



## Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, April 7, 2021

Place: Council Chambers  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Linda McPhail, Chair  
Councillor Alexa Loo  
Councillor Carol Day (by teleconference)  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Harold Steves (by teleconference)

Also Present: Councillor Chak Au (by teleconference)  
Councillor Michael Wolfe (by teleconference)

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 March 2, 2021, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

April 21, 2021, (tentative date) at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, April 7, 2021**

---

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**

1. **2021 – 2031 RICHMOND CHILD CARE ACTION PLAN**

(File Ref. No. 07-3070-01) (REDMS No. 6625123)

Discussion ensued with regard to (i) prioritizing child care development in areas of the city where there is high demand for child care (ii) researching the demographic and the place of residence of Richmond child care users, and (iii) encouraging the development of child care spaces in new developments.

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that current legislation permits 24-hour child care, however there are no child care providers that offer such service in Richmond.

It was suggested that the 2021-2031 Richmond Child Care Action plan be referred to the Council/School Board Liaison Committee.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the 2021 – 2031 Richmond Child Care Action Plan as outlined in the staff report titled, “2021 – 2031 Richmond Child Care Action Plan,” dated February 25, 2021, from the Director, Community Social Development, be adopted; and*
- (2) *That the 2021 – 2031 Richmond Child Care Action Plan be referred to the Council/School Board Liaison Committee.*

**CARRIED**

Discussion then ensued regarding options to encourage contributions for child care spaces in new developments, and as a result, the following **referral motion** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

*That staff explore a policy or bylaw for contribution for a certain percentage for child care spaces for all new developments, similar to the City’s policies for affordable housing, and report back.*

The question on the motion was not called as staff responded to queries, noting that there are provisions in the Official Community Plan for developer child care contributions. Staff added that several proposed early childhood development hubs will be opening in the city and staff can provide Council with information on proposed future child care developments and current child care providers.

It was suggested that staff explore broad options to increase child care spaces in the city, and as a result, the following **amendment motion** was introduced:

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, April 7, 2021**

---

It was moved and seconded

*That the referral motion for staff to explore a policy or bylaw for contribution for a certain percentage for child care spaces for all new developments, be amended to the following:*

*That staff explore options to increase child care in Richmond, including priority areas and opportunities to remove potential regulatory barriers, and report back.*

**CARRIED**

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

2. **APPLICATION BY VAN LAND USE CONSULTING FOR A ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE “INDUSTRIAL RETAIL (IR1)” ZONE TO PERMIT A RETAIL LIQUOR STORE AT 12571 BRIDGEPORT ROAD**

(File Ref. No. ZT 20-909767) (REDMS No. 6615268 v. 3)

Staff reviewed the application, noting that the application is not consistent with the Bridgeport Area Plan, the Industrial Lands Intensification Initiative and City policies related to liquor licence applications, and as a result, staff are recommending that the application be denied.

Discussion ensued with regard to (i) the types of other commercial retailers in the area, (ii) the proximity of the proposed retail liquor store to other liquor stores in the city and, (iii) the application process for retail liquor stores.

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that the subject site’s current zoning restricts retail uses to sales of building materials and restaurants.

Joe Van Vliet, applicant, expressed concern with regard to the retail liquor permit application process and industrial retail zoning noting that (i) there are existing commercial retailers in the area, (ii) there is residential support for the application, and (iii) the proposed application is not in close proximity to other liquor retailers in the city. He added that as a result of another liquor store relocating, there will not be a net increase of liquor stores in Richmond.

It was moved and seconded

*That the application for a Zoning Text Amendment to the “Industrial Retail (IR1)” zone to permit a retail liquor store at 12571 Bridgeport Road be approved.*

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to the retail liquor permit application process and the proximity of existing retail liquor stores to the subject site.

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, April 7, 2021**

---

The question on the motion was then called and it was **DEFEATED** with Cllrs. McPhail, Day and Steves opposed.

It was moved and seconded

*That the application for a Zoning Text Amendment to the “Industrial Retail (IRI)” zone to permit a retail liquor store at 12571 Bridgeport Road be denied.*

**CARRIED**

3. **APPLICATION BY FIREWORK PRODUCTIONS LTD. FOR A TEMPORARY COMMERCIAL USE PERMIT RENEWAL AT 8351 RIVER ROAD AND DUCK ISLAND (LOT 87 SECTION 21 BLOCK 5 NORTH RANGE 6 WEST PLAN 34592)**

(File Ref. No. TU 20-905119) (REDMS No. 6612513 v. 4)

Staff reviewed the application, noting that the event would require compliance with Provincial Public Health orders and a submission of a noise management plan to the City.

Discussion ensued with regard to options to mitigate the event’s noise impact on surrounding areas. Staff noted that a noise study on the site will occur prior to the start of the event and that noise monitoring will occur during the entirety of the event.

Raymond Cheung, spoke on the application, noting that there are bicycle parking provisions on-site.

It was moved and seconded

*(1) That the application by Firework Productions Ltd. for a Temporary Commercial Use Permit Renewal at 8351 River Road and Duck Island (Lot 87, Section 21 Block 5 North Range 6 West Plan 34592) be considered at the Public Hearing to be held on May 17, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Richmond City Hall, and that the following recommendation be forwarded to that meeting for consideration:*

*“That a Temporary Commercial Use Permit be issued to Firework Productions Ltd. for properties at 8351 River Road and Duck Island (Lot 87, Section 21 Block 5 North Range 6 West Plan 34592) for the purposes of permitting the following:*

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, April 7, 2021**

---

- (a) *Night market event between May 21, 2021 to December 31, 2021 (inclusive) to allow for a maximum of 80 event operational days in accordance with identified dates and hours as outlined in Schedule C attached to the Temporary Commercial Use Permit;*
  - (b) *Night market event between April 29, 2022 to October 16, 2022 (inclusive) for a maximum of 80 event operational days in accordance with identified dates and hours as outlined in Schedule C attached to the Temporary Commercial Use Permit;*
  - (c) *Night market event between April 28, 2023 to October 15, 2023 (inclusive) for a maximum of 79 event operational days in accordance with identified dates and hours as outlined in Schedule C attached to the Temporary Commercial Use Permit; and*
  - (d) *The night market event as outlined in the report dated March 17, 2021 from the Director of Development be subject to the fulfillment of all terms, conditions and requirements outlined in the Temporary Commercial Use Permit and attached Schedules.”*
- (2) *That the Public Hearing notification area be extended to include all properties to the north of Bridgeport Road and West of Great Canadian Way as shown in Attachment 5 to the staff report dated March 17, 2021 from the Director of Development.*

**CARRIED**

4. **MARKET RENTAL AGREEMENT (HOUSING AGREEMENT) BYLAW 10243 TO PERMIT THE CITY OF RICHMOND TO SECURE MARKET RENTAL HOUSING UNITS AT 9900 NO. 3 ROAD AND 8031 WILLIAMS ROAD**

(File Ref. No. RZ 18-835532; 12-8060-20-010243) (REDMS No. 6611248 v. 2)

It was moved and seconded

*That Market Rental Agreement (Housing Agreement) (9900 No. 3 Road and 8031 Williams Road) Bylaw 10243 to permit the City to enter into a Market Rental Agreement (Housing Agreement) substantially in the form attached hereto, in accordance with the requirements of Section 483 of the Local Government Act, to secure the Market Rental Housing Units required by Rezoning Application RZ 18-835532, be introduced and given first, second and third readings.*

**CARRIED**

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, April 7, 2021**

---

5. **AMENDMENT TO THE APPOINTMENT OF AN APPROVING OFFICER**

(File Ref. No. 08-4100-00) (REDMS No. 6625826)

It was moved and seconded

*That the appointment of Reg Adams as Approving Officer for the City, as per Item 7 of Resolution R08/15-4, adopted by Council on September 8, 2008, be rescinded.*

**CARRIED**

6. **UPDATE ON THE CITY OF RICHMOND TREE PROTECTION BYLAW NO. 8057**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-008057/10246/10247) (REDMS No. 6597355)

Correspondence received from Sharon MacGougan, President, Garden City Conservation Society, (attached to and forming part of these minutes as Schedule 1), and Kerry Starchuk, Richmond resident (attached to and forming part of these minutes as Schedule 2) was distributed.

Discussion ensued with regard to (i) the various criteria for issuing tree permits including size, health and species, (ii) exploring increasing maximum fines for unauthorized tree removal, (iii) the average lifespan of trees in Richmond, (iv) utilizing appropriate tree species for replanting, (v) removing potentially hazardous trees (vi) maintaining the city's tree canopy, (vii) options to protect low growth trees and shrubs, (viii) protecting trees during construction and during property landscaping maintenance, and (ix) outreaching to residents for tree protection education and awareness.

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that (i) fines for unauthorized tree removal can range from \$1,000 to \$10,000, however the Provincial courts can authorize higher amounts if requested by the City, (ii) trees that pose a hazard to public safety are typically approved for removal, (iii) there is a process in place to inspect replacement trees, and (iv) staff can explore implementing a tree sale in the City.

John Roston, Richmond resident, referenced his submission (attached to and forming part of these minutes as Schedule 3), and expressed support for the proposed regulations and additional enhancements to protect trees. He spoke on strengthening enforcement, the benefits of planting additional trees and improving the City's list of replacement trees and tree replacement procedure.

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, April 7, 2021**

---

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Tree Protection Bylaw 8057, Amendment Bylaw 10246 amending regulations for tree removal and replacement be introduced and given first, second and third reading; and*
- (2) *That Consolidated Fees Bylaw 8636, Amendment Bylaw 10247 amending the Tree Protection Bylaw permit fees table be introduced and given first, second and third reading.*

**CARRIED**

Discussion took place with regard to updating the Suitable Trees for Replanting list and options to enhance public education on appropriate tree planting methods, and as a result, the following **referral motion** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

*That staff review the Suitable Trees for Replanting list and tree planting information on the City's website, and report back.*

**CARRIED**

Discussion ensued with regard to the recommended maximum number of allowable trees in a lot, and as a result, the following **referral motion** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

*That staff review the recommended maximum number of trees in a residential lot, and report back.*

**CARRIED**

Discussion ensued with regard to the destruction of old-growth forest in the province and it was noted that the City of Port Moody has drafted a resolution on the matter to be forwarded to the Union of British Columbia Municipalities, and as a result, the following **notice of motion** was provided:

It was moved and seconded

*That the following motion and associated background information be included at the next Planning Committee meeting agenda:*

*That the City of Richmond endorse and support the old-growth forest resolution passed by the City of Port Moody on March 23, 2021.*

**CARRIED**

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, April 7, 2021**

---

7. **MANAGER'S REPORT**

(i) *Director of Policy Planning*

Joe Erceg, General Manager, Planning and Development, announced that John Hopkins has been appointed as the new Director of Policy Planning.

(ii) *Housing Referral Report*

Mr. Erceg noted that staff will be reporting back on various housing-related referrals including market rental housing policies, Low-End Market Rental Strategy, and Rental Restriction on Strata Councils at an upcoming Planning Committee meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded  
*That the meeting adjourn (5:51 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, April 7, 2021.

---

Councillor Linda McPhail  
Chair

---

Evangel Biason  
Legislative Services Associate



TO: MAYOR & EACH  
COUNCILLOR  
FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the  
Planning Committee meeting of  
Richmond City Council held on  
Wednesday, April 7, 2021.

**From:** Sharon MacGougan, President, Garden City Conservation Society, Richmond  
**To:** Richmond Planning Committee meeting, April 7, 2021  
**Re:** Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057, amendments

Dear Planning Committee,

The Garden City Conservation Society supports the proposed amendments. Our concern is to mitigate ecological loss in Richmond, and trees are a key element of biodiversity. Planting more trees, especially bird habitat trees, is a good idea.

We have a few comments and suggestions about the trees in Richmond neighbourhoods:

- **Large, healthy, mature trees have value.** They take decades to reach maturity, and their ecological benefits increase greatly over many years. We lose a lot when these trees are cut. We are not currently replacing decades-old trees in a way that is commensurate with what we lose when they are eliminated.
- **Planting a sapling does not make up for killing an eighty-year-old tree.** In this time of rapid ecological loss, we need more than ever to protect what we can, in as many ingenious ways as possible. At the very least, we need to give back as much as we take away.
- **“Review the current value of replacement trees”** was the referral to staff at the Talisman public hearing when this issue of valuation of mature trees came up. A summary of current practice has been given, perhaps as a first step in a response. But has there been a review?
- **The kind of tree planted is important.** Birds need habitat. The number of birds in North America has declined by 3 billion birds since the 1970s, and loss of habitat is the number one cause. Birds don't have trees to make nests in neighbourhoods where large mature trees are routinely replaced by decorative smaller trees.
- **Can we mandate better bird-habitat trees in clearer ways?** That would balance this helpful statement of what to avoid: “We **DO NOT** accept the following as replacement trees: hedging cedars, palm trees, banana plants, dwarf species or topiaries.” That's from a City of Richmond Bulletin, “Tree Bylaw Section (Replacement Tree Guideline) 2012/12/18”.
- **We can build for birds.** Cities can track how bird-friendly their forest canopy cover is with *Building for Birds*. It would be great if Richmond could use this tool when planning the mandate and when measuring the effectiveness of the bylaw in maintaining bird habitats in different neighbourhoods. Birds are part of our community, and we do future generations a favour when we plan for the future community of birds in Richmond.

RECEIVED

APR 07 2021

RECEIVED



- **We need to discourage pollarding.** That extreme way of pruning trees that are mature enough to be useful for birds makes them useless for it. Pollarding appears to be increasing at multi-unit development sites, and this practice negates ecological give-back to a neighbourhood.
- **We need more public education about tree topping.** As the City staff who deal with trees know, topping trees is very harmful to them. Unfortunately, the harmful behaviour seems increasingly common.
- **We need to get a handle on the extent of tree loss.** One facet is that trees are disappearing from yards and not being replaced, as I notice on my walks. To me it means the situation is worse than realized and that new or better-implemented strategies are needed. That might include a persuasive awareness campaign.
- **We can apply our public-lands values to neighbourhoods.** Mixed groups of good habitat trees are being planted on our public lands. For example, the City has helped establish a wonderful variety of street trees on the north side of Alderbridge Way, east of No. 4 Road. It is like a small mixed forest—the way a forest grows.

In closing, we are grateful that Richmond has a Tree Protection Department that works hard to protect our trees. We give our full support to their proposed amendments, and we would like to see better value for mature trees.

Schedule 2 to the Minutes of the  
Planning Committee meeting of  
Richmond City Council held on  
Wednesday, April 7, 2021.

**From:** Kerry Starchuk <kerrystarchuk@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** April 7, 2021 10:12 AM  
**To:** MayorandCouncillors <MayorandCouncillors@richmond.ca>  
**Subject:** Tree Bylaw Amendment

April 7, 2021

To: Mayor and Council,

Re: Tree Bylaw Proposed Bylaw Amendment - [Open Planning 4-7-2021.pdf \(richmond.ca\)](#)

I am opposed to this tree bylaw amendment and ask the following questions:

Why would you expect a homeowner to pay to have a diseased tree removed from their own property and then pay the city \$62.00 for doing so? This is just another ludicrous tax grab.

The City just raised property taxes by 5.6% which is a huge burden on many homeowners, especially seniors. Why would you place an extra burden for those who need to remove a diseased tree at their own expense?

In a well-established garden why would a homeowner necessarily be expected to replace a diseased tree if there is already enough mature trees remaining on the property?

The bylaw amendment report claims that Richmond is not keeping up with other cities on this issue. What cities are those and why does it matter what other cities are doing when on the farmland issues some councillors called for a "Made in Richmond" solution? Do we want Richmond to be unique or don't we?

Is ever-increasing taxation and the desire to do what other cities are doing part of UN Agenda 21 Sustainable Development that the City of Richmond signed on to in without transparent consultation with the public and that staff have received training for through ICLEI? Why hasn't the City come clean with residents about this covert plan and call it what it really is?

I look forward to your timely response.

Kerry Starchuk  
Richmond, B.C.

**TO: MAYOR & EACH  
COUNCILLOR  
FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE**

Schedule 3 to the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of Richmond City Council held on Wednesday, April 7, 2021.

Dear Planning Committee:

**Re: Tree Bylaw Amendments, April 7, 2021.**

While we support the tree bylaw amendments in the staff report, we believe they do not go far enough. In particular, there should be much higher application fees and penalties for the removal of very large healthy trees and staff should have greater discretion to specify all replacement tree characteristics and location depending upon the individual site.

**Very Large Healthy Trees**

The bylaw requires a permit to remove trees 20cm caliper or larger. There should be additional provisions for the removal of very large healthy trees 30cm caliper or larger which average 75' in height and provide our community tree canopy. Removing such a tree provides only one benefit – a larger footprint for a structure. What is lost is shade to cope with global warming, oxygen production, carbon storage, bird and animal habitat, and natural beauty that makes Richmond a better place to live. The proposed bylaw changes ensure that there is at least one replacement 6 cm tree. Unfortunately, that tree will provide no meaningful shade and carbon storage and no bird will build a nest in it. It takes on average more than 35 years for the new tree to grow to the size of the removed 30cm tree. In the meantime, it is the community which suffers the loss, not just the property owner more interested in a larger house.

**Application Fees and Penalties for Removal of Very Large Healthy Trees**

The staff report gives excellent examples of the installation of new infrastructure near a tree while protecting it. Clearly staff will spend a disproportionately large amount of time on an application to remove a very large healthy tree to seek alternatives. A \$75 application fee does not cover the time involved nor the far larger cost to the community of losing the tree.

We suggest a \$5,000 application fee of which \$4,000 will be refunded if the application is refused. The retained \$1,000 covers the staff time involved. The additional \$4,000 covers the loss of benefits from the removed tree over 35 years and should be used to help offset the cost of an additional City arborist to review tree removal applications.

The current fine for removing a tree without a permit is \$1,000 which makes it easier and cheaper to simply remove a very large tree. The fine should be increased to \$10,000 in the case of removal or damage affecting the health of a tree 30cm or larger and \$5,000 in the case of unwarranted damage affecting the benefits provided by such a tree.

**Greater Discretion for Staff**

As the staff report points out, replacement trees can be the required size, but if they are an inappropriate species, not properly planted or not cared for, the survival rate and benefit to the community is poor. In many cases, the survival rate is much better on public property such as parks, schools and boulevards. It is not sufficient that the applicant can request that a tree be planted on public property. City staff should have much wider discretion to specify the species of tree, how it is planted and where, including on public property. Staff should also be able to direct that City staff plant the tree with the cost borne by the applicant.

**John Roston, Michelle Li and Laura Gillanders**



RECEIVED  
APR 07 2021  
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE