



**Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings
Tuesday, February 16, 2021**

Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair
Councillor Chak Au
Councillor Carol Day (by teleconference)
Councillor Alexa Loo (by teleconference)
Councillor Bill McNulty (by teleconference)
Councillor Linda McPhail (by teleconference)
Councillor Harold Steves (by teleconference)
Councillor Michael Wolfe (by teleconference)

Matthew O'Halloran, Acting Corporate Officer

Call to Order: Mayor Brodie opened the proceedings at 7:00 p.m.

1. **PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SINGLE-FAMILY LOT SIZE
POLICY 5420/RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT
BYLAW 10035 (RZ 17-784927)**

(Location: 10200/10220 Railway Avenue; Applicant: Raman Kooner)

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was available to respond to queries.

Written Submissions:

Kevin Krygier, 5220 Hollycroft Drive (Schedule 1)

Submissions from the floor:

None.



**Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings
Tuesday, February 16, 2021**

PH21/2-1

It was moved and seconded

That Single-Family Lot Size Policy 5420 in Section 36-4-7, adopted by Council on October 16, 1989, be amended to exclude 5026 Williams Road and the 45 properties bordering Railway Avenue between Williams Road and 10700 Railway Avenue.

The question on the motion was not called as in response to queries from Council, staff noted that (i) there is no room for additional parking on site, (ii) with the tandem parking, there is a covenant on title to ensure the space can not be converted for other uses, (iii) proposal complies with the City's parking requirements, (iv) a traffic study can be undertaken, (v) sufficient parking has been provided for the proposed dwellings and street parking is not necessary, and (vi) public notification for this application complies with the statutory requirements as noted in Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500.

Discussion took place on ensuring sufficient signage and increased enforcement in the area to decrease parking and traffic issues.

As a result of the discussion, the following **referral motion** was introduced:

PH21/2-2

It was moved and seconded

That the rezoning application by Raman Kooner at 10200/10220 Railway Avenue be referred back to staff to conduct a traffic study and examine alternative solutions for parking.

DEFEATED

Opposed: Mayor Brodie
Cllrs. Au
Loo
McNulty
McPhail
Steves

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



Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings
Tuesday, February 16, 2021

PH21/2-3

It was moved and seconded

That staff conduct a traffic study in the surrounding area, on Hollymount Drive and the laneway, including issues related to parking, signage and enforcement.

The question on the motion was not called as it was requested that staff liaise with the school in the area to clarify drop-off and pick-up locations and the surrounding residents for their input on traffic issues.

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

PH21/2-4

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10035 be given second and third readings.

CARRIED

Opposed: Cllrs. Day
Steves
Wolfe

2. **OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW 9000, AMENDMENT BYLAW 10180 AND RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 10181 (INDUSTRIAL LAND INTENSIFICATION INITIATIVE)**

(Location: City-wide; lands zoned and/or designated for industrial or mixed employment use; Applicant: City of Richmond)

In accordance with Section 100 of the *Community Charter*, Councillor Linda McPhail declared a conflict of interest as her husband has interest in a business that owns industrial land in Richmond and left the meeting – 7:21 p.m.

Applicant’s Comments:

City staff were available to respond to queries.

Written Submissions:

- (a) Joe Carreira, VP Development, Conwest Developments (Schedule2)
- (b) Alisa Bailey, Project Director, Omicron (Schedule 3)



**Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings
Tuesday, February 16, 2021**

Submissions from the floor:

Joe Carreira, VP Development, Conwest Developments, expressed support for the application, noting that the proposed amendments modernize the current zoning regulations and create flexibility for industrial land users.

PH21/2-5

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 10180 be amended to correct the conversion acreage figure from 5 acres to 6.2 acres on page 1 of the Bylaw.

The question on the motion was not called as in response to queries from Council, staff noted that (i) the proposed bylaws do not propose a change to industrial stratification as further research and examination is required, (ii) a number of sustainability initiatives are underway with regard to extending BC’s Energy Step Code requirements to industrial lands, and (iii) the zoning on industrial lands allows for food and beverage services and outdoor amenities on site.

Discussion took place on referring this back to staff until reports with regard to sustainability aspects are brought forward to ensure that all future projects are consistent with City requirements.

As a result of the discussion, the following **referral motion** was introduced:

PH21/2-6

It was moved and seconded

That the staff report titled “Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 10180 and Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10181 (Industrial Land Intensification Initiative)” be referred back to staff until reports are brought forward to Council regarding Community Energy Emission Plans in relation to industrial lands.

DEFEATED

Opposed; Mayor Brodie
Cllrs. Au
Loo
McNulty
Steves

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



Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings
Tuesday, February 16, 2021

PH21/2-7 It was moved and seconded
That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 10180 be given second reading, as amended.

CARRIED
Opposed: Cllr. Wolfe

PH21/2-8 It was moved and seconded
That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 10180 be given third reading.

CARRIED
Opposed: Cllr. Wolfe

PH21/2-9 It was moved and seconded
That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 10180 be adopted.

CARRIED
Opposed: Cllr. Wolfe

PH21/2-10 It was moved and seconded
That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10181 be given second and third readings.

CARRIED
Opposed: Cllr. Wolfe

PH21/2-11 It was moved and seconded
That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10181 be adopted.

CARRIED
Opposed: Cllr. Wolfe

Councillor McPhail returned to the meeting – 7:40 p.m.



**Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings
Tuesday, February 16, 2021**

3. **RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500, AMENDMENT BYLAW 10224
(RZ 17-792242)**

(Location: 6520 Williams Road; Applicant: Gradual Architecture Inc.)

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was available to respond to queries.

Written Submissions:

None.

Submissions from the floor:

None.

PH21/2-12

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10224 be given second and third readings.

The question on the motion was not called as in reply to queries from Council, the applicant noted that Grasscrete is used to ensure the ground is more permeable to allow rain water to drain and the area next to the retained tree will be away from the foundation.

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

ADJOURNMENT

PH21/2-13

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (7:46 p.m.).

CARRIED



City of Richmond

Minutes

Regular Council meeting for Public Hearings Tuesday, February 16, 2021

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the Regular meeting for Public Hearings of the City of Richmond held on Tuesday, February 16, 2021.

Mayor
(Malcolm D. Brodie)

Acting Corporate Officer
(Matthew O'Halloran)

Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the Public
Hearing meeting of Richmond City
Council held on Tuesday, February 16, 2021.

To: Mayor & Each Councillor

From: City Clerk's Office

Materials Relating to an Agenda Item

Meeting: Public Hearing

Date: Feb. 16, 2021 Item#: #1

From:
Sent: February 12, 2021 5:52 PM
To: MayorandCouncillors
Subject: FW: Submission to Council - Public Hearing Feb 16, 2021
Attachments: Submission - Council Hearing Feb 16 2021.pdf; Signed Petition to COR 1.pdf

From: Station London <stationlondon@gmail.com>
Sent: February 12, 2021 1:09 PM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@richmond.ca>
Subject: Submission to Council - Public Hearing Feb 16, 2021

City of Richmond Security Warning: This email was sent from an external source outside the City. Please do not click or open attachments unless you recognize the source of this email and the content is safe.

To: Director, City Clerk's Office

Please find attached my submission to Council in relation to the public hearing scheduled for Tuesday, February 16, 2021.

Please confirm your receipt of same in advance of the hearing.

Thank you,

Kevin Krygier
(604)999-6205



Mr. Mayor and Councillors,

Thank you for accepting this submission. It is being provided to you in relation to an application by Mr. Raman Kooner to rezone 10200/10220 Railway Avenue from the “Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1)” Zone to the “Coach Houses (RCH1)” Zone in order to permit the property to be subdivided into three single-detached lots with coach houses. Concurrent with the rezoning application, Mr. Kooner has requested that Council consider an amendment to Single-Family Lot Size Policy 5420 to exclude properties – including the subject site – along Railway Avenue between Williams Road and Steveston Highway from the Lot Size Policy 5420 (approximately 45 properties total). My neighbours, my family, and I have several concerns and, as such, we do not support the application. I respectfully request that you consider our concerns and oppose the application as presented. However, should you approve the application we ask that the city implement several measures, outlined below, which we believe will help to mitigate some of the concerns we have raised.

The application currently before Council is by all accounts the same application that was previously presented to Council in July of 2019. At that time, notice was provided to all residents of the Holly Park neighbourhood. The notice outlined details of the application and a public hearing where residents would be provided the opportunity to speak ‘for’ or ‘against’. In response, a petition was circulated throughout our neighbourhood and quickly gathered the signatures of eighty (80) residents of Holly Park. All of those who signed the petition opposed the application by Mr. Kooner. The petition was presented to the City Clerks Office on July 12, 2019. For reference, a copy of this petition has been attached to this submission.

On July 15, 2019, myself and other residents of Holly Park attended a hearing at Council Chambers to speak directly to numerous concerns with respect to the application by Mr. Kooner. During that hearing, myself and my neighbours identified several issues and raised various concerns, including:

- Parking which regularly obstructed intersections causing hazardous situations for motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians. It was noted that, despite many calls and emails requesting the City Bylaws office conduct enforcement to address this issue, the problem persisted. Concern was expressed that the situation was such that it was only a matter of time before someone was hurt as one car swerved around a blind corner at an intersection striking a person (child) or colliding with an oncoming or parked vehicle.
- High traffic volumes within the neighbourhood which has become significant at all hours of the day. For example, during early morning and evening hours when folks leave or return from school or work. When folks walk or bike to and from work / school or go out for a walk together, it was observed that they were frequently navigating an increasingly treacherous trip around parked vehicles and around large volumes of traffic. This situation was made routinely more problematic on days when garbage, green, and recycling bins were placed out on the roadways. Intersections and related municipal infrastructures in the neighbourhood had not been upgraded to account for the influx of traffic or parked vehicles created by the increase to neighbourhood density in recent years.
- A lack of enforcement and safety concerns pertaining to access to the laneway that runs behind the subject properties and parallel to Railway Avenue. Numerous examples of vehicles parked throughout the laneway, obstructing access for other residents, emergency vehicles were provided.
- A lack of improvements to roads, laneways, sidewalks, lighting, crosswalks, walkways, and other infrastructure to account for an influx of vehicle, pedestrian traffic and parked vehicles in the neighbourhood. The lack of infrastructure improvements had resulted in a situation that essentially condoned the use of areas such as the laneways in a manner that negatively impacted access and undermined safety. It was noted that no signage was erected in the laneway to deter parking, speeding.

- A consequential increase in additional speculative development in Holly Park which would add further to these issues and diminish livability of the area.

At the conclusion of this public meeting, Council voted to refer the matter to staff for study and requested that staff meet with developer to devise alternative housing typologies that considered increased density. Since this hearing, no city staff have visited Holly Park to speak with current residents, study or evaluate the issues of concern in the context of the application you have before you. The original application as was reviewed in July 2019 has been left essentially unchanged and is now subject to the current hearing.

As was previously indicated, the City Clerk had notified all Holly Park residents of the original application of Mr. Kooner, previously presented to Council in July 2019. At that time, all of the residents were given the opportunity to engage each other to discuss views, present them in the form of letters, a signatures on a petition, or in person directly to Council for consideration. It is troubling therefore, that in relation to the current hearing considering Mr. Kooner's application, the City Clerks Office had substantially narrowed the notification area to residents within 50 meters (or 150 feet) of the subject property. The only rationale for limiting the communication of such a notification would be to limit the opportunity for current residents within the neighbourhood to similarly express their views in opposition to the application which is now back before Council. This situation is unfortunate as it diminishes the integrity of the process.

The City of Richmond's Official Community Plan (OCP) for Steveston, includes the area which is subject to this application. The OCP for this area outlines the city's vision for this community and states, among other things, that "pedestrian and vehicular circulation will be designed to be safe and comfortable while providing ready access throughout the area". This is not the current reality and the situation has only been worsened by recent development, which has increased density. The OCP also identifies several key objectives, including:

- Ensuring that the road network is adequate to provide for the needs of motorists, transit, pedestrians and cyclists.
- Supporting development that looks beyond the boundaries of its own site in order that it may knit into not only what exists today, but what existed in the past and is likely to exist in the future.
- Making sure the form of new development is guided by that of adjacent existing development, even where new uses are being introduced. For example, multiple family residential or commercial uses introduced adjacent to single family homes should adopt a scale and character similar to those existing dwellings.

The OCP emphasizes a need “to limit commercialization of single family neighbourhoods and to mitigate impacts on traffic, parking congestion, and noise in single family neighbourhoods”. The application before you works directly counter to this. It is possible and arguably likely that, should the application be approved, many of the current properties in the subject area of Railway Avenue will be listed for sale as their values become greatly enhanced by the prospect of being able to maximize the density of housing (and therefore profits) on these existing single family lots is realized. This has been the case in many other similar circumstances elsewhere throughout the city and region. There is also no information provided within the proposal or within the Staff Report that supports the view that as the proposal recommends, building more homes, closer together in our neighbourhood will in any way decrease vehicle usage tendencies, reduces parking congestion, and noise. The experience in Holly Park has been entirely to the contrary.

The OCP also specifically addresses ‘Neighbourhood Character’ and ‘Sense of Place’. It states, “enhancing the character and accessibility of neighbourhoods is important”. However, the proposals before council, if approved, will further contribute to an alteration of Holly Park’s overall character and sense of place, the

things that currently make it the desirable neighbourhood it is. In actual fact, the proposals alter our neighbourhood character and diminish our neighbourhood accessibility by increasing the number of residences accessible only via the laneway at the rear of the proposed properties and directly from the laneway entrances, which can only be accessed from the minor streets within our neighbourhood. The streets where many residents walk, cycle, and engage in other recreational activities. Moving vehicles off of major roadways, onto minor roadways, and into our single family neighbourhood with laneways that do not enter or exit directly onto the major arterial roads themselves, serves only to create a conflict. It indeed does enable the creation of more housing, accessible only from the rear of residential lots and off major arterial roads, but it brings more vehicles into our neighbourhood and into direct conflict with the residents who seek to use their neighbourhood in a manner consistent with the way the neighbourhood was designed, built, and they have become accustomed to using it.

The application before you seeks to increase the density of residential units at 10200/10220 Railway Avenue and elsewhere along this area of Railway Avenue to a maximum allowable density. In the case of the properties at 10200 / 10220 Railway Ave, this means an increase from two to six residences or 300% in total (including parking as follows: two per single family dwelling and one per coach house for a total of nine parking spaces. Access to this parking will be off of the existing laneway). The proposal also provides for zero visitor parking other than what can be found on adjacent streets, such as those inside Holly Park, or in the laneway. A Staff Report prepared by development staff, Mr. Jordan Rockerbie, recommends that you approve the application. However, residents including myself are concerned that the staff report provided to Council in relation to this application neglected to consider two additional options which are consistent with the OCP and which had not otherwise been contemplated as part of the analysis conducted by staff. One such option, for example, would utilize existing zoning and would permit the development of two strata lots with two units each for a total of four homes and 100% density increase on the existing property. This option would enable the city

and the developer to achieve several preferred outcomes while taking into account and balancing the concerns of the neighbourhood residents. Again, this option was omitted from the Staff Report as an alternative for consideration, but has been confirmed by Mr. Rockerbie to be an option. A second, albeit less preferred option, also omitted in the Staff Report, would have provided for redevelopment of the existing site to permit the construction of three single residential units, resulting in a 50% density increase. Several other homes along this stretch of Railway Avenue (neighbouring the subject property) had recently been re-developed in a manner consistent with this option. Again, this option would utilize existing zoning and would account for and mitigate several of the concerns raised by neighbourhood residents.

On February 5th, 2021 I spoke personally with Mr. Rockerbie regarding his Staff Report, the exclusion of the two alternative options which used existing zoning, and the omission of mention of the opposition to the application by 80 residents of the neighbourhood. Mr. Rockerbie advised me during this call that he was instructed by his Director, Mr. Wayne Craig, who had himself “interpreted the referral from Council” to prepare a report that only considered options that involved maximizing density to the maximum permitted in the Official Community Plan. However, the referral from Council did not specify a requirement to seek “maximum” densification, but rather requested that development staff meet with developer to devise alternative housing typologies that considered increased density. Mr. Rockerbie’s omission of the additional alternatives advances only the interest and concerns of the developer and neglects to consider the interest and concerns of neighbourhood residents. This despite the fact that the Official Community Plan outlines a policy which requires that “changes to the character of single family neighbourhoods occurs in a fair, complementary manner with community consultation”. On balance the omission of mention (and therefore consideration) of these alternative options for densification undermines the credibility of the report and the reliability of the analysis undertaken. Residents of the neighbourhood expressed clear opposition to any application which considered maximizing

densification and encouraged the city and the developer to consider other alternatives to increase density consistent with the Official Community Plan.

There are several concerns which have been raised by myself and other neighbourhood residents. The following are specific examples of these concerns:

Laneway Parking

Parking behind the homes (such as those subject to the application before Council) which are accessed through the laneway parallel to Railway Avenue remains a concern. Vehicle such as emergency vehicles, service vehicles, and other resident vehicles are constrained to navigate the laneway as a result of parked vehicles which are left to block travel through the laneway.



Fig. 1 – Rear of 10240 Railway Ave (directly beside the property subject to the application)

Street Parking

Street parking in locations, including adjacent to intersections within the neighbourhood constrains already narrow streets and has resulted in recent collisions and many other near misses involving vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists as driver's who cannot see parked cars as they turn must swerve to avoid them. The situation is made worse on days when garbage, green, and recycling bins are left out for collection.



Fig. 2 - Parking on Hollycroft Gate at Hollycroft Drive. This narrow intersection has become dangerous for vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists to navigate.

Lack of Infrastructure Upgrade / State of Disrepair

Areas within laneways are in a state of disrepair. For example, poor drainage has resulted in the laneway frequently experiencing substantial pooling of water in various locations. As the laneway is also used by pedestrians to access the rear of their homes, navigation becomes problematic.

Unlike many other laneways throughout the city, this laneway does not currently have curbing, lighting, speed signage, speed mitigation, or parking signage (the

exception being the portion at the rear of a new development at 5071 Steveston Highway).



Fig. 3 – Laneway at the rear of the subject property, parallel to Railway Ave.



Fig.4-Partially upgraded portion of the laneway with lighting, speed signage, curbing, and drainage improvements.

Poorly Marked or Unmarked Pedestrian Crossings Create a Conflict

Areas within Holly Park where pedestrians are forced leave walkways in order to cross roadways are not marked or are otherwise not clear to either pedestrians or driver's. The result is high risk of a interactions between the pedestrians and vehicles. Furthermore, sidewalks in several areas do not have appropriate drop curbs and adjacent road markings to connect them to existing walkways, this includes areas leading to / from McKinney Elementary School.



Fig. 5 - Sidewalk and walkway at the intersection of Hollymount Gt and Hollymount Dr, leading to the pedestrian walkway and McKinney Elementary School.

Sustainable growth and affordability are important matters across BC, including here in Richmond. Everyone must contribute to the evolution and advancement of our city and our communities. We are not against the sub division

of the property at 10200/10220 Railway Avenue. However, we do not support a blanket approach which involves maximizing densification in the manner being proposed. We are not speaking out against progress or identifying and implementing solutions to challenging issues. What we cannot support is moving forward without a more measured approach that involves a fulsome examination of all relevant issues with an opportunity for meaningful input at all levels from various stakeholders, including existing residents. My family, neighbours, and I continue to feel strongly that the application before you fails to consider the unique character, circumstances, and needs of our neighbourhood. Furthermore, approval of the application will result in negative consequences for Holly Park for years to come. The report you have received from staff does not provide a credible analysis nor does it consider our views with respect to issues such as safety, privacy, noise, traffic and parking. As I highlighted, other options are available under existing zoning and account for the need for sustainable growth and affordability. These options have not been studied by staff and or considered by Council in the context of the concerns my neighbours and I have identified for you. Each of the residents from Holly Park who signed the petition against the application has their own specific reasons for signing it. All of them are voters and all of them oppose the proposed changes to the character and sense of place that Holly Park currently provides to them. I respectfully request that you deny the application of Mr. Kooner. However, should you approve the application, I respectfully request that you direct staff to undertake the following:

- Repairs and upgrades to the laneway at the rear of the subject properties to address issues with parking, drainage, and lighting similar to what has been put in place elsewhere in portions of this laneway. This would include the

installation of 'no parking' signage as is in place in many other laneways throughout Richmond.



Fig. 6 – One of Richmond's many other laneways with posted speed limit and no parking signs.

- Improvement to sidewalks and crosswalks to create a better connection between the two, better mark them in order to diminish the chances of an incident between pedestrians and vehicles.
- Installation of traffic calming measures such as rumble strips, speed humps, or other similar devices along neighbourhood streets and in laneways to encourage speed reduction and prevent injurious accident involving pedestrians / cyclists. Similar installations exist in other neighbourhoods throughout Richmond.



Fig. 7 – A laneway elsewhere in West Richmond, with traffic calming and speed mitigation. This lane also has curbing and lighting installed.

- Changes to on street parking rules, in particular at the congested and narrow intersections of Hollycroft Gate at Hollycroft Drive and Hollymount Gate at Hollymount Drive. These intersections are made more treacherous and narrow to navigate on days when garbage, green, and recycling bins are placed out for collection.
- Conduct proactive enforcement through City Bylaws to ensure compliance with new signage, rules, and other regulations.

I thank you again for reviewing my submission and considering the concerns and suggestions presented.

Kevin Krygier

5220 Hollycroft Drive, Richmond

Hollypark Residents Petition

On July 15, 2019, the City of Richmond will hear a proposal to amend the single-family lot size policy 5420, Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, in Section 36-4-7 (Hollypark neighbourhood), to exclude 46 properties on Railway Avenue and two properties on Williams Road from the Lot Size Policy.

At this same hearing the City of Richmond will hear an application, in relation to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, to rezone these two properties and permit the subdivision into three properties, each with an additional 'coach house' suite with vehicle access from the rear.

As a resident of Hollypark, I want to preserve the character of my neighbourhood. I do not support the proposed single-family lot size bylaw amendment nor do I support the application being presented to Council with respect to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, Richmond.

Print Name	Address	Phone #	Email	Signature	Date
LINDA GAVSIE	10620 Hollycraft DR	778-340-9888	Lindagavsie@gmail.com		July 7/19
Dale Sackeman	5240 Hollycraft Dr	604-238-8114	dalsackeman@gmail.com		July 7/19
Amy JACIMAN	5240 Hollycraft Dr	604-319-7814	amyjaciman@gmail.com		July 7/19
ED GANSE	10620 Hollycraft Dr	604-973-1773	ed@ganse.com		July 7/19
Maurice Tory	5248 Hollycraft Dr	604-273-8216	maurice.tory@hotmail.com		July 7/19
LESA CHU	5248 Hollycraft Dr	778-322-2823	lsachun@gmail.com		July 7, 2019
Greg Houston	5231 Hollycraft Dr	604-277-1442	Houstony@shaw.ca		July 7 2019
Malon Houston	5231 Hollycraft Dr	604-277-1442	Houstony@shaw.ca		7 July 2019
David Lexier	5217 Hollycraft Dr	604-616-9815	dlexier@hotmail.com		July 7, 2019
Thur Lexier	5217 Hollycraft Dr	604-616-9815	th...76@hotmail.com		July 7, 2019

Hollypark Residents Petition

On July 15, 2019, the City of Richmond will hear a proposal to amend the single-family lot size policy 5420, Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, in Section 36-4-7 (Hollypark neighbourhood), to exclude 46 properties on Railway Avenue and two properties on Williams Road from the Lot Size Policy.

At this same hearing the City of Richmond will hear an application, in relation to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, to rezone these two properties and permit the subdivision into three properties, each with an additional 'coach house' suite with vehicle access from the rear.

As a resident of Hollypark, I want to preserve the character of my neighbourhood. I do not support the proposed single-family lot size bylaw amendment nor do I support the application being presented to Council with respect to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, Richmond.

Print Name	Address	Phone #	Email	Signature	Date
Michael Nakaniishi	10110 Hollywell Dr	604-722-1999	Michael.nakaniishi@outlook.com		July 7/19
Frances Nakaniishi	"	"	frances.nakaniishi@gmail.com		"
Dmitry Smulevich	5297 Hollycroft Dr	604-500-5551	dima808@yahoo.com		July 7/19
Ralph von Padel	10131 Hollywell Dr	604-818-7237	rvp2thehills@gmail.com		July 7/19
Shari Collett	10131 Hollywell Dr	604-307-0346	shari.collett@gmail.com		July 7/19
Robyn Anderson	10151 Hollywell Dr	604-802-2775	robynanderson@telus.net		July 7/19
Patrick Lok	5071 Hollycroft Dr	604-300-5511	lok-patrick@hotmail.com		July 7, 2019
Doris Lok	5071 Hollycroft Dr	604-720-8293	doris.lok@hotmail.com		July 7, 2019
Ming Qiu	5228 Hollycroft Dr	604-396-3443	ming1983@hotmail.com		July 7-2019
Norm Yee	5237 Hollycroft Dr	604-306-3560	normyee@shaw.ca		July 7, 2019

Hollypark Residents Petition

On July 15, 2019, the City of Richmond will hear a proposal to amend the single-family lot size policy 5420, Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, in Section 36-4-7 (Hollypark neighbourhood), to exclude 46 properties on Railway Avenue and two properties on Williams Road from the Lot Size Policy.

At this same hearing the City of Richmond will hear an application, in relation to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, to rezone these two properties and permit the subdivision into three properties, each with an additional 'coach house' suite with vehicle access from the rear.

As a resident of Hollypark, I want to preserve the character of my neighbourhood. I do not support the proposed single-family lot size bylaw amendment nor do I support the application being presented to Council with respect to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, Richmond.

Print Name	Address	Phone #	Email	Signature	Date
AMTA KEER	5153 HOLLYCROFT DR. RICHMOND	604-275-9385	akerrse@mz.com	<i>Amy Keer</i>	July 7, 2019
STUART KEER	5188 HOLLYCROFT DR RICHMOND	(604) 275-9385	akerrse@telus.net	<i>SK</i>	July 7, 2019
BOB BADER	5117 HOLLYCROFT DR RICHMOND	604-277-4551	THEBADERS@shaw.ca	<i>Bob Bader</i>	July 7, 2019
SHERRI BADER	5117 HOLLYCROFT DR RICHMOND	604-277-4991	thebaders@shaw.ca	<i>Sa. Bader</i>	July 7, 2019
Bill Wilson	5051 HOLLYCROFT DR RICHMOND	604-551-3427	runbillrun52@gmail.com	<i>Bill Wilson</i>	July 7, 2019
Ann Lorayes	10111 HOLLYMAINT DR.	(778) 229-1596	Mlorayes@gmail.com	<i>Ann Lorayes</i>	July 7/19
WANG, DONG	10181 HOLLYMAINT DR.	778-859-2768	wdongy29@yahoo.ca	<i>Dong Wang</i>	July 7/19
WANG, ZHI MIN	10181 HOLLYMAINT DR.	778-885-4868	Jianyi.Pestion@telus.net	<i>Zhi Min Wang</i>	July 7/19
RITA LAURENBERG	10181 HOLLYMAINT DR.	604-274-2664	LAURENBERG.RITA@gmail.com	<i>Rita Laurenberg</i>	July 7/19
Tim Nelson	10271 HOLLYMAINT DR.	604-241-8855	jungern@shaw.ca	<i>Tim Nelson</i>	July 7/19

Hollypark Residents Petition

On July 15, 2019, the City of Richmond will hear a proposal to amend the single-family lot size policy 5420, Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, in Section 36-4-7 (Hollypark neighbourhood), to exclude 46 properties on Railway Avenue and two properties on Williams Road from the Lot Size Policy.

At this same hearing the City of Richmond will hear an application, in relation to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, to rezone these two properties and permit the subdivision into three properties, each with an additional 'coach house' suite with vehicle access from the rear.

As a resident of Hollypark, I want to preserve the character of my neighbourhood. I do not support the proposed single-family lot size bylaw amendment nor do I support the application being presented to Council with respect to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, Richmond.

Print Name	Address	Phone #	Email	Signature	Date
Germaine Lee-Nelson	10271 Hollymount Dr. Richmond BC V7E 4E5	604-241-8853	glee.nelson@cs138.bc.ca		July 7/19
GIOVANNI MANTOROLA	10291 HOLLYMOUNT	778 840-2074	gimantorola74@gmail.com		7 Jul 19
LEE DOWSETT	10361 HOLLYMOUNT	604-352-7424	dowse.mur@gmail.com		July 7 th 2019
GERAUNA CURALE DOWSETT	10361 HOLLYMOUNT	604-352-7424	gindowsettl@shaw.ca		July 7 th 2019
Ross McEcker	10540 Hollymount Dr.	778 879 7365	rossmcecker@shaw.ca		July 7, 2019.
Mazin Sulaiman	10571 Hollymount Dr.	778 773 3566	bright.ace@gmail.com		July 7, 2019
Lubna Istifan	10571 Hollymount Dr.	778 990 2258	listifan@vestwoodmovers.org		July 7, 2019
Khairija Sulaiman	10571 Hollymount Dr.	236 888 2925	bradst.444@gmail.com		July 7, 2019
ELAINE PEDERSEN	10580 HOLLYMOUNT DR	604 276-9206	maryp.p@gmail.com		July 7 '19
KURT PEDERSEN	10580 HOLLYMOUNT DR	604 276-9206	pedersen@telus.net		July 7 '19

Hollypark Residents Petition

On July 15, 2019, the City of Richmond will hear a proposal to amend the single-family lot size policy 5420, Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, in Section 36-4-7 (Hollypark neighbourhood), to exclude 46 properties on Railway Avenue and two properties on Williams Road from the Lot Size Policy.

At this same hearing the City of Richmond will hear an application, in relation to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, to rezone these two properties and permit the subdivision into three properties, each with an additional 'coach house' suite with vehicle access from the rear.

As a resident of Hollypark, I want to preserve the character of my neighbourhood. I do not support the proposed single-family lot size bylaw amendment nor do I support the application being presented to Council with respect to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, Richmond.

Print Name	Address	Phone #	Email	Signature	Date
Hiana Yee	5237 Hollycoff Dr.	604 306-9070	alanatamcsh@i		July 7/19
Richard Myers	10641 Hollymount Dr	778-867-9684	richmyer@home.net		JULY 7/19
CHRIS SILVERSON	10651 HOLLYMOUNT DRIVE	604-878-7113	CHRIS@SILVERSON.CA		JULY 7/19
Melanie Silverson	10651 Hollymount Drive	604-644-8740	melmorins@shaw.ca		July 7/19
DAVID KNOTT	10681 HOLLYMOUNT DRIVE	778-668-5390	david.knott@hotmail.com		July 7/19
Ben Ho	10661 Hollymount Dr	604-363-5992	benyphoe@hotmail.com		July 7/19
Georgia Lau	10661 Hollymount Dr.	778-882-6077	georgialau@gmail.com		July 7/19
Patti AKNIN	10250 HOLLYWOOD DR	604-271-3565	aknind@shaw.ca		July 7/19
RALPH AKIN	10250 Hollywood Dr	604 271 3565	akinr@shaw.ca		July 7/19
Dylan Thomas	10691 Hollymount Dr	604-271-4750	dthomassa@shaw.ca		July 8, 2019

Hollypark Residents Petition

On July 15, 2019, the City of Richmond will hear a proposal to amend the single-family lot size policy 5420, Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, in Section 36-4-7 (Hollypark neighbourhood), to exclude 46 properties on Railway Avenue and two properties on Williams Road from the Lot Size Policy.

At this same hearing the City of Richmond will hear an application, in relation to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, to rezone these two properties and permit the subdivision into three properties, each with an additional 'coach house' suite with vehicle access from the rear.

As a resident of Hollypark, I want to preserve the character of my neighbourhood. I do not support the proposed single-family lot size bylaw amendment nor do I support the application being presented to Council with respect to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, Richmond.

Print Name	Address	Phone #	Email	Signature	Date
GYNETH YOUNG	10330 HOLLYWELL DR.	778 928 0271	gyneyoung@yahoo.com		7/8/19
GLUDIE YOUNG	10330 HOLLYWELL DR.	778 928 271	=		7/8/19
YORK SIU YOUNG	10330 HOLLYWELL DR.	778-928271	=		7/8/19
SONNY YOUNG	- do -	778-928271	=		7/8/19
SINAN SULAIMAN	10571 HOLY MOUNT DR	604 241 4882	sinan.sulaiman@gmail.com		07/08/19
MATRICK STAPLETON	5291 HOLLYCROFT DRIVE	604-318-1427			July 9/2019
Sam ISAACS	10380 Hollymount	604-271-3228			July 9, 2019
EDWARD LIMPOCO	10031 HOLLYMOUNT	604 275 3443	EDL@SMAO.CA		9 JUL 2019
PAT MURRAY	10040 HOLLYCROFT GATE	604-271-8840			✓
MURRAY	✓	✓			✓

Hollypark Residents Petition

On July 15, 2019, the City of Richmond will hear a proposal to amend the single-family lot size policy 5420, Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, in Section 36-4-7 (Hollypark neighbourhood), to exclude 46 properties on Railway Avenue and two properties on Williams Road from the Lot Size Policy.

At this same hearing the City of Richmond will hear an application, in relation to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, to rezone these two properties and permit the subdivision into three properties, each with an additional 'coach house' suite with vehicle access from the rear.

As a resident of Hollypark, I want to preserve the character of my neighbourhood. I do not support the proposed single-family lot size bylaw amendment nor do I support the application being presented to Council with respect to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, Richmond.

Print Name	Address	Phone #	Email	Signature	Date
Keith Irwin	10650 Hollymount Dr	604 277-8657	kirwin@yahoo.ca		July 9/19
Mary Irwin	10650 Hollymount Drive	604-277-8657	maryirwin2010@hotmail.com		July 8/19
Sorey Knott	10681 Hollymount Drive	(604) 790-9795	Soreyknott@gmail.com		July 8/19
Brent Southa	5235 Hollywood Dr	604-271-1769	bissoutha@yahoo.com		July 9/19
Leanne Santha	5235 Hollywood Dr.	604-271-1769	lcsantha@yahoo.ca		July 8/19
Neil Varma	5208 Hollywood Dr	604 272-4008	nvarma@grains.com		July 9/19
Jeanne Gausse	5220 Hollycroft Dr	604 272-5551	jgausse@gmail.com	J. Gausse	July 8/19
Patsy Chan	10211 Hollywell Dr.	(604) 771-9829	patsychan@gmail.com		July 10/19
GARY TSE	10210 Hollywell Dr	604-272-5749	gary.tse@shaw.ca		July 10/19
Ivy Tse	10210 Hollywell Dr	604 270 3362	woodstock55@gmail.com		July 10/19

Hollypark Residents Petition

On July 15, 2019, the City of Richmond will hear a proposal to amend the single-family lot size policy 5420, Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, in Section 36-4-7 (Hollypark neighbourhood), to exclude 46 properties on Railway Avenue and two properties on Williams Road from the Lot Size Policy.

At this same hearing the City of Richmond will hear an application, in relation to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, to rezone these two properties and permit the subdivision into three properties, each with an additional 'coach house' suite with vehicle access from the rear.

As a resident of Hollypark, I want to preserve the character of my neighbourhood. I do not support the proposed single-family lot size bylaw amendment nor do I support the application being presented to Council with respect to 10200 and 10220 Railway Avenue, Richmond.

Print Name	Address	Phone #	Email	Signature	Date
Ruth Henderson	10161 Hollymount Dr	604 275-1736	ruth.henderson@shaw.ca	R.Henderson	July 9/19
Don Henderson	10101 Hollymount Dr	604 275-1736	don.m.henderson@shaw.ca	J.M. Henderson	July 9/19
TAY ROOKE	10161 HOLLYMOUNT	778.859 8472	hellocrush67@gmail.com	J. Neede	July 9, 19
Kevin Krysiw	5220 Hollycraft	604-999-6205		[Signature]	July 11/19
MAUREEN BURR	10000 Hollymount Dr	604 271 8817	abambur@shaw.ca	M. Burr	July 12/19
Patricia Stapleton	5291 Dr. Hollycroft	604 272 4154	pstapleton12@shaw.ca	Patricia Stapleton	July 12 / 19
Erin MugaKumi	10550 Hollymount Dr	604 274 3262	steinruck@hotmail.com	[Signature]	July 12 / 19
Atenso C. Sison	10591 Hollymount Dr	778-388-4004	atenso.c.sison@gmail.com	Aten - Sison	July 12 / 19
Aaron Ng	10520 Hollymount Dr	778-858-5170	ng@shaw.ca	[Signature]	July 12, 2019
Madehyn Ng	10520 Hollymount Drive	778-858-5170	3619a1177@gmail.com	[Signature]	JULY 12 2019

Schedule 2 to the Minutes of the Public
Hearing meeting of Richmond City
Council held on Tuesday, February 16, 2021.

To: Mayor & Each Councillor
From: City Clerk's Office
Materials Relating to an Agenda Item
Meeting: Public Hearing
Date: Feb. 16, 2021 Item#: 2

From:
Sent: February 16, 2021 10:47 AM
To: MayorandCouncillors
Subject: February 16 Public Hearing - Request to Speak
Attachments: Richmond ILII Support Letter.pdf

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

From: Dwayne Drobot <Dwayne.Drobot@conwest.com>
Sent: February 16, 2021 9:41 AM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@richmond.ca>
Subject: RE: February 16 Public Hearing - Request to Speak

City of Richmond Security Warning: This email was sent from an external source outside the City. Please do not click or open attachments unless you recognize the source of this email and the content is safe.

Attached is our letter of support we submitted at Referral for this item. If it's not already included in the correspondence for this item please included it.

Dwayne



CONWEST

Mayor and Council
City of Richmond
6911 No 3 Rd.
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

January 11, 2021

RE: Industrial Lands Intensification Initiative

Good afternoon Mayor Brodie, members of Council. My name is Joe Carreira, VP Development with Conwest Developments.

We are pleased to support the findings in the Industrial Lands Intensification Initiative (ILII). We would also like to acknowledge the efforts of staff in bringing this report to Council.

Conwest is a 35-year-old company with experience in commercial, industrial, residential, and social purpose real estate across the lower mainland. In Richmond, our project "Benchmark," on No. 6 Road, is currently under construction. We also have projects that will be coming forward in the future. Conwest participated on the Advisory groups for the ILII which informed this phase of work and the report to Council, as well as on the Metro Vancouver Industrial Lands Task Force.

We support the recommendations in the report and are encouraged by the changes to intensify and modernize industrial land in Richmond. Industrial land is part of a thriving, robust city, required not only to meet the City's economic goals but also its environmental goals. The changes to provide certainty regarding accessory office as well as reduced parking allowances will create more flexibility for development sites.

We also are supportive of the proposed increases in building height to 16m (52ft) contemplated under this initiative. There has been a shift in the market for higher clear heights within buildings to accommodate new technology in racking systems for warehousing and goods storage. These increases in efficiency allow for greater utilization of our sparse industrial land and present significant efficiencies related to racking as well as energy usage.

We hope this insight is helpful and we thank City staff for their efforts in bringing this to Council.

Sincerely,



Joe Carreira
VP Development
joe.carreira@conwest.com
Cell: 604-837-2390

Schedule 3 to the Minutes of the Public
Hearing meeting of Richmond City
Council held on Tuesday, February 16, 2021.

To: Mayor & Each Councillor
From: City Clerk's Office
Materials Relating to an Agenda Item
Meeting: Public Hearing
Date: Feb. 16, 2021 Item#: 2

From: Alisa Bailey <ABailey@omicronaec.com>
Sent: February 16, 2021 3:18 PM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@richmond.ca>
Subject: Questions for Public Hearing - February 16, 2021

City of Richmond Security Warning: This email was sent from an external source outside the City. Please do not click or open attachments unless you recognize the source of this email and the content is safe.

Hello,

Please find below the questions/comments for the **Industrial Lands Intensification Initiative** portion of today's public hearing, on behalf of Montrose Properties Inc. and Omicron AEC Ltd. for the Richmond Industrial Centre Development.

1. Proposed changes indicate not encouraging retail sales in the I and IL zones, and the current zoning bylaw is not clear on whether customer pick-up and drop-off (for returns) are allowed in the I and IL zones. With the accelerating global shift to ecommerce, businesses are reducing or eliminating dedicated storefront spaces. As such, there needs to be some accommodation for some form of customer interaction within the I and IL zones. Some accommodation in the zoning bylaw to allow for customer receiving activities within the I and IL zones, would allow for future proofing these areas.
2. For Industrial zones outside of the City Centre, land use policy should accommodate local amenity retail, in particular food and beverage, that would support the local workforce needs and avoid unnecessary vehicle trips to food and beverage options in other areas of the city thereby exacerbating existing congestion on access roads.
3. Proposed changes to height are intended to accommodate 36' clear ceilings, which is a current trend in the industry. We question why a policy update would impose a new restricted internal height to 36' clear as the trend in the industry is to continue to go higher and thereby intensify the use of Industrial lands as well as facilitate automation and increased racking height? Given racking systems are built in four-foot vertical sections, an internal clear height of at least 44' might be considered so as to support expected construction over the next decade.
4. No changes are proposed for the calculation of maximum Building Height, specifically related to including roof top features, ie. RTUs or skylights. With the emphasis on sustainability, roof top units increase in size to accommodate energy efficiency and skylights add to the height. This will over time erode the clear ceiling heights that the increase to the Building Height is intended to promote. Having the Building Height separated to indicate a defined elevation for the height of the building, with a separate height allowance for roof top features, would prevent erosion of the clear ceiling height. In addition, for buildings outside the City Centre, we would suggest removing the height restriction on roof top features subject to those features not being visible from the sightline of the street.
5. No changes are proposed for the calculation of maximum Building Height, specifically related to calculation of height being related to the elevation of the lot corners. Depending on site conditions, this will limit the clear ceiling height that the Building Height change is intended to promote. For buildings outside of the City Centre, we would suggest adjusting the bylaw to allow for heights to be calculated from the top of slab.
6. To accommodate intensification of industrial lands, Transportation and Policy planning needs to include and ensure the connectivity of the industrial lands for transit services and goods movement



7. Bike infrastructure requirements, ie bike racks and change rooms, need to be reviewed for industrial areas. Current requirements do not take into consideration current available safe bike routes for industrial areas, which limits the number of industrial employees that will use the bike infrastructure. This results in a large amount of bike infrastructure being installed and not used, as employees do not feel safe riding adjacent to large semitrailers on narrow roads.

Thanks,

Alisa Bailey ASCT
Project Director
OMICRON
D: +1 604 632 4362 M: +1 604 499 6981 E: ABAiley@omicronaec.com

Fifth Floor Three Bentall Centre
595 Burrard Street
PO Box 49369 Vancouver BC V7X 1L4 Canada
T: +1 604 632 3350 / +1 877 632 3350 F: +1 604 632 3351 W: www.omicronaec.com



This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Omicron. Please check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. Omicron accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.