



Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, February 8, 2022

Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Bill McNulty, Chair
Councillor Alexa Loo (by teleconference)
Councillor Chak Au
Councillor Carol Day (by teleconference)
Councillor Andy Hobbs
Councillor Harold Steves (by teleconference)

Also Present: Councillor Linda McPhail (by teleconference)
Councillor Michael Wolfe (by teleconference)

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

MINUTES

It was moved and seconded

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on January 18, 2022, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

1. **FOURSQUARE GOSPEL CHURCH OF CANADA - APPLICATION**
(File Ref. No. TU 20-901466) (REDMS No. 6806554)

It was moved and seconded

(1) *That the application by Foursquare Gospel Church of Canada for a Temporary Commercial Use Permit (TCUP) for the property at Unit 140 - 11300 No. 5 Road to permit "Religious Assembly" use be considered for three years from the date of issuance; and*

(2) *That this application be forwarded to the March 21, 2022 Public Hearing at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Richmond City Hall.*

CARRIED

Planning Committee
Tuesday, February 8, 2022

2. **ENHANCED PROTECTIONS FOR SIGNIFICANT TREES**

(File Ref. No. 12-8360-01) (REDMS No. 6824071)

Staff provided a brief summary highlighting that the proposed regulations within the tree protection bylaw address the contributions to the community and neighborhoods that large significant trees make, as well as seek to preserve large healthy trees.

Discussion ensued regarding (i) maximum number of trees required for replacement, (ii) the intent of the tree protection bylaw being to protect healthy trees, (iii) structurally unstable trees are not protected by the bylaw, and (iv) creation of a series of bulletins outlining the new amendments and processes.

Sharon MacGougan, President, Garden City Conservation Society referred to her submission (attached to and forming part of these minutes as Schedule 1) and commented that protecting habitats and significant trees is very important. She stated that she would like to see some wording in the Bylaw acknowledging wildlife trees.

Further discussion ensued regarding the bylaw's intent to allow staff to precipitate the removal of hazardous trees and to ensure the replacement and planting of significant trees in the same location.

Staff advised that this bylaw gives them a regulatory authority that is very important when addressing specific situations of willful damage. The authority is not used unless warranted and staff will continue to monitor a new tree even after a year if they see that it is needed.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Tree Protection Bylaw No. 8057, Amendment Bylaw No. 10343 amending regulations for the enhanced protections of significant trees be introduced and given first, second and third reading;*
- (2) *That Consolidated Fees Bylaw 8636, Amendment Bylaw No. 10348 introducing the security deposit amounts for tree survival and tree replacement related to building permit and subdivision be introduced and given first, second and third reading;*
- (3) *That Municipal Ticket Information Authorization Bylaw No. 7321, Amendment Bylaw No.10348 introducing tickets related to the amendments to the tree protection bylaw be introduced and given first, second and third reading;*
- (4) *That Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 and 9000, Amendment Bylaw 10339, which would amend provisions for the protection of trees, be introduced and given first reading;*
- (5) *That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 and 9000, Amendment Bylaw 10339, having been considered in conjunction with:*

Planning Committee
Tuesday, February 8, 2022

- (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 477(3)(a) of the Local Government Act; and

- (6) That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 and 9000, Amendment Bylaw 10339, having been considered in accordance with Section 475 of the Local Government Act and the City's Official Community Plan Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is found not to require further consultation.*

CARRIED

Discussion ensued in regards to (i) the term biodiversity in place of landscaping (ii) maintenance of wildlife trees when not hazardous, (iii) the maintenance time being extended from one year to two years for new trees and (iv) definitions of hazardous trees, standing dead trees and dying trees.

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

It was moved and seconded

That staff review tree regulations and options to incorporate the following:

- (1) The word "landscape" be removed and replaced with "mature trees" and "biodiversity"*
- (2) The maintenance of wildlife trees when not in a hazardous state, and*
- (3) The effects of English Ivy planted around trees.*

The question on the **referral motion** was not called, as discussion ensued with regards to creating communication around the pros and cons of the Ivy plant.

The question on the **referral motion** was then called and **CARRIED**

3. BC HOUSING'S SAFER PROGRAM

(File Ref. No. 08-4057-05) (REDMS No. 6772537)

Discussion ensued regarding the City of Richmond sending a resolution to the the Lower Mainland Local Government Association requesting that UBCM (Union of British Columbia Municipalities) request the Provincial Government and BC Housing for increase to the maximum rent ceiling and monthly payment amounts provided by the BC Housing Shelter Aid for Elderly Rents (SAFER) program

Further discussion ensued regarding the (i) disparity in rental rates (ii) the City's commitment to playing a leadership role in creating affordable housing and (iii) the need for Provincial and Federal government funding to reach this goal.

Planning Committee
Tuesday, February 8, 2022

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the staff report titled “BC Housing’s SAFER program,” dated January 5, 2022 from the Director, Community Social Development, be received for information;*
- (2) *That the City of Richmond write to the provincial government, including the Attorney General and Minister Responsible for Housing, Richmond’s Members of the Legislative Assembly and BC Housing to advocate for an increase to the maximum rent ceilings and monthly payment amounts provided by the BC Housing Shelter Aid for Elderly Renters (SAFER) program; and*
- (3) *That the City of Richmond send a resolution to the LMLGA (Lower Mainland Local Government Association) requesting that UBCM (Union of British Columbia Municipalities) request the Provincial Government and BC Housing for an increase to the maximum rent ceiling and monthly payment amounts provided by the BC Housing Shelter Aid for Elderly Rents (SAFER) program*

CARRIED

4. **REFERRAL RESPONSE ON PUBLIC ACCESS ALONG THE STEVESTON WATERFRONT AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE STEVESTON AREA PLAN**

(File Ref. No. 08-4060-05-01) (REDMS No. 6773172)

Staff provided a brief summary highlighting key components and proposed amendments to the Steveston Area Plan and providing direction on the preferred location of the waterfront walkway including provisions for pedestrian access from Bayview Street with the ultimate objective of providing a continuous walkway over the long term in this area.

Discussion ensued regarding (i) concerns of further development of residential along the Steveston walkway; (ii) the current zoning of 3880 Bayview Street, (iii) no provisions for public access at 3866 Bayview Street, (iv) enhancement of the plan for the waterfront network, and (v) mixed commercial/residential use on waterfront lots that have been a permitted use in the Steveston Area Plan since 1986.

Further discussion ensued regarding amendments that were made to the Steveston Area Plan in 2017 reducing height and density along the south side of Bayview Street.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 10344, to revise policies on public access to and along the waterfront in the Steveston Village Riverfront area contained in Section 2.4 of the Official Community Plan (Steveston Area Plan), be introduced and granted first reading.*

Planning Committee
Tuesday, February 8, 2022

- (2) *That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 10344, 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 programs and plans, in accordance with Section 477(3)(a) of the Local Government Act.

- (3) *That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 10344, having been considered in accordance with Section 475 of the Local Government Act and the City's Official Community Plan Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is found not to require further consultation.*

CARRIED

As a result of discussion around continuous access and walkability along the waterfront the following **referral motion** was introduced:

To bring forward amendments to the Steveston Area Plan on the south side of Bayview Street between 3rd Avenue and No. 1 Road by:

- (1) *Removing the allowance of mixed commercial/residential uses from all plans on the waterfront.*
- (2) *Holding active rezoning applications in abeyance until such time as the referral is addressed.*
- (3) *Providing a map of the building at 3866 Bayview Street and the walkway around the end of it to examine a way to connect the two sites together.*

CARRIED

4A PRESALE OF NEW DEVELOPMENTS RAISING HOUSING PRICES

Discussion ensued regarding the presales of condos and townhouses occurring before the homes are built which can increase the final price. Investors then flipping the property causing local buyers to pay far more than the original price making new homes unaffordable. As a result of the discussion, the following **referral** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That staff be directed to research whether the City of Richmond can require that developers marketing their units for sale in all new developments must give local buyers an exclusive opportunity to purchase new homes before sales are open to the rest of the world, and that this would include presales and sales upon completion of the units.

Planning Committee
Tuesday, February 8, 2022

The question on the **referral** motion was not called as further discussion ensued in regards to this referral was worth researching, as not much is known about how residential units created within the city are actually marketed and consumed. There is a substantial amount of presale and resale before the units are bought by the final occupier.

The question on the **referral** motion was then called and **CARRIED**

5. **MANAGER'S REPORT**

(i) *Agricultural Land Commission*

Staff advised Committee of Agricultural Land Commission's approval of a non-farm use application at 11371 No. 3 Road.

(ii) *Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy Update*

Staff advised Committee that most Council endorsed comments from Richmond on the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth strategy were incorporated by Metro Vancouver and that staff anticipate further discussions with Metro Vancouver staff on the draft strategy.

(iii) *YVR Land Use Plan*

Staff advised Committee that YVR is looking at commercial development opportunities on Sea Island Way but any specific development plans are years away and engagement with the City of Richmond will be required.

(iv) *Census Update*

Staff advised that on February 9, 2022 Statistics Canada will be releasing its first set of data from the 2021 Census

(v) *Building Activity for 2021*

Staff advised that the value of approved construction was \$719 million in 2021. Commercial and industrial construction appears to be strong and there has been a resurgence in single family construction.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (5:30 p.m.).

CARRIED

Planning Committee
Tuesday, February 8, 2022

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, February 8, 2022

Councillor Bill McNulty
Chair

Raman Grewal
Legislative Services Associate

To: Richmond Planning Committee, February 8, 2022

From: Sharon MacGougan, President, Garden City Conservation Society

Re: **Enhanced Protections for Significant Trees**

Mayor Brodie and Councillors,

The Garden City Conservation Society strongly supports the proposed amendments to the Tree Protection Bylaw. We are especially pleased with (a) the language that supports habitat retention and restoration and (b) the language that affirms the importance of wildlife and birds.

As you know, Richmond is on the Pacific Flyway, so we are very significant for migrating birds along with native ones. We are on the verge of being designated a Key Biodiversity Area. By embedding the importance of birds and wildlife into our OCP, we take a positive step. Thank you to the authors of this report for recommendations that can help mitigate some ecological loss, adjusting our direction for the better.

In North America, three billion birds have been lost since the 1970s, sometimes with extinction of species, and habitat loss is the number one cause. It's our responsibility to figure out ways we can help turn that trend around. The protection of significant trees has a part in it, as recognized in the staff report, especially because they take decades to grow in capacity to deliver their benefits.

I will refer to some amendments to Bylaw 8057 and comment each time.

Article (2) says, ***“compel a property owner to remove a hazardous and/or standing dead or dying tree.”*** Here’s our comment:

We agree but point out that “wildlife trees” are important habitat for insects and birds. In some cases, residents maintain dying birch trees by cutting off the dead tops but retaining the tree for the food and nesting opportunities it provides. Other residents let a tree fall and stay for the same purposes. Those wildlife trees retain habitat. We hope they will *continue to be permitted* unless the tree is hazardous.

Article (4) says, ***“when a ‘Significant tree’ is willfully damaged ... one of the three required replacement trees ... is a minimum of 8 m high.*** We respond:

Someone has done great thinking here! We support amendments that work toward replacing canopy. We can’t replace “Significant trees” – without waiting decades – but mitigating that loss is always good.

Article (5) says, ***“Amend Consolidated Fees Bylaw 8636 to establish the various security amounts.”*** We agree:

We support the increase in the tree survival security for significant trees and would like to see it higher. There have been problems around the loss of trees for too long in Richmond.

Article (6) says, ***“Amend Tree Protection Bylaw 8057 to stipulate how securities are used, how long they are held (for significant trees) and how they are returned or cashed.***

We point out that the bylaw needs to go beyond trees that ***“die within the one-year maintenance period.”*** Many trees are struggling through the one-year maintenance period and then dying. Can the City extend the length of the maintenance period?

I will refer next to Bylaw 10039 (Significant Tree Protection) PLN – 39

Section 1, subsection 14.2.5 A(e) would be replaced with this: **(e)**
To reinforce the image of a well-established landscape, developers are encouraged to retain and incorporate mature trees and landscaping into the development area.

We respectfully suggest deleting “the image of “so the text reads “To reinforce a well-established landscape ...” That is what’s needed!

Section 2 (h) says, **“Incorporate mature trees and landscaping into the development area.”**

We suggest that the word “landscaping” be replaced with the term “biodiversity.” The amendment would then say, **“Incorporate mature trees and biodiversity into the development area.”** An aspect of a “Significant” tree is the biodiversity around it. (“Landscaping” can mean grass, which is not usually good for biodiversity.)

Section 2: (g) says, **“Preserve natural heritage by retaining, relocating and augmenting existing healthy on-site trees and shrubs.”** We say:

Thank you for including *shrubs*! We are losing valuable lower canopy habitat every time mature shrubs are cut down. Birds need lower growth as well as trees.

That section also says, **“Wherever possible, plant new landscaping which will be beneficial to native and migratory birds.”**

Wonderful! Whatever actions we take to mitigate ecological loss is a positive step and a shining legacy for our city.

Thank you to everyone who has had (and will have) a part in the excellent and thoughtful recommendations in the report this committee is considering.

TO: MAYOR & EACH

COUNCILLOR

From: Sharon MacGougan <sharonmacg@telus.net>
Sent: February 8, 2022 1:40 PM
To: Mayor and Councillors
Subject: ADDITION/Enhanced Tree Protection
Attachments: AdditionEnhanced Tree Protection.docx

ON TABLE ITEM

Date: Feb 8 2022
Meeting: Planning Committee
Item: #2

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.

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I have added more information to my Speaker's Notes for today's Planning Meeting, per attachment.

Thank you,
Sharon MacGougan
President, Garden City Conservation Society
604.618-8866



PHOTOCOPIED
FEB 08 2022
& DISTRIBUTED

To: Planning Committee, February 8, 2022
From: Sharon MacGougan, President, Garden City Conservation Society
Re: **ADDITION/Enhanced Protections for Significant Trees**

Article (2) says, **“compel a property owner to remove a hazardous and/or standing dead or dying tree.”**

We would like to see acknowledgment of the importance of wildlife trees in the wording; and given the significant loss of habitat, especially for cavity nesters, that efforts are made to keep at least some portion of dead and dying trees as habitat whenever it is possible.

Dead or dying trees can be important nesting sites for cavity nesters such as woodpeckers and owls as well as smaller birds like nuthatches. Of course, hazardous trees need to be managed but automatic removal shouldn't be the first option. An assessment of level of risk, nesting values and pruning to maintain a wildlife tree for as long as safely possible would be preferred. Below is some potential wording:

“ for trees over XX diameter, compel a property owner to undertake a risk assessment of standing dead or dying tree to identify beneficial pruning practices based on the Wildlife Tree / Dangerous Tree Assessor's Course Workbook to safely maintain the tree as a wildlife tree until the tree is determined to be a risk public safety based on the Tree Danger Rating criteria defined in Wildlife Tree / Dangerous Tree Assessor's Course Workbook.”

Link to work book. <https://www2.unbc.ca/sites/default/files/sections/continuing-studies/harvsilvhandbook-09jan2019.pdf>