



Planning Committee

Date: Wednesday, May 22, 2013
Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair
Councillor Chak Au
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Harold Steves
Absent: Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt
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, May 7, 2013, be adopted as circulated.*

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

Tuesday, June 18, 2013, (tentative date) at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room

Planning Committee
Wednesday, May 22, 2013

There was agreement to vary to the order of the agenda to consider Item No. 4 first.

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

4. **APPLICATION BY AJIT THALIWAL FOR REZONING AT 8960 HEATHER STREET FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/B) TO SINGLE DETACHED (RS2/A)**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-9011; RZ 13-628035) (REDMS No. 3824001)

It was moved and seconded

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9011, for the rezoning of 8960 Heather Street from "Single Detached (RS1/B)" to "Single Detached (RS2/A)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

1. **HAMILTON AREA PLAN UPDATE: 2ND PUBLIC SURVEY FINDINGS AND PROPOSED AREA PLAN CONCEPT**

(File Ref. No. 08-4045-20-14/2013) (REDMS No. 3851456)

Terry Crowe, Manager, Policy Planning, provided background information and highlighted the following information:

- three development options were presented for consideration at the second Open House, each option varying in estimated population increases and densities;
- a total of 76 completed surveys were submitted; overall, the surveys indicated that the public preferred Option 3 as it suggested the highest level of community amenities;
- staff conducted a preliminary analysis of the types and costs of amenities and the ability of the three option to provide them;
- as a result of the preliminary analysis, staff enhanced Option 1 (lowest estimated population increase and density) and propose Option 4; and
- Option 4 can provide the majority of the preferred community amenities as suggested in Option 3, however with a significantly lower estimated build-out population.

With the aid of various artist renderings, Mr. Crowe reviewed the various Hamilton areas and commented on the proposed types of development for each area. Also, Mr. Crowe noted that the Hamilton area abuts the City of New Westminster's Queensborough community and as such, there is potential to improve 'live, work, play' opportunities for Hamilton residents.

Planning Committee Wednesday, May 22, 2013

In response to a comment made by the Chair, Mr. Crowe summarized the proposed changes to the Hamilton area plans: (i) Area 1 will remain as-is with predominantly single-family dwellings; (ii) Area 2 will retain the existing park and could accommodate townhouses; and (iii) Area 3 will be enhanced with a new riverfront park, the shopping centre will be densified, the north side of Gilley Avenue could accommodate mixed-uses, and the remainder of Area 3 could accommodate a range of townhouses.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Crowe advised that (i) the projected population increase and the provision of community amenities is based on the build out of the Hamilton Area Plan for 2034; and (ii) the proposed Concept is based on a 'Developer Pay' approach, as such, funds towards amenities would be collected as development occurs.

Discussion ensued regarding public transportation in the Hamilton area, and Victor Wei, Director, Transportation, advised that TransLink was consulted regarding the various land use options, and support the principles that encourage the use of sustainable transportation such as walking and cycling.

In response to a query from Committee, Mr. Crowe commented on the 'Developer Pay' approach, noting that staff consider the set of proposed community amenities in the proposed Concept reasonable. Mr. Crowe clarified that the City is not asking developers to fund amenities such as a museum or art gallery.

The Chair spoke of the projected population increase and the potential need for an additional elementary school and a new high school in the Hamilton area.

Dana Westermarck, Oris Consulting Ltd., spoke in favour of the proposed Concept, and was of the opinion that the Hamilton community welcomes the development of their neighbourhood. Also, he stated that he believes that there is a sense of urgency in moving forward with the proposed Concept, and as such, requested that the City proceed in a timely manner.

Mr. Westermarck believed that the next phase of public consultation should first ensure that the proposed Concept (Option 4) meets the expectations of Hamilton residents and second, clarify what is expected of the development community. He stated concern related to (i) the assumption that developers contribute approximately 65% of the land lift from rezonings to proposed community amenities, and (ii) the findings of the City's independent economic consultant, noting that the figures have not been shared with the development community. Mr. Westermarck was of the opinion that these issues need to be discussed with the Urban Development Institute, the Greater Vancouver Home Builders' Association, and local builders.

Planning Committee
Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. Westermarck concluded by suggesting that the proposed Concept specify areas for single-family dwellings in an effort to seamlessly transition between lower and higher density areas.

Councillor McPhail left the meeting (4:39 p.m.).

In reply to a query from Committee, Mr. Crowe advised that the findings of the City's independent economic consultant would be shared with the development community prior to finalizing the proposed Concept.

Councillor McPhail re-entered the meeting (4:43 p.m.).

Joe Erceg, General Manager, Planning and Development, stated that once the public consultation phase has concluded, a detailed implementation plan would be developed. Also, Mr. Erceg commented that while the proposed Concept reflects a 'Developer Pay' approach for community amenities, developers would not be asked to fund other facilities that the City typically funds such as a Fire Hall.

It was moved and seconded

That the proposed Hamilton Area Plan Update Concept be presented for public comment as outlined in the staff report dated May 14, 2013, from the General Manager, Planning and Development.

CARRIED

2. **PROPOSED EXPANSION OF CONVERTIBLE TOWNHOUSE FEATURES THROUGH INCLUSION OF SELECTED SAFERHOME STANDARDS**

(File Ref. No. 08-4057-07) (REDMS No. 3810778)

Wayne Craig, Director, Development, provided background information, noting that it is recommended that the Convertible Unit Guidelines be updated to include nine SAFERhome Standards criteria and to introduce one equivalency provision.

It was moved and seconded

That the Convertible Unit Guidelines, which apply to townhouse development, be expanded to include the specific SAFERhome features identified in the staff report dated May 1, 2013 from the Director, Development and the Senior Manager, Building Approvals.

CARRIED

Planning Committee
Wednesday, May 22, 2013

3. **APPLICATION BY SANDHILL HOMES LTD. FOR REZONING AT 9080 NO. 3 ROAD FROM ASSEMBLY (ASY) TO LOW DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTL4)**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-9030/9031; RZ 12-619503) (REDMS No. 3839351 v.3)

Mr. Craig provided a brief history of the proposed subject site and commented on Council's policy related to applications that re-designate land from 'Community Institutional' to other Official Community Plan (OCP) designations for the purpose of redevelopment.

In reply to a query from Committee, Mr. Craig advised that he was not aware of the subject site's permissive tax exemption history.

Discussion ensued regarding the equity of re-designating land from 'Assembly Use' to other OCP designations for the purpose of redevelopment as it relates to permissive tax exemptions. It was suggested that such applications be required to repay an average of permissive tax exemptions granted.

In reply to a query from Committee, Mr. Craig stated that the subject site could accommodate a small assembly should there be a demand in the market.

Jon Henderson, 8271 Rideau Drive, accompanied by Gerald Tangi, 8311 Rideau Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed development. Mr. Henderson read from his submission (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as Schedule 1). In reply to a query from Committee, Mr. Henderson stated that additional green space on the subject site would be welcomed.

Discussion took place regarding Council's policy related to applications that re-designate land from 'Assembly Use' to other OCP designations for the purpose of redevelopment. It was noted that the policy states that such applications be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

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

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the Application by Sandhill Homes Ltd. for rezoning at 9080 No. 3 Road from Assembly (ASY) to Low Density Townhouses (RTL4) be referred back to staff to examine the issue of green space; and*
- (2) *That staff examine in general the question of repayment of taxes to the City if a permissive tax exemption was granted.*

The question on the referral was not called as discussion ensued regarding the loss of 'Assembly Use' designation for the purpose of redevelopment and its effects on the community.

The Chair expressed concern regarding the proposed referral, noting that a policy with several principles regarding such matters may be more suitable than applying a case-by-case standard.

Planning Committee
Wednesday, May 22, 2013

In reply to a query from the Chair, Mr. Erceg advised that staff would require at minimum three months to draft fundamental principles to be applied to applications that re-designate land from 'Assembly Use' to other OCP designations for the purpose of redevelopment.

There was agreement to add the following text to the end of Part 2 of the proposed referral: 'and any other principles that may be applied to such applications.'

Discussion further ensued and it was noted that the Applicant likely did not receive permissive tax exemptions for the proposed development site, and as such, additional green space should be investigated to enhance the application. However, in the case of all 'Assembly Use' re-designations, if permissive tax exemptions were granted, an average of those taxes should be repaid to the City. Furthermore, if permissive tax exemptions were not granted, is there something that the City should reasonably request from the applicant.

Committee clarified in making the referral motion that a full policy review is not intended, rather that staff are requested to clarify the type of considerations that the City may reasonably request with regard to such applications.

The question on the referral, which now reads,

- (1) That the Application by Sandhill Homes Ltd. for rezoning at 9080 No. 3 Road from Assembly (ASY) to Low Density Townhouses (RTL4) be referred back to staff to examine the issue of green space; and*
- (2) That staff examine in general:*
 - (a) the question of repayment of taxes to the City if a permissive tax exemption was granted; and*
 - (b) any other principles that may be applied to such applications.'*

was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

4. APPLICATION BY AJIT THALIWAL FOR REZONING AT 8960 HEATHER STREET FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/B) TO SINGLE DETACHED (RS2/A)

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-9011; RZ 13-628035) (REDMS No. 3824001)

Please see Page 2 for action on this matter.

Planning Committee
Wednesday, May 22, 2013

5. **MANAGER'S REPORT**

(i) Request by the City of Port Moody for Additional Regional Growth Strategy Special Study Areas

Mr. Crowe referenced a memorandum dated May 22, 2013 (copy on file, City Clerk's Office) regarding the City's response to a proposed Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) amendment requested by the City of Port Moody. Also, Mr. Crowe commented on the timeframe for municipalities to respond to RGS amendments of this kind, noting that 30 days is insufficient.

Discussion ensued and Committee expressed concern regarding the proposed RGS amendment.

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

It was moved and seconded

That staff prepare a resolution to be submitted to Metro Vancouver expressing Richmond's opposition to the conversion of industrial lands to other uses.

CARRIED

(ii) Planning & Development Department Updates

Mr. Craig provided an update on the Ling Yen Mountain Temple, noting that a second open house is anticipated to take place mid-June 2013.

Mr. Craig commented on a liquor store relocation application, noting that as part of the application process, a telephone survey with area residents would be conducted in order to determine if the neighbourhood supports such an application.

Mr. Craig provided an update on the referral related to the rezoning application at 4991 No. 5 Road, highlighting that staff have negotiated an increase in cash contributions for additional density.

In reply to a query from Committee, Mr. Craig advised that due to the subject site's proximity to Highway 99, the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure has requested that a noise attenuation wall be constructed.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (5:36 p.m.).

CARRIED

Planning Committee
Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Wednesday, May 22, 2013.

Councillor Bill McNulty
Chair

Hanieh Berg
Committee Clerk

May 22 , 2013 ,

**Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the
Planning Committee meeting held
on Wednesday, May 22, 2013.**

To Richmond City Council ,

This rezoning application (RZ 11-577561) at 9080 # 3RD. and the details surrounding it have left the adjacent neighbours in the Rideau subdivision somewhat perplexed. What was to become a Jewish synagogue will now become 12 town homes sold at market value. What was Assembly land will be rezoned to a multiple family designation. We have been led to believe that the new OCP which has been in place since November of 2012 nullifies many of the pre-existing concerns regarding the disposition of Assembly zoned land and allows for any kind of development including multi-family housing based on market value without significant compensation to the community. The following are other concerns that we as adjacent neighbours have with respect to this particular application..

A) As neighbours to the ongoing development at 9100 # 3 Rd., we were not made aware that any development on the adjacent property at 9080 #3Rd would be accessed through the ongoing development at 9100 #3Rd (entrance and exit). Although this allowance will not significantly impact the neighbours on Rideau Dr. ,we should have at least been informed. This agreement also raises questions as to when and why did the City of Richmond sacrifice Assembly zoned property in order to accept proposals which would complement the development next door ? At the present time, a retaining wall and fence is securely in place separating both properties.

B) We are discouraged that the City has abandoned its policy of exacting a" significant" Community Benefit for those Assembly lands that have been allowed to rezone to multi-family, based on market valued housing - a policy that appears to have been in place up until 2009.

C) We are also discouraged that the City has abandoned its policy of preserving Assembly zoned lands, given the fact that up to 2009 city staff were concerned that such lands were being lost to market driven forces.

D) We were also discouraged that the developer at 9080 # 3Road [Sandhill Construction] hasn't taken the time to meet with the homeowner at 9311 Rideau Drive (the only adjacent single family residence to directly feel the full impact of this project) in order to explore ways of lessening the impact of said development. eg. providing the amenity space adjacent to the single family home. We understand that this is not a requirement in the City of Richmond but it would have been a polite gesture.

It appears that this application for rezoning is" fait accompli "; however , we hope Council reconsiders its policy regarding the rezoning of Assembly lands given the fact these lands have some distinct amenities attached to them.

Respectively submitted by.

Gerald Tangi (9311 Rideau Drive)

and Jon Henderson (8271 Rideau Drive)

On behalf of other Rideau residents affected by this development.