



## Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, December 16, 2014

Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Linda McPhail, Chair  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Chak Au  
Councillor Carol Day  
Councillor Harold Steves

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

The Chair advised that the order of the agenda would be varied to consider Item No. 4 last.

### MINUTES

It was moved and seconded

*That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, December 3, 2014, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

Tuesday, January 6, 2015, (tentative date) at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room

## **COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

1. **RICHMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AND RICHMOND INTERCULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
REPORT REGARDING SETTLEMENT SERVICES FUNDING  
CHANGES**

(File Ref. No. 07-3000-00) (REDMS No. 4444296)

In reply to queries from Committee, Lesley Sherlock, Social Planner, commented on the changes to settlement services funding and noted the following:

- there is an anticipated decrease in settlement services funding of approximately seven percent in April 2015 based on Province-wide immigration levels;
- the impact to settlement service programs in Richmond as a result of changes to settlement services funding is unknown;
- there will be an anticipated reduction in staffing and clientele in organizations associated with settlement services as a result of changes to funding and eligibility;
- the City can discuss the funding of settlement services with higher levels of government; and
- the Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee (RCSAC) will keep Council updated with regard to settlement funding changes.

Discussion ensued regarding the transfer of responsibility for settlement services to the Municipal level from the Federal and Provincial levels of government. It was suggested that the RCSAC discuss reversing the funding changes with higher levels of government.

In reply to queries from Committee, Ms. Sherlock advised that future commitment for settlement services funding is not anticipated from higher levels of government. She added that English as a Second Language services (ESL) will use a fee-based approach; however fees could be waived based on a needs assessment.

Discussion ensued regarding the response made by other municipalities with respect to settlement funding changes.

Daylene Marshall and Parm Grewal, RCSAC, commented on the anticipated changes to settlement services funding and noted the following:

- the seven percent reduction will be in addition to an eleven percent reduction previously made;

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, December 16, 2014**

---

- Federal funding for settlement services is based on the distribution of new immigrants across Canada;
- transitional funding for settlement services is being considered by the Province;
- there are discussions with higher levels of government with regard to options for funding settlement services; and
- the statistics used to assess the distribution of new immigrants is based on the port of entry.

Discussion ensued regarding how settlement services funding is incorporated into the Provincial and Federal budgets.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the Provincial Government be requested to continue funding the provision of settlement services to immigrant categories no longer eligible for CIC funding as of April 2015;*
- (2) *That the Federal Government be requested to adopt a funding formula reflective of and responsive to community need, and enter into stable funding arrangements with community service providers; and*
- (3) *That the staff report titled Richmond Community Services Advisory Committee and Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee Report regarding Settlement Services Funding Changes, dated November 26, 2014, from the General Manager, Community Services, be distributed to Provincial and Federal Ministers responsible, Richmond MPs and MLAs, Kwantlen Polytechnic University and the Richmond School Board.*

**CARRIED**

## **PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**2. APPLICATION BY SANDHILL HOMES LTD. FOR REZONING AT 6500 GRANVILLE AVENUE FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E) TO COMPACT SINGLE DETACHED (RC2)**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009186; RZ 14-668415) (REDMS No. 4382060)

Wayne Craig, Director, Development, briefed Committee on the proposed development and noted the following:

- the proposed development is anticipated to comply with arterial growth requirements;
- four on-site trees will be retained;

3.

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, December 16, 2014**

---

- the proposed development will incorporate secondary suites in keeping with the City's Affordable Housing Strategy; and
- the proposed development will require a servicing agreement for frontage improvements.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Craig advised that there is development signage on-site and that notices will be mailed to area residents at the Public Hearing stage.

Discussion ensued regarding the inclusion of secondary suites in the development.

It was moved and seconded

*That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9186, for the rezoning of 6500 Granville Avenue from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Compact Single Detached (RC2)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

3. **APPLICATION BY JHUJAR CONSTRUCTION LTD. FOR REZONING AT 3920 LOCKHART ROAD FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E) TO SINGLE DETACHED (RS2/B)**

(File Ref. No. 23-8060-20-009184; RZ 14-667490) (REDMS No. 4435194)

Mr. Craig briefed Committee on the proposed development and noted that (i) cedar hedges will be retained, (ii) two new trees will be added and, (iii) there will be secondary suites on both lots.

It was moved and seconded

*That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9184, for the rezoning of 3920 Lockhart Road from "Single Detached (RS1/E)" to "Single Detached (RS2/B)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

5. **APPLICATION BY YAMAMOTO ARCHITECTURE INC. FOR REZONING AT 9611, 9631 AND 9651 BLUNDELL ROAD FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/F) TO TOWN HOUSING (ZT60) – NORTH MCLENNAN (CITY CENTRE)**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009200; RZ 13-647246) (REDMS No. 4389266 v.2)

Mr. Craig provided an overview of the proposed development and noted that the proposed townhouse development (i) complies with the South McLennan Area Plan, (ii) will provide a cash-in-lieu contribution to the Affordable Housing Strategy and the Public Art Fund, (iii) will be built to EnerGuide 82 standards, (iv) will have pre-ducting for sustainability features, and (v) will provide a community amenity contribution.

4.

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, December 16, 2014**

---

In reply to queries from Committee with regard to density, Mr. Craig advised that the proposed townhouse development complies with the Affordable Housing Strategy and would not require an allocation of units for affordable housing.

Mr. Craig noted that the proposed development and density is consistent with other developments in the South McLennan Area. He added that the proposed development is providing contributions to the Affordable Housing Strategy, Park Development Fund, and frontage improvements.

Discussion ensued with respect to the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the requirements for affordable housing.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Craig advised that based on the Affordable Housing Strategy, townhouse developments are only required to provide cash contribution. Also, he noted that apartment developments over 80 units are required to provide affordable housing units and that staff are currently reviewing the Affordable Housing Strategy.

Discussion took place with respect reviewing the Affordable Housing Strategy to include other developments such as single-family sites.

In reply to queries from Committee, Cathryn Volkering Carlile, General Manager, Community Services, advised that staff are currently reviewing the Affordable Housing Strategy and could examine the policy in relation to single-family developments.

Joe Erceg, General Manager, Planning and Development, advised that the staff review on the Affordable Housing Development would be brought back to Council in a series of reports and noted that staff are also reviewing the land use contracts in the city.

In reply to queries from Committee regarding height guidelines, Mr. Erceg clarified how building height is calculated for townhouse developments.

In reply to queries from Committee, John Foster, Manager, Community Social Development, advised that staff are reviewing the Affordable Housing Strategy and will present findings in a series of reports. He added that staff can also examine multi-family development contributions related to the Affordable Housing Strategy. Ms. Carlile advised that the staff reports on Affordable Housing will be presented to Council in 2015.

Staff were then directed to examine the contributions of single-family and multi-family developments in relation to the Affordable Housing Strategy and report back.

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, December 16, 2014**

---

In reply to queries from Committee regarding the proposed development's bonus density, Mr. Craig noted that the density for this project is consistent with the Major Arterial Roads Policy and is compliant with the Affordable Housing Strategy and Parks Development Fund. He added that the proposed development is providing frontage improvements and will be contributing to the Public Art Fund.

Mr. Erceg noted that the proposed development is consistent with past and current developments in the city and complies with the South McLennan Area Plan, which have provisions for bonus density.

Discussion ensued with regard to the review of the Affordable Housing Strategy and potential benefits associated with the proposed development

Discussion then ensued with respect to applying the Affordable Housing Strategy policies fairly across all development applications.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Craig advised that proposed development applications are evaluated based on existing City policy and consistency with other approved development projects in the area.

Discussion ensued with respect to using a formula to determine the density in a proposed development. Mr. Erceg advised that approval of proposed development application is based on existing City policy and not a direct formula.

Discussion then ensued with regard to (i) reviewing the Affordable Housing Strategy, (ii) the densification of single-family areas, and (iii) ensuring consistency in the application of City policies to all developments.

It was moved and seconded

*That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9200, for the rezoning of 9611, 9631 and 9651 Blundell Road from "Single Detached (RS1/F)" to "Town Housing (ZT60) – North McLennan (City Centre)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

Opposed: Cllr. Day

4. **APPLICATION BY POLYGON DEVELOPMENT 273 LTD. FOR REZONING ON A PORTION OF 10440 AND 10460 NO. 2 ROAD FROM SCHOOL & INSTITUTIONAL USE (SI) TO TOWN HOUSING (ZT72) – LONDON / STEVESTON (NO. 2 ROAD)**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009155/009156; RZ 13-649524) (REDMS No. 4453737 v.3)

Mr. Craig gave an overview of the revisions made and options presented for the proposed development and noted the following:

- a third open house occurred on December 2, 2014;

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, December 16, 2014**

---

- Option A would include the integration of affordable housing units in pairs of two in six different buildings, the childcare facility is moved to the north-west corner of the site and the City-owned greenway, with connections to the park, relocated to the north side of the site;
- Option B would include the modifications in Option A but have a two greenways, with connections to the park, located on the north and south side of the site; and
- there would be a fully signalized intersection for the proposed development, including north and south left turn lanes along No. 2 Road.

In reply to queries from Committee with respect to Option A, Mr. Craig noted the following:

- staff are recommending Option A for the proposed development;
- the greenway relocated to the northern side of the site, as presented in Option A, is anticipated to visually provide more security;
- an alternative access point to the park would be along Dylan Place and Spender Drive on the south side of the site;
- there is modestly more community support for the proposed northern greenway (Option A);
- the public will not be able to access the park through the central drive aisle of the proposed development; and
- the proposed development will use transparent fencing along the greenway to provide visibility.

Discussion ensued with regard to park access and vehicle parking. Mike Redpath, Senior Manager, Parks, advised that park users could utilize the childcare facility's vehicle parking during off-hours and that staff will initiate public consultation on the park's use and report back to Council prior to adjusting of the rezoning bylaw.

Mr. Craig advised that staff examined other options for public vehicle access to the park including changing the orientation of site; however options for a public/private road were not feasible.

Jason Ma, 6220 Goldsmith Drive, provided feedback on the proposed development and read from his submission (attached to and forming part of these minutes as Schedule 1).

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, December 16, 2014**

---

Terry Crowe, Manager, Policy Planning, commented on the public consultation undertaken for the proposed development and noted that (i) public consultation notices were advertised in the local newspaper and were reviewed by staff, (ii) staff were present at the public consultation sessions, (iii) OCP amendments would follow the Public Hearing process, (iv) there will be additional public consultation opportunities, and (v) there were opportunities for residents to engage staff during the open house.

In reply to queries from Committee regarding the applicant's methods of notification for the third open house, Mark McMullen, Senior Coordinator-Major Projects, noted that (i) notices were provided for residents within a 300 metre radius from the proposed development, (ii) notices were advertised in the local newspaper, (iii) notices were received within a few days of the scheduled third open house, and (iv) approximately 65 residents attended the third open house.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Ma noted that he attended the open house for the proposed development and that comment cards were available for feedback. He was of the opinion that the City should host the public consultation, and insufficient notice was given for the third open house.

Mr. Crowe commented on the public consultation process and noted that City staff and staff representing the applicant were available for discussion during the open houses. He added that residents were able to provide feedback on the proposed development via comment cards.

Discussion ensued with regard to improving the consultation process for the proposed development.

Steve May, 6240 Goldsmith Drive, spoke on the proposed development and proposed a variant of the options introduced by staff, which could include greenways with access to the park on both the northern and southern side of the site. He added that the proposed variant of Options A and B would include lighting to increase security and that the addition of the southern greenway would lessen pedestrian traffic on the northern greenway.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Craig advised that in Option B, there would be greenways on the northern and southern side of the site; however the northern greenway would be narrower in Option B compared to the northern greenway proposed in Option A.

Mr. May suggested that the width of the northern greenway remain the same as in Option A, and the southern greenway extended eastward to the park. Also, Mr. May expressed concern with regard to the availability of vehicle parking for residents and park users when the site is developed.



## Planning Committee

### Tuesday, December 16, 2014

---

Discussion ensued regarding the public consultation process and the declining attendance of the open houses. Mr. May was of the opinion that residents were not given enough notice to attend the open houses; however, he expressed that he was satisfied with the consultation process.

Discussion then ensued with regard to the variant of Options A and B as suggested by Mr. May. Mr. Craig advised that the centre units in the proposed development may be compromised if the northern and southern greenways are both widened to 40 feet.

In reply to queries from Committee regarding the ownership of the proposed southern greenway, Mr. Craig advised that public access through a privately owned greenway is possible. He added, should the proposed southern greenway be privately owned, the strata corporation associated with proposed development would be responsible for maintenance of the greenway's landscaping and the City would be responsible for the maintenance of the greenway's pathway surface.

Kai Tham, 6680 Gainsborough Drive, commented on the public consultation related to the proposed development. He was of the opinion that the public consultation related to the proposed development should be a comprehensive approach that would include dialogue with area residents in a non-confrontational way.

Chris Ho, Polygon Development 273 Ltd., spoke of the public consultation process related to the proposed development and noted that the initial open house presented concepts and gathered comments from area residents. Subsequent open houses used feedback from area residents to modify the proposed development. He added that the proposed variant of Option A and B would be a satisfactory solution for the applicant.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Ho advised the following:

- there would be a northern greenway with a setback of 40 feet and a southern greenway with a setback of 30 feet;
- reducing the number of units in the proposed development is not recommended because of minimal shadowing concerns along the southern edge of the site and concerns related to project costs; and
- the densification of the centre units by using a London-flat style design in the proposed development is not recommended because of the nature of the surrounding neighbourhood which are mostly single-family homes.

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, December 16, 2014**

---

Discussion ensued with regard to the options to add density to the proposed development in order to widen the southern greenway. In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Ho noted that due to the limited space available on-site, reconfiguring the site to accommodate the space needed for widened greenways would be difficult.

Discussion then ensued with regard to the variant of Option A and B and the ownership of the southern greenway. In reply to queries from Committee with respect to the proposed southern greenway, Mr. Craig advised that staff direction from Committee would be required for public access options if strata-ownership of the proposed southern greenway is preferred. He added that a modification of the zoning and the OCP bylaw amendment would be required if City ownership of the proposed southern greenway is preferred.

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

- (1) *That Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 9156 and Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9155 be amended to achieve a City-owned greenway with a 30 foot setback along the south side of the sites at 10440 and 10460 No. 2 Road;*
- (2) *That Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 9156 (as amended by Committee) to re-designate 10440 and 10460 No. 2 Road from "School" to "Neighbourhood Residential" and "Park" in the 2041 Land Use Map be introduced and given first reading;*
- (3) *That Bylaw 9156 as amended, having been considered in conjunction with:*
  - (a) *The City's Financial Plan and Capital Program; and*
  - (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;*
- (4) *That Bylaw 9156 as amended, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is hereby found not to require further consultation in accordance with Section 879(2)(b) of the Local Government Act; and*
- (5) *That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9155 as amended, to create the "Town Housing (ZT72) – London / Steveston (No. 2 Road)" zone, and to rezone a portion of 10440 and 10460 No. 2 Road from "School & Institutional Use (SI)" to "Town Housing (ZT72) – London / Steveston (No. 2 Road)" be introduced and given first reading.*

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, December 16, 2014**

---

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to (i) options to widen the proposed southern greenway, (ii) the approval process of the proposed application, and (iii) options for increasing the proposed development's density.

As a result of the discussion the following **amendment** was introduced for Part (1):

It was moved and seconded

***That the Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 9156 and Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9155 be amended to achieve a City-owned greenway with a 40 foot setback along the south side of the sites at 10440 and 10460 No. 2 Road;***

The question on the amendment was not called as discussion ensued with regard to the ownership of the proposed southern greenway and the approval process of the proposed application.

In reply to queries from Committee, Mr. Craig advised that maintenance of the proposed southern greenway would be the responsibility of the owners.

Mr. Ho noted that the proposed southern greenway would be delineated from the proposed development using short and transparent fencing.

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

The question on the motion as amended, which reads as follows:

- (1) *That Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 9156 and Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9155 be amended to achieve a City-owned greenway with a 40 foot setback along the south side of the sites at 10440 and 10460 No. 2 Road;*
- (2) *That Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, Amendment Bylaw 9156 (as amended by Committee) to re-designate 10440 and 10460 No. 2 Road from "School" to "Neighbourhood Residential" and "Park" in the 2041 Land Use Map be introduced and given first reading;*
- (3) *That Bylaw 9156 as amended, having been considered in conjunction with:*
  - (a) *The City's Financial Plan and Capital Program; and*
  - (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;*

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, December 16, 2014**

---

- (4) *That Bylaw 9156 as amended, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is hereby found not to require further consultation in accordance with Section 879(2)(b) of the Local Government Act; and*
- (5) *That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9155 as amended, to create the "Town Housing (ZT72) – London / Steveston (No. 2 Road)" zone, and to rezone a portion of 10440 and 10460 No. 2 Road from "School & Institutional Use (SI)" to "Town Housing (ZT72) – London / Steveston (No. 2 Road)" be introduced and given first reading.*

was not called as discussion ensued regarding (i) the timeline of the approval process for the proposed development, (ii) additional opportunities for public consultation, and (iii) new site drawings reflecting the modifications to the proposed development.

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

4. **MANAGER'S REPORT**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (5:48 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, December 16, 2014.

---

Councillor Linda McPhail  
Chair

---

Evangel Biason  
Auxiliary Committee Clerk

Feedback on proposed redevelopment of the Steveston High site, and Polygon's open house:

1) Property belongs to future generations.

We should directly or indirectly do all we can to preserve land in the Public Trust. While the Ministry, led astray by politics, has erred by permitting sale of schools, we are given an affirmative opportunity to preserve Common land. The City must be aggressive with the School Board, to insist that Steveston-London High school, instead of usurping park use for its curricula, needs to have its own fields. It is not right that the school is at liberty to take over vast sections of the park and relegate its use by Richmond residents who pay for its care. A land swap plus part payment would be a good idea to procure the site from the School Board. This way the City is working quicker towards adding an additional 133 ha (330 ac.) of parkland as required by 2041 per the OCP. We urge Council to champion this for the common good.

2) Effective Consultation.

Regarding Official Community Plan Bylaw 9000, proposed Amendment Bylaw 9156, we appreciate the City's display board of the "City Development Review Process". We interpret the "Public Consultation" step, noted on the display board, as pursuant to Section 879 of the Local Government Act on amendment of the OCP. While the Act in part states, "... *the proposing local government must provide one or more opportunities... for consultation...*", it appears varied in practice; this event is hosted by Polygon, not by the proposing local government, and named as an "Open House", not "Public Consultation". Had the event been presented as "Public Consultation" hosted by the City, the terms of reference - implicit understanding, relationship, and interactions with/by attendants - would be completely different. As an open house by the developer, it connotes passivity of presentation to a guest audience; while as a public consultation by the local government, it empowers the participants and facilitates ideas. (*Aside: Authoritative governance persuades consent by showcase, while democratic social-design harnesses empowered participation towards consensus.*) We believe this section of the Act makes clear that it must be a consultation, not an open house.

3) As part of the consultative stage, we were hoping to contribute ideas and feedback during the design process to the layout of options A and B, rather than voicing afterwards. Voicing afterwards, during the open house, does not change the drawings, and one either relents or is compelled to confront those plans at the Committee. The experience becomes less meaningful and less effective. At a stage when it ought to be inclusive and collaborative, feelings give confrontation a creep-in.

4) In presenting Options A and B, the developer is assured that only A or B is the outcome. Validating one or the other is to the advantage of the developer. This would not be a problem if item 2) above, effective consultation, was adopted.

5) More than 2 options exist.

A third may be a variant of option A - to add a walkway on the southern greenway to enable additional access. (The northern greenway should remain wider than the south, as on the current drawing, because there is shadowing (none south), and also, most of the park is to the north with greater pedestrian, pet, and bicycling traffic.) Please also note that the previous design has a 40ft central greenway, 20ft buffer north and south, giving a total of 80ft for these corridors. Now we have 70ft total. The 10ft gain is now used to create townhouse walkways between yards. Walkways between townhouse yards are not necessary. Perhaps Polygon is amenable to giving back 10 feet, as it can actually save money by not building a walkway between yards. Reclaiming the 10 feet to create a 40ft northern greenway would keep the width same as the originally proposed central one.

The process may have taken on irreversible momentum. At this juncture, point 5) is a compromise that may be the most actionable, and we urge the Committee to consider.