

Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2008
Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
Present: Councillor Harold Steves, Chair
Councillor Bill McNulty, Vice-Chair
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt
Mayor Malcolm Brodie
Absent: Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Rob Howard
Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, April 22, 2008, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Wednesday, May 21, 2008, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

DELEGATION

3. Mary Gazetas and Margaret Hewlett of the Richmond Food Security Task Force to provide an update on the Community Food Action Initiative Program.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 6, 2008

Ms. Gazetas thanked Committee for giving the Richmond Food Security Task Force (RFSTF) an opportunity to present an update on the 2007/2008 highlights of the Community Food Action Initiative Program (CFAI). She reported that the two-day Food For All Dialogue conference held in February, 2008 attracted over 200 participants, and she distributed the “Local Food Guide – A Map Resource Guide to Richmond’s Local Food Sources, 2008” (on file in the City Clerk’s Office). Ms. Hewlett remarked that momentum for food security is growing, and referenced recent media stories regarding global food shortage issues.

Ms. Gazetas noted that the Ministry of Health’s Smart Fund program is committed to three more years of funding for the RFSTF, and that not all of the work entailed can be accomplished by members of the Task Force. She asked that Committee explore ways in which the City and the Task Force can work together.

Discussion ensued regarding the following points:

- the RFSTF has liaised with the City’s Agricultural Advisory Committee and has undertaken outreach activities with members of Richmond’s farming community;
- education is key in informing the public regarding the RFSTF’s activities and accomplishments, and the local media is one vehicle that assists in the education process;
- both elementary and high school educators have been proactive in creating programs that involve community gardens;
- ‘pocket markets’ and how the concept can be implemented in Richmond;
- the criteria used by the RFSTF to include local food sources in its Local Food Guide;
- the programs run by the RFSTF, and the CFAI as well as the creation of Steveston Market encourages the production and selling of local produce.

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

That the update on the Richmond Community Food Action Initiative (CFAI), delivered to the Planning Committee on May 6, 2008 by Mary Gazetas and Margaret Hewlett of the Richmond Food Security Task Force, be referred to staff to:

- (1) explore the feasibility of the appointment of a City staff liaison to the Richmond Food Security Task Force;***
- (2) examine the opportunity for the City to work with the Richmond Food Security Task Force to begin developing a food strategy for Richmond; and***

Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 6, 2008

- (3) *investigate resources in the City's 2009 budget for the provision for a Food Security Coordinator City position.*

CARRIED

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

4. **HIGHLIGHTS: PROPOSED STEVESTON VILLAGE DESIGN GUIDELINES**

(Report: April 23, 2008, File No.:) (REDMS No. 2440241)

Terry Crowe, Manager, Policy Planning, stated that consultant James Burton, Birmingham and Wood Architects/Planners would use boards to present highlights of the Steveston Village Design Guidelines. The discussion of the highlights would assist in preparing the Implementation Program of the Steveston Village Conservation Program.

Mr. Burton spoke in detail regarding the Review of Development Permit Guidelines – Steveston Area Plan (on file in the City Clerk's Office). He highlighted the following points:

- the existing regulations blend wording from the Design Criteria for the Steveston Revitalization Area (also known as the 'Sakamoto Guidelines', 1987) and the Steveston Area and require more clarity;
- current best-practices emphasize that new design should balance 'distinguishability' with 'compatibility';
- the greater the degree of prescription, the greater the uniformity and certainty when making and reviewing proposals;
- five of the design variables available to balance distinguishability and compatibility are: (i) settlement pattern, (ii) massing and height, (iii) architectural elements, (iv) appendages such as signage and awnings, and (v) landscape elements;
- the three Steveston style periods are: (1) pre-World War II: Frontier Commercial Style; (2) 1945-1980: Modern Commercial Style and; (3) 1980-present: Guidelines Commercial Style;
- today's Steveston should: (i) incorporate as many of the identified commonalities as possible while (ii) responding to today's requirements for living and working in the Village;
- with respect to the 'Contemporary Steveston Style' design guidelines, three highlights are: (1) front façades are at the front property line; (2) good quality metal doors and windows that are an architecturally pleasing element; and (3) along Moncton Street a maximum of two storey structures, while elsewhere three storey buildings can be featured;

Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 6, 2008

- new buildings need to support the heritage character of Steveston and make economic sense in today's market.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members, staff and Mr. Burton regarding the review of the proposed development permit guidelines highlights and the following comments were made:

- it is important to create something in Steveston that tells a historical story about the whole Village;
- current best practices with respect to heritage villages is to not confuse the viewer/visitor as to what buildings are original and what buildings are new;
- the difference between a 'heritage building' (recognized and designated by the community) and a 'character building' (which supports a general heritage character in the community and can be either old or new, but its characteristics and qualities have not been identified as heritage);
- more homogeneity in appearance in buildings comes from a more prescriptive approach;
- the proposal is too modern and the Sakamoto Guidelines are more in keeping with what is desired in the Village;
- whether the term 'contemporary' should be applied to the proposed style;
- whether small commercial buildings, replicating the small lot style of Steveston's residential buildings, is the way to go;
- how to combine the Sakamoto Guidelines and the proposed guidelines to enhance the Village;
- the value of the massing, the setback criteria, and the front face.

Dana Westermarck, Richmond Heritage Commission member, noted that before the presentation to Committee, the Guidelines have been discussed at Heritage Commission meetings. He remarked that: (i) it is a challenge to achieve a cohesive/diverse balance in the Village; (ii) the chaotic nature of the Village is part of its appeal; (iii) the prescriptive requirement may lead to an artificial or 'Disney-esque' appearance; (iv) small commercial lots are not always economically viable and contribute to a high turnover of shopkeepers; (v) the intent of presenting and discussing the proposed guidelines is to ensure the progression of the Village of Steveston.

Mr. Westermarck concluded his remarks by noting that the proposed guidelines are an opportunity for the Village to evolve, and that freezing Steveston's design at a certain point in time will not reflect the nature of the Village. He added that the Village has always changed and should continue to do so.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 6, 2008

Graham Turnbull, Chair, Richmond Heritage Commission addressed Committee and advised that the 'never static' nature of the Village is unique and attractive. He stated that in the draft Heritage Conservation Strategy there are approximately 30 buildings in Steveston identified as worthy of conservation, and that the intent of discussing the design guidelines for the Village and its buildings is to create incentives for the owners of these buildings to save and to repair their buildings.

In response to a query, Mr. Crowe stated that Development Permit applications currently under review follow the existing development permit guidelines.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the Proposed Steveston Village Design Guidelines be referred to staff to revise the draft "Contemporary Steveston Style" to:

- (1) ensure that the "Sakamoto Guidelines" are the basis of the revised Steveston Area Plan, Development Permit Guidelines;*
- (2) provide a greater degree of prescription to achieve the Sakamoto Guidelines;*
- (3) allow the use of modern materials; and*
- (4) enable two Development Permit review processes: (i) a short one for applications which meet the guidelines, and (ii) a longer one for those applications which propose a different design from the guidelines.*

CARRIED

5. MANAGER'S REPORT

(1) City Centre Area Plan (CCAP)

No report was given.

(2) Steveston Study

Please see the discussion Item 4 on pages 3, 4 and 5.

(3) Official Community Plan (OCP)

No report was given.

Planning Committee

Tuesday, May 6, 2008

(4) *Liveable Region Strategic Plan Review (LRSP)*

Mr. Crowe advised that Metro Vancouver staff has created a draft Regional Growth Management Strategy (GMS) based on feedback received from only 11 of 22 municipalities. A brief discussion ensued and Joe Erceg, General Manager, Planning and Development stated that City staff would provide memorandums in order to update Committee on the progress of the GMS process.

(5) *Draney House*

Mr. Crowe reported that staff attended the property at 12011 No. 4 Road ('Draney House') in response to a telephone call from a member of the Richmond Heritage Commission with respect to possible demolition activity observed at the address. Mr. Crowe advised that the homeowners have not applied for a demolition permit, but had indicated to staff that the application would be made during the week of May 12, 2008.

Discussion ensued with comments being made that, due to the heritage nature of the home, conservation of the building should be explored, but that the building is not City-owned and there is a short time to discuss the matter with the owners and to ascertain their plans for the structure.

Mr. Crowe advised that a further discussion of the matter would take place at the May 8, 2008 meeting of the Richmond Heritage Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (6:13 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, May 6, 2008.

Councillor Harold Steves
Chair

Sheila Johnston
Committee Clerk