all other properties to the Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E) zone;

(iii) Delete the properties fronting Blundell Road between Cheviot Place and No. 2 Road; and

(iv) Restrict development to single-family residential only and no multi-family residential development shall be permitted.

(2) That Bylaw No. 8059, for the rezoning of 6611, 6631, 6671, and 6691 Blundell Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

7. OCP BYLAW PREPARATION CONSULTATION POLICY

(Report: March 28, 2006; File No.: 08-4045-00,) (REDMS No. 1795397)

Mr. Lamontagne indicated that the policy was in preparation for an OCP update to be undertaken the following year. He added that it outlined other agencies to be consulted (e.g. School Board).

It was moved and seconded

That, (as per the report dated, March 28, 2006 from the Manager, Policy Planning):

(1) The existing Council Policy 7017 "Consultation During OCP Development" (adopted May 9, 2005), be rescinded;

(2) The proposed "OCP Bylaw preparation Consultation Policy (Attachment 2) be adopted.

(3) The March 28th, 2006 report and adopted Policy be referred to the Council/School Board Liaison Committee for information.

CARRIED

8. **ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREA DESIGNATION AMENDMENT (MITCHELL ISLAND)**

(REPORT: MARCH 17, 2006, FILE NO.: 12-8060-20-8050) (REDMS NO. 1787251, 1778780)

Staff provided a brief outline of the housekeeping amendment to reduce the Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) on two properties on Mitchell Island. Agreement was made to relocate the park on the western portion of the island to an area not yet determined.

In discussion, Committee expressed dismay that the site was preloaded before it was addressed by Committee or approved. Although the application made sense, the extent of control over development was queried.

In response to queries from Committee staff advised that:

- An application would be forthcoming for the western portion of the island. City staff was working with the applicant to relocate the park.
- A general compliance ruling had been to Council relative to the application;
- This was a housekeeping application and was different from developers preloading in general;
- The Development Permit Panel had recently referred three applications where developers had removed trees and preloaded sites;
- Building and Engineering departments were looking at the potential for regulating preloading, however various contentious issues were being considered; and
- The clearing of the site in 1996 was relative to the need for remediation of the soils.

It was moved and seconded

(1) That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 8050, which amends Attachment 3 (Environmentally Sensitive Areas) to Schedule 1 of Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, by reducing the upland extent of the Environmentally Sensitive Area designation to 30 metres from the shoreline for 11380 Eburne Way and 11488 Eburne Way, be introduced and given first reading.

(2) That Bylaw 8050, having been considered in conjunction with:

(a) the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program;

(b) the Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;

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

(3) That Bylaw 8050, having been considered in accordance with the City Policy on Consultation During OCP Development, is hereby deemed not to require further consultation.

CARRIED

9. FORMAL ENDORSEMENT FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE RICHMOND - FREMP AREA DESIGNATIONS AGREEMENT

(Report : March 22, 2006; File No.: 10-6150-06-01) (REDMS No. 1779688)

Mr. Lamontagne noted that FREMP regulated the waterfront throughout the region and had its own Master Plan in which their designation was different from Council's vision. Staff had been working with FREMP on the designation amendment. Therefore, it would be appropriate for Council to also reflect the similar designation in line with Council's vision for recreational use of the river.

It was moved and seconded

(1) That the General Manager – Urban Development be authorized to endorse, on behalf of the City of Richmond, the accompanying Amendment to the Fraser River Estuary Management Program – Richmond Area Designations Statement of Intent.

(2) That staff update the Statement of Intent agreement document accordingly.

CARRIED

10. MANAGER'S REPORT

(1) Affordable Housing

Mr. Burke reported that the Request for Proposal (RFP) had closed on April 13, 2006. Five consultant proposals were received and were under review. The consultant was anticipated to be announced by the next meeting.

Letters were sent to stakeholders interested in affordable housing and meetings were planned with the consultant for May 2006. The project was due to be complete by year end.

(2) City Centre Plan

Mr. Burke advised that IBI Group had been approached to do the City Centre Plan update, as they were familiar with what was happening in the city centre due to their work on the Canada Line. A city staff team was assembled and reviewed the work program; and it was anticipated the project would be completed by year end.

In discussion, Committee suggested that the City of New York be considered as an example relative to the amount of parkland in the city core. Discussion then ensued on the Pinnacle/Western rezoning application, during which Committee offered that "park over parking" was not offensive. The Committee also agreed with affordable housing being included at the 50% residential build out point.. Staff advised that IBI would define the city centre boundaries, and a workshop with Council had been scheduled for May 1. At the end of the process, form, density, neighbourhood precincts and parks would be identified in more detail than was currently available.

In response to queries from Committee staff advised that:

- Staff did not support the previous proposal as the design detail was not included;
- 100,000 sq ft of affordable rental housing was requested from Suntech. There was desire to include it in the final phase in order to address concern that the site could be largely built out and then flipped;
- Staff suggestion was to seek a commitment for 5% affordable housing on the site with the stipulation that it must be completed at 50% of residential build out;
- Payment of the RAV fee was tied to Phase One. $4/sq ft was built into the new RAV fee to be approved by Council;
- 1.45 acres of parkland with public rights and passage was requested by staff as a basic minimum; and
- Originally the proposal was going to provide a park with city parking underneath.

(3) Steveston Study

Staff advised that the Steveston Study RFP closing date was April 28, 2006. A work program was in place for completion by year end.

(4) Official Community Plan/Liveable Region Strategic Plan Review

Staff advised that a workshop would be planned later in May 2006.

In discussion, Committee comment was that Richmond lot sizes were a little larger than those in other municipalities, and therefore there could be less constraint on redevelopment due to the lot size if a small house was not maximizing the lot use.

In response to queries from Committee staff advised that:

- The vast majority of Richmond was not being redeveloped. However, as the arterials were, if services were in place Richmond would not need to have DCCs. Alternatively a position could be taken to force developers to do upgrades at the time of development;
- In regard to arterial road public consultation, a duplex option was presented and received little interest; and
- There were challenges to renovating older homes, and there was potential to recycle houses.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (5:15 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 Wednesday, April 19th, 2006

Councillor Harold Steves
Chair

Karen Miller, Recording Secretary
Raincoast Ventures Ltd.