



## Planning Committee

Date: Thursday, August 15, 2002  
Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall  
Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair  
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt  
Councillor Howard  
Absent: Councillor Lyn Greenhill, Vice-Chair  
Councillor Linda Barnes  
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 Planning Committee held on Tuesday, July 16, 2002, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

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

### URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **APPLICATION FOR A PERMANENT CHANGE TO A CLASS "B" LIQUOR LICENCE TO ALLOW FOR ENTERTAINMENT AT 7551 WESTMINSTER HIGHWAY**

(Report: August 6/02, File No.: 8275-05) (REDMS No. 826523)

The Manager, Zoning, Alan Clark, was present to answer questions.

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 15, 2002

---

It was moved and seconded

*That the application by the Richmond Hotel to the Liquor Control and Licencing Branch for a permanent change to a Class "B" Liquor Licence to allow for entertainment be supported, and that the Liquor Control and Licencing Branch be advised:*

- i) of this recommendation; and*
- ii) that the R.C.M.P. does not object.*

**CARRIED**

4. **APPLICATION FOR A CLASS "B" LIQUOR LICENCE WITH AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (KARAOKE) AT UNIT 100 - 7911 ALDERBRIDGE WAY**

(Report: July 23/02, File No.: 8275-05) (REDMS No. 818407)

The Manager, Zoning, Alan Clark, was present to answer questions.

It was moved and seconded

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

- i) of this recommendation; and*
- ii) that the R.C.M.P. does not object.*

**CARRIED**

5. **ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT BYLAW 5300 AMENDMENT BYLAW 7416**

(Report: August 8/02, File No.: 8060-20-7416) (REDMS No. 829243, 829720)

The Manager, Zoning, Alan Clark, was present to answer questions.

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw 7416 which amends Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300 as it relates to covered areas of the principal building in Comprehensive Development District (CD/28), be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 15, 2002

---

6. **APPLICATION BY AMAR SANDHU FOR REZONING AT 8411 STEVESTON HIGHWAY FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA K (R1/K)**  
(RZ 02-203809 - Report: June 10/02, File No.: RZ-02-203809) (REDMS No. 716462)

Mr. Patrick Cotter, architect, representing the applicant, with the aid of photoboards and a site plan, responded to questions pertaining to the existing neighbouring development and the proposed length of the lane at completion. Further to this, Mr. Cotter said that the current proposal, (for garages in the front and a covenant on title for temporary use of the land required for the lane and cross access agreement/utilities right-of way ) was a compromise that would allow for the longer term objectives of the lane policy to be met, while, in the interim, enhancing the marketability of the project. Mr. Cotter said that the application was consistent with the type of development usually considered for arterial roads and would not impact the existing streetscape and also that the Lane Policy jeopardizes the feasibility of creating small lots along arterial roads.

A discussion ensued during which concern was expressed for the difficulties that could be incurred at the point in the future when the land dedicated for the lane was required and the need for full disclosure of the land dedications to prospective purchasers of the property.

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, said that staff do not support the rezoning and that, further to this, in reviewing the considerable number of new lots processed in the last year under the Lane Policy and Arterial Road Redevelopment Policy, the current policies do not appear to impede the type of development being discussed.

Mr. Sandhu, the applicant, questioned the marketability of the lots referred to by Mr. Erceg.

It was moved and seconded

*That the rezoning of 8411 Steveston Highway from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area K (R1/K)" be approved.*

Prior to the question being called a discussion ensued that resulted in the following **referral** motion being introduced:

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 15, 2002

---

It was moved and seconded

*That the rezoning of 8411 Steveston Highway from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area K (R1/K)" be referred to staff to clarify with the applicant:*

- i) details of the land dedication;*
- ii) rights of way for servicing; and*
- iii) payment of a Neighbourhood Improvement Charge contribution.*

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

7. **REZONING OF THE EASTERLY PORTION OF 9060 BRIDGEPORT ROAD, ALL OF THE WINNIPEG ROAD ALLOWANCE AND THE WESTERLY 4 M OF 9100 BRIDGEPORT ROAD FROM "SERVICE STATION DISTRICT (G2)" AND SCHOOL AND PUBLIC USE (SPU) TO "COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/136)"**  
(RZ 02-212736- Report: July 26/02, File No.: 8060-20-7413) (REDMS No. 735010, 735156)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, was available to answer questions.

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7413 for the rezoning of 9060 Bridgeport Road, all of the Winnipeg Road allowance and the westerly 4 metres of 9100 Bridgeport Road from "Service Station District (G2)" and School and Public Use (SPU) to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/136)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 15, 2002

---

8. **AMENDMENT TO STEVESTON AREA PLAN OF THE OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN**

(Report: August 7/02, File No.: 4045-20-04-TR) (REDMS No. 800418, 685254, 823748, 822097)

The General Manager, Urban Development, David McLellan, advised the Committee that as the Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, perceived himself to be in a conflict of interest on this matter due to the location of his residence, he had signed off on the report in Mr. Crowe's place. Mr. McLellan provided a brief history of the Trites Road area and the different levels of interest that have made difficult the development of an Area Plan for the Trites Road area.

Ms. Janet Lee, Planner, reviewed the provisions that would be made to buffer the new residential development from the existing industrial use.

Mr. Porte, 1665 W. Broadway, said that he was not opposed to the rezoning but was concerned i) about the siting of the various townhouses including the location of rooms and the required setbacks; ii) that future buyers be made aware that they would be adjacent to fairly intensive industrial use (and the range of those uses); and iii) that future development of his industrial property not be precluded by the proposed development and those that may come forth in the near future.

It was moved and seconded

(1) *That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 7408, which amends Schedule 2.4 of Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100, by amending the Steveston Area Land Use Plan to redesignate 12380, 12420 and 12440 Trites Road from "Industrial" to "Single Family", and 12511 No. 2 Road from "Industrial" to "Multiple Family", be introduced and given first reading.*

(2) *That Bylaw No. 7408, having been considered in conjunction with:*

*i) the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program;*

*ii) 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.*

**CARRIED**

9. **APPLICATION BY PROGRESSIVE CONSTRUCTION LTD. FOR REZONING AT 12440 TRITES ROAD FROM I2 (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT) TO CD/61 (COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT) AND R1/K (SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT)**

(RZ 97-121285, Report: August 8/02, File No.: 8060-20-7409) (REDMS No. 539012, 818598, 818615)

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 15, 2002

---

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, was present to answer questions.

Ms. Allison Davis, Progressive Construction Ltd., said that the I2 designation of the industrial property adjacent to the subject property contained a provision for no heavy industry and no nuisance by way of odor, glare, vibration etc. Further to this, Ms. Davis said that buffering requirements had been taken into account and also that future purchasers would be advised that the industrial use of the adjacent property would be for an indefinite term.

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7409, for the rezoning of 12440 Trites Road from "I2 (Light Industrial District)" to "CD/61 (Comprehensive Development District)" and "R1/K (Single-Family Housing District)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

10. **APPLICATION BY SUNCOR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND PANSTAR DEVELOPMENT LTD. FOR REZONING AT 12380 AND 12420 TRITES ROAD FROM I2 (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT) TO CD/61 (COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT)**

(RZ- 02-202838, Report: August 8/02, File No.: 8060-20-7410) (REDMS No. 782147, 818654, 818643)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg, in response to a question, provided the information that contributions to the Public Art program were voluntary, and that in this case, had been declined. Contributions would be made, however, to frontage works and construction of a pedestrian walkway system.

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 7410, for the rezoning of 12380 and 12420 Trites Road from "I2 (Light Industrial District)" to "CD/61 (Comprehensive Development District)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

11. **SERVICE LEVEL REVIEW - ZONING DEPARTMENT**  
(Report: August 2/02, File No.: 0340-20-UDEV1) (REDMS No. 825250, 677733)

The Manager, Zoning, Alan Clark, reviewed and responded to questions on the Zoning Department service levels.

It was moved and seconded

*That the report (dated August 2nd, 2002 from the Manager, Zoning) regarding departmental levels of service, be received for information.*

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, August 15, 2002

---

**CARRIED**

Mayor Brodie left the meeting.

12. **SERVICE LEVEL REVIEW - POLICY PLANNING DEPARTMENT**  
(Report: August 2/02, File No.: 0340-20-UDEV1) (REDMS No. 822052, 821733)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, reviewed and responded to questions on the Policy Planning Department service levels. A handout provided by Mr. Crowe is attached as Schedule 1 and forms a part of these minutes.

It was moved and seconded

*That the report (dated August 2, 2002 from the Manager, Policy Planning), be received for information.*

13. **MANAGER'S REPORT**

There were no reports.

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (10:15 a.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 Thursday, August 15, 2002.

---

Councillor Bill McNulty  
Chair

---

Deborah MacLennan  
Administrative Assistant

**Handout**  
**2002 Policy Planning Department Review**  
**City of Richmond**

**1. Intermunicipal Planning Staff Comparisons**

The charts below show the community planning staff resources of certain GVRD municipalities.

While allowances must be made for the specific responsibilities which community planners are assigned in other municipalities, the information shows that:

- Richmond is efficient
- has fewer community planners dedicated to policy work than other municipalities on a per capita basis.

**(1) Planning Staff \* Estimates in Certain GVRD Municipalities - All Planning Staff**

**a) Ranked by Municipal Population size**

<b>Chart 1</b> <b>All Planning Staff - Ranked by Municipal Population Size</b> <b>Planning Staff * Estimates in Certain GVRD Cities/Municipalities</b>					
City	City Population	Current Planning (e.g. Dev. Apps.)	Policy Planning Staff **	Total Planning Staff	Pop. Served/ Planning Staff
Vancouver ***	571,708	54	60	114	5,014:1
Surrey	347,800	33	7	40	8,695:1
Burnaby	193,954	13	14	27	7,183:1
<b>Richmond</b>	<b>165,000</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9,700:1</b>
Coquitlam	112,890	11	9.5	20.5	5,506:1
Delta	97,208	5	7	12	8,100:1
Dist. North Vancouver	86,800	8	8	16	5,425:1
City of North Vancouver	44,330	6	5	11	4,030:1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,619,690</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>119.5</b>	<b>257.5</b>	
<b>Average</b>	<b>202,461</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>6,706:1</b>

**b) Ranked by Population Served per Planning Staff**

<b>Chart 2</b> <b>All Planning Staff Ranked by Population Served Per All Planning Staff</b> <b>Planning Staff * Estimates in Certain GVRD Cities/Municipalities</b>					
City	City Population	Current Planning (e.g. Dev. Apps.)	Policy Planning Staff **	Total Planning Staff	Pop. Served/ Planning Staff
<b>Best</b>					
1. City of North Vancouver	44,330	6	5	11	4,030:1
2. Vancouver ***	571,708	54	60	114	5,014:1
3. Dist. North Vancouver	86,800	8	8	16	5,425:1
4. Coquitlam	112,890	11	9.5	20.5	5,506:1
5. Burnaby	193,954	13	14	27	7,183:1
<b>Average</b>	<b>202,461</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>6,706:1</b>
6. Delta	97,208	5	7	12	8,100:1
7. Surrey	347,800	33	7	40	8,695:1
8. Richmond	<b>165,000</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9,700:1</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,619,690</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>119.5</b>	<b>257.5</b>	



## (2) Planning Staff \* Estimates in Certain GVRD Municipalities - Policy Planning Staff Only

## a) Ranked by Municipal Population Size

<b>Chart 3</b>			
<b>Policy Planning Staff Only - Ranked by Municipal Population Size</b>			
<b>Planning Staff * Estimates in Certain GVRD Cities/Municipalities</b>			
<b>City</b>	<b>City Population</b>	<b>Policy Planning Staff</b>	<b>Pop. Served/ Policy Planning Staff</b>
1. Vancouver***	571,708	60	9,528:1
2. Surrey	347,800	7	49,685:1
3. Burnaby	193,954	14	13,853:1
<b>4. Richmond</b>	<b>165,000</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>18,333:1</b>
5. Coquitlam	112,890	9.5	11,883:1
6. Delta	97,208	7	13,886:1
7. Dist. North Vancouver	86,800	8	10,850:1
8. City of North Vancouver	44,330	5	8,866:1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,619,690</b>	<b>119.5</b>	<b>13,554:1</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>202,461</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>13,588:1</b>

## b) Planner Staff - Pop Ratios

<b>Chart 4</b>			
<b>Policy Planning Staff Only - Ranked by Population Served Per Policy Planning Staff</b>			
<b>Planning Staff * Estimates in Certain GVRD Cities/Municipalities</b>			
<b>City</b>	<b>City Population</b>	<b>Policy Planning Staff</b>	<b>Pop. Served/ Policy Planning Staff</b>
Best			
1. City of North Vancouver	44,330	5	8,866:1
2. Vancouver***	571,708	60	9,528:1
3. Dist. North Vancouver	86,800	8	10,850:1
4. Coquitlam	112,890	9.5	11,883:1
5. Burnaby	193,954	14	13,853:1
6. Delta	97,208	7	13,886:1
<b>Average</b>	<b>202,461</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>13,588:1</b>
7. Richmond	165,000	9	18,333:1
8. Surrey	347,800	7	49,685:1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,619,690</b>	<b>119.5</b>	<b>13,554:1</b>

Source: PPD Staff research July 2 002

**Notes:**

- \* Includes exempt staff, planner, planning technician/assistant estimates
  - \*\* Includes social and cultural planning staff estimates
  - \*\*\* Includes exempt staff, planner, planning technician/assistant estimates located in various City departments (Social Planning, Development Services, Housing, Current and City Plan Departments)
- All Municipal Policy Planning sections include a social planning staff component

## 2. PPD Efficiency Efforts

Recent PPD efficiency efforts include:

- reassigned duties
- more effort into social planning issues
- better data management
- reviewed advisory committee terms of reference
- share work with City Departments and partners
- implement recent rezoning and development application efficiencies
- eliminated one community planner position in 2002

## 3. PPD Messages

- (1.) PPD Community Planners provide 10 core services daily.
- (2.) PPD Community Planners do more than rezonings.
- (3.) When development applications are down, PPD staff are busy with nine (9) other Core Service areas.
- (4.) Policy co-ordination, monitoring and preparation among federal, provincial, regional (e.g., GVRD) and private sector stakeholders is increasing, for example:
  - in social, land use and environmental planning
  - draft Community Charter implications
  - proposed Streamside Regulations
  - Provincial gaming policies
  - GVRD Livable Region Strategic Plan (LRSP) review
  - provincial privatization, (e.g., BC Hydro privatization)
- (5.) Social Planning policy issues:
  - are increasing (e.g., aging population)
  - can be controversial (e.g., group homes, affordable housing, child care)
  - often require committees (e.g., many stakeholders)
  - require much co-ordination and consultation. (e.g., to manage many interests)
  - require a better model and criteria to determine when the City provides and does not provide social planning assistance
- (6.) Formal and informal committees are necessary to prepare meaningful policies.
- (7.) PPD staff support to advisory and community committees is:
  - increasing
  - taking up considerable time.
  - making it difficult to support additional committees.
- (8.) Some committees do not have an annual operating budgets (e.g., for speakers, publications, consultations, refreshments)
- (9.) PDD overtime is being exceed each year.
- (10.) Results
 

PPD staff notice that:

  - it is taking longer to prepare reports and address referrals
  - needed policy work is being deferred
  - participation in some initiatives is not being done.

#### 4. Considerations

To address these issues and opportunities, the following possibilities are presented for discussion:

##### 1. Status Quo.

- same corporate work models (e.g., productivity, customer service, strategic planning)
- same social planning model
- same workload
- same budget
- same results and progress

##### 2. Reduce Workloads

- same corporate work models (e.g., productivity, customer service, strategic planning)
- prioritize:
  - new social planning model to determine what social initiatives are supported
  - prioritize social, land use and environmental assistance.
- reduce workload accordingly (e.g., committees, projects per year, work preparation times)
- same budget
- improved results and progress in selected areas

##### 3. Increase Resources

- same corporate work models (e.g., productivity, customer service, strategic planning)
- prioritize:
  - new social planning model to determine what social initiatives are supported
  - prioritize social, land use and environmental assistance.
- same high volume of work (e.g., committees, projects per year, work preparation times)
- increased budget, for example:
  - overtime
  - 1 planner position
  - committee operating budgets
- improved results and progress in many areas.

Prepared by:  
 Policy Planning Department  
 Urban Development Division  
 City of Richmond