



Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, February 4, 2014

Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair
Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Chak Au
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Harold Steves
Mayor Malcolm Brodie

Also Present: Councillor Linda McPhail

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

MINUTES

It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, January 21, 2014, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

Tuesday, February 18, 2014, (tentative date) at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room

The Chair referenced correspondence received from a Richmond resident dated February 3, 2014 (copy on file, City Clerk's Office), regarding concerns of a potential violation against the City's Tree Protection Bylaw 8057.

Planning Committee
Tuesday, February 4, 2014

As a result, the following referral was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That staff investigate the concerns raised in correspondence dated February 3, 2014 from a Richmond resident and report back.

CARRIED

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

1. **APPLICATION BY LIANG (LANCE) HUI FOR REZONING AT 5111 WILLIAMS ROAD FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E) TO SINGLE DETACHED (RS2/C)**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009098, RZ 13-647357) (REDMS No. 4131580)

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9098, for the rezoning of 5111 Williams Road from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Single Detached (RS2/C)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

2. **HAMILTON AREA PLAN UPDATE**

(File Ref. No. 08-4045-20-14/2013) (REDMS No. 4120246 v.4)

With the aid of various artist renderings, Terry Crowe, Manager Policy Planning, provided background information and highlighted the following information in regards to the proposed Hamilton Area Plan:

- the preceding phases of community consultation included several open houses, which indicated that the community supports an increase in density in the area;
- the current population of the area is approximately 5,000 people; however, the proposed Plan enables an estimated population of approximately 12,000 people;
- an increase in density supports more retail amenities and housing choices;
- the Plan includes improvements to road, sewer, and water infrastructure, as well as improvements to cycling and pedestrian realms;
- aesthetic and functional improvements, along Westminster Highway and at the intersection of Westminster Highway and Gilley Road, are anticipated to act as focal points for the area;
- there will be no changes to the established single-family and industrial areas;

2.

Planning Committee Tuesday, February 4, 2014

- there are proposed cycling and pedestrian improvements to the existing Highway 91A overpass, as well as improvements to cycling and pedestrian access to the Queensborough area; and
- there are provisions for a small police office, additional indoor recreational space, and an improved public library.

In reply to queries from the Chair, Mr. Crowe commented on the proposed new parklands and improvements to existing parklands, noting that such works will be primarily funded by development cost charges. Also, he spoke of concerns regarding the proposed new waterfront park, noting that the Parks division corresponded with adjacent property owners advising that there are no immediate plans to expropriate said lands; however, should the development of the proposed waterfront park proceed in the future, affected properties would be appraised at current market value.

Discussion ensued regarding row homes and in reply to queries from Committee, Joe Erceg, General Manager, Planning and Development, advised that the proposed Plan does not explicitly encourage such housing; however, it could be considered.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Crowe provided the following information:

- 85% of the approximate \$22 million net land lift will be allocated towards a range of community amenities;
- land lift calculations will be based on current market values and could be adjusted to reflect current market conditions;
- other lower mainland municipalities utilize a similar approach with regard to land lift contributions; and
- the proposed increase in density supports the development of new retail amenities; moreover, an increase in density in the City of New Westminster's Queensborough Plan further supports the development of such amenities.

In response to queries from Committee, Donna Chan, Manager Transportation Planning, advised that TransLink is supportive of the proposed Plan and that staff are working with TransLink to create transit plan for the area. Also, she stated that the proposed increase in density will support an increase in transit services for the area.

Planning Committee Tuesday, February 4, 2014

Mr. Crowe advised that staff reviewed the City of New Westminster's Queensborough Plan and found it to be complementary to the proposed Hamilton Area Plan. He stated that the proposed Plan enables an estimated population of approximately 12,000 people, which supports the development of new retail amenities; however, such retail amenities would have to be developed by the private sector. Also, Mr. Crowe spoke of various transportation improvements, noting that streets, pathways, bus stops, and pedestrian access points will be upgraded.

Dana Westermark, representing the Urban Development Institute's (UDI) Liaison Committee – Richmond, referenced a letter dated February 4, 2014 from the UDI (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as Schedule 1), and stated the following:

- the proposed financial framework may delay or hinder development in the area;
- new development would fund many of the proposed new amenities;
- the proposed land lift framework is concerning as there are additional miscellaneous expenses; however, these costs are not defined;
- the amenity charges levied to developers should be reviewed regularly and be based on the needs of the community; and
- there are concerns that revenues collected as part of development in the Hamilton Area would be used in other areas of Richmond.

Discussion ensued regarding: (i) the methodologies used to calculate developer contributions, (ii) defining the miscellaneous costs associated with the said contributions, and (iii) reviewing the Development Cost Charge Program periodically to adjust costs as necessary.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Erceg noted that revenue collected as part of development in a particular area is not bound to remain in the same area that the development took place.

Mr. Westermark, representing Oris Consulting Ltd., spoke of the proposed Plan and the following was noted:

- following a study on the viability of commercial expansion in the area, it was found that the proposed increase in population supports the demand for more retail amenities;
- appropriate retail for the area consists of smaller retail stores as opposed to large retail chains;
- it is likely that Queensborough community members will utilize the amenities anticipated for the area; and
- there is concern with the methodologies used to calculate developer contributions to help fund future amenities.

Planning Committee Tuesday, February 4, 2014

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Westermark commented on the initial phases of the proposed Plan, noting that retail development, ranging from 10,000 to 12,000 square feet in size, would be concentrated on the north west corner of Gilley Road, and that businesses in the existing mall would relocate to this location. Also, he was of the opinion that there is an expectation that a seniors home be constructed nearby, which would make other retail opportunities, such as a pharmacy, more viable.

Mr. Westermark then commented on later phases of the proposed Plan, noting that retail spaces would expand to other areas along Gilley Road; however, such retailers would be smaller in size but would address the day-to-day needs of local residents.

Heather Hicks and Craig Surnik, 23171 Westminster Highway, raised concern with regard to parts of the proposed Plan. Mr. Surnik presented Committee with a petition (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as Schedule 2) signed by affected residents, citing concerns with the proposed waterfront park and the extension of Willet Avenue through to River Road. It was noted that residents are concerned regarding (i) the potential loss of property value, (ii) possible challenges with remortgaging affected properties, (iii) possible negative impacts to the surround environment, including damage to the wildlife habitat, (iv) an increase in traffic and the corresponding increase in pollution, and (v) the potential solicitation by developers.

Discussion ensued and in reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Erceg noted that the City is not proposing to rezone the properties affected by the future waterfront park and the expansion of Willet Avenue. The proposed designations however should not affect an owner's ability to remortgage his or her property. Also, he stated that the City's Land Acquisition Strategy is based on the future growth in the area and that the City acquires land as it becomes available.

Mayor Brodie left the meeting (5:18 p.m.) and returned (5:19 p.m.).

Walloce Sohl, 22760 River Road, expressed his support for the proposed Plan and suggested that the City develop well designed parks in an effort to attract visitors. Also, he suggested that other attractions such as a pier be constructed for recreational fishing.

Linda Reid, 8040 Garden City Road, spoke in favour of the proposed Plan, and in particular the future development of amenities such as the expansion of the public library. Ms. Reid was of the opinion that redevelopment of this area would ameliorate the Hamilton community's connection with the rest of Richmond. Also, she noted that future redevelopment of the area would generate employment opportunities for local residents.

Discussion ensued regarding the importance of collaboration with other levels of government in an effort to improve neighbourhoods like Hamilton.

Planning Committee
Tuesday, February 4, 2014

Discussion further ensued related to the potential expansion of schools in the area, and in particular, the potential for a new high school that would serve both the Hamilton and Queensborough neighbourhoods.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 9078, that replaces Schedule 14 of the Hamilton Area Plan be introduced and given first reading and be referred to a Special Council meeting for a Public Hearing to be held on Tuesday, February 25, 2014 at 7:00 pm in the Council Chambers at Richmond City Hall;*
- (2) *That Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 9078, 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 found to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3) (a) of the Local Government Act;
- (3) *That Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 9078, be referred to the Agricultural Land Commission for comment for the Public Hearing, in accordance with Section 882(3) (c) of the Local Government Act;*
- (4) *That, in accordance with section 879 (2) (b) of the Local Government Act and OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 9078, be referred to the following bodies for comment for the Public Hearing:*
 - (a) *the Council of the City of New Westminster, and*
 - (b) *the Board of Education of School District No. 38 (Richmond);*
- (5) *That Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 9078, be referred to the Urban Development Institute (Richmond Branch) for comment for the Public Hearing; and*
- (6) *That staff bring forward amendments to Development Cost Charges Imposition Bylaw 8024, no later than 2015 in order to add Hamilton Area Plan DCCs to the City-wide DCC review process.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued regarding the proposed financial framework in relation to the miscellaneous costs.

Staff advised that there are different manners in which amenity contribution rates can be reviewed, and that historically, there have been instances when rates have been adjusted to reflect current market conditions.

Planning Committee
Tuesday, February 4, 2014

Committee expressed their support for the proposed Plan, noting that the Plan be adopted in a timely manner.

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

3. MANAGER'S REPORT

(a) Railway Avenue Rezoning Application

Wayne Craig, Director, Development, advised that the applicant anticipates conducting a second round of public consultation towards the end of February 2014.

(b) Duck Island

Mr. Craig advised that Duck Island proponents have engaged a First Nations consultant and are preparing a public consultation plan. The proponents have indicated that their first point of contact will be with the Musqueam Indian Band and Tsawwassen Nations.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (5:53 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 4,
2014.

Councillor Bill McNulty
Chair

Evangel Biason
Auxiliary Committee Clerk



URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE – PACIFIC REGION
#200 – 602 West Hastings Street
Vancouver, British Columbia V6B 1P2 Canada
T. 604.669.9585 F. 604.689.8691
www.udl.bc.ca

February 4, 2014

Councillor Bill McNulty
Chair of the Richmond Planning Committee
and members of the Committee
City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, British Columbia V6Y 2C1

Dear Chair and Planning Committee Members:

Re: Development Financing for the Proposed Hamilton Area Plan

The Urban Development Institute (UDI) is supportive of Council's efforts to develop an Area Plan for the Hamilton community. As the Lower Mainland's population increases, more infill development in existing neighbourhoods is needed, if we are going to grow sustainably. The proposed *Hamilton Area Plan* represents a positive step in this direction.

We do, however, believe more discussion is needed regarding the proposed development financing in the *Plan*. We have been seeking a meeting with staff on this matter, and would like to meet with them in advance of the proposed *Plan* going to Public Hearing in a few weeks.

In the *Hamilton Area Plan*, Richmond is proposing to increase what is funded by new development projects - libraries, police stations and community centres. UDI has always supported the principle that growth must pay for itself, however, we have concerns (detailed below) that under the proposals, new development could be paying for more than this.

We also ask that land vendors be consulted on the implications of the proposed fee increases on their property values. Staff note in their Report that they are "... balancing City, community, and developer interests," but little mention is made of land owner interests. The argument put forward by local governments is that vendors pay for development charges. If that is the case, land owners should understand what the implications of the proposed charges are on their property values.

UDI is supportive of some of the elements in the development financing proposals:

- Richmond has prioritized what community facilities it would like in the Hamilton area (a police station, library and expanded community centre);
- The City is using legitimate financing tools in the *Local Government Act*, such as Development Cost Charges (DCCs) and density bonusing; and

- Staff have established actual dollar figures for the density bonusing charges on a per square foot basis, so developers can more easily assess what they should pay for sites.

We have several questions and concerns that we would like to discuss with staff before the Public Hearing, including:

- The potential **Impact the charges may have on delaying or hindering development** in the area.
- **New growth is paying for many of the new facilities** that will be used by current residents.

Richmond is using a land lift approach, which has nothing to do with the actual costs of the facilities.

- The City of Richmond already extracts funds for public art, childcare and affordable housing from new development. **There may not be the financial capacity to fund community facilities as well as the "Miscellaneous" items proposed by the City.**
- **A clause should be added that density bonusing charges can be changed over time**, so the proposed "Miscellaneous" items in the staff report can be removed.
- **We are concerned that some of the revenue collected in the Hamilton Area will be used outside of the neighbourhood.**

UDI is very supportive of the positive changes being proposed in the Hamilton Area by the City. However, we would like to meet with staff to discuss the implications of the development financing provisions in the draft *Plan* that could undermine its success. They should also be discussed with land owners in the area. We look forward to working with Council and staff as the *Hamilton Area Plan* moves forward.

Yours Truly



Anne McMullin
President and CEO
Urban Development Institute

