



## Planning Committee

Date: Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002  
Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall  
Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair  
Councillor Lyn Greenhill, Vice-Chair  
Councillor Linda Barnes  
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt  
Councillor Harold Steves  
Also Present: Councillor Rob Howard (3:13 p.m.)  
Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

### MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded  
*That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2002, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, **June 4, 2002**, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

The Chair advised at this point that a staff report on the matter of a referral on an amendment to the City of New Westminster Official Community Plan for 800/900 Boyd Street, would be added to the agenda as an additional item.

# Planning Committee

Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002

---

3. **ADVERTISING OF DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL MEETINGS**  
(Report: May 7/02, File No.: 0100-20-DPER1-01, Xref. 0105-06-03) (REDMS No. 699864, 682692, 682722, 682798)

A brief discussion ensued among Committee members, during which a general agreement was expressed for Option B, as proposed in the staff report. As a result, the following **amended** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

*That the report dated May 7, 2002 from the Manager, Legislative Services, regarding the advertising, using Option B, of Development Permit Panel meetings and other minimal or no-cost customer service improvements, be received for information.*

**CARRIED**

4. **DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FEES**  
(Report: May 3/02, File No.: 8060-20-7276) (REDMS No. 559104, 479533)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, briefly reviewed the report with the Committee. During the discussion which ensued among Committee members and staff on the proposed fee increases, questions were raised about the decision of staff not to phase in implementation of these increases, as requested by the Urban Development Institute (UDI). In response, advice was given that the initial plan had been to impose the new fees immediately, however, following discussions with representatives of UDI, the suggestion was made that the new fees be implemented as of July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2002.

Discussion continued among Committee members and staff on:

- the current processing time to deal with development applications as compared to other municipalities
- whether the current increase in development growth would continue, and whether the current level of activity would be sufficient to meet revenue projections for the year
- whether a review of development application fees would be undertaken on an annual basis.

(Cllr. Howard entered the meeting at 3:13 p.m., during the above discussion.)

Mr. Norm Coultie, Chair of the Richmond UDI Liaison Committee, noted that City staff had addressed earlier concerns of the organization, however, there were still several outstanding issues.

# Planning Committee

Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002

---

Mr. Couttie explained that (i) the concept of overall cost recovery could not be supported; (ii) Vancouver should not be included in the comparison of fees because the City operated under different legislation, and if Vancouver was eliminated from the review, Richmond would have the highest fees; (iii) the increase in fees represented a 66% increase over 1997, and while fees had not been increased since 1997, the rate of inflation was only 5% per year, not 66%; and (iv) development growth was slowly increasing and could result in additional revenue being generated for the City without increasing development application fees.

Ms. Renata Bublick, Associate Executive Director, UDI, provided examples of the impact which the proposed fees would have on certain types of developments. A copy of the material circulated to the Committee to illustrate this impact is on file in the City Clerk's Office.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on such issues as:

- why the City should not endeavour to recover the cost of processing development applications
- the rationale for the significant increase in the processing of applications for Comprehensive Development Districts
- the differences in the rates charged by the Cities of Vancouver, Surrey, and Richmond to process development application fees
- the request of UDI that the new fees be phased in over a period of time and the impact of phasing in the increased development application fees on the Urban Development Division budget for 2002
- the need of City staff to consider the 'full package' of costs faced by developers when considering the proposed increase in development application fees.

Mr. Peter Simpson, Chief Operating Officer and Executive Officer of the Greater Vancouver Builders Association, expressed agreement with the arguments put forward by the UDI delegation. He then spoke about the ability of the City to attract development to the community, and suggested that the City would generate more revenue as a result of development growth than by excessively increasing fees. Mr. Simpson also spoke about the affordability of new homes to first time buyers and suggested that the increased costs would be passed onto these buyers, thereby making the purchase of new homes even more difficult. In concluding his presentation, Mr. Simpson commented on the good working relationship with City staff, and he urged the Committee to re-examine the fees being proposed at this time as they were excessive.

# Planning Committee

Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002

---

Mr. Graeme Silvira, Chair of the National Association of Industrial and Office Properties (NAIOP), elaborated on material which he circulated, which dealt with specific development applications currently underway. A copy of this material is on file in the City Clerk's Office. Mr. Silvira also expressed agreement with the comments made by UDI that the proposed fee increases should be phased-in and should provide a 'grandfather' clause for applications submitted to the City prior to the adoption of the new fees.

A brief discussion then ensued among Committee members and Mr. Silvira, during which he advised in response to questions, that Richmond was ranked high in a survey undertaken by NAIOP regarding the amount of time taken to process applications. A question was raised about whether a two tier system, whereby a developer could pay a fee to expedite his application if a quick turn around time was required, should be considered, and Mr. Silvira expressed agreement that the ability ought to exist which would allow a developer to pay additional fees to jump the queue.

Discussion then took place among Committee members and staff on the proposed fee increases, during which the following information was provided and further discussion generated on:

- the fact that the application of the new fee increases applied to new applications only and not to applications currently being processed
- the fact that if the City had undertaken an annual review of the basic rezoning rates since 1997, based on a 5% inflation rate, the rates would be approximately \$2,000 which was the rate being recommended by staff
- the impact of postponing implementation of the fees on the revenue to be generated by the new rates
- with reference to the request of UDI that the current \$525 fee to process Development Variance Permits not be increased, the fact that at least half of that amount was absorbed by the City Clerk's Department in mailing notices to affected property owners
- the fact that the 2002 budget had included the anticipated revenue to be generated from the increase in development application fees, and a reduction in fees and/or a delay in implementation could jeopardize the objective of the department to reach its budget goal
- the feasibility of introducing the proposed rate increases over a certain period of time.

It was moved and seconded

*That Development Application Fees Bylaw No. 7276, which increases and introduces new Development Application fees, be introduced and given first, second and third readings.*

# Planning Committee

Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002

---

The question on the motion was not called, as the following **amendment** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

*That the following words be added, "and that the fees be phased-in with 50% of the increase implemented effective July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2002, and the remaining 50% implemented on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2003.*

The question on the amendment was not called, as a brief discussion ensued on (i) the merits of the proposed amendment, (ii) the turn around time taken to process development applications; and (iii) whether the proposed fees reflected the City's costs to process development applications.

The question on the amendment was then called, and it was **DEFEATED** with Cllrs. McNulty, Barnes and Steves opposed.

The question on the main motion was not called, as a further **amendment** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

*That the following words be added, "and that the fees be phased-in on one-third increments commencing July 15<sup>th</sup>, 2002 and every four months after that."*

**DEFEATED**

OPPOSED: Cllr. McNulty  
Barnes  
Greenhill  
Steves

The question on the main motion was then called, and it was **DEFEATED** with Cllrs. McNulty, Greenhill and S. Halsey-Brandt opposed.

It was moved and seconded

*That the issue of application fees be referred to staff for report to Committee at its June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2002 meeting, which would:*

- (1) re-examine areas where the cost of processing specific applications were not adequately recovered;*
- (2) examine the needs within the 2002 budget compared to growth with a view to implementing fees which would allow the City to realize its objectives for the 2002 budget;*
- (3) examine the feasibility of implementing a time value for money with regard to the 'fast tracking' of development applications; and*
- (4) provide at least two options on the possible phasing-in of proposed development application fee increases.*

**CARRIED**

OPPOSED: Cllr. Greenhill

# Planning Committee

Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002

---

5. **NEW PROCEDURE BYLAW FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMITS, DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS AND TEMPORARY USE PERMITS**

(Report: April 25/02, File No.: 8060-20-7273) (REDMS No. 473281, 400374)

Mr. Erceg, accompanied by the Manager, Legislative Services, David Weber, briefly reviewed the report with the Committee. A brief discussion ensued on the requirements of the applicant with regard to temporary use permits.

(Cllr. Howard left the meeting at 4:40 p.m., and did not return.)

It was moved and seconded

(1) *That Bylaw No. 7273, which establishes updated procedures for the issuing of Development Permits, Development Variance Permits and Temporary Use Permits, as well as incorporating procedures for Development Permit General Compliance Rulings, be introduced given first, second and third readings.*

(2) *That public notice be served that Council intends to amend the Council Procedure Bylaw (as required by the Local Government Act) to add requests for Development Permit General Compliance Rulings to the category of non-delegable items at Council and Committee meetings.*

(3) *That the following Council policies each be rescinded:*

(a) *Letters of Credit – Development Permits, Land Use Contracts (adopted January 22, 1979); and*

(b) *Development Property – Signage (adopted January 24th, 1977).*

**CARRIED**

6. **BOARD OF VARIANCE ESTABLISHMENT & PROCEDURE BYLAW NO. 7150, AMENDMENT BYLAW NO. 7347**

(Report: March 22/02, File No.: 8060-20-7347) (REDMS No. 670044, 670037)

It was moved and seconded

*That Board of Variance Establishment & Procedure Bylaw No. 7150, Amendment Bylaw No. 7347, which transfers the fees for Board of Variance orders from the Development Application Fee Bylaw to the Board of Variance Bylaw, be introduced and given first, second and third readings.*

**CARRIED**

# Planning Committee

Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002

---

7. **APPLICATION FOR A CLASS "B" LIQUOR LICENCE WITH AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (KARAOKE AND DANCING) AT UNIT 145 - 4751 GARDEN CITY ROAD.**

(Report: April 29/02, File No.: 8275-05) (REDMS No. 702085)

A brief discussion ensued among Committee members and staff on the matter, during which in response to questions, the Manager, Zoning, Alan Clark, provided information on the involvement of the RCMP in reviewing such applications.

It was moved and seconded

*That the application by Apple Garden to the Liquor Control and Licencing Branch for a Class "B" Liquor Licence with audience participation (Karaoke and Dancing) be supported, and that the Liquor Control and Licencing Branch be advised:*

- (1) *of this recommendation; and*
- (2) *that the R.C.M.P. does not object.*

**CARRIED**

8. **APPLICATION BY MICHAEL LI FOR REZONING AT 7400 NO. 2 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA K (R1/K)**

(RZ 02-203096, Report: May 1/02, File No.: 8060-20-7367) (REDMS No. 704915, 705091, 705096)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7367, for the rezoning of 7400 No. 2 Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area K (R1/K)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

9. **APPLICATION BY STACY MAEDA FOR REZONING AT 6711 AND 6691 COMSTOCK ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA K (R1/K)**

(RZ 02-203351, Report: April 25/02, File No.: 8060-20-7364) (REDMS No. 699702, 279973, 700043, 700046)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7364, for the rezoning of 6711 and 6691 Comstock Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area K (R1/K)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

# Planning Committee

Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002

---

10. **APPLICATION BY GURMEJ BAINS FOR REZONING AT 10340 CAMBIE ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA F (R1/F) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B)**  
(RZ 02-203023, Report: April 25/02, File No.: 8060-20-7366) (REDMS No. 700389, 703491, 703493)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7366, for the rezoning of 10340 Cambie Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

11. **APPLICATION BY HOTSON BAKKER ARCHITECTS FOR AMENDMENT OF THE OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF 14791 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM "ATHLETICS AND ENTERTAINMENT DISTRICT (AE)" TO "COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/134)"**  
(RZ 02-199258, Report: May 13/02, File No.: 8060-20-7370/71) (REDMS No. 707910, 703300, 703302, 716471)

Mr. Erceg briefly reviewed the report with the Committee. The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, responded to questions from Committee on the rationale for recommending that the application be submitted to the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) for review prior to the matter being considered at a public hearing

In speaking to the matter, Mr. Crowe referred to the City's Official Community Plan (OCP) Regional Context Statement (RCS), noting that the proposal was not consistent with the Statement, because the proposed 'permanent residential' use had not been part of the original OCP and RCS for the area. The opinion was expressed however that the third readings of the bylaw should be made by the City prior to the submission of the amending OCP and RCS to the GVRD. Advice was given by the General Manager, Urban Development, David McLellan, that Richmond could undertake such an action, however, the result could be the holding of two public hearings.

Discussion ensued among Committee members and staff, during which in response to questions, Mr. Crowe explained the process which would be followed if the application was forwarded to the GVRD prior to being submitted to a public hearing. He also provided information on the timing of the completion of an area plan (as recommended in Part 6 of the staff recommendation). Comments were also offered by Mr. McLellan regarding the Regional Context Statements created for Richmond and other municipalities within the GVRD.



# Planning Committee

Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002

---

Mr. Bob Ransford, representing the applicant, introduced Mr. Norm Hotson, of Hotson Bakker Architects, Mr. Chris Phillips, of Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg, and Mr. Hans Troeslen, to the Committee. Mr. Ransford then reviewed the proposal and the concerns of staff in detail with the Committee. A copy of the material and Mr. Ransford's submission is on file in the City Clerk's Office.

Mr. Hotson, with the use of artists' renderings and site plans, explained specific elements of the project to the Committee. Mr. Phillips reviewed the proposed landscaping for the development and how this project would be connected to the Riverport Entertainment Centre area.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and the delegation on such issues as:

- the noise generated by trains using the adjacent railroad and by existing and future recreational entertainment activities, and the impact which this could have on the proposed development
- the proposed covenants and whether children would be living in the residential component of the development
- the proposed community space and whether the rooms would be available to the public and would be of sufficient size to accommodate such activities as sports workshops
- the type of landscaping proposed for the project, and whether it would be formal in nature, natural or a combination of both
- whether the proposed dormitory would be of sufficient size to accommodate several visiting sports teams; whether there would be accommodation available for the parents of the participants; and whether any consideration had been given to increasing the size of the dormitory to accommodate additional teams
- the appeal of the proposed child minding/preschool facility to employees working in the area.

It was moved and seconded

**(1) That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 7371, to amend Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100, to:**

**(a) Redesignate 14791 Steveston Highway:**

- i) From "Commercial" to "Mixed Use" in Attachment 1 to Schedule 1, and**
- ii) From "Commercial" to "Limited Mixed Use" in Attachment 2 to Schedule 1, and**

**(b) Amend the Regional Context Statement to identify the Riverport Area as a mixed use centre, including limited residential uses,**

# Planning Committee

Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002

---

*be introduced and given first reading.*

- (2) *That Bylaw No. 7371, having been considered in conjunction with:
  - (a) the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program;
  - (b) the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plan;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 No. 7370, for the rezoning of 14791 Steveston Highway from "Athletics and Entertainment District (AE)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/134)", be introduced and given first reading.*

The question on the motion was not called, as Committee members provided their comments on the proposed project.

Cllr. Greenhill expressed her opposition to the development, advising that she did not agree with the provision of permanent residential uses in an area for which there was no plan. She also commented on the impact of existing and future noise emanating from the entertainment complex on the development, and suggested that the project did in fact have an impact on the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program.

Support for the project and forwarding the application to a public hearing to obtain the views of the public was offered by the remaining members of the Committee, although there were concerns expressed about (i) the noise issue; (ii) the railway crossing; and (iii) the size of the proposed dormitory which it was felt could be larger in size.

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

A brief discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on staff recommendation No. 4, which proposed that the public hearing be held after the GVRD's comments are received and staff comment on them in a report back to Planning Committee. Advice was given that if Committee wished the application to proceed in the usual manner, they could simply choose to ignore the proposed recommendation. As a result, it was agreed that Recommendation No. 4 would not be dealt with.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That no additional residential development be approved in the Riverport Area until an Area Plan for this area is completed.*
- (2) *That an Area Plan be undertaken for the Riverport Area.*

The question on the motion was not called, as the request was made that the recommendations be dealt with separately.

# Planning Committee

Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002

---

The question on Part (1) of the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED** with Cllr. Greenhill opposed.

The question on Part (2) of the motion was not called, as a brief discussion ensued on when staff would begin work on the development of the area plan. Advice was given that work would not commence any earlier than 2003.

The question on Part (2) of the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

It was agreed that a short recess would take place (6:00 p.m.), and the meeting reconvened at 6:03 p.m., with Cllr. Sue Halsey-Brandt absent.

12. **APPLICATION BY WESTSHORE CAPITAL INC. FOR REZONING AT 10500 SHEPHERD DRIVE FROM COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (C/D 62 - TOWNHOUSES) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (C/D 61 - SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT)**

(RZ 02-203085, Report: May 8/02, File No.: 8060-20-7364) (REDMS No. 702253, 708363, 703376)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7364, for the rezoning of 10500 Shepherd Drive from "Comprehensive Development District C/D 62 - Townhouses", to Comprehensive Development District C/D 61 - Single-Family Housing District, be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

13. **ZONING & DEVELOPMENT BYLAW 5300 AMENDMENT BYLAW 7363**

(Report: April 26/02, File No.: 8060-20-7363) (REDMS No. 700497, 700584, 702061)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw 7363, which amends Comprehensive Development District (CD/61) as it relates to single-family dwelling requirements, be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

14. **ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT FOR PENDLEBURY ROAD**

(Report: April 17/02, File No.: 8060-20-7357) (REDMS No. 680060, 679960, 692764)

Mr. Erceg briefly reviewed the report with the Committee.

(Cllr. Sue Halsey-Brandt returned to the meeting (6:04 p.m.)).

A brief discussion ensued on the retention of larger sized lots in Richmond's older subdivisions, during which advice was given that staff had been asked to look at rationalizing zones within an overall review of the Zoning & Development Bylaw to provide a broader spectrum to deal with similar situations in the future.

# Planning Committee

Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002

---

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw 7357 that would amend Division 600 of the Zoning Bylaw to require lots to front Pendlebury Road in matters regarding subdivision to ensure that corner lots are not permitted to subdivide along the side roads, be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

15. **CITY OF NEW WESTMINSTER OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT BYLAW 6730, 2002, FOR 800/900 BOYD STREET, NEW WESTMINSTER, BC**

(Report: May 21/02, File No.: 0155-00) (REDMS No. 720605)

Mr. McLellan provided information to the Committee on this matter, during which he advised that the City had offered its expertise to the City of New Westminister to undertake a traffic study for the subject area, however the proposal had been rejected.

It was moved and seconded

*That Richmond City Council advise New Westminister City Council that:*

- (1) *The proposed major commercial development at 800/900 Boyd Street may conflict with the GVRD's LRSP policy directions by encouraging major commercial development outside of a designated Regional Town Centre.*
- (2) *Prior to the consideration of the proposed New Westminister OCP amendment for 800/900 Boyd Street, the applicant be requested to expand the scope of the traffic management study for the proposed development, in consultation with Richmond staff, to include:*
  - (a) *the identification of the potential traffic impacts on the Hamilton community from the proposed development, particularly on Westminister Highway, and*
  - (b) *the development and implementation of any mitigation measures at the developer's expense to address such traffic impacts.*
- (3) *New Westminister staff be directed to report back to the City of Richmond on the outcome of the above traffic impact assessment and development of mitigation strategies, prior to the final reading of the proposed OCP amendment for New Westminister.*

**CARRIED**

# Planning Committee

Wednesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002

---

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded  
*That the meeting adjourn (6:11 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, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002.

---

Councillor Bill McNulty  
Chair

---

Fran J. Ashton  
Executive Assistant