

Agenda

City Council

Council Chambers, City Hall 6911 No. 3 Road Monday, June 22, 2020 7:00 p.m.

Pg. # ITEM

CNCL-18

MINUTES

- 1. Motion to:
- CNCL-10 (1) adopt the minutes of the Regular Council meeting held on June 8, 2020; and
 - (2) adopt the minutes of the Special Council meeting held on June 15, 2020.

AGENDA ADDITIONS & DELETIONS

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

- 2. Motion to resolve into Committee of the Whole to hear delegations on agenda items.
- 3. Delegations from the floor on Agenda items.

PLEASE NOTE THAT FOR LEGAL REASONS, DELEGATIONS ARE NOT PERMITTED ON ZONING OR OCP AMENDMENT BYLAWS WHICH ARE TO BE ADOPTED OR ON DEVELOPMENT PERMITS/DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS – ITEM NO. 16.

4. *Motion to rise and report.*

RATIFICATION OF COMMITTEE ACTION

CONSENT AGENDA

PLEASE NOTE THAT ITEMS APPEARING ON THE CONSENT AGENDA WHICH PRESENT A CONFLICT OF INTEREST FOR COUNCIL MEMBERS MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA AND CONSIDERED SEPARATELY.

CONSENT AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- Receipt of Committee minutes
- A New Coastal Strategy
- Richmond Cultural Harmony Plan Implementation of Strategic Directions
- Application to Request a Food Primary Entertainment Endorsement for Food Primary Liquor Licence # 303817 - WC Hotels LLP (Westin Wall Centre, Vancouver Airport) - 3099 Corvette Way
- Proposed Amendments to Traffic Bylaw No. 5870 Engine Brake and Cyclist Crosswalk Regulations
- Phoenix Net Loft Public Consultation Process
- Phoenix Net Loft Deconstruction and Salvage
- 5. Motion to adopt Items No. 6 through No. 12 by general consent.

Consent Agenda Item

6. **COMMITTEE MINUTES**

CNCL-24 That the minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting held on June 15, 2020 be received for information.

7.

Consent Agenda Item

Consent

Agenda

Item

CNCL-49

CNCL-33

A NEW COASTAL STRATEGY (File Ref. No.) (REDMS No.)

See Page CNCL-33 for full report

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- (1) That Richmond request the BC Government to develop and enact a Coastal Strategy and Law to leverage and coordinate the work of provincial ministries, First nations, local communities, and stakeholders groups to preserve coastal and ocean health, halt coastal habitat loss, accelerate the completion of a network of marine protected areas to benefit fisheries, biodiversity and the economy, set marine environmental quality objectives, and help communities adopt ecosystem –based approaches to manage risk from flooding due to extreme weather events, sea level rise, climate change and ocean acidification; and
- (2) That the City of Richmond write a letter of support and requesting action to the Union of British Columbia Municipalities, BC Minister of Environment, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Indigenous Affairs and Reconciliation, and the Premier of British Columbia in support of a Coastal Protection Strategy.

8. RICHMOND CULTURAL HARMONY PLAN – IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

(File Ref. No.) (REDMS No.)

See Page CNCL-49 for full report

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- (1) That staff be directed to propose by November 1, 2020 an implementation plan to include timelines, cost estimates, and cultural heritage value for the restoration of the First Nations Bunk House located at the Britannia Heritage Shipyards site being an opportunity pursuant to item #3 of Strategic Direction One of the Richmond Cultural Harmony Plan 2019-2029 report;
- (2) That staff be directed to implement item #5 of Strategic Direction Two of the Richmond Cultural Harmony Plan 2019-2029 to:
 - (a) pursue programs and funding opportunities provided by senior levels of government regarding cultural harmony initiatives; and

- (b) report progress back to General Purposes Committee in 12 months; and
- (3) That staff be directed to implement item #4 of Strategic Direction Five of the Richmond Cultural Harmony Plan 2019-2029 to
 - (a) strengthen relationships with various cultural and ethnic communities in order to integrate their arts, cultural and heritage practices into the City's programs and events; and
 - (b) report progress back to General Purposes Committee in 12 months.

9. APPLICATION TO REQUEST A FOOD PRIMARY ENTERTAINMENT ENDORSEMENT FOR FOOD PRIMARY LIQUOR LICENCE # 303817 - WC HOTELS LLP (WESTIN WALL CENTRE, VANCOUVER AIRPORT) - 3099 CORVETTE WAY (File Ref. No. 12-8275-30-001) (REDMS No. 6463853)

No. 12-8275-50-001 (REDNIS No. 0403855)

See Page CNCL-53 for full report

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- (1) That the application from WC Hotels LLP (Westin Wall Centre, Vancouver Airport), doing business as, The Apron, operating at 3099 Corvette Way, requesting a Food-Primary Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement to Food-Primary Liquor Licence No. 303817, to enable patrons to dance at the establishment, be supported with:
 - (a) No change to person capacity currently in place; and
 - (b) No change to service hours currently in place; and
- (2) That a letter be sent to the Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Branch, which includes the information attached as Appendix A, advising that Council supports the amendment for a Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement on Food-Primary Liquor Licence No. 303817 as this request has been determined, following public consultation, to be acceptable in the area and community.

Consent Agenda Item

CNCL-53

10.

Consent Agenda Item

CNCL-62

Pg. #

Council Agenda – Monday, June 22, 2020

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TRAFFIC BYLAW NO. 5870 -ENGINE BRAKE AND CYCLIST CROSSWALK REGULATIONS (File Ref. No. 12-8060-02-01) (REDMS No. 6457707 v. 7)

See Page CNCL-62 for full report

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- (1) That Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, Amendment Bylaw No. 10184, to prohibit the use of engine brakes on municipal roads in Richmond and permit cyclists to ride in crosswalks with elephant's feet markings, be introduced and given first, second and third reading;
- (2) That Municipal Ticket Information Authorization No. 7321, Amendment Bylaw No. 10185, to assign a fine for the prohibited use of engine brakes on municipal roads in Richmond, be introduced and given first, second and third reading;
- (3) That staff be directed to send a letter to the British Columbia Trucking Association advising of the proposed bylaw amendments with respect to the prohibited use of engine brakes; and
- (4) That Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, Amendment Bylaw No. 10184 and Municipal Ticket Information Authorization No. 7321, Amendment Bylaw No. 10185 be reviewed in 12 months' time.
- 11. **PHOENIX NET LOFT PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS** (File Ref. No. 11-7000-01) (REDMS No. 6445923 v. 2)

CNCL-69

Consent

Agenda

Item

See Page CNCL-69 for full report

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- (1) That staff be authorized to proceed with Phase One of the Phoenix Net Loft Public Consultation Process as described in the staff report titled "Phoenix Net Loft Public Consultation Process", dated May 22, 2020, from the Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage Services; and
- (2) That staff add the Steveston Community Society, Richmond School District No. 38, the Richmond Seniors Advisory Committee, the Richmond Centre for Disability, youth groups, and the Musqueum First Nation to the primary list of stakeholders in the consultation process.

Consent Agenda Item 12. PHOENIX NET LOFT DECONSTRUCTION AND SALVAGE (File Ref. No. 06-2052-25-PNET1) (REDMS No. 6469794 v. 12)

CNCL-74

See Page CNCL-74 for full report

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That staff be authorized to proceed with the deconstruction and salvage of heritage elements of the Phoenix Net Loft as described under Option 1 on Page 3, in the staff report titled "Phoenix Net Loft Deconstruction and Salvage", dated May 21, 2020, from the Director, Facilities and Project Development.

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA

NON-CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair

13. APPLICATION BY YUANHENG SEASIDE DEVELOPMENTS LTD./YUANHENG SEAVIEW DEVELOPMENTS LTD. FOR A ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE "RESIDENTIAL/LIMITED COMMERCIAL AND COMMUNITY AMENITY (ZMU30) – CAPSTAN VILLAGE (CITY CENTRE)" ZONE AT 3399 CORVETTE WAY AND 3311 & 3331 NO. 3 ROAD

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-010189; ZT 19-872212) (REDMS No. 6466184 v. 3)

CNCL-81

See Page CNCL-81 for full report

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Opposed: Cllr. Wolfe

(1) That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10189, for a Zoning Text Amendment to the "Residential/Limited Commercial and Community Amenity (ZMU30) – Capstan Village (City Centre)" zone, a site-specific zone applicable at 3399 Corvette Way and 3311 & 3331 No. 3 Road, to:

- (a) increase the maximum number of permitted dwelling units from 850 to 941 (without any increase in total residential floor area); and
- (b) relocate 964 m² (10,371 ft²) of permitted (unbuilt) floor area from the development's first phase at 3331 No. 3 Road to its second phase at 3311 No. 3 Road and third phase at 3399 Corvette Way;

be introduced and given first reading; and

(2) That the terms of the voluntary developer community amenity contribution secured through the original rezoning of 3399 Corvette Way and 3311 & 3331 No. 3 Road (RZ 12-603040) be amended to permit the completion of the proposed City Centre North Community Centre, at 3311 No. 3 Road, be deferred from December 31, 2021 to December 31, 2023.

14. POTENTIAL TEMPORARY ROAD CHANGES IN STEVESTON VILLAGE

(File Ref. No. 10-6360-06-01) (REDMS No. 6475103)

CNCL-105

See Page CNCL-105 for full report

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Opposed: Cllrs: Au & Wolfe

That pedestrian, cyclist and motorist operations continue to be monitored in the Steveston Village for crowding and physical distancing issues and staff report back to Council on the need for any temporary measures to add additional space for pedestrians and cyclists, should the traffic volume of these modes consistently exceed the capacity of existing infrastructure.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair

15. 2019 CITY ANNUAL REPORT AND 2019 ANNUAL REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

(File Ref. No. 03-0905-01) (REDMS No. 6464975)

CNCL-121 See Page CNCL-121 for full report

FINANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That the reports titled "2019 Annual Report and 2019 Annual Report – Highlights" be approved.

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS AND EVENTS

NEW BUSINESS

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL

16. RECOMMENDATION

See DPP Plan Package (distributed separately) for full hardcopy plans

CNCL-220

- CNCL-226
- (1) That the minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on June 10, 2020 and the Chair's report for the Development Permit Panel meeting held on May 13, 2020, be received for information; and

(2) That the recommendation of the Panel to authorize the approval of changes to the design of the Development Permit (DP 16-740262) issued for the property at 5333 No. 3 Road (formerly 7960 Alderbridge Way and 5333 & 5411 No. 3 Road) be endorsed, and the changes be deemed to be in General Compliance with the Permit.

ADJOURNMENT



Regular Council

Monday, June 8, 2020

| Place: | Council Chambers Richmond City Hall |
|----------------|--|
| Present: | Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie Councillor Chak Au Councillor Carol Day (attending via teleconference) Councillor Kelly Greene (attending via teleconference) Councillor Alexa Loo (attending via teleconference) Councillor Bill McNulty (attending via teleconference) Councillor Linda McPhail (attending via teleconference) Councillor Harold Steves (attending via teleconference) Councillor Michael Wolfe (attending via teleconference) |
| Call to Order: | Mayor Brodie called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. |
| RES NO. ITEM | |

MINUTES

R20/11-1 1. It was moved and seconded *That the minutes of the Regular Council meeting held on May 25, 2020, be adopted as circulated.*

CARRIED

Mayor Brodie noted that since no members of the public were present at the meeting, a motion to resolve into Committee of the Whole to hear delegations from the floor on Agenda items and to rise and report (Items No. 2 to 4) would not be necessary.



Regular Council Monday, June 8, 2020

CONSENT AGENDA

R20/11-2 5. It was moved and seconded *That Items No. 6 through No. 11 be adopted by general consent.*

CARRIED

6. COMMITTEE MINUTES

That the minutes of:

- (1) the Special General Purposes Committee meeting held on May 25, 2020;
- (2) the Finance Committee meeting held on June 1, 2020; and
- (3) the General Purposes Committee meeting held on June 1, 2020;

be received for information.

ADOPTED ON CONSENT

- 7. AWARD OF REQUEST FOR QUOTATION (RFQ) 6867Q "SUPPLY & DELIVERY OF NETWORK EQUIPMENT" TO TELUS (File Ref. No. 03-1000-20-6867Q) (REDMS No. 6466332 v.5; 6471602)
 - (1) That Request For Quotation (RFQ) 6867Q be awarded to TELUS Communications Inc. in the amount of \$1,659,552 over a 3-year term based on the public RFQ process; and
 - (2) That the Chief Administrative Officer and the General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services be authorized to execute the contract with TELUS Communications Inc.

ADOPTED ON CONSENT



Regular Council Monday, June 8, 2020

- 8. APPLICATION TO REQUEST A FOOD PRIMARY ENTERTAINMENT ENDORSEMENT FOR FOOD-PRIMARY LIQUOR LICENCE # 051872 - PACIFIC GATEWAY HOTEL AT VANCOUVER AIRPORT - 3500 CESSNA DR. (File Ref. No. 12-8275-30-001/2020) (REDMS No. 6435323 v.3)
 - (1) That the application from Van-Air Holdings Ltd., doing business as, Pacific Gateway Hotel at Vancouver Airport, operating at 3500 Cessna Drive, requesting a Food-Primary Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement to Food-Primary Liquor Licence No. 051872, to enable patrons to dance at the establishment, be supported with;
 - a) No change to person capacity currently in place; and
 - b) No change to service hours currently in place; and
 - (2) That a letter be sent to the Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Branch, which includes the information attached as Appendix A, advising that Council supports the amendment for a Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement on Food-Primary Liquor Licence No. 051872 as this request has been determined, following public consultation, to be acceptable in the area and community.

ADOPTED ON CONSENT

9. CONTRACT AWARD (REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 6762P) – SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF A QUINT AND ENGINE FOR RICHMOND FIRE RESCUE (RFR)

(File Ref. No. 02-0775-50-6762; XR 03-1000-20-6762P) (REDMS No. 6456143 v.12)

That contract 6762P be awarded for the supply and delivery of a Quint and Engine for Richmond Fire Rescue (RFR) to Commercial Emergency Equipment Co. for a total cost of \$2,41'7,373, exclusive of taxes.

ADOPTED ON CONSENT



Regular Council Monday, June 8, 2020

10. APPLICATION BY CDS-CHEN DESIGN STUDIO LTD. FOR REZONING AT 6560 GRANVILLE AVENUE FROM THE "SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E)" ZONE TO THE "COMPACT SINGLE DETACHED (RC2)" ZONE

(File Ref. No. RZ 18-825323; 12-8060-20-010109) (REDMS No. 5981494 v.4; 6320439)

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10109, for the rezoning of 6560 Granville Avenue from the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" zone to the "Compact Single Detached (RC2)" zone, be introduced and given first reading.

ADOPTED ON CONSENT

11. APPLICATION BY ZHAO XD ARCHITECT LTD. FOR REZONING AT 8231 AND 8251 WILLIAMS ROAD FROM THE "SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E)" ZONE TO THE "LOW DENSITY TOWNHOUSES (RTL4)" ZONE

(File Ref. No. RZ 18-824503; 12-8060-20-010173) (REDMS No. 6436354 v.3; 6443824)

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10173, for the rezoning of 8231 and 8251 Williams Road from the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" zone to the "Low Density Townhouses (RTL4)" zone to permit the development of ten townhouse units, be introduced and given first reading.

ADOPTED ON CONSENT



Regular Council Monday, June 8, 2020

NON-CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair

- 12. COUNCIL AND COMMITTEE 2020 AUGUST MEETING SCHEDULE (File Ref. No.: 01-0105-01; 01-0107-01) (REDMS No.6473567)
- R20/11-3 It was moved and seconded

That the General Purposes Committee and Public Works and Transportation Committee meetings scheduled for Tuesday, September 15, 2020, be rescheduled to September 21, 2020 and September 22, 2020, respectively.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion took place on (i) changing the dates as the Union of British Columbia Municipalities' (UBCM) conference will be virtual and only 3 days, (ii) leaving the dates as is to ensure UBCM events do not conflict with Committee meetings, and (iii) Richmond being the only municipality in the Province not cancelling meetings during the UBCM conference week.

As a result of the discussion, there was agreement to vote on the motion in two parts.

R20/11-4 It was moved and seconded *That the General Purposes Committee meeting scheduled for Tuesday, September 15, 2020, be rescheduled to September 21, 2020.*

CARRIED



Regular Council Monday, June 8, 2020

R20/11-5 It was moved and seconded That the Public Works and Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for Tuesday, September 15 be rescheduled to September 22, 2020.

> DEFEATED Opposed: Cllrs: Au Day Greene Steves Wolfe

BYLAW FOR ADOPTION

R20/11-6 It was moved and seconded *That Business Regulation Bylaw No. 7538, Amendment Bylaw No. 10127 be adopted.*

CARRIED

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PANEL

- R20/11-7 13. It was moved and seconded
 - (1) That the minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on May 27, 2020, and the Chair's report for the Development Permit Panel meetings held on May 15, 2019 and May 13, 2020, be received for information.
 - (2) That the recommendations of the Panel to authorize the issuance of:
 - (a) a Development Permit (DP 17-771214) for the property at 3311 Sweden Way (formerly 12580 Vickers Way); and
 - (b) a Development Permit (DV 19-869780) for the property at 8011 Zylmans Way and 15111 Williams Road;

be endorsed, and the Permits so issued.





Regular Council Monday, June 8, 2020

The question on the motion was not called as discussion took place on (i) increased height of the building, (ii) solar panels and agricultural uses on the rooftop, and (iii) electric vehicle charging stations for all parking stalls.

In reply to queries from Council, staff noted that there is no requirement for electric vehicle charging stations for non-residential developments, and a geotechnical analysis will be conducted during the Building Permit phase.

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

R20/11-8 It was moved and seconded That the recommendations of the Panel to authorize the issuance of a Development Permit (DV 19-869780) for the property at 8011 Zylmans Way and 15111 Williams Road, be referred back to staff to include electric vehicle charging stations for all parking stalls and review the requested height variance.

> DEFEATED Opposed: Mayor Brodie Cllrs: Au Day Loo McNulty McPhail Steves

R20/11-9 It was moved and seconded That staff examine the requirements for increasing the capacity for electric vehicle charging stations for non-residential projects, including a review of rooftop solar panels and rooftop agricultural uses, and report back.

CARRIED

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



Regular Council Monday, June 8, 2020

ADJOURNMENT

R20/11-10 It was moved and seconded *That the meeting adjourn (8:00 p.m.).*

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the Regular meeting of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Monday, June 8, 2020.

Mayor (Malcolm D. Brodie)

Corporate Officer (Claudia Jesson)



Special Council Monday, June 15, 2020

| Place: | | Council Chambers Richmond City Hall |
|----------------|------|---|
| Present: | | Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie Councillor Chak Au (attending via teleconference) Councillor Carol Day (attending via teleconference) Councillor Kelly Greene (attending via teleconference) Councillor Alexa Loo (attending via teleconference) Councillor Bill McNulty (attending via teleconference) Councillor Linda McPhail (attending via teleconference) Councillor Harold Steves (attending via teleconference) Councillor Michael Wolfe (attending via teleconference) |
| Call to Order: | | Mayor Brodie called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. |
| RES NO. | ITEM | |
| | | Mayor Brodie recessed the meeting at 4:01 p.m. for the General |

Mayor Brodie recessed the meeting at 4:01 p.m. for the General Purposes Committee meeting.

The meeting reconvened at 5:47 p.m. with all members of Council present.

Mayor Brodie noted that Item No. 3 - Potential Temporary Road Changes in Steveston Village, is removed from agenda and will be considered at the upcoming Regular Council meeting on June 22, 2020.



Special Council Monday, June 15, 2020

RES NO. ITEM

RICHMOND OLYMPIC OVAL CORPORATION

1. CONSENT RESOLUTIONS OF THE SHAREHOLDER OF RICHMOND OLYMPIC OVAL CORPORATION (File Ref. No.: 01-0005-01) (REDMS No. 6470733)

SP20/8-1 It was moved and seconded *RESOLVED THAT:*

- (1) the Shareholder acknowledges and confirms the previous receipt of financial statements of the Company for the period from January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019, together with the auditor's report on such financial statements, which financial statements were approved by the Company's board of directors on April 16, 2020 and presented to the Shareholder at the Finance Committee meeting of Richmond City Council on May 4, 2020;
- (2) The shareholder acknowledges that the following directors are currently serving a 2-year term (2019-2021) and will continue to serve as directors for the coming year:

<u>Name</u>

- *i.* Dennis Skulsky;
- *ii. Moray Keith;*
- *iii. Umendra Mital;*
- iv. Lisa Cowell;
- v. Chris Gear;
- vi. Christine Nesbitt; and
- vii. Wayne Duzita;
- (3) In accordance with the Company's Articles, the following persons are hereby elected as directors of the Company, to hold office for the term ending immediately prior to the annual general meeting of the Company held in 2022:



Special Council Monday, June 15, 2020

RES NO. ITEM

| | Name | <u>Term</u> |
|-------|-----------------|-------------|
| viii. | George Duncan; | 2021 |
| ix. | Peter German; | 2021 |
| x. | Gail Terry; | 2021 |
| xi. | Walter Soo; and | 2021 |
| xii. | Gary Collinge; | 2021 |

- (4) KPMG LLP be appointed as auditors of the Company until the next annual reference date of the Company or until a successor is appointed, at a remuneration to be fixed by the directors;
- (5) the 2019 Annual Report of the Company is hereby received; and
- (6) June 15, 2020 be and is hereby selected as the annual reference date for the Company for its current annual reference period.

The question on the motion was not called as staff responded to queries from Committee, advising that term limits do not apply to members of the Company's Board of Directors.

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

LULU ISLAND ENERGY COMPANY LTD.

2. CONSENT RESOLUTIONS OF THE SHAREHOLDER OF LULU ISLAND ENERGY COMPANY LTD. (File Ref. No.) (REDMS No. 6469246)

SP20/8-2 It was moved and seconded *RESOLVED THAT:*

(1) the shareholder acknowledges that the financial statements of the Company for the period ended December 31, 2019, and the report of the auditors thereon, have been provided to the shareholder in accordance with the requirements of the British Columbia Business Corporations Act;

3.



Special Council Monday, June 15, 2020

RES NO. ITEM

- (2) all lawful acts, contracts, proceedings, appointments and payments of money by the directors of the Company since the last annual reference date of the Company, and which have previously been disclosed to the shareholder, are hereby adopted, ratified and confirmed;
- (3) the number of directors of the Company is hereby fixed at 7;
- (4) the following persons, each of whom has consented in writing to act as a director, are hereby elected as directors of the Company, to hold office until the next annual general meeting of the Company or unanimous resolutions consented to in lieu of holding an annual general meeting, or until their successors are appointed:
 - i. Cecilia Maria Achiam;
 - ii. Jerry Ming Chong;
 - iii. John David Irving;
 - iv. Joseph Erceg;
 - v. Andrew Nazareth;
 - vi. Kirk Taylor; and
 - vii. Anthony Capuccinello Iraci;
- (5) KPMG LLP be appointed as auditors of the Company until the next annual reference date of the Company or until a successor is appointed, at a remuneration to be fixed by the directors;
- (6) June 15, 2020 is hereby selected as the annual reference date for the Company for its current annual reference period; and
- (7) any one director of the Company is authorized to execute and to deliver all further documents and to take all further action as may be required to give effect to these resolutions.

The question on the motion was not called as staff responded to queries from Committee, advising that term limits do not apply to members of the Company's Board of Directors.



Special Council Monday, June 15, 2020

RES NO. ITEM

Discussion then ensued with regard to introducing term limits to members of the Company's Board of Directors, and as a result, the following **referral motion** was introduced:

SP20/8-3 It was moved and seconded *That staff examine term limits for members of the Lulu Island Energy Company's Board of Directors, and report back.*

> DEFEATED Opposed: Mayor Brodie Cllrs. Loo McNulty McPhail Steves

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

3. POTENTIAL TEMPORARY ROAD CHANGES IN STEVESTON VILLAGE

(File Ref. No. 10-6360-06-01) (REDMS No. 6475103)

Please see Page 1 for action on this item.

ADJOURNMENT

SP20/8-4 It was moved and seconded *That the meeting adjourn (5:57 p.m.).*

CARRIED



Special Council Monday, June 15, 2020

RES NO. ITEM

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the Special meeting of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Monday, June 15, 2020.

Mayor (Malcolm D. Brodie)

Corporate Officer (Claudia Jesson)



General Purposes Committee

| Date: | Monday, June 15, 2020 |
|----------------|--|
| Place: | Council Chambers Richmond City Hall |
| Present: | Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair Councillor Chak Au (attending via teleconference) Councillor Carol Day (attending via teleconference) Councillor Kelly Greene (attending via teleconference) Councillor Alexa Loo (attending via teleconference) Councillor Bill McNulty (attending via teleconference) Councillor Linda McPhail (attending via teleconference) Councillor Harold Steves (attending via teleconference) Councillor Michael Wolfe (attending via teleconference) |
| Call to Order: | The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m. |

MINUTES

It was moved and seconded That the minutes of the meeting of the Special General Purposes Committee held on May 25, 2020 and General Purposes Committee held on June 1, 2020, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

COUNCILLOR HAROLD STEVES

1. **A NEW COASTAL STRATEGY** (File Ref. No.) (REDMS No.)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) That Richmond request the BC Government to develop and enact a Coastal Strategy and Law to leverage and coordinate the work of provincial ministries, First nations, local communities, and stakeholders groups to preserve coastal and ocean health, halt coastal habitat loss, accelerate the completion of a network of marine protected areas to benefit fisheries, biodiversity and the economy, set marine environmental quality objectives, and help communities adopt ecosystem-based approaches to manage risk from flooding due to extreme weather events, sea level rise, climate change and ocean acidification; and
- (2) That the City of Richmond write a letter of support and requesting action to the Union of British Columbia Municipalities, BC Minister of Environment, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Indigenous Affairs and Reconciliation, and the Premier of British Columbia in support of a Coastal Protection Strategy.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to (i) the history and the disbanding of the Fraser River Estuary Management Program, (ii) Richmond's jurisdiction over its coastal areas, (iii) Port of Vancouver's coastal strategy and proposed projects, and (iv) coastal environmental regulatory and enforcement capacities of senior levels of government.

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

COUNCILLOR CHAK AU

1A. RICHMOND CULTURAL HARMONY PLAN – IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

(File Ref. No.) (REDMS No.)

It was moved and seconded

(1) That staff be directed to propose by November 1, 2020 an implementation plan to include timelines, cost estimates, and cultural heritage value for the restoration of the First Nations Bunk House located at the Britannia Heritage Shipyards site being an opportunity pursuant to item #3 of Strategic Direction One of the Richmond Cultural Harmony Plan 2019-2029 report;

- (2) That staff be directed to implement item #5 of Strategic Direction Two of the Richmond Cultural Harmony Plan 2019-2029 to:
 - (a) pursue programs and funding opportunities provided by senior levels of government regarding cultural harmony initiatives; and
 - (b) report progress back to General Purposes Committee in 12 months; and
- (3) That staff be directed to implement item #4 of Strategic Direction Five of the Richmond Cultural Harmony Plan 2019-2029 to:
 - (a) strengthen relationships with various cultural and ethnic communities in order to integrate their arts, cultural and heritage practices into the City's programs and events; and
 - (b) report progress back to General Purposes Committee in 12 months.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to (i) the proposed restoration of the First Nations Bunkhouse, including cost estimates, construction timelines and funding opportunities, (ii) potential future programming of the Bunkhouse, (iii) current programs and organizations in the community dedicated to cultural harmony, and (iv) encouraging dialogue on issues related to First Nation and Black Canadian communities

As a result of the discussion, staff were directed to refer the proposed implementation of strategic directions of the City's Cultural Harmony Plan to the Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee.

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that staff will provide regular updates regarding Steveston Heritage sites and the City's Cultural Harmony initiative. Also, staff noted that the City regularly examines funding opportunities from senior levels of government.

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

COUNCIL/SCHOOL BOARD LIAISON COMMITTEE

1B. LIVESTREAM OF COUNCIL/SCHOOL BOARD LIAISON COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(File Ref. No.) (REDMS No.)

Discussion ensued with regard to (i) public accessibility of the City's Committee meetings, (ii) coordination of potential live streaming of the Council/School Board Liaison Committee meetings with Richmond School District No. 38, and (iii) reviewing the technical assistance provided to the City's advisory committees.

As a result of the discussion, staff liaisons to advisory committees were directed to reach out to their committees to assess their needs for assistance to meet remotely.

Mayor Brodie noted that all of the City's standing committees are being live streamed, however none of the City's advisory committees are currently being live streamed.

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

It was moved and seconded

That staff be directed to review the possibility of live-streaming to the City of Richmond's YouTube Channel all Standing Committee meetings and the Council-School Board Liaison Committee meetings and report back.

CARRIED

COMMUNITY SAFETY DIVISION

2. APPLICATION TO REQUEST A FOOD PRIMARY ENTERTAINMENT ENDORSEMENT FOR FOOD PRIMARY LIQUOR LICENCE # 303817 - WC HOTELS LLP (WESTIN WALL CENTRE, VANCOUVER AIRPORT) - 3099 CORVETTE WAY (File Ref. No. 12-8275-30-001) (REDMS No. 6463853)

It was moved and seconded

(1) That the application from WC Hotels LLP (Westin Wall Centre, Vancouver Airport), doing business as, The Apron, operating at 3099 Corvette Way, requesting a Food-Primary Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement to Food-Primary Liquor Licence No. 303817, to enable patrons to dance at the establishment, be supported with;

(a) No change to person capacity currently in place; and

- (b) No change to service hours currently in place; and
- (2) That a letter be sent to the Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Branch, which includes the information attached as Appendix A, advising that Council supports the amendment for a Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement on Food-Primary Liquor Licence No. 303817 as this request has been determined, following public consultation, to be acceptable in the area and community.

CARRIED

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TRAFFIC BYLAW NO. 5870 -ENGINE BRAKE AND CYCLIST CROSSWALK REGULATIONS (File Ref. No. 12-8060-02-01) (REDMS No. 6457707 v. 7)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) That Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, Amendment Bylaw No. 10184, to prohibit the use of engine brakes on municipal roads in Richmond and permit cyclists to ride in crosswalks with elephant's feet markings, be introduced and given first, second and third reading;
- (2) That Municipal Ticket Information Authorization No. 7321, Amendment Bylaw No. 10185, to assign a fine for the prohibited use of engine brakes on municipal roads in Richmond, be introduced and given first, second and third reading;
- (3) That staff be directed to send a letter to the British Columbia Trucking Association advising of the proposed bylaw amendments with respect to the prohibited use of engine brakes; and
- (4) That Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, Amendment Bylaw No. 10184 and Municipal Ticket Information Authorization No. 7321, Amendment Bylaw No. 10185 be reviewed in 12 months' time.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to (i) limiting use of engine brakes by truck drivers and enforcement options for repeat offenders, (ii) clarifying cycling and pedestrian regulations, (iii) consulting with cycling groups such as HUB, and (iv) installing signage advising of engine brake restrictions in residential areas.

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that the proposed regulations will apply to all municipal roads in Richmond. Staff added that cyclists have the option of using the roadway, however when using pedestrian crosswalks and multi-use pathways, cyclists must abide by the regulations related to their use.

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

4. APPLICATION BY YUANHENG SEASIDE DEVELOPMENTS LTD./YUANHENG SEAVIEW DEVELOPMENTS LTD. FOR A ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE "RESIDENTIAL/LIMITED COMMERCIAL AND COMMUNITY AMENITY (ZMU30) – CAPSTAN VILLAGE (CITY CENTRE)" ZONE AT 3399 CORVETTE WAY AND 3311 & 3331 NO. 3 ROAD

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-010189; ZT 19-872212) (REDMS No. 6466184 v. 3)

In accordance with Section 100 of the *Community Charter*, Cllr. Au declared to be in a conflict of interest as a family member is a potential buyer of a unit from the proposed development at 3399 Corvette Way and 3311 and 3331 No. 3 Road, and Cllr. Au left the meeting – 5:01 p.m.

Staff reviewed the application, highlighting that (i) the applicant is seeking to relocate approximately 10,000 ft² of the proposed development's unbuilt floor area to the second phase, increase the number of proposed units to 941, and defer completion of the proposed community centre at 3311 No. 3 Road to December 31, 2023, (ii) the proposed unit sizes are consistent with other developments in the area, (iii) should the application move forward, the application will proceed to a Public Hearing, (iv) a staff report on the governance of the proposed community centre will be forthcoming prior to its completion, and (v) staff anticipate that the Capstan Station will be completed by mid-2022.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10189, for a Zoning Text Amendment to the "Residential/Limited Commercial and Community Amenity (ZMU30) – Capstan Village (City Centre)" zone, a site-specific zone applicable at 3399 Corvette Way and 3311 & 3331 No. 3 Road, to:
 - (a) increase the maximum number of permitted dwelling units from 850 to 941 (without any increase in total residential floor area); and
 - (b) relocate 964 m² (10,371 ft²) of permitted (unbuilt) floor area from the development's first phase at 3331 No. 3 Road to its second phase at 3311 No. 3 Road and third phase at 3399 Corvette Way;

be introduced and given first reading; and

(2) That the terms of the voluntary developer community amenity contribution secured through the original rezoning of 3399 Corvette Way and 3311 & 3331 No. 3 Road (RZ 12-603040) be amended to permit the completion of the proposed City Centre North Community Centre, at 3311 No. 3 Road, be deferred from December 31, 2021 to December 31, 2023.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to the estimated completion date of the proposed community centre.

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

Cllr. Au returned to the meeting -5:08 p.m.

COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION

5. PHOENIX NET LOFT PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS (File Ref. No. 11-7000-01) (REDMS No. 6445923 v. 2)

It was moved and seconded

That staff be authorized to proceed with Phase One of the Phoenix Net Loft Public Consultation Process as described in the staff report titled "Phoenix Net Loft Public Consultation Process", dated May 22, 2020, from the Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage Services.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to expanding the primary list of stakeholders and identifying individual representatives of the community groups participating in the consultation process.

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that expanding the stakeholder list is possible but may lengthen the consultation process. Also, staff noted that a broader consultation will take place in Phase Two of the consultation process.

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

It was moved and seconded

That staff add the Steveston Community Society, Richmond School District No. 38, the Richmond Seniors Advisory Committee, the Richmond Centre for Disability, youth groups, and the Musqueum First Nation to the primary list of stakeholders in the consultation process.

The question on the amendment motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to identifying a specific youth group for consultation participation and exploring potential funding options for the project.

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

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

(1) That staff be authorized to proceed with Phase One of the Phoenix Net Loft Public Consultation Process as described in the staff report titled "Phoenix Net Loft Public Consultation Process", dated May 22, 2020, from the Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage Services; and (2) That staff add the Steveston Community Society, Richmond School District No. 38, the Richmond Seniors Advisory Committee, the Richmond Centre for Disability, youth groups, and the Musqueum First Nation to the primary list of stakeholders in the consultation process.

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

ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

6. PHOENIX NET LOFT DECONSTRUCTION AND SALVAGE (File Ref. No. 06-2052-25-PNET1) (REDMS No. 6469794 v. 12)

Discussion ensued regarding identifying shovel-ready projects in Richmond and exploring funding options for the proposed Phoenix Net Loft project.

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that staff will provide periodic updates on the matter and that the subject site's artifacts will be relocated to a City site on 7400 River Road. Staff added that traffic and parking logistics related to the upcoming 2020 Richmond Maritime Festival will be discussed with Community Services staff.

It was moved and seconded

That staff be authorized to proceed with the deconstruction and salvage of heritage elements of the Phoenix Net Loft as described under Option 1 on Page 3, in the staff report titled "Phoenix Net Loft Deconstruction and Salvage", dated May 21, 2020, from the Director, Facilities and Project Development.

CARRIED

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

7. POTENTIAL TEMPORARY ROAD CHANGES IN STEVESTON VILLAGE

(File Ref. No. 10-6360-06-01) (REDMS No. 6475103)

It was moved and seconded

That pedestrian, cyclist and motorist operations continue to be monitored in the Steveston Village for crowding and physical distancing issues and staff report back to Council on the need for any temporary measures to add additional space for pedestrians and cyclists, should the traffic volume of these modes consistently exceed the capacity of existing infrastructure. The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued with regard to (i) the survey results and low support by area merchants for the potential temporary road changes, (ii) exploring alternative traffic configurations to allow for one-way traffic along Moncton Street and Bayview Street, and (iii) expanding the availability of accessible parking in the area.

In reply to queries from Committee, staff noted that area merchants have expressed concern with regard to potential loss of parking as a result of the proposed traffic configurations. Staff added that the current pedestrian, cyclist and motorist activity is being monitored and that staff will bring forward new recommendations if required.

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

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded *That the meeting adjourn (5:46 p.m.).*

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Monday, June 15, 2020.

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie Chair Evangel Biason Legislative Services Associate

To: Mayor and Councillors

From: Councillor Harold Steves,

Re: A New Coastal Strategy

In 1968 Imperial Oil acquired over 100 acres beyond Richmond's west dyke from Steveston Highway to Garry Point for a super tanker port. The Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board, precursor to the GVRD, had designated Sturgeon Banks as "Undetermined Reserve" in the Official Regional Plan. Coincidentally, the LMRPB prepared a report, "Our Southwestern shores", that outlined conflicting uses for the Fraser River Estuary, and recommended some industry on Sturgeon Banks. Richmond Council opposed the oil port and industrial development on Sturgeon Banks. Eventually the Official Regional Plan designation for Sturgeon Banks was changed to Conservation.

In 1972 a report, "A Commitment To The Future", drafted by DR Halladay, BC Fish and Wildlife Branch, and RD Harris, Canadian Wildlife Service, called for the identification and protection of critical areas in the Fraser River Estuary.

In 1973 the incoming BC Government introduced the "Land Commission Act" that protected agricultural land, estuaries, and parkland. With opposition to such widespread provincial planning the protection of estuaries and parkland was removed from the legislation and only farmland was protected with the ALR. The newly formed GVRD was given the role of determining the final ALR boundaries and protected farmland adjacent to the river but estuaries remained unprotected. As Richmond MLA I introduced a Private Members' Bill, "The BC Coastal Zone Act", but it was not adopted before there was a change in government.

In 1977 the Fraser River Coalition was formed and held a major conference in Richmond to specifically request protection of the Fraser River Estuary. Consequently, in 1978, the BC and Canadian governments initiated the Fraser River Estuary Study. Richmond Council endorsed the plan in June 1980. Subsequently, the Fraser River Estuary Management Program, FREMP, was established, similar to the Agricultural Land Reserve. It determined zones where industry could be located and red zones where industry could not be located. It also established zones where new habitat could be created to compensate for habitat loss elsewhere.

Recently, FREMP was disbanded and their responsibilities turned over to Port Vancouver. Port Vancouver subsequently approved a Jet Fuel Terminal in Richmond and attempted to convert City owned land, boat launching ramp, and related water lot, at Gilbert Beach to habitat as compensation for their developments elsewhere. Richmond was unsuccessful in opposing the Jet Fuel Terminal but the City was successful in preventing the Port from taking over the City land and water lot.

Clearly there is a need for an independent authority to protect the Fraser River Estuary.

At the same time the main west coast port for the BC Fishing Industry is located at Steveston. Unlike the Maritime Provinces, BC has no comprehensive, marine, Coastal Strategy and Law. There is no marine counterpart to the ALR. A new Law is needed to protect coastal and ocean health, enhance wild salmon and other fisheries, and halt coastal habitat and marine species loss.

Recommendation:

That Richmond request the BC Government to develop and enact a Coastal Strategy and Law to leverage and coordinate the work of provincial ministries, First nations, local communities, and stakeholders groups to preserve coastal and ocean health, halt coastal habitat loss, accelerate the completion of a network of marine protected areas to benefit fisheries, biodiversity and the economy, set marine environmental quality objectives, and help communities adopt ecosystem –based approaches to manage risk from flooding due to extreme weather events, sea level rise, climate change and ocean acidification.

And That Richmond endorse a similar resolution sent to the UBCM by Port Moody.





Protect the Coast A New Coastal Strategy and Law for British Columbia

British Columbia needs a coastal strategy and law to leverage and coordinate the work of provincial ministries, First Nations, local communities, and stakeholder groups.

Why do we need a B.C. Coastal Strategy and Law?

To assert jurisdiction and leverage engagement from other orders of government

B.C. exercises considerable jurisdiction in the marine and coastal realm, and works closely with other levels of government who share this jurisdiction. Yet unlike all the Atlantic provinces, B.C. has no comprehensive coastal and marine strategy. A B.C. coastal strategy will clearly articulate provincial jurisdiction and enable the province to better engage with other governments and communities.

To better advance and integrate provincial policy objectives

A coherent B.C. coastal strategy will enable provincial agencies to find opportunities for greater integration and increase the impact of diverse programs on environmental protection, coastal infrastructure, training and capacity-building, economic development, and technology and innovation.

To advance reconciliation

A B.C. Coastal strategy will support reconciliation with coastal First Nations by recognizing First Nations' rights and title and upholding the province's commitment to implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

To signal to the world the importance of B.C.'s ocean and coastlines

A B.C. Coastal strategy will provide a vision and objectives to guide actions in the increasingly crowded coastal zone and highlight the importance the government places on these vital areas. In addition to protecting B.C.'s coast, sensitive marine ecosystems, and vulnerable species, a strategy will also protect our coastal communities and economies.

To provide a comprehensive legal response to a broad suite of cross-cutting issues

B.C. does not have a comprehensive coastal protection law. No marine counterpart to the B.C. *Land Act* exists, and piecemeal legislation and policy govern numerous coastal marine activities.

To establish a home for coastal issues within the government

The province of B.C. used to have a provincial Ministry of Fisheries, which became a division, then a branch. Now coastal and marine responsibilities are scattered throughout various Ministries. A law could establish a new governance body such as a B.C. Coastal Management Council or Authority.

¹G.S. Gislason and Associates. 2007. Economic Contribution of the Oceans Sector in British Columbia. (numbers updated to 2018 dollars)

CNCL – 35





To keep wild places wild

A new law will preserve coastal and ocean health, and halt coastal habitat loss. It will accelerate the completion of a network of marine protected areas to benefit fisheries, biodiversity and the economy. A law can better regulate clean water: it can set marine environmental quality objectives from upland activities. It will help communities adopt ecosystem-based approaches to manage risks from flooding due to extreme weather events, sea level rise, climate change, and ocean acidification.

To implement enforceable coastal and marine zone plans, similar to land use plane

The notable plans from the Marine Planning Partnership for the North Pacific Coast (MaPP) develop collaboratively with First Nations contain zoning and management directions for a wide range of marine uses and activities under provincial jurisdiction like monitoring and enforcement, pollution, and tenured activities. A new law can provide a clear pathway for legislative implementation of these plans.

To enhance food security by ensuring local access to marine food resources.

A new law will support the implementation of the Wild Salmon Strategy as well as a comprehensive approach to sustainable aquaculture.

A new B.C. Coastal Strategy and Law will ensure that the government of B.C. has the right tools in place to protect the coast and keep our ocean healthy for the future.

Why have we reached out to you?

The idea of a coastal strategy and law has been contemplated at various times in B.C. since the elimination of the B.C. Ministry of Fisheries. With the government's numerous commitments to coastal communities, the time is right to provide a legislative framework to support their implementation. We hope that you see the value that this initiative can contribute to your own coastal and ocean work.

We hope that you are interested to learn more about this campaign, available to provide feedback and able to join our growing wave of allies as we continue to advocate for a B.C. Coastal Strategy and Law. If you are interested in learning more about this campaign and how you can support our initiative please contact:

Kate MacMillan, CPAWS Provincial Ocean and Coastal Coordinator, 778-886-0870, kmacmillan@cpaws.org

Michael Bissonnette, WCEL Marine Program Staff Lawyer, 604-684-7378 x 233, mbissonnette@wcel.org
Caring for our Coast: Lessons for BC from Coastal Management Laws around the World

January 2020

British Columbia's iconic coast extends for tens of thousands of kilometers and is relied upon by millions of people. It is one of the largest coastal jurisdictions in the world. And the future of the coast is in peril - declining biodiversity, intensifying climate change impacts, and increasing conflicts over resources are a few challenges BC is currently facing. Yet, despite the importance of the coast to BC's culture and economy, many are surprised to learn that we don't have a comprehensive provincial coastal strategy or law to care for the coast.

By contrast, most other coastal provinces¹, states², and many other countries have coastal management strategies and laws. In the US, 34 of 35 coastal states have Coastal Zone Management programs. If they can do it, why can't we?

BC can benefit from the experience of other jurisdictions as it develops a coastal strategy and law. What follows below is a short, selective look at coastal strategies and laws developed by other jurisdictions to address challenges similar to those currently facing BC. We have focused on six issues in particular that a coastal strategy and law could address in BC: 1) implementing coastal and marine plans, 2) rules to direct climate adaptation, 3) reducing shoreline hardening, 4) prevention of coastal habitat loss, 5) intergovernmental coordination, and 6) maintaining public access. However, this list is in no way exhaustive; there are many other coastal issues that could benefit from a coastal strategy and law.

1. Implementing Coastal and Marine Plans

In BC, no provincial law requires collaborative planning along the coast. As a result, some of the province's busiest coastal and ocean areas have no guiding plan whatsoever. Nonetheless, BC has made considerable progress in developing coastal and marine plans. For example, the provincial government co-led the Marine Plan Partnership (MaPP) with 17 First Nations along the coast and produced Canada's first marine spatial plans with ocean zoning, involving stakeholders in a collaborative process. The MaPP marine plans provide spatial solutions to prevent user conflict, implement ecosystem-based management, and clarify complex jurisdictions. However, in the absence of legislation to ensure these plans are followed, the plans do not have any teeth, and risk being ignored, both by third parties and government decision-makers. Other jurisdictions require legally binding coastal and marine plans.

¹ East Coast Environmental Law Association, "Protecting the Coast: A Multi-Jurisdictional Legislative Review" (August 2018) at 11, online (pdf): *East Coast Environmental Law* <<u>https://www.ecelaw.ca/media/k2/attachments/ECELAW_Protecting_the_Coast_Report.pdf</u>>.</u> ² 34 of the 35 coastal states and territories in the US have coastal zone management laws. For a recent review of the US *Coastal Zone Management Act*, how it works, and how it has been implemented, see: Congressional Research Service, "Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA): Overview and Issues for Congress" (15 January 2019), online (pdf): *Federation of American Scientists* <<u>https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R45460.pdf</u>>.

Examples:

Washington State - Washington Marine Waters Planning and Management Act

Washington State has completed an impressive marine spatial plan for its entire coast line.³ The *Washington Marine Waters Planning and Management Act*⁴ requires all state decisions to be consistent with the final marine spatial plan.

California - Coastal Act

This Act is widely considered to be a model for the US. The Act requires local governments to develop local coastal programs (LCPs) that are approved by the California Coastal Commission.⁵ All public agencies, including most federal agencies, must comply with the Act.

Scotland – Marine (Scotland) Act 2010

In Scotland, the *Marine (Scotland) Act 2010* requires the development of a national marine plan, as well as supplementary marine plans at the regional level. Decision-makers are required to "take any authorisation or enforcement decision in accordance with the appropriate marine plans, unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise" and "have regard to" the plan in making any other decisions.⁶

2. Rules to Direct Climate Change Adaptation

When it comes to sea level rise, BC's own assessments have identified many stretches of coastline⁷ that are particularly vulnerable to climate impacts.⁸ Scientists are now projecting an acceleration of the rate of sea level rise, with unknown consequences for marine and coastal life.⁹ Some potential impacts include loss of property due to erosion and permanent inundation, saltwater intrusion into coastal aquifers, and loss of cultural and historical sites. In addition to this, rising temperatures, changes in the geographic range of key species, increased frequency and severity of coastal storms and acidification will all have significant impacts on coastal communities and ecosystems. Strategies are needed to support adaptation to a climate change future.

BC has developed sea level rise guidance to assist local planning, but more needs to be done to ensure that all communities are safe, to guard against property damage, and to protect and manage coastal ecosystems. Other jurisdictions have enacted coastal management laws that set clear rules for coastal development, ensure new developments are safe in a changing climate, and protect sensitive coastal ecosystems.

⁶ Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 (Scot), ASP 5, s 15(1) and 15(3).

- ⁷ Doug Biffard et al, "Report: BC Parks Shoreline Sensitivity Model" (June 2014), online (pdf): *Ministry of Environment*
- <http://a100.gov.bc.ca/pub/acat/public/viewReport.do?reportId=42825>.
- ⁸ West Coast Environmental Law, "Protecting the Coast in the Face of Climate Change" (25 September 2019), online (pdf): *WCEL* <<u>https://www.wcel.org/blog/protecting-coast-in-face-climate-change</u>>.
- ⁹ Scott A Kulp & Benjamin H Strauss, "New elevation data triple estimates of global vulnerability to sea-level rise and coastal flooding." (2003) 10:4844 Nature communications 1–12.

³ Washington State Department of Ecology, "Marine Spatial Plan for Washington's Pacific Coast" (October 2017), online (pdf): *Washington Marine Spatial Planning* <<u>https://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/WA_final_MSP.pdf</u>>

⁴ Marine Waters Planning and Management, 43 Wash Rev Code § 372 (Statute Law Committee 2019).

⁵ California Coastal Comission, "Description of California's Coastal Management Program (CCMP)" (last visited 14 January 2020), online (pdf): *State of California – Natural Resource Agency* <<u>https://www.coastal.ca.gov/fedcd/ccmp_description.pdf</u>>.

Examples:

Nova Scotia - Coastal Protection Act

The Act recognizes that the coastline provides valuable services to the health and well-being of Nova Scotians, and that, in a changing climate, long-term economic prosperity depends upon sound environmental management.¹⁰ The Act also recognizes that sea level rise, coastal flooding, storm surges and coastal erosion pose significant threats to coastal areas. The Act sets clear rules to ensure new developments are located in places safe from sea level rise and coastal flooding. Regulations to implement the legislation are currently being developed.

New South Wales - State Environmental Planning Policy (Coastal Management) 2018

This policy, established under the *Coastal Management Act*, defines different types of coastal areas and supports coordinated and integrated management by state and local authorities, taking into account "environments, hazards, pressures and interests."¹¹ It provides guidance to local governments on controlling development and establishes approval pathways for coastal protection works to support adaptation to climate change impacts.

3. Reducing Shoreline Hardening

The negative effects of hardened shorelines on ecosystems and coastal communities has been extensively documented around the world.¹² On the south coast of BC in particular, shoreline hardening with sea walls, dikes and other structures has had negative impacts on coastal ecosystems and has exacerbated storm damage and flooding. Beaches have disappeared, as well as wildlife, plants and fish. A recent local study explains the links between shoreline hardening and negative impacts on southern resident killer whales. The destruction of coastal habitat for forage fish reduces their availability as a food source for Chinook salmon, which in turn reduces the availability of the salmon as a food source for orcas.¹³ Hard shorelines also place coastal infrastructure at risk of damage by amplifying wave energy and the consequences of flooding. Rising sea levels will exacerbate these impacts. Some municipalities, like West Vancouver have taken great steps, at considerable expense, to address these risks.¹⁴

Other jurisdictions have recognized the costly threats of shoreline hardening and have implemented policies and legislation that encourage soft shore approaches to protect both coastal habitat and development. But in BC, there are significant gaps in existing provincial legislation that make it difficult to implement these approaches, even where coastal property owners and local governments are supportive.

¹⁰ Bill 106, An Act Respecting Coastal Protection in Nova Scotia, 2nd Sess, 63rd GA, NS, (assented to 12 April 2019).

¹¹ State Environmental Planning Policy (Coastal Wetlands) (NSW), 2018/106

¹² See, for example, Gittman, R., Fodrie, F., Popowich, A., Keller, D., Bruno, J., Currin, C. A., et al. (2015). Engineering away our natural defenses: an analysis of shoreline hardening in the US. Front. Ecol. Environ. 13:301–307. doi: 10.1890/150065 and Rangel-Buitrago, N., Williams, A., and Anfuso, G. (2017). Hard protection structures as a principal coastal erosion management strategy along the Caribbean coast of Colombia. A chronicle of pitfalls. Ocean Coast. Manag. 156, 58–75. doi: 10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2017.04.006

¹³ Environmental Law Centre, University of Victoria, "Saving Orcas by Protecting Fish Spawning Beaches" (October 2019) online (pdf): Environmental Law Centre <<u>http://www.elc.uvic.ca/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/2019-01-11-Saving-Orcas-by-Protecting-Fish-Spawning-Beaches.pdf</u>>.

¹⁴ District of West Vancouver, "Shoreline Protection Plan 2012-2015" (last visited 14 January 2020), online (pdf): *West Vancouver* <<u>https://westvancouver.ca/sites/default/files/shoreline-protection-plan.2012-2015.pdf</u>>.

Examples:

Washington State - Shoreline Management Act

This Act delegates responsibility to local governments to develop Shoreline Master Programs (SMPs), while retaining an oversight role for the State through SMP guidelines.¹⁵ The Act recognizes that shoreline armoring (i.e. building physical structures to prevent coastal erosion) can adversely impact shoreline ecology. New developments must be designed to avoid future shoreline armoring and property owners are required to consider soft alternatives to protect their properties.¹⁶

Oregon – Oregon Beach Bill

This legislation gives Oregon a consistent, statutory basis to regulate structures along the shoreline to meet a state land-use planning goal that limits shoreline hardening and protects coastal habitat.¹⁷

Nova Scotia - Coastal Protection Act

The Act was created to protect the coast for future generations by preventing development that: 1) may damage the coastal environment; and 2) may be at risk from sea level rise, coastal flooding, storm surges and coastal erosion.¹⁸ It prohibits any activity that "interferes with the natural dynamic and shifting nature of the coast" unless it complies with the Act.¹⁹ Specific regulations on "shore-stabilizing structures" will be developed in the future.²⁰

4. Prevention of Coastal Habitat Loss

In the absence of legislation that prioritizes ecological protection, coastal habitat along BC coasts is being lost at ever increasing rates. For example, by 1978, diking, drainage and development in the Lower Mainland had destroyed more than 80% of salt marshes in the area.²¹ Estuaries, eelgrass beds, and marshes are highly productive areas that provide habitats for a host of ecologically and economically important species including herring and salmon. They are also important sites of carbon sequestration and potential climate change adaptation. Unfortunately, these ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to coastal development pressure.²²

¹⁵ Shoreline Management Act, 90 Wash Rev Code § 58 (Statute Law Committee 1971); Department of Ecology, "Shoreline Master Programs" (last visited 14 January 2020), online: Department of Ecology – State of Washington <<u>https://ecology.wa.gov/Water-Shoreline-coastal-management/Shoreline-coastal-planning/Shoreline-Master-Programs</u>; Department of Ecology, "Shoreline Master Programs Handbook" (revised December 2017), online: Department of Ecology – State of Washington <<u>https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1106010.html</u>>; State Master Program Approval/Amendment Procedures and Master Program Guidelines, 173 WAC § 26 (2017).

¹⁶ Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, "Your Marine Waterfront: A Guide to Protecting your Property While Promoting Healthy Shorelines" (2016) online (pdf): *Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife* <<u>https://wdfw.wa.gov/sites/default/files/publications/01791/wdfw01791.pdf</u>>.

¹⁷ Oregon Beach Bill, HR Res 1601, OR Leg (1967).

¹⁸ Bill 106, An Act Respecting Coastal Protection in Nova Scotia, 2nd Sess, 63rd GA, NS, (assented to 12 April 2019) s 2.

¹⁹ Bill 106, An Act Respecting Coastal Protection in Nova Scotia, 2nd Sess, 63rd GA, NS, (assented to 12 April 2019) s 10.

²⁰ Bill 106, An Act Respecting Coastal Protection in Nova Scotia, 2nd Sess, 63rd GA, NS, (assented to 12 April 2019) s 28(1).

²¹ Province of British Columbia, "Fraser River Estuary Study– Summary" (1978) online (pdf): *Government of Canada – Province of British Columbia* <<u>https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfd/library/documents/Bib68894.pdf</u>>.

²² "Seventy percent of the Fraser River estuary wetlands have been diked, drained, and filled to reclaim land for development (the greatest cause of estuary loss in the past), and this has likely had an impact on the size of the Fraser River fisheries. Similarly, on Vancouver Island, about half of both the Nanaimo and Cowichan estuary wetlands have been lost." – Samantha Flynn, Carmen Cadrin

Intense and inappropriate coastal development at the ocean's edge carries urban sprawl into the marine environment as well as other issues including pollution and erosion.

Many jurisdictions have enacted coastal laws that set clear priorities for ecological protection and protect key sensitive coastal and shoreline areas. In BC, it is the province's responsibility to protect these vulnerable areas where land and sea interact. BC has adopted legislation that protects freshwater shorelines,²³ but does not have similar protection for marine shorelines, despite the fact that much of the foreshore along BC's coast is legally under provincial control.

Examples:

Nova Scotia – Beaches Act

The Atlantic provinces have legislated provisions to protect sensitive coastal areas. For example, the Nova Scotia *Beaches Act* prohibits development on listed beaches unless provincial approval is obtained.

Washington - Shoreline Management Act

The Act requires any use of the shoreline to be "consistent with the control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment"²⁴ and prioritizes environmental protection when determining how the coast can be used.²⁵ The Department of Ecology reviews and approves shoreline development permits to ensure compliance with the Act.²⁶ The Act also requires local governments to put in place policies to achieve "no net loss of ecological function."²⁷

California - Coastal Act

In the face of significant population growth, California's iconic *Coastal Act* has successfully protected its coast from overdevelopment.²⁸ A main goal of the Act is to "protect, maintain, and, where feasible, enhance and restore the overall quality of the coastal zone environment and its natural and artificial resources.²⁹ The Act requires "any person," including a state or local agency, to obtain a permit before undertaking development, defined broadly, in the coastal zone.

²⁹ California Coastal Act, 20 CA PRC § 30230–30240 (1976).

[&]amp; Deepa Filatow, "Estuaries in British Columbia" (March 2006) online (pdf): *British Columbia – Ministry of Environment* <<u>http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/Estuarieso6_20.pdf</u>>

²³ Riparian Areas Protection Act [SBC 1997] c. 21

²⁴ State Master Program Approval/Amendment Procedures and Master Program Guidelines, 173 WAC § 26-176 (2017).

²⁵ Department of Ecology, "Shoreline Master Programs Handbook" (revised December 2017) at 22 (supra note xxiii), online: *Department of Ecology – State of Washington* <<u>https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1106010.html</u>>.

²⁶ Washington Department of Ecology reviews the locally approved variance permit and either approves, approves with conditions, or denies it within 30 days of receiving the permit package. Department of Ecology, "Shoreline Permitting Manual- Guidance for local governments" (revised November 2019), online (pdf): *Department of Ecology – State of Washington* <<u>https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1706029.pdf</u>>

 ²⁷ State Master Program Approval/Amendment Procedures and Master Program Guidelines, 173 WAC § 26-186(8)(b) (2017); See also:
 Department of Ecology, "Shoreline Master Programs Handbook" (revised December 2017), online: Department of Ecology – State of

Washington <<u>https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1106010.html</u>>.

²⁸ "Although California's population has doubled again since 1970, the urban footprint along the coast is largely the same today as it was in 1972."-Gary Griggs & Charles Lester, "Coastal protection on the edge: The challenge of preserving California's legacy", *The Conversation* (10 October 2017), online: <<u>https://theconversation.com/coastal-protection-on-the-edge-the-challenge-of-preserving-</u> californias-legacy-76927>

5. Intergovernmental Coordination

Effective coastal management requires coordination among several provincial ministries, as well as Indigenous, federal and municipal governments. A coastal management law can clarify the responsibilities of the provincial and local governments and ensure improved cooperation and coordination among all orders of government. Without coordinated governance, gaps and overlaps in jurisdiction arise resulting in piecemeal and patchwork management of the coast and inefficient decision-making. The lack of clarity also creates confusion and conflict between users and governing bodies, and results in cumulative impacts that are not adequately measured or addressed.

The new BC *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act* requires that all provincial laws be in harmony with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). This requires the Province to effectively engage with Indigenous governments in a coordinated manner. A coastal management strategy and law can proactively ensure provincial decision-making along the coast complies with UNDRIP.

Other jurisdictions have established through law a specialized agency as a 'one-stop shop' for coastal management. Internally, this ensures government resources and capacity are allocated efficiently, and that policy and decision-making are coordinated instead of being spread across different ministries and working groups. Externally, this supports communication, cooperation and action with other orders of government and ensures the public knows where to go with coastal issues.

Examples:

Washington - Department of Ecology under the Shoreline Management Act

The Shoreline Management Act was created to prevent the "inherent harm in an uncoordinated and piecemeal development of the state's shorelines"³⁰ and to meet federally mandated state obligations to implement coastal management laws. Under the Act, the Department of Ecology (DOE) is the lead coastal management agency which provides a "single point of contact for Federal agencies"³¹ and users. The DOE has the authority to cooperate with the federal government, receive any benefits available through federal statutes, and represent Washington's interests. The DOE also coordinates coastal policy at the state level by setting requirements for local governments in regards to planning and regulation.

California - Coastal Commission under the Coastal Act

In California, coastal management is overseen by the Coastal Commission, which has rule making authority over land and water use within the coastal zone. The Coastal Commission was set up in 1972 to help control development and maintain the character of the coast. It provides an integrated, 'one-stop shop', approach to coastal management.³²

³⁰ Shoreline Management Act, 90 Wash Rev Code § 58.020 (Statute Law Committee 1971).

³¹ Federal Consistency with Approved Coastal Management Programs, 15 CFR § 930.6 (2019)

³² "The Coastal Commission approves local coastal plans, hears appeals of certain local decisions, regulates development from the high tide line out to the three-nautical mile boundary of state waters, and reviews federal actions to ensure they are consistent with the Act's policies." – Jordan Diamond et al, "The Past, Present, and Future of California's Coastal Act – Overcoming Division to Comprehensively Manage the Coast" (August 2017), online (pdf): *Berkeley Law* <<u>https://www.law.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Coastal-Act-Issue-Brief.pdf</u>>.

Louisiana - Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority

The Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority³³ was created after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita devastated the coast in 2005 and painfully demonstrated the need to coordinate state-level policy. The Authority carries out strategic planning for the coast, bringing together resources from across different government departments, and develops a master plan of projects for protection and restoration.

6. Maintaining Public Access

Public access to the coast is a contentious issue in BC.³⁴ Public shoreline access is not only important for local residents but is critical for a growing tourism sector. As the population grows, concern over coastal access will only increase. In BC, while there are common law rights to land boats on and embark from the foreshore in cases of emergency, riparian rights for coastal property owners, and rights of navigation, anchoring, mooring, and fishing over lands covered by water, there are no general public rights of access to the coastline or provincial standards. In contrast, in the US, coastal access is a highly protected and valued legal right.

Example:

California - Coastal Act

The Act guarantees public access to the coast and prohibits development from interfering with that access. It also requires "conspicuously posted" signage to encourage access.³⁵ The Act requires appropriate and feasible public facilities (including parking) to be distributed throughout an area to mitigate against impacts of overcrowding or overuse, and provides safeguards to prevent visitor and recreational facilities from becoming unaffordable.³⁶



California coast (Photo: Alejandro De La Cruz).

³³ Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority, <u>https://coastal.la.gov</u>

³⁴ See for example: S Gorkoff and W Kelowna, "Common law protects public and private rights on foreshore", *The Daily Courier* (27 April 2017), online: <<u>http://www.kelownadailycourier.ca/opinion/letters_to_editor/article_26896c14-2ada-11e7-87e3-4321fdef42b5.html</u>>.

³⁵ Jordan Diamond et al, "The Past, Present, and Future of California's Coastal Act – Overcoming Division to Comprehensively Manage the Coast" (August 2017), online (pdf): *Berkeley Law* <<u>https://www.law.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Coastal-Act-Issue-Brief.pdf</u>>.

³⁶ California Coastal Act, 20 CA PRC § 30210, 30211, 30212, 30212.5, 30213, 30214 (1976).

Conclusion

A brief look around the world shows that BC is an outlier in not having a coastal management strategy and law and that there is much more the BC government can do to address the challenges faced along the coast.

As West Coast Environmental Law has detailed elsewhere, the <u>BC government has considerable jurisdiction</u> to regulate the coast.³⁷ A provincial coastal management strategy and law could address many other coastal issues not mentioned in this brief including: oil spill response, marine debris, land-based marine pollution, moorage, blue carbon, coastal habitat restoration, ocean renewable energy, community-based fisheries, aquatic plant harvest and protection, provincial contributions to orca recovery, and aquaculture. Without such a strategy and law, BC puts the ecological integrity of the coast as well as the economic and cultural future of coastal communities in jeopardy.

We encourage you to contact WCEL with any questions about coastal management and law.

Authors:

Georgia Lloyd-Smith, Staff Lawyer glsmith@wcel.org

Michael Bissonnette, Staff Lawyer mbissonnette@wcel.org

Deborah Carlson, Staff Lawyer dcarlson@wcel.org

³⁷ West Coast Environmental Law, "Frequently Asked Questions: Provincial Jurisdiction of British Columbia over Coastal and Ocean Matters" (Accessed 14 January 2020), online (pdf): <<u>https://www.wcel.org/sites/default/files/publications/2019-10-08-faq-provincialjurisdiction-coastal-final.pdf</u>>



West Coast Environmental Law 200-2006 West 10th Avenue Vancouver, BC Canada V6J 2B3 604-684-7378 (toll-free in BC: 1-800-330-WCEL) **www.wcel.org** • @WCELaw •



Frequently Asked Questions:

Provincial Jurisdiction of British Columbia over Coastal and Ocean Matters

Which order of government is responsible for regulating coasts and marine areas in British Columbia?

All orders of government (federal, First Nations, provincial and local) have jurisdiction in coastal and marine areas in Canadian law, and each has an important role to play in coastal and marine planning, protection management, and enforcement. Indigenous peoples also have sovereign powers over their territories and Indigenous laws apply to those territories as well as Canadian laws.

In Canadian law, how far seaward does provincial jurisdiction extend?

The boundaries for coastal provinces typically include all land to the "low tide mark" (the level reached by the tide at low water), as well as all "inland waters," meaning the area between headlands such as bays, harbours, and coves (historically referred to as *inter fauces terrae*, "within the jaws of the land"), including the seabed in those areas.

What gives the Province of BC relatively expansive coastal jurisdiction?

The waters between Vancouver Island and the Lower Mainland have been interpreted to be "inland waters" within the Province of BC by the Supreme Court of Canada, following a reference case brought by the Province that was decided in 1984.ⁱ

This includes the Strait of Juan de Fuca, the Strait of Georgia, Johnstone Strait and Queen Charlotte Strait. This gives the province the power to legislate over the seabed and waters in these areas, on subject matters within its jurisdiction.



Map credit: British Columbia Marine Conservation Analysis Project Team. 2011. Marine Atlas of Pacific Canada: A Product of the British Columbia Marine Conservation **Conservation Generation** www.bcmca.ca

Ownership of the seabed further north along the coast of BC remains unresolved. In practice, the provincial and federal governments effectively share jurisdiction over the waters of Dixon Entrance, Hecate Strait and Queen Charlotte Sound. In these regions, the province has designated marine protected areas adjacent to terrestrial parks. On the North and Central Coast, joint federal-provincial-Indigenous ocean management and protected area planning processes are underway.

What coastal and ocean activities does BC currently regulate?

The long list of provincially regulated activities includes: environmental assessments, tourism and recreation, aquaculture (marine plants, shellfish and finfish), marinas and yacht clubs, log handling, renewable energy projects, conservation and scientific research, commercial harvest of vegetation, ferries and heritage conservation. However, BC lacks a coastal management strategy and legal framework that would address the cumulative effects of these activities

Which levels of government have jurisdiction over major ocean-based activities?

- **Fishing:** The federal government has exclusive jurisdiction over fisheries in tidal waters, subject to s. 35(1) of the Canadian Constitution.ⁱⁱ
- **Shipping:** The federal government has exclusive jurisdiction on navigation in all navigable waters, including interior waters, "no matter who owns the land underneath."ⁱⁱⁱ Provincial laws do apply to some aspects of shipping, however, including shipping that is strictly within the province.^{iv}
- *Mineral and hydrocarbon resources*: The federal and provincial government each have jurisdiction over resource extraction in British Columbia's marine waters, depending on where the resources are located. The province owns undersea hydrocarbons and minerals as part of its ownership of the province's inland waters and submerged lands beneath them, which includes the area between the mainland and Vancouver Island. The federal government has authority over offshore oil and gas regulation and any undersea mining in the seabed and subsoil of the territorial sea zone, and the exclusive economic zone (EEZ). ^v There are, however, longstanding federal and provincial moratoriums on offshore oil and gas on the Pacific Coast.
- *Marine finfish and shellfish aquaculture*: These operations require a provincial Crown land tenure under the *Land Act* to authorize the use of the site, federal approval under the *Navigation Protection Act* and an aquaculture license under the Pacific Aquaculture Regulations of the *Fisheries Act*.^{vi}



Photo: Gord McKenna via Flickr Creative Commons

CNCL – 46



Photo: Mike Gabelmann via Flickr Creative Commons

- **Protected areas:** All levels of government have the authority to establish protected areas in the marine and coastal areas under their jurisdiction. In BC, there are a few federal marine protected areas as well as approximately 150 provincially designated marine protected areas (although the province cannot restrict federally regulated activities like fishing in these areas). This shared jurisdiction can be harnessed to work collaboratively on marine protection planning processes, as is presently occurring with the federal, provincial and many Indigenous governments in BC's Northern Shelf Bioregion.^{vii}
- **Permits and Authorizations:** Many marine activities and uses require provincial authorization, including tenures for wharves, marinas and renewable energy.^{viii} While the province shares authority over many of these marine activities with the federal government, this shared jurisdiction does not prevent the province from regulating activities that are within its jurisdiction, such as the management and use of land and natural resources, and developing legal objectives for coastal and marine areas in its extensive marine "inland waters"
- **Environmental assessments:** Both levels of government have laws requiring environmental assessments for projects, related to their legislative and proprietary jurisdiction.^{ix}
- *Marine Pollution*: Both the federal and provincial governments have the authority to regulate marine pollution, though the province's jurisdiction is restricted to the area it owns.^x

What order of government manages sea level rise and coastal flood risks to communities?

The provincial government has provided guidance about the rates of expected sea level rise (0.5 m by 2050 and 1.0 m by 2100), but most local governments own and operate their own flood management infrastructure. This infrastructure, such as dikes and pumping stations, is usually located at or above the high water mark (natural boundary). As sea level rises, existing coastal habitat seaward of dikes in developed areas like the South Coast will be lost because it can't migrate landward. Nature-based approaches to flood management that could protect both ecosystems and communities usually require nearshore and foreshore elements that are outside the jurisdiction of local governments.

Do federal laws apply on provincial lands and waters?

Yes, the federal government can exercise jurisdiction established by the Constitution over activities such as fishing or shipping, and federal laws will apply on provincial lands and waters.

Do provincial laws apply on federal land and land belonging to federal Port authorities within the province?

The Province's ability to regulate activities on federal land, including Port land, is quite restricted. Some provincial laws may apply on federal land, but only to the extent that they do not interfere or conflict with federally-regulated activities on those lands.

What jurisdictional zones exist in the ocean?

Both the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and the federal Oceans Act divide the ocean into six maritime zones: a state's inland waters, its territorial sea, its contiguous zone, its exclusive economic zone ("EEZ"), the continental shelf, and the high seas.¹ The federal government has jurisdiction over the seabed and subsoil of the territorial sea, which begins at the low tide mark on western Vancouver Island and extends to 12 nautical miles (nm) offshore, and the EEZ, which extends from 12nm to 200nm off shore. The province owns the lands and waters in inland waters, which includes the area between the mainland and Vancouver Island. The foreshore/coastal waters/intertidal zone and the internal waters are most relevant for provincial jurisdiction.



Diagram from the Asia Maritime Transparency Initiative (adapted from the original).^{xi}

ⁱ Reference re: Ownership of the Bed of the Strait of Georgia and Related Areas, [1984] 1 SCR 388 at 2.

ⁱⁱ British Columbia (Attorney General) v. Canada (Attorney General) (1913), 15 D.L.R. 308 (Jud. Com. of Privy Coun.), affirming (1913) 47 S.C.R. 493.

iii St-Denis de Brompton (Municipality) v Filteau, [1986] RJQ 2400 (QC Court of Appeal) at para 31.

^{iv} Island Tug & Barge Ltd v Communication, Energy and Paperworkers Union, Local 601 2003 BCCA 247.

^v Reference re Offshore Mineral Rights (British Columbia), [1967] SCR 792.

^{vi} R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 245, and BC-FLNRO, Land Use Operational Policy-- Aquaculture, June 2011; R.S.C. 1985, c. N-22; SOR/2010-270. See Alexander Ross Clarkson, "The jurisdiction to regulate aquaculture in Canada" (2014); https://aptnnews.ca/2018/06/02/b-c-firstnation-files-aboriginal-title-claim-challenging-fish-farms-in-their-territory/

^{vii} https://mpanetwork.ca/bcnorthernshelf/whats-happening/

ix BC Environmental Assessment Act, S.B.C. 2002, c. 43; Canadian Environmental Assessment Act 2012, S.C. 2012, c. 19, s. 52.

[×] R v Crown Zellerbach Canada Ltd, [1988] 1 SCR 401; Constitution Act, 1867, ss 92(5), (13).

^{xi} <u>https://amti.csis.org/maritime-zones/</u>

^{viii} http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/oceans/publications/pg-gp/pageo2-eng.html

First Nations Bunkhouse

The First Nations Bunkhouse was constructed around 1895 as a dwelling for First Nations w employed by the Phoenix Cannery. The building is constructed of vertical red cedar board ar secured with square cut iron nails. The building is similar in form to First Nations longhouse cannery workers lived communally, living in the building during the fishing season and retur traditional grounds in the off-season. The building was originally located on pilings further r main dyke. Some time between 1942 and 1946, it was moved to its present location.



I TELUS 🗢

1:36 PM richmond.ca

Strategic Direction 1: Intercultural Connections

Showcasing Richmond's diversity allows residents to have a better understanding and respect for different cultures. Cultural celebrations can be learning opportunities for the host community and allow them to become engaged with the lives of newcomers. These celebrations can also be a way of bringing newcomers into direct engagement with local residents.

One of the ways to foster harmonious relations between cultures is through mutual exchanges that do not seek to eliminate differences but instead facilitate meaningful contact between diverse communities. The City believes that fostering cultural harmony needs to go beyond recognizing and celebrating diversity; it is equally important to encourage opportunities for Richmond residents of diverse backgrounds to interact with and learn from each other. This can lead to increased intercultural understanding and respect, and also increases a sense of community for both recent immigrants and long-term residents.

| | Timeline | | | |
|----|--|-------------|--|--|
| 1. | Continue to recognize and celebrate Richmond's diverse cultures and unique heritage through intercultural celebrations and events. | Ongoing | | |
| 2. | Develop and implement a neighbourhood approach to facilitating positive intercultural exchange and understanding between Richmond's diverse cultural communities, such as community-based dialogues, storytelling, and sharing of art, food, and music. | Short term | | |
| 3. | Review the calls to action from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's (TRC) report and explore opportunities for Richmond to respond. | | | |
| 4. | Identify and recognize community champions who improve awareness, acceptance and positive relations among people of different cultural and ethnic backgrounds, and between long-time residents and recent immigrants. | | | |
| 5. | Incorporate criteria into the City Grant program that supports programs and events that facilitate intercultural interaction and promote intercultural understanding. | Medium term | | |

CNCL – 50

Strategic Direction 2: Collaboration and Partnerships

Richmond has a strong network of Community Associations and Societies, community service organizations, community service organizations, and ethnocultural and faith-based community groups that deliver various services in the community. The City has established collaborative partnerships with many of these organizations to identify and meet the needs of Richmond's diverse population. The City values working together to share information, identify gaps in services, and respond to challenges and opportunities in the community.

The City recognizes that an essential part of fostering a culturally harmonious society is building the capacity of Richmond's community service organizations and ethno-cultural community groups. Central to the process of capacity building is access to resources that allows these organizations and groups to serve the unique needs of the diverse communities in Richmond.

| | Recommended Actions | Timeline | | |
|----|---|-------------|--|--|
| 1. | Continue to work with Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee (RIAC) members to implement the RIAC Intercultural Strategic Plan and Work Program. | Ongoing | | |
| 2. | Continue to support the capacity building of community service organizations that serve the needs of Richmond's diverse population. | Ongoing | | |
| 3. | B. Pursue opportunities to participate in joint planning and networking with community service organizations in order to share information and identify gaps in program and service delivery. | | | |
| 4. | Participate in community initiatives that seek to develop mechanisms for responsive action against incidents of racism. | | | |
| 5. | Pursue programs and funding opportunities provided by senior levels of government regarding cultural harmony initiatives. | Short term | | |
| 6. | Explore participation in networks that work towards building inclusive societies. | Medium term | | |

Strategic Direction 5: Programs and Services

The City believes that a culturally harmonious society is a welcoming and inclusive society. It is characterized by a widely shared social experience and the active participation of its residents. Promoting cultural competence at the staff level through training and professional development contributes to cultural competence at the level of program design and implementation.

Programs and services that reflect the needs and priorities of Richmond's diverse population facilitate a sense of belonging and well-being. Offering culturally sensitive activities and services is one way of reducing barriers and promoting social interaction within Richmond's diverse communities.

| | Timeline | | | |
|----|---|-------------|--|--|
| 1. | Undertake a comprehensive review of City and Community Associations and Societies programs and services from a diversity and inclusion perspective, identifying gaps and improvements, and implementing any actions that have been identified. | Ongoing | | |
| 2. | Review and update the New Canadian Tour program to reflect the needs of the newcomer communities in Richmond. | | | |
| 3. | Develop and implement City and Community Associations and Societies programs and services that enhance positive social and intercultural connections, as appropriate, within and among Richmond's diverse cultural, ethnic and religious populations. | Short term | | |
| 4. | Strengthen relationships with various cultural and ethnic communities in order to integrate their arts, cultural and heritage practices into the City's programs and events. | Short term | | |
| 5. | Work with immigrant-serving agencies and Community Associations and Societies to reduce barriers for new immigrants to participate in programs and services at City facilities. | Short term | | |
| 6. | Consult and seek opportunities for collaboration with the diverse cultural, ethnic and faith organizations in Richmond to gain a better understanding of the needs of Richmond's population and ensure there are a variety of services available in the community. | Medium term | | |



| То: | General Purposes Committee | eral Purposes Committee Date: May 7, 2020 | |
|-------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| From: | Cecilia Achiam General Manager, Community Safety | File: | 12-8275-30-001/2020- Vol 01 |
| Re: | Application to Request a Food Primary Entertainment Endorsement For Food Primary Liquor Licence # 303817 - WC Hotels LLP (Westin Wall Centre, Vancouver Airport) - 3099 Corvette Way | | |

Staff Recommendation

- That the application from WC Hotels LLP (Westin Wall Centre, Vancouver Airport), doing business as, The Apron, operating at 3099 Corvette Way, requesting a Food-Primary Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement to Food-Primary Liquor Licence No. 303817, to enable patrons to dance at the establishment, be supported with;
 - a) No change to person capacity currently in place; and
 - b) No change to service hours currently in place.
- That a letter be sent to the Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Branch, which includes the information attached as Appendix A, advising that Council supports the amendment for a Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement on Food-Primary Liquor Licence No. 303817 as this request has been determined, following public consultation, to be acceptable in the area and community.

CNCL - 53

Cecilia Arhiam, General Manager, Community Safety (604-276-4122)

Att. 4

| REPORT CONCURRENCE | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| SENIOR STAFF REPORT REVIEW | | |
| APPROVED BY CAO | | |

Staff Report

Origin

The Provincial Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Branch (LCRB) issues licences in accordance with the *Liquor Control and Licensing Act* (the Act) and the Regulations made pursuant to the Act. This report deals with an application to the LCRB and the City of Richmond by WC Hotels LLP (Westin Wall Centre, Vancouver Airport), doing business as The Apron, (hereinafter referred to as "Westin Wall Centre") for an amendment to its Food-Primary Liquor Licence No. 303817 to:add patron participation entertainment endorsement which must end by midnight;

- maintain the current hours of liquor service; and
- maintain the current total person capacity.

The City of Richmond is given the opportunity to provide written comments by way of a resolution to the LCRB with respect to the liquor licence applications and amendments. For an amendment to a Food-Primary Liquor Licence, the process requires the local government to provide comments with respect to the following criteria:

- the potential for noise;
- the impact on the community; and
- whether the amendment may result in the establishment being operated in a manner that is contrary to its primary purpose.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #7 A Supported Economic Sector:

Facilitate diversified economic growth through innovative and sustainable policies, practices and partnerships.

Analysis

With the current measures in place to prevent the spread of COVID-19, The Provincial Health Officer is now implementing limited partial openings of certain sectors of businesses with measures for example of no gatherings in excess of 50 participants and social distancing of 2m (6Ft.) to be maintained. Staff are bringing this report forward at this time because the City is obligated to proceed with the licencing process dictated by the LCRB, given that there are mandated timelines and the public notification process has been completed.

Westin Wall Centre has operated the establishment since 2009. The property is zoned Residential/Hotel (ZMU5) Capstan Village (City Centre) and the use of a hotel with restaurant, banquet rooms and meeting rooms is consistent with the permitted uses in this zoning district.

Westin Wall Centre is requesting a permanent change to add patron participation, which initiates a process to seek local government approval. The current licencing for total person capacity will remain unchanged and is set at 786 occupants, including staff and patrons.

Westin Wall Centre's request for a patron participation entertainment endorsement is to enable patrons to dance when hosting events such as weddings, grads and galas in the food primary

licenced area of the hotel. This would add a greater operational flexibility to Westin Wall Centre and an added amenity for patrons

Impact of Noise on the Community

The location of this establishment is such that there should be no noise impact on the community. The patron participation entertainment endorsement must end by midnight and the establishment should not operate contrary to its primary purpose as a food primary establishment.

Impact on the Community

The community consultation process for reviewing applications for liquor related licences is prescribed by the Development Application Fees Bylaw 8951 which under Section 1.8.1 calls for:

- 1.8.1 Every **applicant** seeking approval from the **City** in connection with:
 - (a) a licence to serve liquor under the Liquor Control and Licensing Act and Regulations;

must proceed in accordance with subsection 1.8.2.

- 1.8.2 Pursuant to an application under subsection 1.8.1, every applicant must:
 - (a) post and maintain on the subject property a clearly visible sign which indicates:
 - (i) type of licence or amendment application;
 - (ii) proposed person capacity;
 - (iii)type of entertainment (if application is for patron participation entertainment); and
 - (iv)proposed hours of liquor service; and
 - (c) publish a notice in at least three consecutive editions of a newspaper that is distributed at least weekly in the area affected by the application, providing the same information required in subsection 1.8.2(b) above.

The required signage was posted on March 20, 2020 and three advertisements were published in the local newspaper on March 26, 2020, April 2, 2020 and April 9, 2020.

In addition to the advertised signage and public notice requirements, staff sent letters to businesses, residents and property owners within a 50 meter radius of the establishment. On March 23, 2020, 781 letters were sent to residents, businesses and property owners. The letter provided information on the proposed liquor licence application and contained instructions to comment on the application. The period for commenting for all public notifications ended April 22, 2020.

As a result of the community consultative process described, the City has not received any responses opposed to this application.

Other Agency Comments

As part of the review process, staff requested comments from other agencies and departments such as Vancouver Coastal Health, Richmond RCMP, Richmond Fire-Rescue, Building Approvals Department and the Business Licence Department. These agencies and departments generally provide comments on the compliance history of the applicant's operations and premises. No concerns were raised by Vancouver Coastal Health, Richmond RCMP, or the Building Approvals Department. Richmond Fire-Rescue was unable to complete a final inspection but confirmed that the fire panel and sprinkler systems are in good working order and have no objections to the approval of this application.

Financial Impact

None.

Conclusion

The results of the community consultation process of Westin Wall Centre's application for patron participation entertainment endorsement was reviewed based on LCRB criteria. This process began before the regulations were introduced to prevent the spread of COVID-19. The analysis concluded there should be no noticeable potential impact from noise, no significant impact to the community and there were no concerns raised by City departments. With this in place, staff recommend that Council approve the application from Westin Wall Centre to permit a patron participation entertainment endorsement with no changes to the seating capacity or the hours of liquor service permitted. If approved, this endorsement would be available to Westin Wall Centre opce health orders allow them to host patrons on site.

Victor M. Duarte-

Supervisor, Business Licences (604-276-4389)

VMD:vmd

Att. 1: Letter of Intent

- 2: Appendix A
- 3: Arial Map with 50 metre buffer area
- 4: Email From Chief Fire Prevention Officer

Carli Williams, P. Eng. Manager, Business Licence and Bylaws (604-276-4136)

Westin Wall Centre Airport Hotel Application for Food-Primary Entertainment Endorsement

.

As a hotel, we hold many events with dancing such as wedding, grads and gala events and therefore we need to add the food-primary entertainment endorsement to our license. We usually hold these events in one of our 3 ballrooms but on occasion we have smaller events in our other meetings rooms, all of which are covered under our food primary license, #1345038.

Appendix A

-1-

Re: Application For A Permanent Change To Food Primary Licence For Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement – Westin Wall Centre - 3099 Corvette Way, Richmond BC

- 1. That the application from WC Hotels LLP (Westin Wall Centre)., doing business as, The Apron, operating at 3099 Corvette Way, requesting a permanent change to Food Primary Liquor Licence number 303817 for patron participation entertainment endorsement to enable patrons to dance in the food primary licenced areas of the Hotel, be supported, and;
- 2. That a letter be sent to Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Branch advising that:
 - a) Council supports the amendment for a Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement on Food Primary Liquor Licence number 303817 as the endorsement will not have a significant impact on the community;
 - b) The hours of liquor sales will remain the same at, Monday to Sunday, 9:00 AM to 2:00 AM;
 - c) The seating capacity will remain the same, set at 786 occupants, including staff and patrons.
- 3. Council's comments on the prescribed criteria (Section 71 of the Liquor Control and Licencing Regulations) are as follows:
 - a) The impact of additional noise and traffic in the area of the establishment was considered;
 - b) The potential impact on the community was assessed through a community consultation process; and
 - c) Given that there has been no history of non-compliance with the operation, the amendment to permit patron participation entertainment endorsement under the Food Primary Liquor Licence should not change the establishment such that it is operated contrary to it primary purpose;
 - d) As the operation of a licenced establishment may affect nearby residents, businesses and property owners, the City gathered the views of the community through a community consultation process as follows:
 - i) Residents, businesses and property owners within a 50 meter radius of the establishment were notified by letter. The letter provided information on the application with instructions on how to submit comments or concerns; and

- Signage was posted at the subject property and three public notices were published in a local newspaper. The signage and public notice provided information on the application with instructions on how to submit comments and concerns.
- e) Council's comments on the general impact of the views of residents, businesses and property owners are as follows:
 - i) The community consultation process was completed within 90 days of the application process; and
 - ii) The community consultation process did not generate any comments and views of residents, businesses and property owners.
- f) Council recommends the approval of the permanent change to add patron participation entertainment endorsement to the Food Primary Licence for reasons that the addition of the endorsement proposed is acceptable to the majority of the residents, businesses and property owners in the area and the community.

3099 Corvette Way

Attachment 3



Select properties based on spatial relation to a layer _Query result

3099 Corvette Way

City Hall

Override 1

Duarte, Victor

From:Jansen, SandraSent:April 15, 2020 11:59To:Duarte, VictorSubject:RE: WWC Hotels LLP (Westin Wall Centre, Vancouver Airport) dba: - Amendment to
Food Primary Liquor Licence - For Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement-
3099 Corvette Way

Hi Victor,

This property currently has an overdue inspection by us, with some outstanding deficiencies in the past.

We are currently, due to COVID-19 protocol, not able to do a full inspection; however, we have attended and confirmed that their Sprinkler System and Fire Panel are in good working order.

Sandra.

Sandra Jansen Chief Fire Prevention Officer | Richmond Fire-Rescue 6960 Granville Ave. | Richmond, BC | V7C 3V4 O 604.303.2758 | C 778.836.9362

From: Duarte,Victor <<u>VDuarte@richmond.ca</u>>

Sent: April 9, 2020 2:12 PM

To: 'Stephanie ASHTON' <<u>stephanie.ashton@rcmp-grc.gc.ca</u>>; Jansen, Sandra <<u>SJansen@richmond.ca</u>>; 'Health Protection [RH]' <<u>HealthProtectionRH@vch.ca</u>>; Chiang, Paul <<u>PChiang@richmond.ca</u>> **Subject:** RE: WWC Hotels LLP (Westin Wall Centre, Vancouver Airport) dba: - Amendment to Food Primary Liquor Licence - For Patron Participation Entertainment Endorsement- 3099 Corvette Way

Hello Group,

just a reminder if you can let me know of any concerns or no concerns with this. Much appreciated. I will be starting a Report To Council shortly.



Report to Committee

| То: | General Purposes Committee | Date: | May 14, 2020 |
|-------|---|-------|-------------------------------|
| From: | Lloyd Bie, P.Eng. Director, Transportation | File: | 12-8060-02-01/2020- Vol 01 |
| Re: | Proposed Amendments to Traffic Bylaw No. 5870 - Engine Brake and Cyclist Crosswalk Regulations | | |

Staff Recommendation

- 1. That Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, Amendment Bylaw No. 10184, to prohibit the use of engine brakes on municipal roads in Richmond and permit cyclists to ride in crosswalks with elephant's feet markings, be introduced and given first, second and third reading;
- 2. That Municipal Ticket Information Authorization No. 7321, Amendment Bylaw No. 10185, to assign a fine for the prohibited use of engine brakes on municipal roads in Richmond, be introduced and given first, second and third reading; and
- 3. That staff be directed to send a letter to the British Columbia Trucking Association advising of the proposed bylaw amendments with respect to the prohibited use of engine brakes.

Lloyd Bie, P.Eng. Director, Transportation (604-276-4131)

| REPORT CONCURRENCE | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| ROUTED TO: | CONCURRENCE | CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER | | | |
| Community Bylaws RCMP Parks Services | হা হা | pe Erceg | | | |
| SENIOR STAFF REPORT REVIEW | | APPROVED BY CAO | | | |

Staff Report

Origin

In response to recent complaints received by the City particularly from the Hamilton area, this report proposes amendments to Traffic Bylaw No. 5870 and Municipal Ticket Information Authorization No. 7321to prohibit and establish a fine for the use of engine brakes on municipal roads in Richmond. The use of engine-assisted braking can cause the emission of loud and unnecessary noise that can disturb the peace and comfort of adjacent residents, especially on local roads. A further amendment to Traffic Bylaw No. 5870 is proposed to permit cyclists to ride in crosswalks marked with two lines of intermittent squares (elephant's feet).

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #1 A Safe and Resilient City:

Enhance and protect the safety and well-being of Richmond.

1.4 Foster a safe, caring and resilient environment.

Analysis

Regulation of Noise from Motor Vehicle Braking Systems

The *British Columbia Motor Vehicle Act* (MVA) outlines the laws that govern the operation and equipment of motor vehicles including the vehicle braking system specifications and requirements. MVA regulations prohibit driving a vehicle that causes "any loud and unnecessary noise" from the braking system. The fine for unnecessary noise is \$109 plus three driver penalty points.

The Insurance Corporation of British Columbia (ICBC) guide for driving commercial vehicles references the use of engine brakes (also referred to as engine retarders) to help save the main braking system for emergency stopping. The guide describes engine brakes as useful for providing auxiliary slowing of vehicles, such as for controlling the speed on long downgrades without the use of the main braking system.

The loud sound associated with use of an engine brake occurs as compressed air is forced through the exhaust valve in the engine's cylinder. The ICBC guide states that modern trucks are manufactured to meet safety standards including noise levels and that a well-engineered truck with an engine brake and properly maintained muffler system should not be noisy. Wear and tear on



the system, especially the muffler, can increase the noise levels when used. The guide alerts drivers to restrictions in many municipalities regarding the use of engine brakes (Figure 1).

Local governments (typically those with steeper road grades) have enacted engine brake restrictions through municipal bylaws and signage to supplement the MVA and *Commercial Vehicle Transport Act* regulations. A municipal bylaw allows for the complete prohibition of engine brakes and increased enforcement by local bylaw officers.



To ensure consistency in the region of the proposed bylaw amendments, staff reviewed the bylaw language and fine amounts of other Metro Vancouver municipalities with respect to the prohibition of the use of engine brakes (Table 1). The proposed bylaw amendment wording and fine amount of \$250 are consistent with that of the City of Vancouver.

| Municipality | Bylaw Wording | Fine Amount |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------|
| City of Vancouver | A person must not use or operate a "Jacobs" brake or other type of engine brake on a motor vehicle for any purpose other than as an emergency braking device incidental to the safe operation of the motor vehicle. | \$250.00 |
| City of New Westminster | No person shall, except in the case of an emergency, use an engine brake of any kind to slow or Stop a Vehicle in the City. | \$320.00 |
| City of North Vancouver | Objectionable Sounds: The sound made through the operation of a "Jacobs or Jake" brake or other type of engine brake on a motor vehicle for any purpose other than as an emergency braking device for the safe operation of the motor vehicle. | \$150.00 |
| City of Surrey | No person shall, except in the case of an emergency, use an engine brake of any kind (including a brake commonly known as a Jacob's Brake or Jake Brake) to slow or stop a vehicle. | \$200.00 |
| City of Delta | Unnecessary use of engine brake in residential district. | \$150.00 |

Table 1: Engine Brake Bylaws of Metro Vancouver Municipalities

Regulation of Cyclists in Crosswalks

Section 183 (Rights and duties of operator of cycle) of the British Columbia MVA prohibits cyclists from riding in a crosswalk unless authorized to do so by a municipal bylaw or unless otherwise directed by a sign.

The City's active transportation network includes a number of off-street multi-use pathways that continue through intersections where cyclists share the crosswalk with pedestrians (e.g., Railway Greenway). To permit cyclists on these pathways to ride within the crosswalk at each intersection, the City has:

- installed signage (Figure 2) as required by the MVA;
- installed signage to reinforce the right-of-way of through bicycle movements (Figure 3) as recommended by the BC Active Transportation Design Guidelines; and
- added pavement markings comprised of two lines of intermittent squares known as elephant's feet that are placed outside the painted white lines that mark pedestrian crosswalks (Figure 4).

Elephant's feet markings are defined within national guidelines of the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) to provide better awareness to motorists where cyclists cross a roadway, but are not defined in the MVA. The markings help to reinforce the right-of-way of bicycle through movements over turning motor vehicles and over the person on the cross road.



Fig. 2: Signage for Crosswalk Users



Fig. 3: Signage for Motorists



Figure 4: Elephant's Feet Markings

With the on-going expansion of the active transportation network (e.g., recent construction of off-street multi-use pathways on Alderbridge Way and No. 2 Road), staff propose an amendment to Traffic Bylaw No. 5870 to define elephant's feet markings and remove the requirement to add "cyclists may use crosswalk" signs at every cyclist crossing location.

- 4 -

The proposed amendments will reduce sign clutter at intersections as well as eliminate City costs for the production, installation and maintenance of the signage. For regional consistency, the proposed bylaw wording reflects that used by the City of Vancouver and the City of North Vancouver. As recommended by the BC Active Transportation Design Guidelines, the wording requires that people cycling yield right-of-way to pedestrians when using a combined crosswalk.

Housekeeping Item

The proposed amendments to Traffic Bylaw No. 5870 include one housekeeping item to provide consistency of language throughout the bylaw by replacing "disabled persons" with "persons with disabilities."

Financial Impact

None. The installation of any required signage to prohibit the use of engine brakes can be accommodated within existing approved budgets.

Conclusion

The proposed bylaw amendment to prohibit the use of engine brakes on municipal roads in Richmond will reduce vehicle noise, enhance community liveability and provide the City with the ability to enforce violations. The proposed bylaw amendment to permit cyclists to ride in a crosswalk marked with elephant's feet will reduce sign clutter at intersections as well as eliminate City costs for the signage.

CNCL – 65

Anii Amin

Sonali Hingorani, P.Eng. Transportation Engineer (604-276-4049)

Joan Caravan Transportation Planner (604-276-4035)

6457707



Traffic Bylaw No. 5870 Amendment Bylaw No. 10184

The Council of the City of Richmond enacts as follows:

- 1. **Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**, as amended, is further amended by adding a new Section 8.3 as follows:
 - 8.3 A person must not use or operate a "Jacobs" brake or other type of engine brake on a motor vehicle for any purpose other than as an emergency braking device incidental to the safe operation of the motor vehicle.
- 2. **Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**, as amended, is further amended by deleting Section 12.13 and replacing it with the following:
 - 12.13 No person shall stop a vehicle in any parking space designated or reserved by a traffic control device for persons with disabilities unless the vehicle displays an accessible parking permit indicating that the vehicle is operated by or transporting a person with disabilities.
- 3. **Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**, as amended, is further amended by adding a new Section 29.5 as follows:
 - 29.5 No person shall ride a bicycle in a marked crosswalk, unless it is also marked by two lines of intermittent squares (elephant's feet) on one or both sides of the crosswalk, or it is otherwise signed to permit cycling.
- 4. **Traffic Bylaw No. 5870**, as amended, is further amended by adding a new Section 29.6 as follows:
 - 29.6 Any person riding a bicycle in a marked crosswalk also marked by two lines of intermittent squares (elephant's feet) on one or both sides of the crosswalk, or otherwise signed to permit cycling, must yield the right-of-way to any pedestrians in the marked crosswalk.
- 5. This Bylaw is cited as "Traffic Bylaw No. 5870, Amendment Bylaw No. 10184."

 FIRST READING
 CITY OF RICHMOND

 SECOND READING
 APPROVED for content by dept.

 THIRD READING
 J3

 ADOPTED
 LS

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



Municipal Ticket Information Authorization Bylaw No. 7321 Amendment Bylaw No. 10185

The Council of the City of Richmond enacts as follows:

1. Municipal Ticket Information Authorization Bylaw No. 7321, as amended, is further amended by deleting SCHEDULE B 12A and replacing it with the following:

SCHEDULE B 12A

TRAFFIC BYLAW NO. 5870

| Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 |
|--|----------------------|----------|
| Offence | Bylaw Section | Fine |
| Use of engine brakes on municipal street | 8.3 | \$250 |
| Failure to drive or operate a Neighbourhood Zero emission Vehicle in lane closest to right hand curb or shoulder | 10.7(b) | \$100 |
| Jaywalking | 30.1 | \$50 |
| Pedestrian crossing a street in a crosswalk in contravention of a traffic control device | 30.3 | \$50 |
| Failure of vehicle to yield to a pedestrian in a crosswalk | 30.5 | \$150 |

2. This Bylaw is cited as "Municipal Ticket Information Authorization Bylaw No. 7321, Amendment Bylaw No. 10185."

| FIRST READING | CITY OF RICHMOND |
|----------------|---|
| SECOND READING | APPPONED for content by originating dept |
| THIRD READING | .03 |
| ADOPTED | APPROVED for legality by Solicitor |
| | LB |

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



| То: | General Purposes Committee | Date: | May 22, 2020 |
|--|--|-------|---------------------------|
| From: | Marie Fenwick Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage Services | File: | 11-7000-01/2020-Vol 01 |
| Re: Phoenix Net Loft Public Consultation Process | | | |

Staff Recommendation

That staff be authorized to proceed with Phase One of the Phoenix Net Loft Public Consultation Process as described in the staff report titled "Phoenix Net Loft Public Consultation Process", dated May 22, 2020, from the Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage Services.

MFenvice

Marie Fenwick Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage Services (604-276-4288)

| REPORT CONCURRENCE | | | | | |
|---|------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| ROUTED TO: | CONCURRENCE | CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER | | | |
| Parks Services Recreation Services Project Development Policy Planning | N N N N | Sevena. | | | |
| SENIOR STAFF REPORT REVIEW | | APPROVED BY CAO | | | |

Staff Report

Origin

At the regular Council meeting on February 24, 2020, Council endorsed the following resolution:

- That the Capital Program budget be amended from the previously approved \$11.5M to \$19.44M for the Phoenix Net Loft Preservation project for Option C – Museum-style Interpretive Centre use for the Phoenix Net Loft preservation project;
- (2) That the difference of the \$11.5M and the Proposed \$19.44M (\$7.94M) to be used for the Phoenix Net Loft preservation project be withdrawn from the Capital Building and Infrastructure Reserve Fund; and
- (3) That the Consolidated 5 Year Financial Plan (2020-2024) be amended accordingly.

The purpose of this report is to seek Council authorization to proceed with Phase One of a public consultation process to determine the future program plan for the Phoenix Net Loft.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #3 One Community Together:

Vibrant and diverse arts and cultural activities and opportunities for community engagement and connection.

3.1 Foster community resiliency, neighbourhood identity, sense of belonging, and intercultural harmony.

3.2 Enhance arts and cultural programs and activities.

3.3 Utilize an interagency and intercultural approach to service provision.

3.4 Celebrate Richmond's unique and diverse history and heritage.

Background

The Phoenix Net Loft was constructed in 1943 as a facility to dry, mend and store fishing nets. It is part of a collection of historic buildings on the waterfront that were constructed to service the fishing and boat building industry in Steveston and operated as a net storage and repair facility until the early 2000's when the City acquired the building from BC Packers as part of the redevelopment of their land in Steveston.

Its character defining elements include:

- association with the canning and fishing industry in Steveston;
- location on the riverfront adjacent to the Britannia Shipyards buildings;
- scale, massing, and heavy timber construction; and
- details of its construction including board and batten siding, unique gabled roof design and piling foundation.

Proposed Public Consultation Process

Part of the standard City approach to program planning for a public facility such as this is an extensive public consultation process to ensure the building program meets the current and future needs of the community.

The purpose of the public consultation is:

- To ensure the building, exhibits and programs meet the current and future needs of target audiences and the residents of Richmond;
- To ensure the development process for the facility is transparent and provides opportunity for input into decision making where appropriate; and
- To ensure the public is informed, engaged, and excited about the benefits to the community of the facility.

Exhibit and program planning is an iterative and involved process that will ultimately lead to design documents and a plan with sufficient detail to prepare capital and operating budgets.

Staff recommend advancing interior space program planning with a two-phase public consultation process.

Phase One: Key Stakeholder Consultation

The purpose of this phase would be to define a set of interior program options that can be taken for broader public consultation. This would be accomplished in consultation with key stakeholders in the museum, heritage and tourism sectors.

The objectives of Phase One include:

- Determining target audiences for the facility;
- Defining the key interpretive theme or themes; and
- Identifying amenities and interpretive elements that would be required to support the interpretive themes and attract target audiences.

Program options will be guided by creating a space that:

- Contributes to the cultural vibrancy of Richmond;
- Offers interpretive and informal learning opportunities;
- Complements the existing interpretation at Britannia Shipyards and throughout Steveston; and
- Is sensitive to the heritage value of the site.

Staff recommend targeted consultation with the following key stakeholders from the museum, heritage, and tourism sectors.

- Britannia Shipyards National Historic Site Society;
- Richmond Museum Society;

CNCL – 71

- Steveston Historical Society;
- Gulf of Georgia Cannery Society; and
- Tourism Richmond.

It is expected that through this process an option, or range of options, suitable for public consultation will emerge.

Staff will then report back to Council to seek its endorsement for the proposed option(s) and presentation materials prior to proceeding with the next phase of broader public consultation.

Pending Council approval, staff propose to initiate this phase in Fall 2020. Consultation methods will be aligned with the Council approved plan to restore City services and any emerging provincial health authority guidelines.

Phase 2 – Public Consultation

This phase would present the option(s) developed in Phase 1, and approved by Council, to a broader group of stakeholders, and the community as a whole. The proposed plan and engagement method are detailed in Table 1 below.

Consultation methods suggested below may be revised pending COVID-19 related restrictions on public gatherings.

| ENGAGEMENT METHOD | DESCRIPTION |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Stakeholder Consultation | A broader group of stakeholders will be consulted directly through a workshop or series of workshops. |
| | This will include the key stakeholders and additional Community Stakeholders such as Indigenous communities, London Heritage Farm Society, Steveston Harbour Authority, Steveston Merchants Association, Steveston Community Society, Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Richmond Heritage Commission, Japanese Canadian Cultural Centre and the Chinese Canadian Historical Society. |
| Let's Talk Richmond | A Let's Talk Richmond Survey will be launched to gain input from the general public. |
| Community Open House(s) | A Community Open House, or series of Open Houses, will be held to both educate the public about the project and to elicit ideas and feedback on the proposed options. |
| Promotions via print and social media | All public consultation opportunities, including the Public Open House and the Let's Talk Richmond survey will be widely publicized via print and social media to ensure the widest audience possible is aware and engaged in the design process. |

Table 1: Public Consultation Plan
| ENGAGEMENT METHOD | DESCRIPTION | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Direct promotions | Direct mail will be used to invite stakeholders and residents in a catchment area (to be determined) to the Open House and to participate in the Let's Talk Richmond Survey. | | | |

Financial Impact

The estimated cost for phase one of the public consultation process is \$30,000. These costs are included in the existing approved budget.

Funding to implement the program will be the subject of a future report to Council and a capital submission.

Conclusion

A two-phase consultation process for the Phoenix Net Loft is recommended to ensure the building program meets the current and future needs of the community. This report seeks Council authorization to work with key stakeholders in the museum, heritage and tourism sectors to define a set of interior program options. It is expected that through this process an option or range of options suitable for public consultation would emerge.

Staff will then report back to Council to seek its endorsement for the proposed option(s) and presentation materials prior to proceeding with the next phase of broader public consultation.

M Fenvice

Marie Fenwick Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage Services (604-276-4288)



Report to Committee

| То: | General Purposes Committee | Date: | May 21, 2020 |
|-------|---|-------|-------------------------|
| From: | Jim V. Young, P. Eng. Director, Facilities and Project Development | File: | 06-2052-25-PNET1/Vol 01 |
| Re: | Phoenix Net Loft Deconstruction and Salvage | | |

Staff Recommendation

That staff be authorized to proceed with the deconstruction and salvage of heritage elements of the Phoenix Net Loft as described under Option 1 on Page 3, in the staff report titled "Phoenix Net Loft Deconstruction and Salvage", dated May 21, 2020, from the Director, Facilities and Project Development.

Jim V. Young, P. Eng. Director, Facilities and Project Development (604-247-4610)

| REPORT CONCURRENCE | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| ROUTED TO: | CONCURRENCE | CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER | | | | |
| Arts, Culture & Heritage Policy Planning Parks Services Finance & Corporate Services | র হ হ | Jh hing | | | | |
| SENIOR STAFF REPORT REVIEW | INITIALS: | APPROVED BY CAO | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Staff Report

Origin

At the regular Council meeting on February 24, 2020, Council endorsed the following resolution:

- (1) That the Capital Program budget be amended from the previously approved \$11.5M to \$19.44M for the Phoenix Net Loft Preservation project for Option C Museum-Style Interpretive Centre use for the Phoenix Net Loft preservation project; and
- (2) That the difference of the \$11.5M and the proposed \$19.44M (\$7.94M) to be used for the Phoenix Net Loft preservation project be withdrawn from the Capital Building and Infrastructure Reserve Fund; and
- (3) That the Consolidated 5 Year Financial Plan (2020-2024) be amended accordingly.

The purpose of this report is to seek Council authorization to proceed with the deconstruction and selective salvage of heritage elements of the Phoenix Net Loft building.

The information and recommendation contained within this report coincides with the companion report pertaining to Phase One of the Phoenix Net Loft Public Consultation Plan as described in the staff report titled "Phoenix Net Loft Public Consultation Process", dated May 22, 2020, from the Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage Services.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #1 A Safe and Resilient City:

Enhance and protect the safety and well-being of Richmond.

1.2 Future-proof and maintain city infrastructure to keep the community safe.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #6 Strategic and Well-Planned Growth:

Leadership in effective and sustainable growth that supports Richmond's physical and social needs.

6.4 Recognize Richmond's history and heritage through preservation, protection and interpretation.

Analysis

Current Condition of Structure and Liabilities

The Phoenix Net Loft is currently in a state of structural deterioration. A full structural assessment of the building was completed in 2016 by CWMM Consulting Engineers Ltd., where it was highlighted that approximately 90 per cent of the piling foundation showed signs of significant deterioration.

Staff recently engaged a separate structural engineering firm, Advisian, to review the previous information and provide updated comments on the current status of the structure. Advisian has cautioned that the building is not safe for public access, and further noted that the building is continuing to deteriorate and is becoming more unstable.

The increasing instability of the structure will create a risk to public safety beyond the building footprint. Partial or full failure of the structure may impact outdoor public areas and neighbouring infrastructure. In addition to the risks to public safety, possible collapse of the structure into the Fraser River also presents environmental risks due to heavy concentrations of lead contamination present in the building's siding materials.

It is anticipated that the timelines for the completion of the public consultation process on programming, as outlined in the companion report dated May 22, 2020 from the Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage, and the subsequent Council approvals for program selection and Capital funding amendments would mean a possible start date for construction is 2022. Considering these timelines and the current condition of the Phoenix Net loft, options must be considered to address the risk of collapse.

Staff have received the required Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations (FLNRO) environmental permitting necessary to proceed with the deconstruction/reconstruction processes.

Option 1 – Deconstruction and Salvage (Recommended)

Under this option staff would move immediately to complete the deconstruction and selective salvage of heritage elements that are in good condition. The salvaged elements would be stored for usage in the future reconstruction. Deconstruction and salvage is the first phase required to facilitate the full reconstruction project. The deconstruction can take place in advance of any decision on final program.

The cost of this work is estimated to be \$1.4 million (2019 dollars), plus escalation, as confirmed through independent estimates completed by Scott Construction and a quantity surveyor. This cost is included in the \$19.44 million Council approved budget.

The contractor cost estimates for the complete reconstruction of the Phoenix Net Loft include considerable contingency associated with the high risk of the deconstruction and salvage process. When packaged as a single project, the deconstruction risks raise costs for the whole project, as any issue encountered at the deconstruction stage would impact the contractor's ability to deliver the complete project. By proceeding now with deconstruction and salvage as a separate package of work, the associated risk will be eliminated, and contractors bidding on the future reconstruction work will be able to provide more competitive pricing.

Proceeding with deconstruction now provides the best opportunity to retain the salvageable elements in good condition. Any further deterioration of the structure will add cost to the deconstruction and could very likely damage or destroy currently salvageable elements.

Implementation of Option 1 requires structure and site isolation similar to what is described under Option 2 in order to facilitate the works.

Option 2 – Structure Isolation

If deconstruction is not completed expediently, then the site would need to be isolated to address the risk of any partial or full collapse impacting exterior public areas and infrastructure. Under this option, a perimeter fence around the building would be established to keep public safe should the building collapse. It is anticipated that the fence would extend across the boardwalk, possibly into a parking lot, and would require removal of wharves and the relocation of main public pathways.

The cost to complete this work is estimated to be \$65,000 and is included in the \$19.44 million budget approved by Council. Isolation of the structure would be one of the first steps taken by a contractor if they were to proceed with the reconstruction process.

While this option addresses emerging public and infrastructure risks in the vicinity of the building, risks of salvageable element loss, environmental damage and increased deconstruction costs would not be addressed under this option.

Next Steps

Should Council authorize staff to proceed with the recommended Option 1, staff will develop and implement a public communication plan and proceed with deconstruction procurement. Work will commence immediately after a contractor is selected. Staff will include the items identified as having heritage value as part of the bid package and off-site storage will be arranged. Staff, together with heritage preservation experts have identified elements of the existing Phoenix Net Loft that are of high heritage value and suitable to salvage for reuse in a future facility.

Financial Impact

The estimated cost of \$1.4 million to implement deconstruction and salvage of the Phoenix Net Loft (Option 1) is included in the budget approved by Council on February 24, 2020.

Conclusion

The Phoenix Net Loft is in a state of structural deterioration and the recommendation is to proceed with deconstruction and selective salvage activities due to the increased risk to public safety and the environment as time progresses. Work will proceed immediately following Council authorization.

Jim V. Young, P. Eng. Director, Facilities and Project Development (604-247-4610)

JVY:jvy

Att. 1: Phoenix Net Loft - Advisian Condition Assessment letter dated April 27, 2020

ATTACHMENT 1



Suite 500, 4321 Still Creek Drive Burnaby, BC V5C 6S7 CANADA

Tel: 604-298-1616

advisian.com

Worley Canada Services Ltd.

Our Ref: 307071-01328

27 April 2020

O4 Architecture 2386 Oak Street Vancouver, BC V6H 4J1

Attention: Mike Mammone

Dear Mr. Mammone:

PHOENIX NET LOFT - CONDITION ASSESSMENT - UPDATE (REVISION 2)

As part of the Phoenix Net Loft rehabilitation project in Richmond, BC, Advisian has been contracted to perform a condition assessment of the Net Loft building (superstructure only) in addition to providing structural engineering design services. The site has been previously inspected/assessed by previous consultants, Entech Environmental Consultants Ltd. (EECL) and CWMM Consulting Engineers Ltd. (CWMM), as well as Advisian (as Westmar and WorleyParsons on two separate occasions). Advisian has reviewed these previous reports and, coupled with our current condition assessment (superstructure only) performed in March/April 2019 present the following recommendations as to occupancy of the structure:

- <u>Substructure</u>: As noted by CWMM and EECL in their recent reports, as well as by Advisian (Westmar and WorleyParsons) in the past, the substructure is heavily deteriorated and requires significant repair to bring the structure back to its original design load rating. Considering no repairs have been made since the prior issuance of this letter (23 April 2019), and since the original study conducted in 2016, it is fair to assume that the structure has continued to deteriorate and without repairs/remediations will deteriorate further. Furthermore, the original design is not compliant with modern seismic and structural design practices, therefor01e, repair of the structure to its original state would be insufficient to meet modern code requirements should the use of the space deviate from the original design intent – i.e., change in use/occupancy parameters. As noted above, Advisian has not inspected as part of its current scope the substructure.
- Superstructure: As noted by CWMM in its recent report, as well as by Advisian (Westmar and WorleyParsons) in past reports and as part of its current work scope, the Phoenix Net Loft building itself is found to have signs of deterioration. As stated previously, no repairs have been made since the prior issuance of this letter (April 23, 2019), and since the original study conducted in 2016, it is fair to assume that the structure has continued to deteriorate and without repairs/remediations will deteriorate further. Repair of the superstructure to return it to its original design is feasible, and not anticipated to be overly significant in complexity. However, similar to the substructure, repairs would be insufficient to meet modern code requirements should the use of the space deviate from the original design intent. Another item of note is that the superstructure has been built using

307071-01328-00-PM-LET-0001_R2_200427

Advisian 1

Advisian

dimensional lumber, not heavy timber. This provides further design complications with respect to material reuse and fire rating. Lastly, though the superstructure is in relatively better condition that the substructure; since the superstructure is being supported by the substructure, it (the superstructure) should be considered only as safe as the substructure (its foundation).

Moreover, should repair be the chosen course of action, the existing structure will not be compliant with modern established building codes, including the 2018 BC Building Code, and as such, deviation from its original use/occupancy program is not recommended nor would it be permitted. Should repair be the chosen course of action, Advisian would be able to assist in providing repair designs to meet the original design capacity, however Advisian would not be responsible for the original design capacity.

Finally, based on Advisian's recent work and the review of previous reports, Advisian considers the structure as not safe for general public access, and correspondingly recommends the existing structure not be accessed by the general public in any fashion until repairs have been made to the substructure (repair, improvement or replacement) and superstructure (repair, improvement or replacement). Access should only be by those briefed on the limitations of the existing structure, associated risks, and that have work plans established for accessing the site safely, including where personnel can walk, climb and move about, as well as in accordance with any other requirements set by the City of Richmond.

I trust this letter meets your needs at this time. If you have any further questions and/or comments, please contact me at 778-945-5223 or via email at anthony.peterson@advisian.com.

Yours sincerely,



Anthony Peterson, P.Eng. Assistant Practice Lead, Ports & Marine Structures

Power & Transport Advisian Americas

cc. Vahid Sofali, Advisian Jason Braun, Advisian

Disclaimer

This Document represents the work of Worley Canada Services Ltd., operating as Advisian (Advisian) performed to recognized engineering principles and practices appropriate for the terms of reference provided by Advisian's contractual Customer, O4 Architecture (the "Customer"). This Document may not be relied upon for detailed implementation or any other purpose not specifically identified within this Document. This Document is confidential and prepared solely for the use of the Customer. Neither Advisian, its sub consultants nor their respective employees assume any liability for any reason, including, but not limited to, negligence, to any party other than the Customer for any information or representation herein. The extent of any warranty or guarantee of this Document or the information contained therein in

307071-01328-00-PM-LET-0001_R2_200427

Advislan 2

55

A. J. PETERSON

LUNA



favour of the Customer is limited to the warranty or guarantee, if any, contained in the contract between the Customer and Advisian.

307071-01328-00-PM-LET-0001_R2_200427

Advisları 3



To: General Purposes Committee

From: Wayne Craig Director, Development Date: May 25, 2020 File: ZT 19-872212

Re: Application by Yuanheng Seaside Developments Ltd./Yuanheng Seaview Developments Ltd. for a Zoning Text Amendment to the "Residential/Limited Commercial and Community Amenity (ZMU30) – Capstan Village (City Centre)" Zone at 3399 Corvette Way and 3311 & 3331 No. 3 Road

Staff Recommendation

- That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10189, for a Zoning Text Amendment to the "Residential/Limited Commercial and Community Amenity (ZMU30) – Capstan Village (City Centre)" zone, a site-specific zone applicable at 3399 Corvette Way and 3311 & 3331 No. 3 Road, to:
 - a) Increase the maximum number of permitted dwelling units from 850 to 941 (without any increase in total residential floor area); and
 - b) Relocate 964 m² (10,371 ft²) of permitted (unbuilt) floor area from the development's first phase at 3331 No. 3 Road to its second phase at 3311 No. 3 Road and third phase at 3399 Corvette Way;

be introduced and given first reading.

2. That the terms of the voluntary developer community amenity contribution secured through the original rezoning of 3399 Corvette Way and 3311 & 3331 No. 3 Road (RZ 12-603040) be amended to permit the completion of the proposed City Centre North Community Centre, at 3311 No. 3 Road, be deferred from December 31, 2021 to December 31, 2023.

agent

Wayné Craig Director, Development (604-247-4625)

WC:sch Att. 6

| REPORT CONCURRENCE | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| ROUTED TO: | CONCURRENCE | CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER | | | | |
| Affordable Housing | \checkmark | be Erceg | | | | |
| Law | \checkmark | | | | | |
| Project Development | \checkmark | | | | | |
| Recreation Services | V | 1 | | | | |

Staff Report

Origin

Yuanheng Seaside Developments Ltd. and Yuanheng Seaview Developments Ltd. have applied for a Zoning Text Amendment with respect to a three-lot, high-rise, mixed use development at 3399 Corvette Way (Lot C), 3311 No. 3 Road (Lot B), and 3331 No. 3 Road (Lot A) (Attachments 1 and 2) to:

- Amend the "Residential/Limited Commercial and Community Amenity (ZMU30) Capstan Village (City Centre)" zone, for the purpose of increasing the subject site's maximum permitted number of units from 850 to 941 and relocating 964 m² (10,371 ft²) of permitted (unbuilt) floor area from the development's first phase at 3331 No. 3 Road (Lot A) to its second phase at 3311 No. 3 Road (Lot B) and third phase at 3399 Corvette Way (Lot C); and
- 2. Make changes to the terms of the voluntary developer community amenity contribution secured through rezoning (RZ 12-603040), for the purpose of deferring completion of the community centre at 3311 No. 3 Road (Lot B) from December 31, 2021 to December 31, 2023

On May 4, 2020, the General Purposes Committee considered the subject application and referred it back to staff. It was moved and seconded:

That the staff report titled "Application by Yuanheng Seaside Developments Ltd. / Yuanheng Seaview Developments Ltd. for a Zoning Text Amendment to the "Residential/Limited Commercial and Community Amenity (ZMU30) – Capstan Village (City Centre)" Zone at 3399 Corvette Way and 3311 and 3331 No. 3 Road", dated April 23, 2020, from the Director, Development, be referred back to staff to provide more information on the following:

- 1. the proposed changes to the dwelling unit sizes compared to the original proposal;
- 2. the proposed number of rental units;
- 3. options to increase the affordable housing contribution;
- 4. rationale for waiving the Public Hearing;
- 5. the proposed amount of amenity space;
- 6. the rationale for the deferral of the proposed City Centre North Community Centre and the proposed construction timeline; and
- 7. the proposed governance model of the City Centre North Community Centre.

The purpose of this report is to respond to this referral motion and present the applicant's revised development proposal for consideration. Details are included in the Analysis section of the report. Key changes to the developer's original proposal include:

- 1. A maximum of 941 dwelling units (i.e. reduced from the developer's previous proposal for 960), which is 91 units more than the current limit of 850 units under the "Residential/Limited Commercial and Community Amenity (ZMU30) Capstan Village (City Centre)" zone;
- 2. Four additional two-bedroom affordable LEMR units, which increases the development's total number of affordable units to 63 (from a rezoning target of 59), including 41 currently under

construction at 3331 No. 3 Road (Lot A) and 22 (instead of 18) in the project's second phase at 3311 No. 3 Road (Lot B);

- 3. 165 m² (1,773 ft²) of additional affordable low-end-of-market-rental (LEMR) housing floor area, which represents 17% of the 964 m² (10,371 ft²) of permitted (unbuilt) floor area that the developer proposes to relocate from the project's first phase at 3331 No. 3 Road (Lot A) to its second phase at 3311 No. 3 Road (Lot B) and third phase at 3399 Corvette Way (Lot C), together with a corresponding decrease in the floor area of market ownership units (i.e. no change in total permitted residential floor area); and
- 4. Refinements to the form of the developer's additional Capstan Station Bonus (CSB) public open space contribution (i.e. required with respect to the increase in number of units) to better respond to CSB objectives for the provision of park-like open spaces.

In light of the concerns raised by the General Purposes Committee on May 4, 2020, regarding staff's recommendation that the Public Hearing be waived for the subject application, this recommendation has been withdrawn and, if endorsed, the application will be subject to the City's standard Public Hearing process.

The governance model for the community centre will be addressed through a separate report.

Findings of Fact

A Development Application Data Sheet with details of the development is provided in Attachment 3.

Analysis

1. Proposed Changes in Dwelling Unit Sizes (Referral item 1)

On May 4, 2020, the General Purposes Committee questioned whether increasing the subject development's maximum number of permitted dwelling units would negatively affect minimum unit size or unit mix (i.e. resulting very small units or too few family-friendly, twobedroom and larger units). In brief, the subject development includes the following:

- a) 63 affordable LEMR housing units are proposed, including 41 under construction in the first phase and 22 proposed for the second phase. The minimum sizes of the proposed LEMR units complies with the City's Affordable Housing Strategy, and the proposed percentage of two-bedroom and larger LEMR units exceeds the Strategy's minimum requirement (i.e. 63% versus 60%).
- b) 878 market ownership housing units are proposed, including 536 under construction in the first phase and 405 proposed for the second and third phases. The following table summarizes the minimum sizes of the proposed market ownership housing units, broken down by unit type and phase. The proposed minimum unit sizes (which vary slightly between the three phases) are consistent with that of other market residential developments under construction in Richmond. Of the total proposed market units, 67% have two or more bedrooms, which exceeds the Official Community Plan target for family-friendly housing (i.e. 40%).

| | MARKET OWNERSHIP UNITS | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------|---|-----|---|----|---|----------------------|
| Unit | | Phase 1 (Lot A) Under Construction | | Phase 2 (Lot B) | | hase 3 (Lot C) | Total Market |
| Туре | # | Min. Unit Size | # | Min. Unit Size | # | Min. Unit Size | Ownership # Units |
| Studio | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| 1-BR | 162 | 48 m² (515 ft²) | 129 | 57 m ² (608 ft ²) | 0 | N/A | 291 (33%) |
| 2-BR | 251 | 73 m² (781 ft²) | 113 | 74 m ² (801 ft ²) | 34 | 74 m ² (796 ft ²) | 398 (45%) |
| 3-BR | 113 | 98 m² (1,059 ft²) | 11 | 109 m ² (1,172 ft ²) | 40 | 101 m ² (1,082 ft ²) | 164 (19%) |
| 4-BR+ | 10 | 145 m ² (1,558 ft ²) | 0 | N/A | 15 | 142 m ² (1,523 ft ²) | 25 (3%) |
| Total | 536 | Varies | 253 | Varies | 89 | Varies | 878 (100%) |

2. Increased Affordable Housing (Referral items 2 & 3)

The developer proposes to provide four additional two-bedroom affordable LEMR units, which will increase the development's total number of LEMR units from 59 to 63. Of the total, 41 LEMR units are currently under construction in the development's first phase and 22 are proposed for the second phase. The addition of four two-bedroom affordable housing units brings the development's overall percentage of family-friendly (two-bedroom and larger) units to 63%, which slightly exceeds the target identified at rezoning stage (i.e. 60%).

| | | RE | REZONING (TARGET) | | | PROPOSED | |
|-----|-------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------|------------------|-----------|
| LOT | PHASE | Bachelor & 1-BR | 2-BR & Larger | Total | Bachelor & 1-BR | 2-BR & Larger | Total |
| А | 1 | 12 | 29 | 41 | 12 | 29 | 41 |
| В | 2 | 11 | 7 | 18 | 11 | 11 | 22 |
| С | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Тс | otal | 23 (40%) | 36 (60%) | 59 (100%) | 23 (37%) | 40 (63%) | 63 (100%) |

To help achieve the proposed increase in the number of affordable housing units, the developer proposes to increase the floor area of affordable housing in the development's second phase, at 3331 No. 3 Road (Lot B), by 165 m² (1,773 ft²), as indicated in the table below. This additional affordable housing area:

- a) Represents 17% of the 964 m² (10,371 ft²) of permitted (unbuilt) floor area that the developer proposes to relocate from the project's first phase to its second and third phases;
- b) Shall be provided in addition to the voluntary developer affordable housing contribution secured through rezoning, based on the City's Affordable Housing Strategy in effect at that time (i.e. 5% of total residential floor area);
- c) Will increase the percentage of affordable housing floor area in the development's second phase from 6% to 7% (relative to the total residential floor area in the second phase); and
- d) Reduces the developer's maximum buildable floor area of market ownership housing by $165 \text{ m}^2 (1,773 \text{ ft}^2)$ (i.e. equal to the area of additional affordable housing), such that there is no increase in total permitted residential floor area.

Prior to rezoning adoption, a housing agreement and covenant were registered on 3331 No. 3 Road (Lot A) and 3311 No. 3 Road (Lot B) to secure the developer's voluntary 5% affordable housing contribution. Prior to adoption of the subject zoning text amendment bylaw (as set out in the Zoning Text Considerations, Attachment 4), the housing covenant registered on 3311 No. 3 Road (Lot B) will be revised to include the developer's additional 165 m² (1,773 ft²) affordable housing contribution.

| LOT | PHASE | AS APPROVED THROUGH REZONING (RZ 12-603040) & PHASE 1 DP (DP 16-745853) | REVISED PROPOSAL |
|-------|-------|---|--|
| А | 1 | 3,093 m ² (33,287 ft ²) (Under construction) | 3,093 m ² (33,287 ft ²) (Under construction) |
| В | 2 | 1,349 m ² (14,524 ft ²) | 1,514 m² (16,297 ft²) (2) |
| С | 3 | 0 0 | |
| Total | | 4,442 m² (47,811 ft²) <i>(1)</i> | 4,607 m² (49,584 ft²) <i>(2)</i> |

(1) At rezoning stage, the minimum total affordable housing contribution was based on 5% of total residential floor area.
 (2) Minimum affordable housing increased by 165 m² (1,773 ft²). (Market housing reduced by an equal amount).

3. Public Hearing (Referral item 4)

In light of the concerns raised by the General Purposes Committee on May 4, 2020, regarding staff's recommendation that the Public Hearing be waived for the subject application, this recommendation has been withdrawn and, if endorsed, the application will be subject to the City's standard Public Hearing process.

Zoning Text Amendment informational signage has been installed on the subject property. At the time of writing the subject report, staff have not received any comments from the public about the application in response to the placement of the information signage on the property.

Should the General Purposes Committee endorse this application and Council grant first reading to the zoning text amendment bylaw, the bylaw will be forwarded to the Public Hearing scheduled for July 20, 2020, where any area resident or interested party will have an opportunity to comment.

Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the Local Government Act.

4. Capstan Station Bonus (CSB) Publicly Accessible Open Space (Referral item 5)

The Capstan Station Bonus requires that developments making use of CSB bonus density (including the subject development) must contribute publicly accessible open space at a rate of 5 m^2 (54 ft²) per dwelling unit. If the developer's proposal is approved, such that the maximum permitted number of units on the site is increased to 941, the "Residential/Limited Commercial and Community Amenity (ZMU30) – Capstan Village (City Centre)" zone will be amended to require a minimum CSB public open space contribution of 4,705 m² (1.16 ac.). Prior to rezoning adoption, the developer contributed 4,308 m² (1.06 ac.) of CSB public open space (i.e. riverfront park, community centre plaza, and Capstan Way greenway). To satisfy the amended ZMU30 zone, prior to adoption of the zoning text amendment bylaw, the developer will be required to contribute an additional 397 m² (0.10 ac.) of CSB public open space, secured with statutory rights-of-ways registered on title. The conceptual design of the additional CSB open space comprises three locations (Attachment 5), including:

CNCL – 85

- a) Expansion of the riverfront park (secured through the developer's rezoning application) at the north end of 3399 Corvette Way (Lot C), including improvements to the stair and universally-accessible ramp required to gain access to the crest of the dike, together with a covered area for individual or small group activities (e.g., tai chi), planting, seating, lighting, signage, and related features, which will enhance the park's amenity and visibility from Corvette Way and improve access for the general public and users of the nearby community centre;
- b) Expansion of the community centre plaza (secured through the developer's rezoning application), on 3311 No. 3 Road (Lot B), to better meet the needs of the community centre, including roughly doubling the size of the plaza's programmable area (as compared to what was approved through rezoning) and opening the plaza to the sky (by shifting the adjacent residential tower northward to reduce building overhangs); and
- c) A new public open space near the corner of Corvette Way and McMyn Way, on 3311 No. 3 Road (Lot B), in the form of a neighbourhood pocket park, including seating, planting, trees, lighting, a covered area (e.g., to play board games and eat outdoors), and other features that will provide for an intimately-scaled place to socialize and relax.

Staff are supportive of the developer's proposal on the basis that:

- a) The developer's proposed public open space contribution complies with Capstan Station Bonus requirements for 941 units;
- b) Two of the proposed public open space locations will enhance key City Centre amenities secured through the original rezoning (i.e. riverfront park and community centre), while the third is a new neighbourhood pocket park that will enhance livability for local residents and employees; and
- c) As set out in the Zoning Text Amendment Considerations (Attachment 4), all three public open spaces will be secured with statutory rights-of-ways prior to adoption of the zoning text amendment bylaw, and their design, construction, and maintenance shall be the responsibility of the developer, at the developer's sole cost, as determined to the City's satisfaction through the Development Permit processes for the project's second and third phases (DP 17-794169).

5. City Centre North Community Centre Construction Timeline and Rationale (Referral item 6)

The delivery of the proposed community centre, as approved through rezoning, is tied to the development's second phase of construction, proposed for 3311 No. 3 Road (Lot B). More specifically, legal agreements registered on title to the subject site restrict Development Permit and Building Permit issuance for the second phase unless those permits include the community centre, and restrict occupancy of the second phase (and third phase) until the community centre has been completed to the City's satisfaction. In addition, among other things, legal agreements registered on title also restrict occupancy of the development's first phase, in part or in whole, prior to Building Permit issuance for the community centre and require completion of the community centre by December 31, 2021.

The table below provides the developer's key dates for completion of the community centre and the development's first phase. The community centre schedule allocates approximately nine months for permit approvals (i.e. Development Permit, Building Permit, and Servicing Agreements, including City approval as the future owner of the facility) and 33 months for construction (which is generally consistent with industry standards for a complex development project).

CNCL – 86

| KEY DATES | COMMUNITY CENTRE | RESIDENTIAL/COMMERCIAL USES | |
|---------------------|--|---|--|
| Present (June 2020) | | Phase 1 (Lot A) under construction | |
| October 2020 | Review & approval of the Development Permit, Building Permit, Servicing Agreements (for utilities, roads, dike & park) & related City requirements as | Phase 1 (Lot A) – Occupancy of first 1/3 (190 units, including 21 affordable housing units NOTE : Requires occupancy hold to be lifted | |
| January 2021 | the future owner of the community centre | Phase 1 (Lot A) – Occupancy of second 1/3 (203 units, including 7 affordable housing units) NOTE : Requires occupancy hold to be lifted | |
| March 2021 | Building Permit (BP) issuance & construction starts | Phase 2 (Lot B) & Phase 3 (Lot C) Building Permit issuance & construction starts | |
| July 2021 | Under construction | Phase 1 (Lot A) – Occupancy of final 1/3 (184 units, including 13 affordable housing units) NOTE : Occupancy hold shall remain in effect | |
| December 31, 2023 | Completion & occupancy NOTE : Requires completion to be deferred from Dec. 31, 2021 | Phase 2 (Lot B) 1 st occupancy | |

The developer has indicated that, due to the complexity of constructing the community centre as an integral part of a high-rise, mixed use development, it cannot be completed earlier than December 31, 2023. In light of this, as described in the staff report from the Director, Development, dated April 23, 2020, the developer proposes to:

- a) Submit voluntary cash contributions to cover City costs arising from deferring completion of the community centre to December 31, 2023 (\$136,000) and reduce projected City costs for the community centre's furnishings, fixtures, and equipment (FFE) (\$800,000);
- b) Provide for refinements and enhancements to the conceptual design approved through the rezoning, at no cost to the City, to improve the facility's functionality and amenity, as determined to the City's satisfaction; and
- c) Amend the existing occupancy hold registered by legal agreement on the development's first phase to permit occupancy of two-thirds of the first phase's units (i.e. 393 of 577, including 28 affordable LEMR units), which are already under construction, in advance of Building Permit issuance for the community centre. (Note that existing restrictions on occupancy of the first phase's final 184 units, including 13 affordable LEMR units, would remain in effect; as would existing legal agreements requiring completion of the community centre prior to occupancy of residential and commercial uses proposed for the development's second and third phases).

Denial of the developer's proposal will not result in the community centre being completed earlier than December 31, 2023. Moreover, if the developer's proposal was to be denied, the City would forego the voluntary developer contributions outlined above and occupancy of 393 units in the development's first phase (including 28 LEMR units) would be delayed by up to six months (i.e. from October 2020 to March 2021, when Building Permit issuance for the community centre is targeted).

As described in the previous staff report and memorandum from the Director, Recreation and Sports Services (Attachment 6), deferral of the community centre's completion to December 31, 2023, is supported on the basis that:

- a) The later completion date is expected to improve initial community centre attendance, as the number of local residents will be greater and the Capstan Canada Line Station will be complete (i.e. targeted for mid-2022);
- b) The needs of Capstan Village residents can be adequately served in the interim by existing facilities, including the City Centre Community Centre, Minoru Centre for Active Living, and Richmond Olympic Oval;
- c) Refinements to the community centre's original conceptual design, including expansion of the plaza (to enhance its role as a community gathering place and venue for programs and events) and improved interior daylighting, will serve to enhance the facility's vibrancy, livability, and overall customer experience (at no cost to the City); and
- d) The proposed voluntary developer cash-in-lieu contribution towards furnishing, fixtures, and equipment (\$800,000) will reduce projected City costs by 50% (i.e. \$1.6M in 2023 dollars).

The developer's proposal, as described above, was presented to and endorsed by the Senior Management Team and Chief Administrative Officer.

6. <u>City Centre North Community Centre Governance Model (Referral item 7)</u>

The anticipated governance model for the community centre will be addressed through a separate report from the Director, Recreation and Sport Services.

Zoning Bylaw

In light of the developer's revised proposal, Zoning Amendment Bylaw 10189 provides for the following key changes to the site-specific "Residential/Limited Commercial and Community Amenity (ZMU30) – Capstan Village (City Centre)" zone, including:

- 1. Increasing the maximum number of permitted dwellings from 850 to 941;
- 2. Relocating 964 m² (10,371 ft²) of permitted (unbuilt) floor area from the development's first phase to its second and third phases; and
- 3. Increasing the minimum size of the developer's Capstan Station Bonus public open space contribution to reflect the increase in the development's permitted number of dwelling units.

Site Servicing and Frontage Improvements

Off-site Engineering, Transportation, and Parks requirements were identified via rezoning of the subject site (RZ 12-603040). Legal agreements are registered on title requiring that all necessary improvements are designed and constructed, at the developer's sole cost, on a phase-by-phase basis, via the City's Standard Servicing Agreement processes.

Existing Legal Encumbrances

The Zoning Text Amendment Considerations (Attachment 4) set out the changes required to various existing legal agreements to facilitate the developer's proposed changes in floor area distribution, number of units, affordable housing, public open space, and completion of the community centre.

CNCL – 88

Financial Impact or Economic Impact

The developer proposes to submit voluntary cash-in-lieu contributions to offset costs incurred by the City due to deferring completion of the community centre to December 31, 2023 (\$136,000) and for the facility's furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FFE) (\$800,000). Acceptance of the developer's voluntary cash-in-lieu contributions would fully cover City cost arising from the proposed schedule change and reduce future City costs by 50% for FFE (based on an estimated total FFE cost of \$1.6M, 2023 dollars).

Conclusion

Yuanheng Seaside Developments Ltd. and Yuanheng Seaview Developments Ltd. have applied for a Zoning Text Amendment to make changes to the "Residential/Limited Commercial and Community Amenity (ZMU30) – Capstan Village (City Centre)" zone and defer completion of the City Centre North Community Centre from December 31, 2021 to December 31, 2023. In response to the referral from the General Purposes Committee on May 4, 2020, the development proposal has been revised to include a maximum of 941 units (reduced from the previous proposal for 960), increase the developer's affordable housing contribution, including 165 m² (1,773 ft²) of additional floor area and four more two-bedroom units, and improve the design of the developer's expanded Capstan Station Bonus public open space contribution. In addition, as previously presented, the developer proposes to refine the community centre design, as requested by the City, and submit additional voluntary cash-in-lieu contributions to the City for cost recovery and furnishings, fixtures, and equipment. Legal agreements registered on title to the subject site shall ensure that a Building Permit will be issued for the community centre prior to occupancy of the final third of units under construction in the project's first phase, and the community centre will be completed prior to any occupancy of the project's second or third phases.

It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10189 be introduced and given first reading.

Sorranne Contor-Huffman.

Suzanne Carter-Huffman Senior Planner / Urban Design

SCH:blg

Attachments:

- 1. Location Map
- 2. Site Plan
- 3. Development Application Data Sheet
- 4. Zoning Text Amendment Considerations
- 5. Capstan Station Bonus (CSB) Additional Publicly Accessible Open Space
- 6. Memorandum Director, Recreation and Sports Services





CNCL - 90

"VIEWSTAR" Site Plan

3331 No. 3 Rd (Lot A/Phase 1/under construction), 3311 No. 3 Rd (Lot B/Phase 2) & 3399 Corvette Way (Lot C/Phase 3)



CNCL - 91



Development Application Data Sheet

Development Applications Department

ZT 19-872212

Address: 3399 Corvette Way (Lot C), 3311 No. 3 Road (Lot B), and 3331 No. 3 Road (Lot A)

Applicant: Yuanheng Seaside Developments Ltd. / Yuanheng Seaview Developments Ltd.

Planning Area(s): City Centre (Capstan Village)

| | Existing | Proposed |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| Owner | Yuanheng Seaside & Seaview Developments | No change |
| Site Size | 3 lots comprising 24,643 m ² (265,255 ft ²) | No change |
| Land Uses | Vacant (under construction) | Mixed residential & commercial uses |
| OCP Designation | Mixed Use & Park | No change |
| CCAP Designation | Institution (i.e. community centre), Urban Centre (T5), Capstan Station Bonus & Park | No change |
| Zoning | Residential/Limited Commercial and Community Amenity (ZMU30) – Capstan Village (City Centre) | No change |
| Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development | Moderate (Area 3) – All uses may be considered | No change |

NOTE: Lot references (below) mean 3399 Corvette Way (Lot C), 3311 No. 3 Road (Lot B), and 3331 No. 3 Road (Lot A)

| | Existing ZMU30 Zone | Proposed | Variance |
|--|--|--|-------------------|
| Buildable Floor Area* (Max): • Total | 113,131.8 m² including: Lot A: 57,108.8 m² Lot B: 43,179.8 m² Lot C: 12,843.2 m² | 113,131.8 m² including: Lot A: 56,145.2 m² Lot B: 43,937.0 m² Lot C: 13,049.6 m² | None permitted |
| Buildable Floor Area* (Max): • Residential | 88,836.0 m² including: Lot A: 54,977.8 m²(1) Lot B: 21,015.0 m²(1) Lot C: 12,843.2 m² (1) All affordable housing (4,441.8 m²) must be located on Lots A & B | 88,804.0 m² including: Lot A: 54,014.2 m²(1) Lot B: 21,740.2 m²(1) Lot C: 13,049.6 m² (1) Additional 164.7 m² of affordable housing on Lots A & B (Total = 4,606.5 m²) | None permitted |
| Buildable Floor Area* (Max): • Non- Residential | 24,295.8 m² including: Lot A: 2,131.0 m² Lot B: 22,164.8 m²(2) Lot C: Nil (2) Lot B incl. at least 3,106.6 m² for community centre use | 24,327.8 m² including: Lot A: 2,131.0 m² Lot B: 22,196.8 m²(2) Lot C: Nil (2) Lot B incl. at least 3,106.6 m² for community centre use | None permitted |
| No. of Dwellings | 850 units max., including: Market ownership units: 791 Affordable units: 59 (RZ target), including: a) Lot A: 41 units (under construction) b) Lot B: 18 units c) Lot C: Nil (All units are required to be located on Lots A & B) | 941 units max., including: Market ownership units: 878 Affordable units: 63, including: a) Lot A: 41 units (under construction) b) Lot B: 22 units (i.e. 4 additional units) c) Lot C: Nil (All affordable housing units must be located on Lots A & B) | None permitted |
| Capstan Station Bonus Open Space | Min. public open space: 4,250 m ² , based on 850 units @ 5 m ² /unit | Min. public open space: 4,705 m ² , based on 941 units @ 5 m ² /unit | None permitted |
| Lot Coverage | 90% max | No change | None |
| Height | 47.0 m max. | No change | None |

* Preliminary estimate (not inclusive of garage). Actual building size to be confirmed lot-by-lot at Building Permit stage.



Zoning Text Amendment Considerations

Development Applications Department 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Address: <u>3399 Corvette Way and 3331 and 3311 No. 3 Road</u> File No.: <u>ZT 19-872212</u>

Prior to final adoption of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10189, the developer is required to complete the following:

- 1. <u>Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure (MOTI)</u>: Final MOTI approval is required.
- <u>Community Centre Agreement (CA5970496 CA5970503)</u>: Registration of modifications to or replacement of the existing legal agreement registered on title to Lot B with respect to the developer's commitment to the proposed City Centre North Community Centre on the lot:
 - 2.1. To defer the "Deadline" date for completion of the community centre from December 31, 2021 to December 31, 2023.

The City acknowledges that the Deadline date (December 31, 2023) is based on a 33-month construction schedule (April 2021 to December 2023) that assumes Development Permit issuance for Lot B in October 2020 and Building Permit issuance for Lot B in March 2021. The City will use all reasonable efforts to achieve these permit issuance dates, on the understanding that the developer shall satisfy, fulfil, and comply with all bylaw, Building Code, and related requirements as needed to facilitate the timely issuance of the required permits.

- 2.2. To increase the "Cash-in-Lieu Contributions" specified in the agreement for:
 - (i) Project management from \$300,000 to \$406,000, to include \$75,000 for cost recovery and \$31,000 for cost escalation;
 - (ii) Construction management from \$150,000 to \$165,000, to include \$15,000 for cost escalation;
 - (iii) ICT infrastructure from \$150,000 to \$165,000, to include \$15,000 for cost escalation; and
 - (iv) Furniture, fixtures, or other equipment ("FF&E") from nil to \$800,000.

Prior to Building Permit* issuance for Lot B, the developer shall submit:

- (i) \$136,000 in cash to the City, based on the combined total value of the additional cash-in-lieu contributions specified in 2.2(i), (ii), and (iii); and
- (ii) \$800,000 in the form of a Letter of Credit, based on the value of the additional cash-in-lieu contribution specified in 2.2(iv).

<u>On December 31, 2022</u> (i.e. one year ahead of the "Deadline" date for completion of the community centre), the developer shall replace the Letter of Credit with a cash contribution (\$800,000) or the City shall cash the Letter of Credit.

- 2.3. To amend the "City Centre Conceptual Plan" and "Terms of Reference" (i.e. Schedules A and B respectively to the agreement), to:
 - (i) Provide for minor interior changes that do not impact overall construction costs;
 - (ii) Improve interior daylighting, including additional lobby windows fronting the plaza and clerestory windows at the second storey; and
 - (iii) Coordinate the community centre design with the expanded the programmable outdoor plaza area secured through the modification or replacement of the existing Community Centre Plaza – North (Statutory Rights-of-Way) agreement (CA5970406 – CA5970409); and
- 2.4. To make related changes to the terms of the existing agreement as required for consistency and clarity.
- 3. <u>Additional Capstan Station Bonus (CSB) Publicly-Accessible Open Space</u>: Registration of additional Statutory Rights-of-Way (SRW) areas on title to Lot B and Lot C to facilitate public access, together with related landscaping and amenities, in order that the public may have use and enjoyment of the areas as if they were City

park, as required to satisfy CSB publicly-accessible open space bylaw requirements, based on 941 dwelling units, as generally set out in Schedule A.

The required additional CSB open space SRW area shall be provided in a combination of new and expanded (existing) locations. The actual size of each SRW area shall be determined through the Lots B and C Development Permit* (DP 17-794169), to the satisfaction of the City. The sizes and configurations of the new and expanded SRW areas, together with their uses, program elements, landscape and infrastructure features (e.g., lighting, water, electrical), and related aspects shall take into account, among other things, coordination with the City-owned riverfront park fronting Lot C and community centre public access and program objectives on Lot B. Design and construction of the SRW areas shall be at the sole cost and responsibility of the developer, as determined to the City's satisfaction. Maintenance shall be at the sole cost and responsibility of the developer/owner (except for any City-owned sidewalk, utilities, streetlights, traffic signals, and related equipment, street trees, and furnishings, as determined to the City's sole satisfaction through an approved Servicing Agreement*). The developer's construction of the SRW areas shall be secured with the Lots B and C Development Permit* (DP 17-794169) landscape security (Letter of Credit), unless otherwise determined through DP 17-794169. Other terms of the SRW agreements shall generally be consistent with those SRW agreements registered on title to the lots to satisfy CSB open space requirements through "Viewstar's" original rezoning application (RZ 12-603040), unless otherwise determined to the satisfaction of the City through DP 17-794169 and/or the related community centre and Servicing Agreement (e.g., riverfront park) review and approval processes.

Required changes to existing CSB SRW agreements shall include the following:

- 3.1. <u>"Community Centre Plaza North" Statutory Rights-of-Way (CA5970406 CA5970409)</u>: Registration of modifications to or replacement of the existing legal agreement registered on title to Lot B with respect to the plaza secured for the shared use of the community centre on the lot:
 - (i) To increase the existing SRW area by approximately 141.9 m², from 125.4 m² to approximately 267.3 m² or as otherwise determined to the satisfaction of the City through the Lot B Development Permit* (DP 17-794169) and related community centre approval processes, which increase in SRW area shall be secured for the purpose of satisfying the developer's required Capstan Station Bonus publicly-accessible open space contribution;
 - (ii) To increase the programmable area of the plaza to roughly double that originally approved through RZ 12-603040;
 - (iii) Make related changes to the agreement, as required, to accurately reflect the approved plaza design, public use and program objectives, permitted permanent and temporary plaza features and encroachments, building interface considerations (e.g., residential lobby and fronting commercial uses), and related factors; and
 - (iv) Make related changes to the terms of the existing agreement as required for consistency and clarity.
- 3.2. <u>"River Road Park Entrance" Statutory Rights-of-Way (CA5970416 CA5970419)</u>: Registration of modifications to or replacement of the existing legal agreement registered on title to Lot C with respect to the publicly-accessible open space secured at the north end of the lot:
 - (i) To replace the existing 66.8 m² SRW area (which, for clarity, was <u>not</u> eligible for use as Capstan Station Bonus publicly-accessible open space) with an expanded SRW area, approximately 78.2 m² in size or as determined to the satisfaction of the City through the Lot C Development Permit* (DP 17-794169), which expanded SRW area shall be secured for the purpose of satisfying the developer's required Capstan Station Bonus publicly-accessible open space contribution;
 - (ii) To remove provisions in the existing agreement that permit the owner to use the SRW area for loading vehicles and related purposes;
 - (iii) Make related changes to the agreement, as required, to accurately reflect the approved plaza design, intended public use and access to/from the adjacent City-owned riverfront park and dike, permitted permanent and temporary plaza features and encroachments, building interface considerations, and related factors; and
 - (iv) Make related changes to the terms of the existing agreement as required for consistency and clarity.

- 4. <u>"Driveway Crossings" Covenant (CA5970432 CA5970433)</u>: Registration of modifications to or replacement of the existing legal agreement registered on title to Lot C to remove the "River Road Driveway", for the purpose of restricting vehicle access by the owner to the "River Road Park Entrance" plaza SRW (CA5970416 CA5970419), which agreement shall be modified or replaced, as described above, to remove the owner's ability to use the plaza for loading and related purposes, and make related changes to the terms of the existing Driveway Crossing agreement as required for consistency and clarity.
- 5. <u>"Phasing" Covenant (CA5970452 CA5970453)</u>: Registration of modifications to or replacement of the existing legal agreement registered on title to Lots A, B, and C with respect to the phased development and occupancy of the lands to:
 - 5.1. For Lot A: Amend the "Specific Lot A/Phase 1 Restrictions" regarding the prior-to-occupancy requirements with respect to Building Permit issuance for Lot B and the community centre such that those prior-to-occupancy requirements shall only apply to "Stage 3" (i.e. Buildings D & E as set out in the "Phase 1/Lot A Staging" covenant registered on Lot A, CA5970512 CA5970513 / CA6833328 CA6833329), and not to "Stage 1" or "Stage 2" (i.e. Buildings B & C and Buildings A & J, respectively);
 - 5.2. Clarify that for the purpose of the agreement, "occupancy" or "final Building Permit inspection granting occupancy" shall mean using, possessing, taking up, keeping, holding, utilizing, moving into or, living in, taking possession of premises and any other actions resulting in the foregoing, except to the extent that such is permitted by the City for the limited purposes of improving such premises (e.g., constructing tenant improvements) prior to fully taking occupancy; and
 - 5.3. Make related changes to the terms of the existing agreement as required for clarity and consistency.
- 6. <u>"Unit Allocation" Covenant (CA5970464 CA5970465 / CA6833325 CA6833327)</u>: Registration of modifications to or replacement of the existing legal agreement registered on title to Lots A, B, and C with respect to the maximum permitted number of units on the lots:
 - 6.1. To increase the maximum permitted combined total number of units on Lots A, B, and C from 850 to 941;
 - 6.2. To increase the maximum permitted number of units on Lot B to 275 and on Lot C to 89, unless otherwise approved through the Development Permit* for Lots B & C (DP 17-794169); and
 - 6.3. Make related changes to the terms of the existing agreement as required for consistency and clarity.
- Affordable Housing Covenant for Lot B (CA5970492 CA5970503): Registration of modifications to or replacement of the existing legal agreement registered on title to Lot B to accurately reflect the development proposal approved through ZT 19-872212 and the Development Permit for Lot B, which shall include:
 - 7.1. A voluntary developer contribution comprising 164.7 m2 of additional affordable low-end-of-market-rental housing (i.e. over and above the minimum area required by the amended ZMU30 zone); and
 - 7.2. At least 22 affordable housing units (including 11 family-friendly, 2-bedroom or larger units) and related parking, bike storage, amenities, and other features, as determined to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Social Development and Director of Development.
- 8. <u>Development Permit</u>: Processing of a Development Permit* for Lots B and C (DP 17-794169) to a level deemed acceptable by the Director of Development.

Prior to Development Permit for 3311 No. 3 Road and 3399 Corvette Way (DP 17-794169), among other things, the developer is required to complete the following:

1. <u>Sea Island Way Greenway (CA5970410)</u>: Registration of modifications to or replacement of the existing legal agreement registered on title to Lot B to amend the boundaries of the SRW area and provide for related changes, as determined to the satisfaction of the City, to accommodate Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure (MOTI) design requirements for Sea Island Way.

CNCL – 95

 <u>Community Centre Agreement (CA5970496 – CA5970503)</u>: Submission and approval of the Development Design Plans for the community centre, including refinements and enhancements to the conceptual design originally approved through rezoning (e.g., improved daylighting and expansion of the plaza), as determined to the satisfaction of the City as the future owner of the facility.

Note:

- An asterisk (*) indicates that a separate application is required.
- Where the Director of Development deems appropriate, the preceding agreements are to be drawn not only as personal covenants of the
 property owner but also as covenants pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act.

All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall have priority over all such liens, charges and encumbrances as is considered advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements to be registered in the Land Title Office shall, unless the Director of Development determines otherwise, be fully registered in the Land Title Office prior to enactment of the appropriate bylaw.

The preceding agreements shall provide security to the City including indemnities, warranties, equitable/rent charges, letters of credit and withholding permits, as deemed necessary or advisable by the Director of Development. All agreements shall be in a form and content satisfactory to the Director of Development.

- Additional legal agreements, as determined via the subject development's Servicing Agreement(s) and/or Development Permit(s), and/or Building Permit(s) to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering may be required including, but not limited to, site investigation, testing, monitoring, site preparation, de-watering, drilling, underpinning, anchoring, shoring, piling, pre-loading, ground densification or other activities that may result in settlement, displacement, subsidence, damage or nuisance to City and private utility infrastructure.
- Applicants for all City Permits are required to comply at all times with the conditions of the Provincial Wildlife Act and Federal Migratory Birds Convention Act, which contain prohibitions on the removal or disturbance of both birds and their nests. Issuance of Municipal permits does not give an individual authority to contravene these legislations. The City of Richmond recommends that where significant trees or vegetation exists on site, the services of a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) be secured to perform a survey and ensure that development activities are in compliance with all relevant legislation.

SIGNED COPY ON FILE

Capstan Station Bonus (CSB) - Additional Publicly Accessible Open Space Requirements



| | CSB PUBLIC OPEN SPACE FEATURES (1) | CSB Voluntary Public Open Space Contribution | | | |
|---|--|--|----------------------|----------------------|--|
| | CSB FUBLIC OPEN SPACE FEATURES (1) | Fee Simple | Dedication | SRW | |
| 1. | Riverfront Park | 2,963.0 m ² | Nil | Nil | |
| 2. | McMyn Way – Sidewalk widening | Nil | 123.0 m ² | Nil | |
| 3. | Capstan Way – Sidewalk widening | Nil | 845.0 m ² | Nil | |
| 4. | Capstan Way Plaza (Lot A) | Nil | Nil | 136.0 m ² | |
| 5. | Community Centre Plaza – South (Lot A) | Nil | Nil | 116.0 m ² | |
| 6. | Community Centre Plaza – North (Lot B) | Nil | Nil | 125.4 m ² | |
| SUB-TOTAL (Secured through RZ 12-603040) | | 2,963.0 m ² | 968.0 m ² | 377.4 m ² | |
| • | Min. 4,250.0 m ² required for 850 units Actual area exceeds minimum by 58.4 m ² | 4,308.4 m² (1.06 acres) | | | |
| 7. | River Road Park Entrance – New (Lot C) | Nil | Nil | 78.2 m² (2) | |
| 8. | McMyn Neighbourhood Pocket Park – New (Lot B) | Nil | Nil | 176.5 m² (2) | |
| 9. | Community Centre Plaza (North) – Expansion (Lot B) | Nil | Nil | 141.9 m² <i>(2)</i> | |
| SU | B-TOTAL (ZT 19-872212) | Nil | Nil | 396.6 m ² | |
| Area required for 91 additional units = 455.0 m² LESS 58.4 m² excess secured via RZ 12-603040 | | Additional 396.6 m ² (0.10 acres) | | | |
| MINIMUM CSB PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AREA Based on a maximum of 941 units (3) | | 2 | 4,705.0 m² (1.16 a | acres) | |

1) CSB public open space features are NOT eligible for Development Cost Charge credits (for park or road acquisition or construction), but, as per the ZMU30 zone, the developer may use the area of CSB public open space features for density calculation purposes.

2) The areas shown in the table are preliminary. The actual size of each individual public open space will be determined, to the City's satisfaction, prior to Zoning Text Amendment bylaw adoption, through the Lot B and C Development Permit (DP 17-794169). For the community centre plaza, the plaza's size and design shall be subject to all applicable City reviews and Council approvals, and the additional SRW area shall serve to roughly double the plaza's programmable space (as compared to that approved via RZ 12-603040).

3) The combined total number of dwellings on Lots A, B, and C shall not exceed 941. If the combined total number of dwellings is less than 941, there shall be no reduction in the MINIMUM CSB PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AREA.

CSB Open Space - Corvette Way and River Rd Scale: 1:200 CNCL – 98

Riverfront Park Expansion (River Road Park Entrance) – Preliminary Conceptual Design

CSB Open Space - Corvette Way and McMyn Way ¥ a: 1:300 홍 ... **CNCL - 99**

McMyn Neighbourhood Pocket Park - Preliminary Conceptual Design



Community Centre Plaza Expansion – Preliminary Conceptual Design



Memorandum Community Services Division Recreation Services

| То: | Wayne Craig Director, Development | Date: | April 21, 2020 |
|-------|--|-------|-------------------------|
| From: | Elizabeth Ayers Director, Recreation and Sport Services | File: | 06-2052-25-CCNO1/Vol 01 |

Re: Application by Yuanheng Seaside Developments Ltd. – Deferral of Community Centre Completion

The purpose of this memo is to confirm Community Recreation Services' support of the proposal from Yuanheng Seaside Developments Ltd. to defer completion of the community centre in the Capstan Village area from December 31, 2021 to December 31, 2023, as proposed in Zoning Text Amendment application (ZT-19-872212).

Although, the City Centre is identified as the area with the greatest projected population growth in Richmond, the Capstan Village population can adequately be accommodated at the City's other community services facilities, in particular the City Centre Community Centre, the new Minoru Centre for Active Living and the Richmond Olympic Oval, until the new community centre is completed in December 2023. By this time, the number of dwellings in Capstan Village are projected to increase by 60 per cent, or from approximately 2,700 to 4,400 units, compared to December 2020. The Capstan Station will also be operational, bringing even more people to the Capstan Village area. Aligning the community centre's completion with this population surge will ensure increased attendance and access to community recreation services for a larger number of the local population starting from opening day.

As a result of the delay the Developer has agreed to provide additional benefits that will significantly enhance the community centre. The benefits negotiated are:

- 1. Expanded Public Plaza An expanded outdoor community centre plaza of approximately 2,000 sq. ft. which will serve as a public gathering space as well as an area for enhanced programs and events. These opportunities will provide improved service to the community and build a sense of belonging for the new residents;
- Design Modifications The Developer has agreed to allow flexibility to modify and finetune the previously approved community centre conceptual design and Terms of Reference to better meet anticipated community needs and interests. These changes will provide enhanced customer experiences without impacting overall construction costs;
- Improved Interior Daylighting The Developer has identified opportunities to provide additional natural daylight, particularly to interior spaces that were previously without windows. This will provide a more vibrant facility with increased program flexibility; and



6450221

4. Cash contribution of \$800,000 – The Developer will provide an additional cash-in-lieu contribution of \$800,000 towards the Furnishings, Fixtures, and Equipment (FFE) for the facility. The FFE budget is projected to be \$1.6M and is the responsibility of the City, resulting in an \$800,000 capital savings to the City.

In summary, the proposed deferral in the community centre's completion is supported for the reasons outlined above. Denying the developer's Zoning Text Amendment proposal could compromise the developer's ability to construct the community centre, and would mean the loss of additional community benefits and compensation volunteered by the developer.

Regards,

Ayus.

Elizabeth Ayers Director, Recreation and Sport Services 604-247-4669

pc: SMT

Jim V. Young, P. Eng., Director, Facilities and Project Development Paul Brar, Manager, Community Services Planning and Projects



Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 10189 (ZT 19-872212) 3399 Corvette Way and 3311 and 3331 No. 3 Road

The Council of the City of Richmond, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

- 1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by:
 - 1.1. In Section 20.30.4.2(c), replacing "4,250.0 m²" with "4,705.0 m²";
 - 1.2. Replacing Section 20.30.4.5(a) with the following:

"the maximum total combined **floor area** for the **site** shall not exceed 113,131.8 m^2 , of which the **floor area** of residential **uses** shall not exceed 88,804.0 m^2 , including at least 4,441.8 m^2 for **affordable housing units**, and the **floor area** for other **uses** shall not exceed 24,327.8 m^2 , including at least 3,106.6 m^2 for **community amenity space**; and";

- 1.3. Replacing Sub-Sections 20.30.4.5(b)(i), 20.30.4.5(b)(ii), and 20.30.4.5(b)(iii) with the following:
 - "i for "A": 54,014.2 m² for residential **uses**, including at least 3,092.5 m² for **affordable housing units**, and 2,131.0 m² for other **uses**;
 - ii for "B": 21,740.2 m² for residential uses, including at least 1,349.3 m² for **affordable housing units**, and 22,196.8 m² for other **uses**, including at least 3,106.6 m² for **community amenity space**; and
 - iii for "C": 13,049.6 m² for residential **uses**, including nil for **affordable housing units**, and nil for other **uses**; and";
- 1.4. In Section 20.30.4.5(c), replacing "850" with "941".

2. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 10189".

| 101897. | |
|--|-------------------------|
| | CITY OF RICHMOND |
| FIRST READING | APPROVED by |
| PUBLIC HEARING | APPROVED by Director |
| SECOND READING | or Solicitor |
| THIRD READING | |
| OTHER CONDITIONS SATISFIED | |
| MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE APPROVAL | |
| LEGAL REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED | |
| ADOPTED | |
| | |

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



Report to Committee

| То: | General Purposes Committee | | June 11, 2020 |
|-------|---|-------|-------------------------------|
| From: | Lloyd Bie, P.Eng. Director, Transportation | File: | 10-6360-06-01/2020- Vol 01 |
| Re: | Potential Temporary Road Changes in Steveston Village | | |

Staff Recommendation

That pedestrian, cyclist and motorist operations continue to be monitored in the Steveston Village for crowding and physical distancing issues and staff report back to Council on the need for any temporary measures to add additional space for pedestrians and cyclists, should the traffic volume of these modes consistently exceed the capacity of existing infrastructure.

[el 1]

Lloyd Bie, P.Eng. Director, Transportation (604-276-4131)

Att. 5

| REPORT CONCURRENCE | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER | |
| SENIOR STAFF REPORT REVIEW | ÎNITIALS: |
| APPROVED BY CAO | |

Staff Report

Origin

At the May 25, 2020 General Purposes Committee, the following referral was carried:

That staff examine areas in Richmond that could be closed to traffic for a period of time during the summer and generally the expanded use of road space, and report back.

This report responds to the referral.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #1 A Safe and Resilient City:

Enhance and protect the safety and well-being of Richmond.

1.4 Foster a safe, caring and resilient environment.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #7 A Supported Economic Sector:

Facilitate diversified economic growth through innovative and sustainable policies, practices and partnerships.

7.1 Demonstrate leadership through strategic partnerships, collaborations and exploring innovative and emerging economic practices and technical advancements.

Analysis

Potential Districts for Temporary Road Closures

As part of the COVID-19 pandemic response, a number of cities in Metro Vancouver, across Canada and internationally have implemented new temporary street management measures to provide safe access to businesses and ensure that people have safe space for social/physical distancing while getting outside. For Richmond, there are two districts that have a high concentration of restaurants and/or street-front retail where additional physical space via partial lane or full road closures may be of benefit to support the re-opening of businesses and provincial health guidelines: Steveston Village and the City Centre, which includes the concentration of restaurant activity on Alexandra Road between Hazelbridge Way and Garden City Road. Beyond these two areas, the City has not received any requests regarding potential road space allocation but will consider any requests on a case-by-case basis.

City Centre

Staff's preliminary assessment of the Alexandra Road precinct indicates that there are wide setbacks to the street and on-site parking areas such that additional patio, retail and queuing space, if desired, can likely be accommodated solely within private property without impact to the public realm. At this time, the City has not received any requests from the public or

businesses in the area requesting partial or full road closures. Staff will continue to monitor the area and respond as required.

Steveston Village

The popularity of the Steveston Village waterfront for pedestrian activity prompted the installation of a temporary delineated pathway on the south side of Bayview Street between No. 1 Road and Third Avenue to provide increased space on a trial basis for pedestrians and cyclists on May 4, 2020.

Since then, staff observations indicate that additional public space can sometimes be needed for maintaining physical distancing guidelines during peak periods, particularly around restaurants where there is queuing for take-out activities. The need for increased space is anticipated to grow as phased re-opening measures for restaurants and businesses are rolled out and warmer weather encourages greater outdoor activity.

Potential Temporary Road Changes in Steveston Village

Staff identified potential temporary road changes for evaluation to provide increased physical space for walking, queuing, dining and retail activities as summarized in Table 1 and illustrated in Attachment 1. The measures can be implemented independently or in combination.

| Table 1. Polential remporary Road Changes for Evaluation | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Potential Measure | Potential Scope for Evaluation | | | |
| Closure of Moncton Street | Up to 3-block closure between No. 1 Road and Third Avenue | | | |
| | North-south avenues remain open | | | |
| | North-south lanes closed at Moncton Street | | | |
| One-Way Street System for Bayview Street | Conversion from 2-way to 1-way westbound between No. 1 Road and Third | | | |
| | Avenue | | | |
| | Conversion of First and Third Avenues from 2-way to 1-way northbound between | | | |
| | Bayview Street and Moncton Street | | | |

Table 1: Potential Temporary Road Changes for Evaluation

Consultation with Steveston Businesses

Consultation was targeted to all businesses in the Steveston Village area to gain feedback on whether or not the potential temporary changes would help support their economic recovery and ongoing operations while provincial health guidelines regarding physical distancing are still in place. Outreach to businesses comprised the following activities:

- <u>On-Line Survey on Let's Talk Richmond</u>: Hand and email delivery of an information notice to all businesses in the area bounded by No. 1 Road, Bayview Street, Third Avenue, and Chatham Street on June 6, 2020 (Attachment 2). The material included a link to an on-line survey (open June 6-10, 2020) where business operators could provide feedback on the potential temporary measures plus a City telephone number for questions and/or phone-in survey responses. The information notice was provided to more than 225 businesses. Phone calls were made to those businesses that were not open, had no mail box nor an available e-mail address.
- <u>On-Line Presentation</u>: An on-line meeting was held June 9, 2020 where staff presented the potential measures and answered questions. The Steveston Merchants Association and all Steveston Village businesses were invited to attend.

Results of Consultation with Steveston Businesses

A total of 50 on-line and phone survey responses with unique addresses were received from business operators for a response rate of approximately 20%. Responses were dispersed throughout the Steveston Village area with the largest number coming from businesses located on Moncton Street (Figure 1).

Key results from business operators regarding the potential closure of up to three blocks of Moncton Street include (Attachment 3):

• 66% strongly or somewhat oppose any closure of Moncton Street.



Figure 1: Responses by Street Location of Business

- Of respondents that indicated selected blocks of Moncton Street for closure, 26% chose No. 1 Road-First Avenue, 38% chose First Ave-Second Ave, and 36% chose Second Ave-Third Ave.
- Businesses located on Moncton Street in favour of closure include several restaurants whereas those opposed include businesses that do not rely on walk-in traffic and are focused on local/specialized clientele such as medical and dental offices, and fishing supply stores.
- Key concerns cited include loss of on-street parking, which would impact business access; impacts to deliveries and loading; increased vehicle circulation and confusion amongst drivers, which would increase congestion.

Key results from business operators regarding the potential conversion of Bayview Street to oneway westbound include (Attachment 4):

- 60% strongly or somewhat support the potential one-way system.
- However, amongst businesses located on Bayview Street, three of five respondents (60%) strongly or somewhat oppose the potential one-way system.
- Key reasons for support include making the Village more pedestrian-friendly and increasing space to better accommodate pedestrians and cyclists as the existing temporary walkway is not wide enough.
- Key concerns cited include increased vehicle circulation to access businesses and increased confusion amongst drivers, which would increase congestion.

Additional options and/or variations for temporary road changes suggested by businesses include:

- One-way westbound on Bayview Street combined with one-way eastbound on Moncton Street.
- Implementation of a closure of Moncton Street on weekends only in combination with the staging of the Steveston Farmers and Artisans Market (SFAM). Staff note that the SFAM website indicates that the market will not operate for the 2020 season.
Attachment 5 contains a complete list of comments provided by businesses and grouped by the street location of the business.

Recommendation

Based on the survey results, there is not clear support for any closure of Moncton Street or the conversion of Bayview Street to one-way westbound from businesses. Moreover, staff observations to date indicate that overall there is currently sufficient space within Steveston Village's public realm to accommodate physical distancing but increased space may be needed as the summer season progresses.

Accordingly, staff do not recommend implementation of any of the potential temporary road changes at this time. Staff do recommend that pedestrian, cyclist and motorist operations in the Steveston Village area continue to be regularly monitored as phased re-opening measures for businesses expand while provincial health guidelines for physical distancing remain in place. Staff will report back to Council should the need for future temporary road changes such as road/lane closures or one-way systems be required to address crowding and the need to maintain physical distancing measures.

Financial Impact

None.

Conclusion

Staff developed potential temporary road changes for evaluation in Steveston Village to support physical distancing guidelines, particularly during peak periods, and undertook consultation targeted to businesses regarding the potential options. The mixed results indicate overall opposition to changes from the adjacent businesses that would be directly impacted and a lack of consensus across business operators for either any closure of Moncton Street or the conversion of Bayview Street to one-way westbound. Further, staff observations to date indicate that generally there is adequate space for physical distancing in Steveston Village. Based on these factors, staff currently do not recommend implementation of any of the potential temporary road changes.

As conditions may change as the summer season progresses, staff further recommend that pedestrian, cyclist and motorist operations in the Steveston Village continue to be monitored for crowding and physical distancing issues. Should the volume of pedestrian and cyclist traffic consistently exceed the capacity of existing infrastructure, staff will report back with recommended temporary road changes to add additional space for these modes that may include the potential measures discussed in this report if they address an identified need.

Janavan

Joan Caravan Transportation Planner (604-276-4035)

Jani Amm

Sonali Hingorani, P.Eng. Transportation Engineer (604-276-4049)

JC:jc

- Att. 1: Potential Temporary Road Changes in Steveston Village
 - 2: Handout of Potential Temporary Road Changes in Steveston Village Distributed to Steveston Businesses
 - 3: Survey Results: Potential Closure of Moncton Street
 - 4: Survey Results: Potential Conversion of Bayview Street
 - 5: Survey Results: Comments of Businesses Grouped by Street Location

Attachment 1



Potential Temporary Road Changes in Steveston Village



Handout of Potential Temporary Road Changes in Steveston Village Distributed to Steveston Businesses on June 6, 2020



POTENTIAL TEMPORARY ROAD CHANGES IN STEVESTON VILLAGE Request for Feedback from Business Operators

6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

The City is seeking your feedback on potential temporary road changes in Steveston Village to support public safety and the phased re-opening of businesses by providing an opportunity to use road space for walking, queuing, dining, and retail purposes.

POTENTIAL TEMPORARY ROAD CHANGES FOR EVALUATION (turn over for maps)

The potential measures can be implemented independently or in combination. The potential duration is operational 24/7 until September 30, 2020.

| Measure | Proposed Scope |
|---|--|
| Closure of Moncton Street | Up to 3-block closure between No. 1 Road and Third Avenue North-south avenues remain open North-south lanes closed at Moncton Street |
| One-Way Street System for Bayview Street | Conversion from 2-way to 1-way westbound between No. 1 Road and Third Avenue Conversion of First and Third Avenues from 2-way to 1-way northbound between Bayview Street and Moncton Street |

ONLINE FEEDBACK FORM FOR POTENTIAL TEMPORARY ROAD CHANGES

Please provide your feedback at the following link by Wednesday, June 10, 2020 at 11:59 pm: LetsTalkRichmond.ca/stevestontemproadchanges

If you prefer to provide your feedback by telephone, please call 604-276-4049 during City Hall office hours (Mon-Wed, 8:15 am – 5:00 pm).

ONLINE PRESENTATION OF POTENTIAL TEMPORARY ROAD CHANGES

Staff will present the potential temporary road changes and be available to answer questions on Tuesday, June 9, 2020 from 3:00 pm to 5:00 pm. If you would like to participate, please email <u>transportation@richmond.ca</u> or call 604-276-4049 to be sent a meeting invitation.

Thank you for your participation

Handout of Potential Temporary Road Changes in Steveston Village Distributed to Steveston Businesses on June 6, 2020



Survey Results: Potential Closure of Moncton Street



Survey Responses re Potential Closure of Moncton Street



Survey Responses re Blocks of Moncton Street for Potential Closure

6475103





Survey Responses re Potential Conversion of Bayview Street

First Avenue

- If Moncton street would be blocked off access to my business would only be possible from Bayview
 going down First Avenue. My business is primarily serving local residents and seeing what happens
 when there is filming on Moncton street (business drops 30-40%) locals would stay away and that
 would hurt my business. Closing down Moncton while a good idea would only make sense for my
 business if First Avenue could be accessed from Chatham. I'm sure my fellow business owners on
 First Avenue share similar thoughts.
- By closing down Moncton you are removing parking options for customers of the village. This area already has a lot of struggles with parking and this looks like it will add to that. Bayview becoming a 1 way sounds like it will create additional traffic and potentially cause backups. This seems nonbeneficial especially during the summer months when we are looking to have more visitors to the village.
- I think the closing of Moncton will affect a lot of businesses. Especially the ones on the side streets. Losing all that parking is another thing. Unless you can come up with a parking solution it is a NO for our business. I think that closing it for the Farmers market would have a positive affect on the odd Sunday.
- The road closures that are being proposed will have a significant negative impact on the customer traffic on First Ave. The issue is that it will be a problem for many to access our street on First Ave, as they have to go Bayview first, which will severely limit visits to our shop.
- I'm open to this. Would there be additional bike lanes?

Second Avenue

- Enable those restaurants affected by reduced seating to spread out into the street. It would give Steveston a more European feeling and it will help ensure our restaurants survive during this Pandemic.
- As a business in this area where there is a lot of walking traffic anyways, we completely oppose to closing of Moncton for cars, we are just in the process of getting out of Covid 19 period where it was super hard for businesses to survive, if car traffic would disappear from Moncton it will be very hard to get to businesses like ours to get customers that drive through Moncton to our location. We ask to stop road closures in our area! Thank you for understanding!
- Please move the No Entry sign on Second Avenue further out towards Bay Street. Drivers often do not notice the No Entry sign and drive in the wrong way.
- Hi, Yes please make the village more pedestrian friendly Also consider both sides of First Ave & Second Ave pedestrian only from Chatham to Bayview.
- Waste of time and resources in even discussing these options.

Third Avenue

• Concerns about parking availability for visitors and a safe environment.

Bayview Street

- What problem is the City trying to improve? I see no problem.
- I don't mind to try the closure of Moncton but do not change Bayview to one-way street system at the same time. I am afraid that's too much limitation and confusion.
- I would encourage you to make sure all businesses are contacted on Moncton. It affects them the
 most. Closing down Moncton could cause serious congestion problems through the village as cars to
 drive around and around looking for parking. In these uncertain times, this may not be the time to
 experiment with what may or may not be a good idea. What if it backfires and causes a further
 decline in traffic to the stores. Most businesses are seeing 50 % of their usual sales or less as it is.
 They need to be able to make it through the summer AND I stress AND put money in the bank to get
 thru winter. There is no guarantee of that as it stands now. Bayview is dangerous as it is now, making

it one way would give more room for bikes as they cannot and do not use the "NEW " path created, it is too crowded for them. This forces bikes to use the road that has been narrowed. Delivery trucks often just stop on Bayview to unload for up to 30 minutes leaving cars to navigate around them. Not as safe as I see it. Making it one way would help alleviate that problem. Has there been any consideration to making Moncton one way instead of just closing? That saidWhen streetscaping is done for the village (BADLY NEEDED) I would suggest a one-way loop - Moncton heading West - Bayview Heading East. Alow for more gathering areas, wider sidewalks, angle parking, benches, bike lock-ups, a true bike path on Bayview and many other ideas I have too many to mention here. Game changer for the village !! ((Also Keep in mind that a small minority of the businesses on Moncton could or would take advantage of the closure. IE professional services, education centre, banks, closed or shuttered businesses etc.)) Thank you for thinking outside the box just not sure......in these uncertain times it helps.

• This is a great idea to support local businesses and physical distancing.

Chatham Street

- It may not affect my business too much but would bring so much more traffic to Chatham. (already enough, at "normal" times). Parking at a premium and illegal parking.
- As a business owner on Chatham Street (physical therapy clinic in Steveston Medical Building) my sole concern regarding these closures is the impact that they will have on parking in the area. I am concerned that street parking being eliminated on Bayview and/or Moncton for the duration of the closures will force drivers to take already scarce street parking spaces in the immediate area of the clinic. This will negatively impact the ability of patients and staff to park reasonably close to the clinic.
- I would be supportive have both Moncton and Bayview in a one way format. This would allow the
 pedestrian and bike traffic to continue from the Onni development to the Gulf of Georgia site. IMO
 Bayview runs E to W and Moncton runs W to E with parking converted to angle.
- So many businesses have struggled during Covid, I am completely against closing streets and creating even more issues. As any business owner or resident of Steveston (I am both) knows, parking and traffic is a massive issue especially during the summer. We should be ADDING parking options and easing traffic flow, not the opposite by blocking streets and eliminating more spots. While some tourists may enjoy the benefit of walking down the middle of the street, many 'anchor' businesses that serve locals all throughout the year, struggle when Steveston becomes so congested in the summer that many locals stay away and/or shop elsewhere due to sheer parking/traffic frustration. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns.
- We should do this temporary changes during summertime and during Steveston Farmer Market.

Moncton Street

- Pointless to make any changes and a waste of time. You can't have foot traffic without cars bringing people to neighborhood. For cars to be in the area the parking is to be thought of but obviously this hasn't been considered.
- I think it's a great opportunity for the businesses to expand their reduced capacity to the outdoors.
- One-way on Bayview is a good idea because of the volume of people there on summer days; also the sidewalks are narrower than those on Moncton and with social distancing, people are forced to walk in the streets anyway. One-way makes it safer for cars turning off 2nd Ave and No. 1 Road as these would be right-turns, therefore less chance of a pedestrian being struck.
- I feel strongly that closing off Moncton would be dangerous to pedestrians and would confuse drivers leading to more chaos and backups of people looking for parking. This would also make it impossible for commercial trucks to access businesses on Moncton for deliveries and would add yet another layer of challenge to businesses already suffering due to Covid. Closing Moncton would also lead to more cars driving across Moncton at 2nd Ave where there is a tendency of cars already idling in the road waiting for 'ideal' parking spots across from the wharf. The most common sidewalk leading to the warf from Moncton is very narrow and even in non covid times pedestrians walk in the middle of the road to avoid the crowded sidewalk. I support the one way for the portion of Bayview indicated as I

feel that the current measures to wide the pedestrian walkway have created too narrow a roadway for cars and cyclists to navigate safely. It is already very difficult to turn left from 2nd Ave onto Bayview during peak summer months due to the constant flow of pedestrians through the crosswalk, so this would mitigate that concern. This may ultimately lead to a backlog of traffic at 3rd Avenue and Moncton trying to exit the village or circling looking for parking. It is definitely time for the streetscape and traffic flows of Steveston to be updated as was proposed by the City of Richmond a couple of years ago. Whatever happened to that? I am shocked that the City would propose a significant change to traffic flow with such a short opportunity for businesses to respond? This is doubly impactful with the current sewer work that is impacting the lane between 1st and 2nd Ave through Moncton St. I would strongly suggest that any changes made also include safety 'ambassadors' or traffic control to keep traffic flowing and direct people to parking.

- Bayview is too crowded the way it is now. Something must be done here. Another concern is that on
 one-way streets (especially Second Avenue between Moncton and Bayview) cars stop in the middle
 of the road waiting for parking to become available. This really backs up traffic and irritate the drivers
 blocked behind who can neither back up or advance.
- Until you add more parking access to Steveston Village, I feel losing all those parking spaces would be horrendous! I've always thought the city should build a multi-level parlayed on the present empty lot on Chatham that is mostly hogged by the movie companies. And make it free or very low cost (like \$3 all day). Similar to what is offered at the casino for sky train access. I'm sure the city would make a lot of money and goodwill from visitors of the Village & the merchants.
- Please remove car traffic and add more pedestrian space!! its amazing during the Salmon Festival and there is no real reason to have traffic on Moncton
- It would be an awesome idea.
- Need to have priority drop off or parking for people who would have difficulty accessing the establishment like a dental office or restaurants.
- My business requires a "drop off" area for patients. I have a high number of elderly patients with
 mobility challenges as well as children. If Moncton st. Is blocked off I would need some area of
 concession parking/drop off zone. I support this initiative but it does potentially negatively impact my
 patient care. Due to covid I cannot have an occupied waiting room. Patients must remain in their
 vehicles or outside until directed to enter clinic. If the alley (currently under construction) can be
 designated as my parking I would be in support, or alternatively the spaces in front of my office on
 Moncton st.
- My business, Budget Appliances, is not based on walk by tourists. We have larger items and things (such as microwaves) that people drive to the front of our store and stop in the loading zone to pick up. Parking is already very limited in Steveston so I am concerned with even less places for people to park.
- My concern is the lack of parking if we can't park on Moncton. All parking spaces are needed to
 increase business which is desperately needed for all. Plus delivery truck. The space in front of my
 store is partially for loading and used by many delivery company.
- There are too many essential delivery routes which will be disrupted with 24 hr closures of Moncton. Secondly our customers will need to park and won't be able to easily find a place. We have pregnant women And seniors who are already uncomfortable walking and asking them to walk from the community Centre or farther is not a functional option. I like the option on weekends only. Invite the farmers market on a Sundays and it would make the village something really special.
- I believe implementing the temporary road closures will be vitally important to insuring public safety
 as well as assisting small business in our road to re-opening. Preliminary indicators are that there is
 very little demand for inside dining and retail shopping. Without this initiative I would put the
 Steveston Seafood House's chances of surviving though to the fall at near zero. The relative minor
 inconvenience of losing some parking spots pales in comparison to the potential benefits including
 increased public safety, increased business revenues and increased community fellowship. I strongly
 support this initiative.
- I do not want Moncton Street closed for any amount of time. I know when they close Moncton Street for filming, business drops off & it becomes a lot quieter. This would really affect all the business on Moncton Street, in a real adverse way.

Multiple Responses from Single Business on Moncton Street

- This would not be good for any of the businesses in Steveston. There is not enough parking and roadways to handle all of the vehicle traffic to begin with. I am Strongly opposed to the closure of Moncton St. as customers would then protentially have to park blocks away just to access Steveston. A one way system on Bayview would cause confusion and more congestion.
- Absolutely not necessary to change road patterns for COVID. I do not see how changing road
 patterns will prevent COVID from spreading. What will be more effective is for citizens to wear masks
 and practice social distancing.
- We are in the Commercial Fishing, Marine Hardware and Sport Fishing business. We have delivery and pickup everyday ranging from Post Office Vans to Truck with 40 feet container. Our environment is strictly business. We do not cater to the General Public or to Tourist. Our customers who are Commercial Fisherman and Sport Fisherman who come with their 1/2 or 1 ton Truck to buy and to pick up their gear. Their purchase is not something that you can put in a Grocery or Shopping Bag. It can be a bale of net which can weigh 400 lbs or more, quantity of ropes , each coil of rope being 1800 feet in length, Machinery and equipment for their boat etc. Finding parking is a premium on Moncton Street because of Tourism. We are strictly against any street closure. It does not make any practical sense. Moncton street is still a viable Commercial place to do business. The Big Trucks that deliver and pick up need access to both Chatham and Moncton Street to wheel their 40 feet Container. So its' totally impractical . Whose BRIGHT IDEA was it that made this idiotic suggestion.
- I don't think option one does any good for anyone other than maybe the coffee shops and ice cream stores that will be closed during the winter/fall. Whoever proposed these changes clearly isn't thinking about all the aspects of Steveston that have made Steveston what it is today.
- If The closures happen anywhere along Moncton street...I would be strongly opposed. This is a major hub for our business that requires 5 ton and semi trailer pickup and dropoff. We would not be the only ones affected by this stupid idiotic suggestion. Restaurants, appliance store, machine shops anybody with a grocery store would find this even more challenging. I would almost say this would mean an exodus of businesses relocating to more business friendly municipalities and leave Steveston to harbour even more empty restaurants, coffee shops, ice cream parlours and anything else seasonal during the winter. Basically this would turn this to a ghost town and people would say I am not coming down there to shop....I can't get anywhere with your road closures....take our business elsewhere. Whoever brought this proposal is an idiot and should be flogged.....
- This would greatly affect our customers to the point that we would need to close operations in Steveston. We have a wide range of products that we carry to our customers vehicles every day. We receive and ship many shipments via all sizes of trucks on a daily basis. If our customers and suppliers can no longer access our store how do you propose we operate? Dumb Idea in my opinion.
- Our business, Pacific Net & Twine, requires for large trucks and containers to come to our business to load & unload products.
- As a long long time Steveston resident, I strongly oppose this. This makes zero sense for any
 business in Steveston. And also as a resident of Steveston this will be a nightmare for all the side
 roads from Steveston hwy to Chatham street. There's lots of kids that play on these side streets, AND
 WITH MORE TRAFFIC THAT'S A RECIPE FOR DISASTER. As for our business Pacific Net and
 Twine, We heavily rely on trucks to deliver and pick up from our location daily. Also our customers are
 picking up very heavy heavy items all the time. I would like a reply to who's bright idea this was....I
 can't imagine any business voting for this in Steveston. This should not be a vote on people that don't
 live in the area at all. I've heard of a lot of things but this is the stupidest idea I've ever heard of.
- Closing Moncton St during the busiest time of year is a terrible idea. This will impact not only my business but as well as others that need to use the roads for shipping and customers to access store locations. Parking is already difficult enough in the area and this will make it even tougher as im sure, some customers will just turn around and shop elsewhere.
- I'm strongly opposed to the road closure in Steveston. Our business relies heavily on deliveries and
 pick up every day from Post Office Vans to Truck with 40 feet container who need to wheel into the
 lane from either Moncton and Chatham Street. Our customers all have Pick up Trucks so that they
 can load on their purchases from our store. This will absolutely negatively impact our business and
 many others in Steveston.

- My perspective is informed by my recent visit to White Rock beach. There was a limited amount of parking available along the beach, which I agree with. I agree with it because of the sheer density that the full system of parking in the area would create. In contrast, Steveston village already was an insufficient amount of parking available for patrons. Additionally, some portion of the parking is parallel, which already allows for social distancing measures naturally. Lastly, the amount of food service business in Steveston is quite high, and they have already suffered enough from this pandemic. These measures should not be put in place to further hinder them. Finally, the implementation of these closures would seem to contradict the current political climate in regards to the recent protests. Consistency across protocols and procedures needs to be strongly reviewed.
- Getting to and from an area that is already challenged for parking and access will be very difficult.
 Deliveries and shipping will be delayed, and it will cause all kinds of havoc. Strong no from me.
- This will affect my delivery drivers from accessing my business to pick up customer orders.
- There is not enough foot traffic on Moncton Street in the summer to warrant the problems closing the Moncton Street to traffic will cause. Where are people to park, how are delivery vehicles going to access the businesses. There are only 5 restaurants on Moncton Street and one of them is only open for dinner. They are the minority of businesses on Moncton street. As well one of the restaurants has enough space to have an open patio without accessing the street. Therefore, potentially only three restaurants could have a patio as a result of Moncton Street closure. On Bay street with a one way flow from No. 1 to 3 Ave, the commercial fishermen who must access the Docks will be severely impeded because of the traffic jam that will arise. It will also deter people from accessing the fish sales dock . Leave Steveston alone. The Mayor and Council does not know what is best for Steveston.
- Don't make it hard for businesses to survive by not getting deliveries on time and getting stuff out for pickups.

No. 1 Road

- Parking we already have non-customers parking and walking off elsewhere. We also need access South of Moncton Street via the lane between No. 1 Road and 1st Avenue.
- We completely agree with closing Moncton and think this would greatly help the businesses and restaurants however if this closure proceeds we strongly feel that Bayview needs to remain 2 ways. One way would not be a good solution for anything. Thank you,
- As the only entrance for big trucks to the alleyway behind my store is off of Moncton. I oppose closing Moncton between #1 and first.
- Before closing Moncton you have to look at what kind of businesses exist on Moncton. People will still
 flock to waterfront and Bayview Street. Best option would be either to Do option 2 or Close Bay view
 street between Parking lots at Bayview street on 1st ave and 3rd Ave. We possibly won't see any
 tourists till next year and that is major part of our walkin revenue so you have to make sure any
 closures do not impact us in bad way. Anything that causes problem to our domestic customers like
 blocking moncton will have very bad effect on our business in village.
- Traffic of this area is already too busy. The change will attract more people and cars come from other locations. Local customers already complain it's hard to park their cars and avoid to come during weekend. The 24/7 closure will kill our business.
- This change will strongly impact the parking situation and make it very difficult for clients to get to my shop and find parking.
- Moncton is not overly busy on most days. Closures would definitely effect business as well as reduce much needed parking. One-way on bayview could be a positive addition with adding more bike and walking access.
- I'm new to the area, I understand that there is a need to space people apart especially during the weekends. Will this affect the available parking you have between Bayview and Moncton? Could you implement the road closures only on weekends?



Report to Committee

| То: | Finance Committee | Date: | May 8, 2020 |
|-------|---|----------|---------------------------|
| From: | Andrew Nazareth General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services | File: | 03-0905-01/2020-Vol 01 |
| Re: | 2019 Annual Report and 2019 Annual Report Hig | ghlights | |

Staff Recommendation

That the reports titled, "2019 Annual Report and 2019 Annual Report - Highlights" be approved.

A

Andrew Nazareth General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services (604-276-4095)

Att. 2

| REPORT CONCURRENCE | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER | | |
| SENIOR MANAGEMENT TEAM INITIALS CA | | |
| APPROVED BY CAO | | |

Staff Report

Origin

Pursuant to Section 98 of the Community Charter, before June 30th, in each year, a Council must:

- a) Prepare an annual report
- b) Make the report available for public inspection
- c) Have the report available for public inspection at a Council or other public meeting

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #5 Sound Financial Management:

Accountable, transparent, and responsible financial management that supports the needs of the community into the future.

5.1 Maintain a strong and robust financial position.

This report supports Council's Strategic Plan 2018-2022 Strategy #8 An Engaged and Informed Community:

Ensure that the citizenry of Richmond is well-informed and engaged about City business and decision-making.

8.2 Ensure citizens are well-informed with timely, accurate and easily accessible communication using a variety of methods and tools.

Analysis

The City of Richmond's annual report formally presents the audited financial statements and other relevant financial, economic and demographic indicators to the public. The report also highlights many of the City's significant achievements and milestones from 2019.

Two versions of the Annual Report are produced each year in order to reach the different audiences interested in this information. The comprehensive 2019 Annual Report meets all legislative requirements for financial reporting as required under the Community Charter for British Columbia's local governments. This version will be publicly available through the City's website at <u>www.richmond.ca</u> and printed only on a demand basis. The comprehensive version includes the City's audited consolidated financial statements; the City's corporate objectives and success indicators, as identified through Council's Term Goals; and a listing of permissive exemptions. In addition to the statutorily required information, the comprehensive version provides information on the City's milestones from 2019, including awards and achievements and a variety of key corporate financial and community demographic statistical data for the year.

For a broader audience, the City also produces a condensed financial reporting document known as the 2019 Annual Report – Highlights. This shorter version, which is designed to be accessible

and easily understandable for a general audience, provides information about the City of Richmond, its services, highlights from 2019 and the City's financial condition. In order to support sustainable practices the condensed version is available through the City's website and distribution will be done electronically. There will be limited printed copies for presentation purposes and to fulfill statutory obligations. This year, the layout has been enhanced to allow for an expanded section highlighting the City's safe, sustainable and culturally diverse initiatives.

Both copies will be submitted to the Government Finance Officers Association for consideration in their annual awards program.

The reports are produced entirely in house through the joint efforts of the Finance Department and the Corporate Communications and Marketing Department.

Financial Impact

None.

Conclusion

The City of Richmond 2019 Annual Report and the 2019 Annual Report – Highlights satisfy the Community Charter requirements for financial reporting and are important instruments in ensuring public transparency and accountability for the management of City finances. The reports also provide useful information on the City's achievements and milestones during the 2019 fiscal year.

Jerry Chong Director, Finance

(4064)

che Az

Clay Adams Director, Corporate Communications and Marketing (4399)

Att. 1: 2019 Annual Report2: 2019 Annual Report – Highlights

Attachment 1



2019 Annual Report For the year ended December 31, 2019





CNCL – 125



2019 Annual Report

For the year ended December 31, 2019

Our vision is to be the most appealing, livable and well-managed community in Canada

Contents

Introductory section

| Message from the Mayor |
|--|
| Richmond City Council |
| City of Richmond Organizational Chart |
| Message from the Chief Administrative Officer |
| Council Strategic Plan: 2018 to 2022 6 |
| Richmond: safe, sustainable, culturally diverse |
| 2019 Awards 10 |
| Report from the General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services |
| Financial section City of Richmond audited financial statements |
| Statistical section City of Richmond statistical data |
| Tax exemption section2019 permissive property tax exemptions |

For an online copy of this report, please visit www.richmond.ca (City Hall > Finance, Taxes & Budgets > Budgets & Financial Reporting > Annual Reports).

Cover photos: Minoru Chapel, West Dyke Trail and "Together" public art work in front of Minoru Centre for Active Living - three of the winning submissions in the City's annual Street Banner Contest.

This report was prepared by the City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Communications and Marketing Departments. Design, layout and production by the City of Richmond Production Centre. ¢2020 City of Richmond

Gontents printed on Canadian made, 100% recycled stock, using environmentally friendly toners.

Message from the Mayor



The City of Richmond's 2019 Annual Report reflects another year of innovation and success as we move towards achieving our vision of being Canada's most livable and well-managed community.

Council entered 2019 with a four-year strategy to guide us through the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead. To make that plan a reality, we identified eight strategic initiatives that focus on the areas essential to our growth, security and prosperity.

The City of Richmond has always provided a high quality of life and worked hard to preserve this standard far into the future. 2019 was no exception.

foundation of first responders and other programs, Richmond can continue to boast one of the lowest rates of violence and property crime in the Lower Mainland.

Recognizing the impact of climate change, Richmond joined many others in declaring a climate emergency. While not a substitute for action, it reinforced the importance of the extensive environmental programs that we have undertaken for decades. As a local government leader in climate action, we are committed to implementing practices to build a sustainable and environmentally-conscious city for our 212,000 residents.

Richmond was also among the first to propose bylaws banning single-use plastics—a step that could keep around 650 tonnes of non-recyclable plastic from the waste system. At the same time, our Community Energy and Emissions Plan guides us in reducing greenhouse gas emissions by up to 50% over the next decade despite growth in density and population.

In terms of growth, City staff issued building permits for over \$980 million in construction in 2019. We are constantly working with developers and stakeholders to find new and innovative partnerships so we can create strong, connected communities that build a sense of pride, family and belonging.

The City of Richmond is one community. It is a place of resiliency, identity and belonging. Our diversity makes Richmond truly unique and the impacts are visible throughout the city. Differences in cultural heritage strengthen our sense of neighborhood and community, and our Cultural Harmony Plan—the first such municipal plan in Canada—demonstrates our leadership in building on social inclusion practices. Our City's first painted rainbow crosswalk is a lasting reminder that Richmond is a place of inclusion, respect and support.

Our success is a credit to those who contribute to making Richmond a better place, including our staff, volunteers, business, and community and government partners. This Annual Report contains examples of our goals and achievements and, as always, I invite your comments and questions through my office.

Malcolm Brodie Mayor, City of Richmond

Richmond City Council



Front row, left to right:

Councillor Michael Wolfe, Councillor Bill McNulty, Mayor Malcolm Brodie, Councillor Linda McPhail, Councillor Kelly Greene

Back row, left to right:

Deputy Fire Chief Kevin Gray, Richmond Fire-Rescue, Councillor Harold Steves, Councillor Carol Day, Councillor Chak Au, Councillor Alexa Loo, Constable Leah Riske, Richmond RCMP

Connect with Richmond City Council

To contact Council, email mayorandcouncillors@richmond.ca or call 604-276-4000. For Council Meetings agendas and minutes, visit www.richmond.ca/cityhall/council/agendas. To watch Council meetings on live streaming or view videos of past meetings, visit www.richmond.ca/watchonline.

City of Richmond Senior Management Team 2019

Chief Administrative Office

George Duncan, CAO

| Community Safety | Community Services |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Cecilia Achiam, GM | Serena Lusk, GM |
| Engineering and Public Works | Finance and Corporate Services |
| John Irving, GM | Andrew Nazareth, GM |

Planning and Development

Joe Erceg, GM

| Chief Administrative Officer | George Duncan |
|---|-----------------|
| General Manager, Community Safety | Cecilia Achiam |
| General Manager, Community Services | Serena Lusk |
| General Manager, Engineering and Public Works (effective October, 2019) | John Irving |
| General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services | Andrew Nazareth |
| General Manager, Planning and Development | Joe Erceg |
| Deputy Chief Administrative Officer (until September*) | Robert Gonzalez |

Public safety agencies

| Chief, Richmond Fire-Rescue | Tim Wilkinson |
|--|---------------|
| Officer in Charge, Royal Canadian Mounted Police | Will Ng |

Banker

Scotiabank

Auditors KPMG

* Mr. Gonzalez held the positions of Deputy Chief Administrative Officer and General Manager, Engineering and Public Works before passing away in September 2019

Message from the Chief Administrative Officer



I am pleased to present the City of Richmond's Annual Report for 2019. It details our strong financial position, and outlines many of the initiatives we are undertaking to achieve our vision of making Richmond Canada's best managed city.

During this past year, our administration made significant progress in implementing Council's new strategic plan, which is comprised of eight initiatives. Many of those achievements are highlighted throughout this report.

Our city has long been recognized as a leader in environmental action and sustainability, while supporting development and building strong and connected communities. Our award-winning District Energy Utility continued to expand, as did our commitment to encourage clean energy transportation

through further implementation of electric vehicle charging stations.

As Richmond continued to grow, so did the need for services to support our community which is rich in both cultural and economic diversity. While Richmond was one of the few Metro Vancouver cities to exceed its annual net new home housing target in 2019, we also acted to ensure a variety of housing options were maintained. The City worked with the development community to create more affordable rental housing, securing agreements for 179 new units for low and moderate income Richmond households. We also secured over \$2.4 million cash-in-lieu contributions to be applied towards future affordable housing options.

Providing support for young families remained a focus, with our award-winning five-year child care strategy continuing to be recognized as a municipal leader in fostering conditions for a comprehensive child care system.

One of the foundations for any successful organization is its ability to demonstrate strong financial stewardship. Our City's long term financial strategy remained a hallmark of our administration and enabled us to continue to limit property tax increases, while still making significant investments in infrastructure and programs. Richmond's property taxes were again among the lowest in the region and our sound fiscal management positioned us well to address future challenges and opportunities.

The City of Richmond is committed to strengthening our community and encouraging growth within a framework of diversity, sustainability and value for our taxpayers.

George Duncan Chief Administrative Officer

Council Strategic Plan: 2018 to 2022

The Community Charter requires all BC municipalities to include a statement in the Annual Report of their objectives for the current and future years, along with measures to track success towards those objectives.

The City of Richmond's objectives and success indicators are expressed through the Council Strategic Plan. Soon after the new Council began its four-year term in October 2018, it undertook a strategic planning process to help it fulfill its governance role and achieve a successful term of office. Through that process, Council adopted a revised set of eight Strategic Focus areas, which provided the framework for the City's programs and services through 2019.

1. A Safe and Resilient Community

Enhance and protect the safety and well-being of Richmond.

2019 Achievement

As part of our Safe Community Priority Program, 19 new RCMP officers and 12 firefighters were added to strengthen our existing first responder resources. More recruits for each are expected over the next two years.



In 2019, 19 new RCMP officers and 12 firefighters were added to strengthen existing first responder resources.



The Richmond World Festival brings everyone together to celebrate the city's significant cultural diversity.

2. A Sustainable and Environmentally Conscious City

Environmentally conscious decision-making that demonstrates leadership in implementing innovative, sustainable practices and supports the City's unique biodiversity and island ecology.

2019 Achievement

Council developed bylaws banning single-use plastics such as straws, shopping bags and foam containers, potentially removing as many as 35 million items weighing 650 tonnes from the waste stream annually.

3. One Community Together

Vibrant and diverse arts and cultural activities and opportunities for community engagement and connection.

2019 Achievement

Richmond became the first community in Canada to develop a municipal Cultural Harmony Plan. The Plan demonstrates the City's leadership in building on its social inclusion practices and recognizes our unique cultural diversity.

4. An Active and Thriving Richmond

An active and thriving community characterized by diverse social and wellness programs, services and spaces that foster health and well-being for all.

2019 Achievement

Our first emergency shelter, temporary modular housing and a unique partnership with Richmond RCMP and Vancouver Coastal Health on a mental health car reinforced our commitment to support those in need.

5. Sound Financial Management

Accountable, transparent, and responsible financial management that supports the needs of the community into the future.

2019 Achievement

The acquisition of the Richmond Ice Centre, a 155,000 square foot multi-rink facility situated on over 3.0 strategically-located hectares in the Riverport area, turned a highly-used leased facility into a City-owned asset and another major investment in civic infrastructure for recreation.

6. Strategic and Well-Planned Growth

Leadership in effective and sustainable growth that supports Richmond's physical and social needs.

2019 Achievement

Through a unique partnership, the City forwarded \$28.1 million of developer funds to TransLink for construction of a new Canada Line transit station. This will support the rapidly-growing Capstan Village community and reflects the increasing ridership of the Canada Line.



The City acquired the Richmond Ice Centre, turning a highly-used leased facility into a City-owned asset.

7. A Supported Economic Sector

Facilitate diversified economic growth through innovative and sustainable policies, practices and partnerships.

2019 Achievement

Richmond's strong business sector boasts one of the highest job-to-worker ratios in the region, reflecting its important location as a gateway for people and goods movement such as transportation, warehousing and logistics, manufacturing, wholesale and tourism.

8. An Engaged and Informed Community

Ensure that the citizenry of Richmond is wellinformed and engaged about City business and decision-making.

2019 Achievement

The City's LetsTalkRichmond.ca platform continues to connect and engage residents of all backgrounds from across our community on a diverse range of topics ranging from single-use plastics and sustainability, to cultural harmony and our Farming First strategy.

Richmond: safe, sustainable, culturally diverse

As this city grows, our commitment to its citizens grows with it.

In 2019, the City secured agreements for 179 new affordable housing units for low and moderate income Richmond households, and over \$2.4 million cash-in-lieu contributions for future affordable housing options. The opening of a 36-bed emergency shelter in Ironwood, as well as a 40-unit temporary supportive housing facility on Alderbridge Way, offered support to some of the city's most vulnerable as part of our first Homelessness Strategy approved by Council in late 2019.

As an established local government leader in climate action, Richmond is committed to implementing practices to build a sustainable and environmentally-conscious city that will benefit current and future generations. From bylaws to ban single-use plastics—removing 650 tonnes from the waste stream annually—to electric vehicles and circular economy principles, our actions are the importance of the extensive environmental programs that Richmond has undertaken for decades.



The new emergency shelter provides safe and secure shelter spaces in a supportive environment for up to 36 people more than triple the number that existed previously.



The City engaged with the community to inform the public about the proposed bylaw to ban single-use plastics.



Richmond's Cultural Harmony Plan demonstrates the City's leadership in building on its social inclusion practices. It also signifies the City's role in responding to the evolving needs of Richmond's increasingly diverse population.





Richmond's first rainbow crosswalk on Minoru Boulevard.



The diversity among our 212,000 residents is truly unique and makes us stronger as a community. We strengthened our sense of neighbourhood and community through Canada's first municipal Cultural Harmony Plan, which reinforces our leadership in building on our social inclusion practices. 2019 also saw the installation of our city's first painted rainbow crosswalk on Minoru Boulevard, a lasting reminder that Richmond is a city of inclusion, respect and support.

Our many achievements during 2019 and expectations for the future will continue to improve the lives and affairs of our residents and businesses. The City of Richmond has always been a leader with bold, innovative programs and strategies that reflect our character and reputation as a safe, sustainable and culturally diverse city – the most appealing, livable and well-managed community in Canada.

2019 Awards

A measurement of the City's success in achieving its goals are the honours and recognition we received from our peers and others. In 2019, Richmond again received numerous international, national and provincial awards recognizing our commitment to excellence and innovation.

Climate Action

The City of Richmond's first-of-its-kind Electric Vehicle (EV) infrastructure requirement was recognized with a Climate and Energy Action Award from the Community Energy Association. Richmond was the first municipality to enact a policy requiring that 100 per cent of new residential parking spaces be equipped with Level 2 electric vehicle charging capacity. The Climate and Energy Action Award recognizes climate leadership of BC local governments.



Promoting low carbon personal vehicles and setting requirements for electric vehicle infrastructure helps the City reduce community energy use and greenhouse gas emissions.

Technological Innovation

Richmond is the first municipality in the Lower Mainland to regulate the quality of non-storm discharge water into its sewer system and watercourses using primarily field-measurable parameters, an innovation recognized by the BC Environmental Managers Association with the 2019 Technological Innovation Award. The implementation of a simplified non-storm water discharge management program safeguards the City's sewers and strengthens environmental protections.



The Alexandra District Energy Utility distribution pumps disburse thermal energy through the underground pipe network.

District Energy

The recipient of over a dozen awards in the past decade, Richmond's District Energy Program continues to collect accolades for its innovation, efficiency and green sustainability. Among its honours in 2019 was an Association of Energy Engineers, Canada Region – Project of the Year Award for an innovative renewable energy project and a Canadian Association of Municipal Administrators Award of Excellence – Environment Award for the commitment of a municipality to environmentally sustainable governance, to protecting the environment and to combating climate change.



Field monitoring instruments are used to confirm water quality prior to discharge to the City's storm sewer system.

Child care

The City received the Union of British Columbia Municipalities Community Excellence Award in Governance which recognized the City's 2017– 2022 Richmond Child Care Needs Assessment and Strategy. Richmond's investment in a municipal child care strategy began in 1991. The vision for this five year strategy is for the City to build on those three decades of work to continue to be a municipal leader in fostering conditions for a comprehensive child care system.

Financial Reporting

Once again, the Government Finance Officers Association of the US and Canada presented Richmond with the Canadian Award for Financial Reporting for the 17th year in a row and the Popular Financial Reporting Award for the 10th successive year for our 2018 Annual Report.



The Canadian Award for Excellence in Financial Reporting Program encourages and assists Canadian local governments to go beyond the minimum requirements of generally accepted accounting principles.



Britannia Heritage Shipyards National Historic Site

Flood Protection

The City was given the Award of Merit by the Association of Consulting Engineering Companies BC for the Britannia Heritage Shipyard Flood Protection Improvements Project, which upgraded flood prevention infrastructure for a national historic site that is located outside of Richmond's diking network.

Storeys Housing Project

The Storeys affordable housing project, a unique mixed-use community housing partnership between five non-profit agencies and the City of Richmond, received an Ovation Award from the Homebuilders Association of Vancouver for the Best Multi-Family High-rise Development.

Report from the General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services

Mayor Malcolm Brodie and members of Richmond City Council,

I am pleased to submit the Consolidated Financial Statements and Auditors' Report for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2019 for the City of Richmond, pursuant to Section 98 and 167 of the Community Charter. The consolidated financial statements have been prepared in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards as prescribed by the Public Sector Accounting Board (PSAB) of the Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada.

KPMG LLP was appointed by City Council to independently audit the City's consolidated financial statements. They have expressed an opinion that the City's consolidated financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the consolidated financial position of the City of Richmond as at December 31, 2019 and its consolidated results of operations, its changes in net consolidated financial assets and its consolidated cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

These financial statements combine the accounts of the City of Richmond, Richmond Olympic Oval, and Richmond Public Library (collectively referred to as the "City"), as well as the City's investment in Lulu Island Energy Company, which is accounted for as a Government Business Enterprise.

Consolidated statement of financial position (in \$000s)

| Financial assets | 2019 Actual \$1,320,747 | 2018 Actual \$1,231,060 | Change \$89,687 |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Liabilities | 514,878 | 467,939 | 46,939 |
| Net financial assets | 805,869 | 763,121 | 42,748 |
| Non-financial assets | 2,433,473 | 2,377,969 | 55,504 |
| Accumulated surplus | \$3,239,342 | \$3,141,090 | \$98,252 |

The City's overall financial position improved by \$98.3 million, with accumulated surplus totalling \$3.2 billion. A significant part of this increase is due to growth in financial assets, as well as additions to capital and statutory reserves. This is partially offset by an increase in liabilities, especially deferred revenue related to the collection of Development Cost Charges (DCCs).

The City's cash and investments have grown to \$1.2 billion while long-term debt continues to decline with an outstanding balance at the end of 2019 of \$27.9 million. Meanwhile, the City's tangible capital assets increased by \$56.1 million, which includes \$28.9 million of in-kind contributions from development as conditions of re-zoning.

Statutory reserves (in \$000s)

| | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Total reserves | \$461,178 | \$471,846 | \$484,883 | \$540,153 | \$557,576 |

Statutory reserves are established by Bylaw for specific purposes, mainly capital expenditures.

The increase in the balance to \$557.6 million is mainly attributable to the timing of these capital expenditures and contributions. Each year, funds are largely transferred to the reserves through Council's Long Term Financial Management Strategy, with an additional focus towards infrastructure construction and renewal.

Consolidated statement of operations (in \$000s)

| | 2019 Budget | 2019 Actual | 2018 Actual |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Revenue | \$541,121 | \$581,942 | \$599,417 |
| Expenses | 463,338 | 483,690 | 414,456 |
| Annual surplus | \$77,783 | \$98,252 | \$184,961 |

The City's consolidated revenue for the year totaled \$581.9 million, a decrease of \$17.5 million from 2018 mainly due to significant development-related contributions received during 2018.

Expenses increased by \$69.2 million from prior year. 2019 expenses included an extraordinary contribution towards the Canada Line Capstan station of \$28.1 million.

The annual surplus for 2019 was \$98.3 million and represents the change in investment in tangible capital assets, reserves and other accumulated surplus.

Budget variance

Consolidated revenue of \$581.9M was greater than budgeted revenue by \$40.8M mainly due to:

- \$27.4M in developer cash contributions, \$18.2M in gain on sale of land and \$9.8M related to the fuel facility contribution that was not budgeted and was included under other revenue.
- \$24.2M lower than budgeted capital funding mainly due to developer contributed assets.
- \$9.1M higher than budgeted investment income mainly due to higher returns and the timing of capital expenditures.
- \$9.0M lower than budgeted DCC revenue due to the timing of capital expenditures. Revenue is recognized when the amounts are spent while the budget represents the 2019 allocation of DCCs towards capital projects that can be spent over multiple years.
- \$5.7M higher than budget for utility fees mainly due to construction related flat rate utility prepayments.

Consolidated expenses of \$483.7M were higher than budgeted by \$20.4M. The main variances include:

- \$28.1M contribution for the Canada Line Capstan station recorded under planning and development.
- \$8.9M lower than budgeted general government costs due to vacancies and timing of programs.
- \$6.4M higher than budgeted engineering and public works costs mainly due to rehabilitation and maintenance expenses funded by the capital program.
- \$6.3M favourable budget variance for community safety due to RCMP policing contract and salary vacancies.

The City's consolidated annual surplus of \$98.3 million exceeded the budgeted annual surplus of \$77.8 million by \$20.5 million, prior to transfers to reserves and other accumulated surplus.

Year over year change

Consolidated revenue of \$581.9M decreased by \$17.5M from 2018 mainly due to:

- a decrease of \$56.8M in capital funding due to the timing of developer contributed assets, which included \$28.9M in 2019 and \$88.0M in 2018.
- an increase of \$14.1M in other revenue mainly from gain on sale of land.
- an increase of \$13.3M in property taxes due to the approved rate increase and growth related to new development.
- an increase of \$8.6M in utility fees, including rate and volume increases.

Consolidated expenses of \$483.7M increased by \$69.2M over 2018 mainly due to:

- \$28.1M contribution for the Canada Line Capstan station.
- \$15.1M increase in contractual wage and other fringe costs.
- \$10.8M increase in rehabilitation and maintenance expenses funded by the capital program.
- \$5.6M increase in contract costs including policing costs and contract costs for E-Comm.

Financial sustainability

City Council's Long Term Financial Management Strategy has ensured prudent fiscal practices while maintaining the City's high service standards through balancing current and long term financial needs. The impact of this policy can be seen in the current financial health of the organization, which has placed the City in a strong position to mitigate some of the financial impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Respectfully submitted,

James-

Andrew Nazareth, BEc, CPA, CGA General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services May 11, 2020

City of Richmond audited financial statements

Year ended December 31, 2019



KPMG LLP PO Box 10426 777 Dunsmuir Street Vancouver BC V7Y 1K3 Canada Telephone (604) 691-3000 Fax (604) 691-3031

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

To the Mayor and Council of the City of Richmond

Opinion

We have audited the consolidated financial statements of the City of Richmond (the "City"), which comprise:

- the consolidated statement of financial position as at December 31, 2019;
- the consolidated statement of operations for the year then ended;
- the consolidated statement of changes in net financial assets for the year then ended;
- the consolidated statement of cash flows for the year then ended; and
- notes to the consolidated financial statements, including a summary of significant accounting policies

(hereinafter referred to as the "financial statements").

In our opinion, the accompanying financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the consolidated financial position of the City as at December 31, 2019, and its consolidated results of operations, its consolidated changes in net financial assets and its consolidated cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

Basis for Opinion

We conducted our audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Our responsibilities under those standards are further described in the *"Auditors' Responsibilities for the Audit of the Financial Statements"* section of our auditors' report.

We are independent of the City in accordance with the ethical requirements that are relevant to our audit of the financial statements in Canada and we have fulfilled our other ethical responsibilities in accordance with these requirements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our opinion.



City of Richmond Page 2

Responsibilities of Management and Those Charged with Governance for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards, and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

In preparing the financial statements, management is responsible for assessing the City's ability to continue as a going concern, disclosing as applicable, matters related to going concern and using the going concern basis of accounting unless management either intends to liquidate the City or to cease operations, or has no realistic alternative but to do so.

Those charged with governance are responsible for overseeing the City's financial reporting process.

Auditors' Responsibilities for the Audit of the Financial Statements

Our objectives are to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, and to issue an auditors' report that includes our opinion.

Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance, but is not a guarantee that an audit conducted in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards will always detect a material misstatement when it exists.

Misstatements can arise from fraud or error and are considered material if, individually or in the aggregate, they could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements.

As part of an audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards, we exercise professional judgment and maintain professional skepticism throughout the audit.

We also:

 Identify and assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error, design and perform audit procedures responsive to those risks, and obtain audit evidence that is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our opinion.

The risk of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from fraud is higher than for one resulting from error, as fraud may involve collusion, forgery, intentional omissions, misrepresentations, or the override of internal control.

- Obtain an understanding of internal control relevant to the audit in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the City's internal control.
- Evaluate the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates and related disclosures made by management.



City of Richmond Page 3

- Conclude on the appropriateness of management's use of the going concern basis of accounting and, based on the audit evidence obtained, whether a material uncertainty exists related to events or conditions that may cast significant doubt on the City's ability to continue as a going concern. If we conclude that a material uncertainty exists, we are required to draw attention in our auditors' report to the related disclosures in the financial statements or, if such disclosures are inadequate, to modify our opinion. Our conclusions are based on the audit evidence obtained up to the date of our auditors' report. However, future events or conditions may cause the City to cease to continue as a going concern.
- Evaluate the overall presentation, structure and content of the financial statements, including the disclosures, and whether the financial statements represent the underlying transactions and events in a manner that achieves fair presentation.
- Communicate with those charged with governance regarding, among other matters, the planned scope and timing of the audit and significant audit findings, including any significant deficiencies in internal control that we identify during our audit.
- Obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence regarding the financial information of the entities or business activities within the group entity to express an opinion on the financial statements. We are responsible for the direction, supervision and performance of the group audit. We remain solely responsible for our audit opinion.

VPMG LLP

Chartered Professional Accountants

Vancouver, Canada May 11, 2020

CITY OF RICHMOND

Consolidated Statement of Financial Position (Expressed in thousands of dollars)

December 31, 2019, with comparative information for 2018

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| Financial Assets | | |
| Cash | \$ 389,564 | \$ 121,861 |
| Investments (note 3) | 830,896 | 1,004,928 |
| Investment in Lulu Island Energy Company ("LIEC") (note 4) | 31,414 | 29,780 |
| Accrued interest receivable | 7,781 | 7,443 |
| Accounts receivable (note 5) | 28,407 | 29,151 |
| Taxes receivable | 11,033 | 11,844 |
| Development fees receivable | 21,144 | 25,545 |
| Debt reserve fund - deposits (note 6) | 508 | 508 |
| | 1,320,747 | 1,231,060 |
| Liabilities | | |
| Accounts payable and accrued liabilities (note 7) | 107,590 | 95,231 |
| Development cost charges (note 8) | 197,671 | 158,882 |
| Deposits and holdbacks (note 9) | 117,364 | 113,620 |
| Deferred revenue (note 10) | 64,362 | 67,364 |
| Debt, net of MFA sinking fund deposits (note 11) | 27,891 | 32,842 |
| | 514,878 | 467,939 |
| Net financial assets | 805,869 | 763,121 |
| Non-Financial Assets | | |
| Tangible capital assets (note 12) | 2,427,798 | 2,371,694 |
| Inventory of materials and supplies | 2,961 | 3,602 |
| Prepaid expenses | 2,714 | 2,673 |
| | 2,433,473 | 2,377,969 |
| Accumulated surplus (note 13) | \$ 3,239,342 | \$ 3,141,090 |

Contingent demand notes (note 6) Commitments and contingencies (note 18) Subsequent event (note 26)

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services
Consolidated Statement of Operations (Expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019, with comparative information for 2018

| | | 2019 | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | Budget | 2019 | 2018 |
| | | (notes 2(p) and 24) | | |
| Revenue: | | and 24) | | |
| Taxation and levies (note 20) | \$ | 229,903 | \$ 230,198 | \$ 216,908 |
| Utility fees | | 105,805 | 111,472 | 102,915 |
| Sales of services | | 41,977 | 42,747 | 39,111 |
| Payments-in-lieu of taxes | | 14,200 | 16,277 | 15,489 |
| Provincial and federal grants | | 8,362 | 10,687 | 10,355 |
| Development cost charges (note 8) | | 22,764 | 13,802 | 17,432 |
| Other capital funding sources | | 63,197 | 39,028 | 95,859 |
| Other revenue: | | , | , - | , |
| Investment income | | 16,062 | 25,142 | 20,705 |
| Gaming revenue | | 16,500 | 15,140 | 16,837 |
| Licenses and permits | | 11,107 | 13,030 | 13,637 |
| Other (note 21) | | 11,244 | 62,785 | 48,678 |
| Equity income in government business | | · | | |
| enterprise ("GBE") (note 4) | | - | 1,634 | 1,491 |
| | | 541,121 | 581,942 | 599,417 |
| Expenses: | | | | |
| Community safety | | 112,526 | 106,209 | 98,500 |
| Utilities: water, sewer and sanitation | | 95,067 | 98,653 | 89,959 |
| Engineering, public works and project | | | | |
| development | | 74,568 | 80,940 | 68,793 |
| Community services | | 68,627 | 67,522 | 61,174 |
| General government | | 64,603 | 55,689 | 52,549 |
| Planning and development | | 20,273 | 48,104 | 18,076 |
| Richmond Olympic Oval | | 16,595 | 15,972 | 15,424 |
| Richmond Public Library | | 11,079 | 10,601 | 9,981 |
| | Mii | 463,338 | 483,690 | 414,456 |
| Annual surplus | | 77,783 | 98,252 | 184,961 |
| Accumulated surplus, beginning of year | | 3,141,090 | 3,141,090 | 2,956,129 |
| Accumulated surplus, end of year | \$ | 3,218,873 | \$ 3,239,342 | \$ 3,141,090 |

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

Consolidated Statement of Changes in Net Financial Assets (Expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019, with comparative information for 2018

| | 2019 | | |
|--|------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Budget | 2019 | 2018 |
| | (notes 2(p) and 24) | | |
| Annual surplus for the year \$ | 77,783 | \$ 98,252 | \$ 184,961 |
| Acquisition of tangible capital assets | (118,551) | (93,154) | (92,851) |
| Contributed tangible capital assets | (50,350) | (28,867) | (88,021) |
| Amortization of tangible capital assets | 61,513 | 64,228 | 60,542 |
| Net loss (gain) on disposal of tangible capital | | | |
| assets | - | (17,637) | 324 |
| Proceeds on sale of tangible capital assets | - | 19,326 | 213 |
| | (29,605) | 42,148 | 65,168 |
| Acquisition of inventory of materials and supplies | _ | (2,961) | (3,602) |
| Acquisition of prepaid expenses | - | (2,714) | (2,673) |
| Consumption of inventory of materials and supplies | - | 3,602 | 3,762 |
| Use of prepaid expenses | - | 2,673 | 2,376 |
| Change in net financial assets | (29,605) | 42,748 | 65,031 |
| Net financial assets, beginning of year | 763,121 | 763,121 | 698,090 |
| Net financial assets, end of year \$ | 733,516 | \$ 805,869 | \$ 763,121 |

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

Consolidated Statement of Cash Flows (Expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019, with comparative information for 2018

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| Cash provided by (used in): | | |
| Operating activities: | | |
| Annual surplus | \$ 98,252 | \$ 184,961 |
| Items not involving cash: | | |
| Amortization | 64,228 | 60,542 |
| Loss (gain) on disposal of tangible capital assets | (17,637) | 324 |
| Contributions of tangible capital assets | (28,867) | (88,021) |
| Equity income in GBE | (1,634) | (1,491) |
| Change in non-cash operating working capital: | | |
| Accrued interest receivable | (338) | (792) |
| Accounts receivable | 744 | (2,115) |
| Taxes receivable | 811 | (2,868) |
| Development fees receivable | 4,401 | (3,169) |
| Inventory of materials and supplies | 641 | 160 |
| Prepaid expenses | (41) | (297) |
| Accounts payable and accrued liabilities | 12,359 | (3,805) |
| Development cost charges | 38,789 | 28,198 |
| Deposits and holdbacks | 3,744 | 30,834 |
| Deferred revenue | (3,002) | 1,077 |
| Net change in cash from operating activities | 172,450 | 203,538 |
| Capital activities: | | |
| Cash used to acquire tangible capital assets | (93,154) | (92,851) |
| Proceeds on disposal of tangible capital assets | 19,326 | 213 |
| Net change in cash from capital activities | (73,828) | (92,638) |
| Financing activities: | | |
| Repayments of debt | (4,951) | (4,761) |
| Repaymente el debr | (1,001) | (1,101) |
| Investing activities: | | |
| Net sale (purchase) of investments | 174,032 | (32,145) |
| | | |
| Net change in cash | 267,703 | 73,994 |
| Cash, beginning of year | 121,861 | 47,867 |
| Cash, end of year | \$ 389,564 | \$ 121,861 |

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

1. Operations:

The City of Richmond (the "City") is incorporated under the Local Government Act of British Columbia. The City's principal activities include the provision of local government services to residents of the incorporated area. These include administrative, protective, transportation, infrastructure, environmental, recreational, water, sewer, and drainage.

2. Significant accounting policies:

The consolidated financial statements of the City have been prepared in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards as prescribed by the Public Sector Accounting Board ("PSAB") of the Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada.

(a) Basis of consolidation:

The consolidated financial statements reflect a combination of the City's General Revenue, General Capital and Loan, Waterworks and Sewerworks, and Reserve Funds consolidated with the Richmond Public Library (the "Library") and the Richmond Olympic Oval (the "Oval"). The Library is consolidated as the Library Board is appointed by the City. The Oval is consolidated as they are a wholly owned municipal corporation of the City. Interfund transactions, fund balances and activities have been eliminated on consolidation. The City's investment in Lulu Island Energy Company ("LIEC"), a wholly owned government business enterprise ("GBE"), is accounted for using the modified equity method.

(*i*) General Revenue Fund:

This fund is used to account for the current operations of the City as provided for in the Annual Budget, including collection of taxes, administering operations, policing, and servicing general debt.

(ii) General Capital and Loan Fund:

This fund is used to record the City's tangible capital assets and work-in-progress, including engineering structures such as roads and bridges, and the related debt.

(iii) Waterworks and Sewerworks Funds:

These funds have been established to cover the costs of operating these utilities, with related capital and loan funds to record the related tangible capital assets and debt.

(*iv*) Reserve Funds:

Certain funds are established by bylaws for specific purposes. They are funded primarily by budgeted contributions from the General Revenue Fund and developer contributions plus interest earned on fund balances.

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

2. Significant accounting policies (continued):

(b) Basis of accounting:

The City follows the accrual method of accounting for revenue and expenses. Revenue is recognized in the year in which it is earned and measurable. Expenses are recognized as they are incurred and measurable as a result of receipt of goods and services and/or the creation of a legal obligation to pay.

(c) Government transfers:

Restricted transfers from governments are deferred and recognized as revenue as the related expenditures are incurred or the stipulations in the related agreement are met. Unrestricted transfers are recognized as revenue when received or if the amount to be received can be reasonably estimated and collection is reasonably assured.

(d) Cash and cash equivalents:

Cash and cash equivalents consist of cash, highly liquid money market investments and short-term investments with maturities of less than 90 days from date of acquisition.

(e) Investments:

Investments are recorded at cost, adjusted for amortization of premiums or discounts. Provisions for losses are recorded when they are considered to be other than temporary.

(f) Investment in government business enterprises:

Government business enterprises are recorded using the modified equity method of accounting. The City's investment in the GBE is recorded as the value of the GBE's shareholder's equity. The investment's income or loss is recognized by the City when it is earned by the GBE. Inter-organizational transactions and balances are not eliminated, except for any gains or losses on assets remaining within the City.

(g) Accounts receivable:

Accounts receivable are net of an allowance for doubtful accounts and therefore represent amounts expected to be collected.

(h) Development cost charges:

Development cost charges are restricted by legislation to expenditures on capital infrastructure. These amounts are deferred upon receipt and recognized as revenue when the expenditures are incurred in accordance with the restrictions.

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

2. Significant accounting policies (continued):

(i) Post-employment benefits:

The City and its employees make contributions to the Municipal Pension Plan. As this plan is a multi-employee plan, contributions are expensed as incurred.

Post-employment benefits also accrue to the City's employees. The liabilities related to these benefits are actuarially determined based on service and best estimates of retirement ages and expected future salary and wage increases. The liabilities under these benefits plans are accrued based on projected benefits prorated as employees render services necessary to earn the future benefits.

(j) Non-financial assets:

Non-financial assets are not available to discharge existing liabilities and are held for use in the provision of services. They have useful lives extending beyond the current year and are not intended for sale in the ordinary course of operations.

(i) Tangible capital assets:

Tangible capital assets are recorded at cost, which includes amounts that are directly attributable to acquisition, construction, development, or betterment of the assets. The cost, less the residual value, of the tangible capital assets, excluding land, are amortized on a straight line basis over their estimated useful lives as follows:

| Asset | Useful life - years |
|--|---------------------|
| Buildings and building improvements | 10 - 75 |
| Infrastructure | 5 - 100 |
| Vehicles, machinery and equipment | 3 - 40 |
| Library's collections, furniture and equipment | 4 - 20 |

Amortization is charged over the asset's useful life commencing when the asset is acquired. Assets under construction are not amortized until the asset is available for productive use.

(ii) Contributions of tangible capital assets:

Tangible capital assets received as contributions are recorded at their fair value at the date of receipt and also are recorded as revenue.

(iii) Natural resources, works of art, and cultural and historic assets:

Natural resources, works of art, and cultural and historic assets are not recorded as assets in the consolidated financial statements.

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

2. Significant accounting policies (continued):

- (j) Non-financial assets (continued):
 - (iv) Interest capitalization:

The City does not capitalize interest costs associated with the construction of a tangible capital asset.

(v) Labour capitalization:

Internal labour directly attributable to the construction, development or implementation of a tangible capital asset is capitalized.

(vi) Leased tangible capital assets:

Leases which transfer substantially all of the benefits and risks incidental to ownership of property are accounted for as leased tangible capital assets. All other leases are accounted for as operating leases and the related payments are charged to expenses as incurred.

(vii) Impairment of tangible capital assets:

Tangible capital assets are written down when conditions indicate that they no longer contribute to the City's ability to provide goods and services, or when the value of future economic benefits associated with the tangible capital assets are less than their net book value. The net write-downs are accounted for as expenses in the consolidated statement of operations.

(viii) Inventory of materials and supplies:

Inventory is recorded at cost, net of an allowance for obsolete stock. Cost is determined on a weighted average basis.

(k) Revenue recognition:

Revenue is recognized in the period in which the transactions or events occurred that gave rise to the revenue. All revenue is recorded on an accrual basis, except when the accruals cannot be determined with a reasonable degree of certainty or when their estimation is impractical.

The City is required to act as the agent for the collection of certain taxes and fees imposed by other authorities. Collections for other authorities are excluded from the City's taxation revenue.

(I) Property taxes:

The City establishes property tax rates based on assessed market values provided by the British Columbia Assessment Authority (BCA). Market values are determined as of July 1st of each year. The City records taxation revenue at the time the property tax bills are issued. The City is entitled to collect interest and penalties on overdue taxes.

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

2. Significant accounting policies (continued):

(m) Deferred revenue:

The City defers a portion of the revenue collected from permits, licenses and other fees and recognizes this revenue in the year in which related inspections are performed, other related expenses are incurred or services are provided.

Deferred revenue also represents funds received from external parties for specified purposes. This revenue is recognized in the period in which the related expenses are incurred.

(n) Deposits:

Receipts restricted by the legislation of senior governments or by agreement with external parties are deferred and reported as deposits and are refundable under certain circumstances. When qualifying expenses are incurred, deposits are recognized as revenue at amounts equal to the qualifying expenses.

(o) Debt:

Debt is recorded net of related sinking fund balances.

(p) Budget information:

Budget information, presented on a basis consistent with that used for actual results, was included in the City's Consolidated 5 Year Financial Plan (2019-2023) ("Consolidated Financial Plan") and was adopted through Bylaw No. 9979 on March 11, 2019.

(q) Contaminated sites:

Contaminated sites are a result of contamination being introduced into air, soil, water, or sediment of a chemical, organic or radioactive material of live organism that exceeds an environmental standard. Liabilities are recorded net of any expected recoveries.

A liability for remediation of contaminated sites is recognized when a site is not in productive use and the following criteria are met:

- (*i*) An environmental standard exists;
- (ii) Contamination exceeds the environmental standard;
- (iii) The City is directly responsible or accepts responsibility;
- (iv) It is expected that future economic benefits will be given up; and
- (v) A reasonable estimate of the amount can be made.

The liability is recognized as management's estimate of the cost of post-remediation including operation, maintenance and monitoring that are an integral part of the remediation strategy for a contaminated site.

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

2. Significant accounting policies (continued):

(r) Use of accounting estimates:

The preparation of consolidated financial statements requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the consolidated financial statements and the reported amount of revenue and expenditures during the reporting period. Significant areas requiring the use of management estimates relate to the value of contributed tangible capital assets, value of developer contributions, useful lives for amortization, determination of provisions for accrued liabilities, performing actuarial valuation of employee future benefits, allowance for doubtful accounts, and provision for contingencies. Actual results could differ from those estimates. Adjustments, if any, will be reflected in the consolidated financial statements in the period that the change in estimate is made, as well as in the period of settlement if the amount is different.

(s) Segment disclosures:

A segment is defined as a distinguishable activity or group of activities of a government for which it is appropriate to separately report financial information to achieve the objectives of the standard. The City has provided definitions of segments as well as presented financial information in segment format.

| | | | 2019 | | 2 | 2018 | |
|--|----|---------|------|-----------------|-----------------|------|-----------------|
| | _ | Cost | | Market value | Cost | | Market value |
| | | | | value | 0031 | | value |
| Short-term notes and deposits Government and government | \$ | 409,759 | \$ | 409,874 | \$ 577,416 | \$ | 577,060 |
| guaranteed bonds Municipal Finance Authority | | 192,314 | | 194,229 | 164,943 | | 165,401 |
| pooled investment fund | | 47,306 | | 46,123 | 46,150 | | 44,716 |
| Other bonds | | 181,517 | | 182,039 | 216,419 | | 213,577 |
| | \$ | 830,896 | \$ | 832,265 | \$ 1,004,928 | \$ 1 | 1,000,754 |

3. Investments:

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

4. Investment in Lulu Island Energy Company Ltd:

The City owns 100% of the issued and outstanding shares of LIEC, which was incorporated under the British Columbia Business Corporations Act on August 19, 2013. LIEC develops, manages and operates district energy utilities in the City of Richmond, on the City's behalf, including but not limited to energy production, generation or exchange, transmission, distribution, maintenance, marketing and sales to customers, customer service, profit generation, financial management and advisory services for energy and infrastructure.

Summarized financial information relating to LIEC is as follows:

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| Cash, cash equivalents, and investments | \$ 11,826 | \$ 8,596 |
| Accounts receivable | 1,303 | 2,242 |
| Tangible capital assets | 33,412 | 32,361 |
| Total assets | 46,541 | 43,199 |
| Accounts payable and accrued liabilities | 778 | 414 |
| Deferred contributions | 6,183 | 5,375 |
| Concession liability | 8,166 | 7,630 |
| Total liabilities | 15,127 | 13,419 |
| Shareholder's equity | \$ 31,414 | \$ 29,780 |
| Total revenue | \$ 5,295 | \$ 4,888 |
| Total expenses | 3,661 | 3,397 |
| Net income | \$ 1,634 | \$ 1,491 |

Included in accounts payable and accrued liabilities in the City's consolidated statement of financial position are payables to LIEC in the amount of \$136,168 (2018 - \$1,375,799).

On October 30, 2014, LIEC and the Oval Village district energy utility developer ("the Concessionaire") entered into a 30-year Concession Agreement, which is a public-private partnership project ("P3"), where the Concessionaire will design, construct, finance, operate, and maintain the infrastructure for the district energy utility at the Oval Village community. As part of the Agreement, the infrastructure will be owned by LIEC.

On October 30, 2014, the Concessionaire and the City entered into a Limited Guarantee Agreement. The City is the Guarantor and guarantees the performance of some of LIEC's obligations under the Concession Agreement to a maximum of \$18.2 million (2018 - \$18.2 million).

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

5. Accounts receivable:

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Water and sewer utilities | \$ 13,671 | \$ 11,999 |
| Casino revenue | 3,903 | 4,010 |
| Capital grants | 1,291 | 5,003 |
| Other trade receivables | 9,542 | 8,139 |
| | \$ 28,407 | \$ 29,151 |

6. Debt reserve fund deposits and contingent demand notes:

The City issues its debt instruments through the Municipal Finance Authority (the "MFA"). As a condition of these borrowings, a portion of the debenture proceeds is withheld by the MFA in a Debt Reserve Fund. The City also executes demand notes in connection with each debenture whereby the City may be required to loan certain amounts to the MFA. These demand notes are contingent in nature and are not reflected in the City's accounts. The details of the cash deposits and contingent demand notes at December 31, 2018 and 2019 are as follows:

| | de | Contingent demand notes | | |
|----------------------|----|-------------------------------|----|-------|
| General Revenue Fund | \$ | 508 | \$ | 2,447 |

7. Accounts payable and accrued liabilities:

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|
| Trade and other liabilities Post-employment benefits (note 15) | \$ 73,403 34,187 | \$ 64,917 30,314 |
| | \$ 107,590 | \$ 95,231 |

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

8. Development cost charges:

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|
| Balance, beginning of year Contributions Interest Revenue recognized | \$ 158,882 48,740 3,851 (13,802) | \$ 130,684 42,792 2,838 (17,432) |
| Balance, end of year | \$ 197,671 | \$ 158,882 |

9. Deposits and holdbacks:

| | Balance December 31, 2018 | | Deposit contributions/ Refund/ interest earned expenditures | | Refund/ enditures | Dece | Balance ember 31, 2019 | |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Security deposits Developer contributions Contract holdbacks Other | \$ | 89,557 7,313 6,650 10,100 | \$ | 25,949 222 2,658 6,184 | \$ | (21,342) (3,891) (6,036) | \$ | 94,164 7,535 5,417 10,248 |
| | \$ | 113,620 | \$ | 35,013 | \$ | (31,269) | \$ | 117,364 |

10. Deferred revenue:

| | Dece | Balance mber 31, 2018 | xternally estricted inflows | Revenue earned | Decer | Balance nber 31, 2019 |
|------------------------------|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------------|
| Taxes and utilities | \$ | 20,450 | \$ 22,836 | \$ (20,450) | \$ | 22,836 |
| Building permits/development | | 15,598 | 9,454 | (5,207) | | 19,845 |
| Oval | | 1,876 | 10,625 | (11,067) | | 1,434 |
| Capital grants | | 19,558 | 2,728 | (11,434) | | 10,852 |
| Business licenses | | 2,523 | 2,251 | (2,123) | | 2,651 |
| Parking easement/leased land | | 2,430 | 58 | (47) | | 2,441 |
| Other | | 4,929 | 5,920 | (6,546) | | 4,303 |
| | \$ | 67,364 | \$ 53,872 | \$ (56,874) | \$ | 64,362 |

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

11. Debt, net of MFA sinking fund deposits:

The interest rate for the year ended December 31, 2019 on the principal amount of the MFA debenture was 3.30% (2018 - 3.30%) per annum. Interest expense incurred for the year on the long-term debt was \$1,676,895 (2018 - \$1,676,895). The maturity date of the MFA debt is April 7, 2024.

The City obtains debt instruments through the MFA pursuant to security issuing bylaws under authority of the Community Charter to finance certain capital expenditures.

Gross amount for the debt less principal payments and actuarial adjustments to date are as follows:

| | k | Gross amount porrowed | and | oayments actuarial ustments | 1 | Net debt 2019 | Net debt 2018 |
|--------------|----|-----------------------------|-----|-----------------------------------|----|------------------|------------------|
| General Fund | \$ | 50,815 | \$ | 22,924 | \$ | 27,891 | \$ 32,842 |

Repayments on net outstanding debt over the next five years are as follows:

| 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 | \$ 5,149 5,355 5,570 5,792 6,025 |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| | \$ 27,891 |

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

12. Tangible capital assets:

| Cost | Dec | Balance cember 31, 2018 | Additions and transfers | | Disposals | | De | Balance cember 31, 2019 |
|---------------------------|-----|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|----|-------------------------------|
| Land | \$ | 984,001 | \$ | 34,517 | \$ | (955) | \$ | 1,017,563 |
| Building and building | | | | | | | | |
| improvements | | 442,181 | | 45,398 | | (338) | | 487,241 |
| Infrastructure | | 1,741,680 | | 66,647 | | (7,436) | | 1,800,891 |
| Vehicles, machinery and | | | | | | | | |
| equipment | | 142,793 | | 10,255 | | (3,163) | | 149,885 |
| Library's collections, | | | | | | | | |
| furniture and equipment | | 9,445 | | 1,068 | | (575) | | 9,938 |
| Assets under construction | | 151,296 | | (35,864) | | - | | 115,432 |
| | \$ | 3,471,396 | \$ | 122,021 | \$ | (12,467) | \$ | 3,580,950 |

| Accumulated amortization | Balance December 31, 2018 | | [| Disposals | Amortization expense | | Balanc December 3 201 | |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------|----|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------|
| Building and building | | | | | | | | |
| improvements | \$ | 186,279 | \$ | (302) | \$ | 16,332 | \$ | 202,309 |
| Infrastructure | | 820,387 | , | (6,919) | · | 36,524 | | 849,992 |
| Vehicles, machinery and equipment | | 86,826 | | (2,982) | | 10,244 | | 94,088 |
| Library's collections, furniture and equipment | | 6,210 | | (575) | | 1,128 | | 6,763 |
| | \$ | 1,099,702 | \$ | (10,778) | \$ | 64,228 \$ | 1,1 | 53,152 |

| Net book value | December 31, 2019 | December 31, 2018 |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Land Buildings and building improvements Infrastructure Vehicles, machinery and equipment Library's collection, furniture and equipment Assets under construction | \$ 1,017,563 284,932 950,899 55,797 3,175 115,432 | 255,902 921,293 55,967 3,235 |
| Balance, end of year | \$ 2,427,798 | \$ 2,371,694 |

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

12. Tangible capital assets (continued):

(a) Assets under construction:

Assets under construction having a value of \$115,432,086 (2018 - \$151,295,702) have not been amortized. Amortization of these assets will commence when the asset is put into service.

(b) Contributed tangible capital assets:

Contributed tangible capital assets have been recognized at fair market value at the date of contribution. The value of contributed assets received during the year is \$28,866,769 (2018 - \$88,020,879) comprised of land in the amount of \$14,665,393 (2018 - \$69,654,386), infrastructure in the amount of \$14,191,349 (2018 - \$13,666,004), buildings had no contributed tangible capital assets in 2019 (2018 - \$4,700,489), and library collections in the amount of \$10,027 (2018 - nil).

(c) Tangible capital assets disclosed at nominal values:

Where an estimate of fair value could not be made, the tangible capital asset was recognized at a nominal value.

(d) Works of art and historical treasures:

The City manages and controls various works of art and non-operational historical cultural assets including building, artifacts, paintings, and sculptures located at City sites and public display areas. The assets are not recorded as tangible capital assets and are not amortized.

(e) Write-down of tangible capital assets:

Tangible capital assets were written down by \$1,754,513 (2018 - nil) related to estimated repair costs associated with one of the lap pools at the Minoru Center for Active Living. The costs to repair the deficiencies will be recovered through insurance.

13. Accumulated surplus:

| | General and Reserve Funds | Waterworks Utility Fund | Sewerworks Utility Fund | Richmond Olympic Oval | Library | 2019 Total | 2018 Tota |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|
| Investment in | | | | | | | |
| tangible capital assets | \$ 2,385,747 | \$- | \$ - | \$ 8,553 | \$ 3,176 | \$ 2,397,476 | \$ 2,336,489 |
| Reserves (note 14) | 548,720 | - | - | 8,856 | - | 557,576 | 540,153 |
| Appropriated surplus | 193,455 | 18,316 | 10,420 | 1,471 | 390 | 224,052 | 207,173 |
| Investment in LIEC | 31,414 | - | - | - | - | 31,414 | 29,780 |
| Surplus | 17,717 | 446 | 6,276 | 604 | 951 | 25,994 | 24,029 |
| Other equity | 2,830 | - | , - - | - | - | 2,830 | 3,466 |
| Balance, end of year | \$ 3,179,883 | \$ 18,762 | \$ 16,696 | \$ 19,484 | \$ 4,517 | \$ 3,239,342 | \$ 3,141,090 |

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

14. Reserves:

| | | Balance, | | | | Balance |
|---------------------------------------|------|----------|----|------------|------|---------|
| | Dece | mber 31, | | Change | Dece | mber 31 |
| | | 2018 | dı | uring year | | 2019 |
| Affordable housing | \$ | 10,836 | \$ | 869 | \$ | 11,705 |
| Arts, culture and heritage | | 4,003 | | (277) | | 3,726 |
| Capital building and infrastructure | | 81,763 | | 18,923 | | 100,686 |
| Capital reserve | | 176,142 | | (4,166) | | 171,976 |
| Capstan station | | 32,332 | | (14) | | 32,318 |
| Child care development | | 6,806 | | 2,116 | | 8,922 |
| Community legacy and land replacement | | 8,852 | | (7,542) | | 1,310 |
| Drainage improvement | | 56,132 | | (487) | | 55,645 |
| Equipment replacement | | 19,600 | | 603 | | 20,203 |
| Hamilton area plan community amenity | | 752 | | 968 | | 1,720 |
| Leisure facilities | | 18,765 | | (1,089) | | 17,676 |
| Local improvements | | 7,155 | | 172 | | 7,32 |
| Neighborhood improvement | | 7,520 | | 340 | | 7,86 |
| Oval | | 6,324 | | 2,532 | | 8,856 |
| Public art program | | 4,860 | | (2) | | 4,858 |
| Sanitary sewer | | 44,107 | | 3,624 | | 47,73 |
| Steveston off-street parking | | 317 | | 8 | | 32 |
| Steveston road ends | | 155 | | (5) | | 15 |
| Waterfront improvement | | 317 | | (115) | | 202 |
| Watermain replacement | | 53,415 | | 965 | | 54,380 |
| | \$ | 540,153 | \$ | 17,423 | \$ | 557,57 |

15. Post-employment benefits:

The City provides certain post-employment benefits, non-vested sick leave, compensated absences, and termination benefits to its employees.

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|--|---|---|
| Accrued benefit obligation, beginning of year Current service cost Interest cost Past service cost (credit) Benefits paid Actuarial loss (gain) | \$ 28,423 1,881 954 3,155 (1,953) 2,724 | \$ 29,892 1,947 879 (397) (2,508) (1,390) |
| Accrued benefit obligation, end of year | \$ 35,184 | \$ 28,423 |

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

15. Post-employment benefits (continued):

An actuarial valuation for these benefits was performed to determine the City's accrued benefit obligation as at December 31, 2019. This actuarial loss is being amortized over a period equal to the employees' average remaining service lifetime of 10 years (2018 - 10 years).

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Post-employment benefit liability: | | |
| Post-employment benefit liability, end of year Unamortized net actuarial (loss) gain | \$ 35,184 (997) | \$ 28,423 1,891 |
| Balance, end of year | \$ 34,187 | \$ 30,314 |

Actuarial assumptions used to determine the City's accrued benefit obligation are as follows:

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Discount rate | 2.40% | 3.30% |
| Expected future inflation rate | 2.00% | 2.00% |
| Expected wage and salary range increases | 2.50% to 3.00% | 2.50% to 3.00% |

16. Pension plan:

The City and its employees contribute to the Municipal Pension Plan (a jointly trusteed pension plan). The board of trustees, representing plan members and employers, is responsible for administering the plan, including investment of assets and administration of benefits. The plan is a multi-employer defined benefit pension plan. Basic pension benefits are based on a formula. As at December 31, 2018, the plan has about 205,000 active members and approximately 101,000 retired members. Active members include approximately 40,000 contributors from local governments.

Every three years, an actuarial valuation is performed to assess the financial position of the plan and adequacy of plan funding. The actuary determines an appropriate combined employer and member contribution rate to fund the plan. The actuary's calculated contribution rate is based on the entry-age normal cost method, which produces the long-term rate of member and employer contributions sufficient to provide benefits for average future entrants to the plan. This rate may be adjusted for the amortization of any actuarial funding surplus and will be adjusted for the amortization of any unfunded actuarial liability.

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

16. Pension plan (continued):

The most recent valuation for the Municipal Pension Plan as at December 31, 2018, indicated a \$2,866 million funding surplus for basic pension benefits on a going concern basis.

The City paid \$13,251,994 (2018 - \$12,759,865) for employer contributions while employees contributed \$11,120,458 (2018 - \$10,615,884) to the plan in fiscal 2019.

The next valuation will be as at December 31, 2021, with results available in 2022.

Employers participating in the plan record their pension expense as the amount of employer contributions made during the fiscal year (defined contribution pension plan accounting). This is because the plan records accrued liabilities and accrued assets for the plan in aggregate, resulting in no consistent and reliable basis for allocating the obligation, assets and cost to individual employers participating in the plan.

17. Contingent assets and contractual rights:

(a) Contingent assets:

Contingent assets are possible assets arising from existing conditions or situations involving uncertainty. That uncertainty will ultimately be resolved when one or more future events not wholly within the City's control occurs or fails to occur.

The City has legal claims, service agreements, and land dedications that may qualify as contingent assets. Amounts cannot be estimated as of December 31, 2019. Contingent assets are not recorded in the consolidated financial statements.

In 2019, the City had requested payment from the Office of the Minister of Public Services and Procurement Canada, for outstanding payments-in-lieu of taxes in the amount of \$11,139,593. As of December 31, 2019, collectability of the requested amount is not determinable and has not been accrued for in the City's consolidated financial statements.

(b) Contractual rights:

The City has entered into contracts or agreements in the normal course of operations that it expects will result in revenue and assets in future fiscal years. The City's contractual rights are comprised of leases, licenses, grants and various other agreements, including the provision of police services with the Vancouver Airport Authority. The following table summarizes the expected revenue from the City's contractual rights:

| 2021 2022 | 15,157 11,574 4,887 3,437 2,011 9,768 |
|--------------|--|
|--------------|--|

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

17. Contingent assets and contractual rights (continued):

(b) Contractual rights (continued):

The City is entitled to receive revenue from certain other agreements. The revenue from these agreements cannot be quantified and has not been included in the amounts noted above.

18. Commitments and contingencies:

(a) Joint and several liabilities:

The City has a contingent liability with respect to debentures of the Greater Vancouver Water District, Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District and Greater Vancouver Regional District, to the extent provided for in their respective Enabling Acts, Acts of Incorporation and Amending Acts. Management does not consider payment under this contingency to be likely and therefore no amounts have been accrued.

(b) Lease payments:

The City is committed to operating lease payments for premises and equipment in the following approximate amounts:

| 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 Thereafter | \$ 3,368 3,311 2,583 2,569 2,369 7,748 |
|--|--|
| | |

(c) Litigation:

As at December 31, 2019, there were a number of claims or risk exposures in various stages of resolution. The City has made no specific provision for those where the outcome is presently not determinable.

(d) Municipal Insurance Association of British Columbia ("Association"):

The City is a participant in the Association. Should the Association pay out claims in excess of premiums received, it is possible that the City, along with other participants, would be required to contribute towards the deficit. Management does not consider external payment under this contingency to be likely and therefore, no amounts have been accrued.

(e) Contractual obligation:

The City has entered into various contracts for services and construction with periods ranging beyond one year. These commitments are in accordance with budgets passed by Council.

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

18. Commitments and contingencies (continued):

(f) E-Comm Emergency Communications for Southwest British Columbia Incorporated ("E- Comm"):

The City is a shareholder of the E-Comm whose services provided include: regional 9-1-1 call centre for the Greater Vancouver Regional District; Wide Area Radio network; dispatch operations; and records management. The City has 2 Class A shares and 1 Class B share (of a total of 34 Class A and 20 Class B shares issued and outstanding as at December 31, 2019). As a Class A shareholder, the City shares in both funding the future operations and capital obligations of E-Comm (in accordance with a cost sharing formula), including any lease obligations committed to by E-Comm up to the shareholder's withdrawal date.

(g) Community associations:

The City has agreements with the various community associations which operate the community centers throughout the City. The City generally provides the buildings and grounds, pays the operating costs of the facilities, and provides certain staff and other services such as information technology. Typically the community associations are responsible for providing programming and services to the community. The community associations retain all revenue which they receive.

19. Trust funds:

Certain assets have been conveyed or assigned to the City to be administered as directed by agreement or statute. The City holds the assets for the benefit of and stands in fiduciary relationship to the beneficiary. The following trust fund is excluded from the City's consolidated financial statements.

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Richmond Community Associations | \$ 1,877 | \$ 1,837 |

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

20. Taxation and levies:

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|--|------------|------------|
| Taxes collected: | | |
| Property taxes | \$ 463,679 | \$ 433,319 |
| Payment-in-lieu of taxes and grants | 27,597 | 26,369 |
| Local improvement levies | 88 | 265 |
| | 491,364 | 459,953 |
| Less transfers to other authorities: | | |
| Province of British Columbia – School taxes | (190,650) | (177,521) |
| TransLink | (40,800) | (37,813) |
| Metro Vancouver | (7,224) | (6,178) |
| BC Assessment Authority | (6,185) | (6,016) |
| Other | (30) | (28) |
| | (244,889) | (227,556) |
| Less payment-in-lieu of taxes retained by the City | (16,277) | (15,489) |
| | \$ 230,198 | \$ 216,908 |

21. Other revenue:

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|--|--|--|
| Developer contributions Tangible capital assets gain on sale of land Penalties and fines Parking program Other | \$ 27,394 18,205 4,303 2,091 10,792 | \$ 33,672 - 3,784 2,054 9,168 |
| | \$ 62,785 | \$ 48,678 |

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

22. Government transfers:

Government transfers are received for operating and capital activities. The operating transfers consist of gaming revenue and provincial and federal grants. Capital transfers are included in other capital funding sources revenue. The source of the government transfers are as follows:

| | \$ 34,862 | \$ 34,593 |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Government of Canada | 4,056 | 50 |
| TransLink | 1,010 | 1,666 |
| Province of British Columbia | 3,968 | 5,685 |
| Capital | | |
| Government of Canada | 1,560 | 1,700 |
| TransLink | 3,666 | 3,593 |
| Province of British Columbia | \$ 20,602 | \$ 21,899 |
| Operating | | |
| | 2013 | 2010 |
| | 2019 | 2018 |

23. Segmented reporting:

The City provides a wide variety of services to its residents. For segment disclosure, these services are grouped and reported under service areas/departments that are responsible for providing such services. They are as follows:

- (a) Community Safety brings together the City's public safety providers such as Police (RCMP), Fire-Rescue, Emergency Programs, and Community Bylaws. It is responsible for ensuring safe communities by providing protection services with a focus on law enforcement, crime prevention, emergency response, and protection of life and properties.
- (b) Utilities provide such services as planning, designing, constructing, operating, and maintaining the City's infrastructure of water and sewer networks and sanitation and recycling.
- (c) Engineering, Public Works and Project Development comprises of General Public Works, Roads and Construction, Storm Drainage, Fleet Operations, Engineering, Project Development, and Facility Management. The services provided are construction and maintenance of the City's infrastructure and all City owned buildings, maintenance of the City's road networks, managing and operating a mixed fleet of vehicles, heavy equipment and an assortment of specialized work units for the City operations, development of current and long-range engineering planning and construction of major projects.

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

23. Segmented reporting (continued):

- (d) Community Services comprises of Parks, Recreation, Arts, and Culture and Heritage Services. These departments ensure recreation opportunities in Richmond by maintaining a variety of facilities such as arenas, community centres, pools, etc. It designs, constructs and maintains parks and sports fields to ensure there is adequate open green space and sports fields available for Richmond residents. It also addresses the economic, arts, culture, and community issues that the City encounters.
- (e) General Government comprises of Mayor and Council, Corporate Administration, and Finance and Corporate Services. It is responsible for adopting bylaws, effectively administering city operations, levying taxes, legal services, providing sound management of human resources, information technology, City finance, and ensuring high quality services to Richmond residents.
- (f) Planning and Development is responsible for land use plans, developing bylaws and policies for sustainable development in the City including the City's transportation systems, and community social development.
- (g) **Richmond Olympic Oval Corporation** is formed as a wholly owned subsidiary of the City. The City uses the Richmond Olympic Oval facility as a venue for a wide range of sports, business and community activities.
- (h) **Richmond Public Library** provides public access to information by maintaining 5 branches throughout the City.

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

23. Segmented reporting (continued):

| | Community safety | Utilities | Engineering, public works and project development | Community services | General government | Planning and development | Total City subtotal |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|--|-----------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Revenue: | | | • | | ······································ | <u> </u> | |
| Taxation and levies | \$- | \$~ | \$ - | \$- | \$ 230,198 | \$- | \$ 230,198 |
| User fees | - | 99,426 | 12,046 | - | - | - | 111,472 |
| Sales of services | 6,732 | 4,235 | 2,476 | 9,917 | 7,786 | 2,284 | 33,430 |
| Payments-in-lieu of taxes | - | - | - | - | 16,277 | - | 16,277 |
| Provincial and federal grants | 99 | - | 3,707 | 37 | 3,545 | 40 | 7,428 |
| Development cost charges | - | 668 | 2,412 | 2,988 | 2,203 | 5,531 | 13,802 |
| Other capital funding sources | - | 3,432 | 11,448 | 3,783 | 14,666 | 5,689 | 39,018 |
| Other revenue: | | | | | | | |
| Investment income | - | 542 | - | - | 24,580 | - | 25,122 |
| Gaming revenue | 706 | - | - | - | 14,434 | - | 15,140 |
| Licenses and permits | 4,588 | 42 | 1,009 | | 15 | 7,376 | 13,030 |
| Other | 2,652 | 3,608 | 1,202 | 1,173 | 51,453 | 153 | 60,241 |
| Equity income | - | - | - | - | 1,634 | - | 1,634 |
| | 14,777 | 111,953 | 34,300 | 17,898 | 366,791 | 21,073 | 566,792 |
| Expenses: | | | | | | | |
| Wages and salaries | 45,582 | 13,962 | 25,595 | 33,372 | 29,366 | 12,425 | 160,302 |
| Public works maintenance | 22 | 7,465 | 7,060 | 1,894 | (1,481) | 337 | 15,297 |
| Contract services | 55,027 | 8,944 | 4,978 | 4,446 | 3,673 | 1,585 | 78,653 |
| Supplies and materials | 2,719 | 33,219 | 1,397 | 13,056 | 10,748 | 1,035 | 62,174 |
| Interest and finance | 78 | 22,918 | - | 72 | 3,017 | - | 26,085 |
| Transfer from (to) capital for | | | | | | | |
| tangible capital assets | (27) | 3,140 | 12,829 | 5,695 | 275 | 30,621 | 52,533 |
| Amortization of tangible | . / | | | | | | |
| capital assets | 2,765 | 8,778 | 28,888 | 8,930 | 10,088 | 2,023 | 61,472 |
| Loss (gain) on disposal of | | | | | | | |
| tangible capital assets | 43 | 227 | 193 | 57 | 3 | 78 | 601 |
| | 106,209 | 98,653 | 80,940 | 67,522 | 55,689 | 48,104 | 457,117 |
| Annual surplus (deficit) | \$ (91,432) | \$ 13,300 | \$ (46,640) | \$ (49,624) | \$ 311,102 | \$ (27,031) | \$ 109,675 |

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

23. Segmented reporting (continued):

| | Total City subtotal | Richmond Olympic Oval | Richmond Public Library | 2019 Consolidated | 2018 Consolidated |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Revenue: | | | | | |
| Taxation and levies | \$ 230,198 | \$ - | \$- | \$ 230,198 | \$ 216,908 |
| User fees | 111,472 | - | - | 111,472 | 102,915 |
| Sales of services | 33,430 | 9,228 | 89 | 42,747 | 39,111 |
| Payments-in-lieu of taxes | 16,277 | - | - | 16,277 | 15,489 |
| Provincial and federal grants | 7,428 | 2,883 | 376 | 10,687 | 10,355 |
| Development cost charges | 13,802 | - | - | 13,802 | 17,432 |
| Other capital funding sources | 39,018 | - | 10 | 39,028 | 95,859 |
| Other revenue: | | | | | |
| Investment income | 25,122 | - | 20 | 25,142 | 20,705 |
| Gaming revenue | 15,140 | - | - | 15,140 | 16,837 |
| Licenses and permits | 13,030 | - | - | 13,030 | 13,637 |
| Other | 60,241 | 2,289 | 255 | 62,785 | 48,678 |
| Equity income | 1,634 | - | - | 1,634 | 1,491 |
| | 566,792 | 14,400 | 750 | 581,942 | 599,417 |
| Expenses: | | | | | |
| Wages and salaries | 160,302 | 9,298 | 7,763 | 177,363 | 162,331 |
| Public works maintenance | 15,297 | - | 2 | 15,299 | 13,405 |
| Contract services | 78,653 | - | 445 | 79,098 | 73,479 |
| Supplies and materials | 62,174 | 5,042 | 1,585 | 68,801 | 67,919 |
| Interest and finance | 26,085 | - | 4 | 26,089 | 23,149 |
| Transfer from (to) capital for | | | | | |
| tangible capital assets | 52,533 | - | (289) | 52,244 | 13,307 |
| Amortization of tangible capital | | | | | |
| assets | 61,472 | 1,628 | 1,128 | 64,228 | 60,542 |
| Loss (gain) on disposal of | | | | | |
| tangible capital assets | 601 | 4 | (37) | 568 | 324 |
| | 457,117 | 15,972 | 10,601 | 483,690 | 414,456 |
| Annual surplus (deficit) | \$ 109,675 | \$ (1,572) | \$ (9,851) | \$ 98,252 | \$ 184,961 |

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements (continued) (Tabular amounts expressed in thousands of dollars)

Year ended December 31, 2019

24. Budget data:

The budget data presented in these consolidated financial statements is based on the Consolidated Financial Plan adopted by Council on March 11, 2019. The table below reconciles the adopted Consolidated Financial Plan to the budget amounts reported in these consolidated financial statements.

| | Dulau | Financial plan | Financial statement |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|
| | Bylav | v No. 9979 | budget |
| Consolidated financial plan: Revenue | \$ | 541,121 | \$ 541,121 |
| Expenses | - | 463,338 | 463,338 |
| Annual surplus | | 77,783 | 77,783 |
| Less: Acquisition of tangible capital assets Contributed tangible capital assets Transfer to reserves Debt principal | | (399,171) (50,350) (69,403) (4,951) | - |
| Add: Capital funding Transfer from surplus | | 417,161 28,931 | - |
| Annual surplus | \$ | | \$ 77,783 |

25. Comparative information:

Certain comparative information has been reclassified to conform to the consolidated financial statement presentation adopted for the current year.

26. Subsequent event:

Subsequent to December 31, 2019, the COVID-19 outbreak was declared a pandemic by the World Health Organization. This situation presents uncertainty over the City's future cash flows, and may have a significant impact on the City's future operations. In response to the outbreak, the City has temporarily closed some of its facilities. Potential impacts on the City's business could include future decreases in revenue and delays in completing capital project work. As the situation is dynamic and the ultimate duration and magnitude of the impact on the economy are not known, an estimate of the financial effect on the City is not practicable at this time.

City of Richmond statistical data

| City of Richmond population 2010–2019 | 48 |
|---|----|
| Total population by age groups | 48 |
| Immigrant status of Richmond residents by period of immigration | 49 |
| Language spoken most often at home | |
| Highest level of education attainment for the population aged 25 to 64 | 50 |
| Occupations of Richmond residents | |
| Top 10 largest employers in Richmond | |
| Housing starts in Richmond 2010–2019 | |
| Richmond housing starts by type of units 2019 | 52 |
| New dwelling units constructed 2010–2019 | |
| Construction value of building permits issued 2010–2019 (in \$000s) | 53 |
| Richmond business licences 2015–2019 | |
| City of Richmond budgeted capital costs 2015–2019 (in \$000s) | |
| Capital program by type 2019 | |
| Breakdown of residential tax bill 2019 | 55 |
| Registration in Richmond Recreation and Cultural Services programs 2015–2019 | 55 |
| 2019 tax rates | |
| 2019 general revenue fund assessment and taxation by property class (in \$000s) | |
| Taxes levied on behalf of taxing authorities (in \$000s) | |
| 2015–2019 general assessment by property class (in \$000s) | |
| Top 10 corporate taxpayers in Richmond | |
| Debt servicing costs compared to general taxation revenue 2015–2019 (in \$000s) | 58 |
| Liability servicing limit 2015–2019 (in \$000s) | |
| City of Richmond debt per capita 2015–2019 | |
| Net debt 2015–2019 (in \$000s) | |
| Expenses by function 2015–2019 (in \$000s) | |
| Expenses by object 2015–2019 (in \$000s) | |
| Revenue by source 2015–2019 (in \$000s) | |
| Accumulated surplus 2015–2019 (in \$000s) | |
| Changes in net financial assets 2015–2019 (in \$000s) | 60 |
| Reserves 2015–2019 (in \$000s) | 61 |
| Investment portfolio per type 2018–2019 (in \$000s) | |
| Ratio analysis indicators of financial condition | 62 |



City of Richmond population 2010–2019

Source: BC Stats

Total population by age groups



Source: Statistics Canada, 2016 Census of Population



Immigrant status of Richmond residents by period of immigration

Source: Statistics Canada, 2016 Census of Population





Source: Statistics Canada, 2016 Census of Population

Highest level of education attainment for the population aged 25 to 64



Source: Statistics Canada, 2016 Census of Population

Occupations of Richmond residents



Source: Statistics Canada, 2016 Census of Population



Top 10 Largest employers in Richmond

Source: 2019 City of Richmond Business Licences

* Approximate

Housing starts in Richmond 2010–2019



Source: City of Richmond building permit records Includes only projects for new residential construction receiving final building permit in given year.



Richmond housing starts by type of units 2019

Source: City of Richmond building permit records Includes only projects for new residential construction receiving final building permit in given year.

New dwelling units constructed 2010–2019



* Includes one family and two family dwellings

Source: City of Richmond building permit records

Includes only projects for new residential construction receiving final building permit in given year.



Construction value of building permits issued 2010–2019 (in \$000s)

Source: City of Richmond building permit records



Richmond business licences 2015–2019

Number of valid business licences

Source: 2019 City of Richmond Business Licences



City of Richmond budgeted capital costs 2015–2019 (in \$000s)

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services





Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services



Breakdown of residential tax bill 2019

Registration in Richmond Recreation and Cultural Services programs 2015–2019



Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services
2019 tax rates

| | City of Richmond | School - Province of BC | Metro Vancouver | BC Assessment | Municipal Finance Authority | TransLink |
|-------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Residential | 1.54934 | 1.05480 | 0.04130 | 0.03890 | 0.00020 | 0.22160 |
| Business | 4.27024 | 3.70000 | 0.10118 | 0.10820 | 0.00050 | 0.83900 |
| Light industrial | 4.27024 | 3.70000 | 0.14042 | 0.10820 | 0.00070 | 1.02480 |
| Seasonal / Recreational | 1.42729 | 2.30000 | 0.04130 | 0.38900 | 0.00020 | 0.17340 |
| Major industrial | 9.88478 | 1.48000 | 0.14042 | 0.48300 | 0.00070 | 1.56130 |
| Farm | 13.90198 | 3.55000 | 0.04130 | 0.38900 | 0.00020 | 0.35100 |
| Utilities | 29.49075 | 13.20000 | 0.14455 | 0.48300 | 0.00070 | 2.30930 |

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services

2019 general revenue fund assessment and taxation by property class (in \$000s)

| | % | | % of taxation | |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|
| | Assessment | by class | Taxation | by class |
| Residential | \$84,391,147 | 78.56% | \$130,751 | 56.58% |
| Business | 18,964,170 | 17.65% | 80,982 | 35.04% |
| Light industrial | 3,528,011 | 3.28% | 15,065 | 6.52% |
| Seasonal / Recreational | 221,291 | 0.21% | 316 | 0.14% |
| Major industrial | 259,457 | 0.24% | 2,565 | 1.11% |
| Farm | 26,166 | 0.02% | 364 | 0.16% |
| Utilities | 35,869 | 0.03% | 1,058 | 0.46% |
| Total | \$107,426,111 | 100.00% | \$231,101 | 100.00% |

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services Amounts are based on billing.

Taxes levied on behalf of taxing authorities (in \$000s)

| | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| City of Richmond | \$190,074 | \$199,744 | \$207,802 | \$216,908 | \$231,100 |
| School Board | 147,087 | 150,420 | 162,120 | 169,005 | 181,863 |
| Metro Vancouver | 4,499 | 4,859 | 5,216 | 5,915 | 6,922 |
| BC Assessment | 4,973 | 5,087 | 5,517 | 5,737 | 5,894 |
| TransLink | 32,644 | 32,623 | 34,380 | 35,991 | 38,863 |
| Other | 16 | 18 | 23 | 26 | 29 |
| Total Taxes | \$379,293 | \$392,751 | \$415,058 | \$433,582 | \$464,671 |

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services Amounts are less supplementary adjustments.

| 2015-2019 | general | assessment by | y propert | y class | (in \$000s) |
|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------|---------|-------------|
|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------|---------|-------------|

| | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Residential | \$47,402,471 | \$53,427,310 | \$73,414,252 | \$80,530,838 | \$84,391,147 |
| Business | 9,770,812 | 10,669,183 | 13,093,222 | 15,848,533 | 18,964,170 |
| Light industrial | 2,208,027 | 2,338,871 | 2,624,855 | 2,998,757 | 3,528,011 |
| Seasonal / Recreational | 144,622 | 126,430 | 183,360 | 200,893 | 221,291 |
| Major industrial | 137,265 | 139,616 | 215,246 | 204,542 | 259,457 |
| Farm | 26,364 | 26,650 | 26,566 | 26,297 | 26,166 |
| Utilities | 21,195 | 22,181 | 26,541 | 29,250 | 35,869 |
| Total | \$59,710,756 | \$66,750,241 | \$89,584,042 | \$99,839,110 | \$107,426,111 |

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services

Top 10 corporate taxpayers in Richmond



Debt servicing costs compared to general taxation revenue 2015–2019 (in \$000s)

| | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Debt servicing costs | 5,931 | 5,916 | 5,909 | 5,909 | 6,628 |
| General taxation revenue | \$189,136 | \$198,612 | \$206,901 | \$216,908 | \$230,198 |
| Debt servicing costs as a % of general taxation revenue | 3.14% | 2.98% | 2.86% | 2.72% | 2.88% |

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services

Liability servicing limit 2015–2019 (in \$000s)

| | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Liability servicing limit | 102,323 | 103,514 | 107,316 | 112,425 | 117,239 |

The liability servicing limit is a calculated amount based on 25% of specific municipal revenues.

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services



City of Richmond debt per capita 2015–2019

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services

Net debt 2015-2019 (in \$000s)

| | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Net debt | 46,583 | 42,181 | 37,603 | 32,842 | 27,891 |

| Expenses by function | 2015-2019 (in \$000s) |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
|----------------------|-----------------------|

| | 2015 | 2016* | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Community Safety | \$85,386 | \$88,702 | \$89,933 | \$98,500 | \$106,209 |
| Engineering and Public Works | 56,294 | 61,243 | 66,120 | 68,793 | 80,940 |
| Community Services | 68,246** | 59,618 | 77,387** | 63,882 | 67,522 |
| General government | 43,438 | 45,634 | 51,720 | 52,549 | 55,689 |
| Utilities | 83,650 | 84,183 | 87,757 | 89,959 | 98,653 |
| Planning and Development | 13,211 | 14,233 | 15,417 | 15,368 | 48,104*** |
| Library services | 9,463 | 9,788 | 9,619 | 9,981 | 10,601 |
| Richmond Olympic Oval | 13,395 | 15,120 | 15,331 | 15,424 | 15,972 |
| Lulu Island Energy Company | 491 | 943 | - | - | - |
| Total expenses | \$373,574 | \$379,464 | \$413,284 | \$414,456 | \$483,690 |

* Amounts have been restated.

** Includes one-time affordable housing contributions.

*** Includes one-time TransLink contribution for Capstan Station.

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services

Expenses by object 2015–2019 (in \$000s)

| | 2015 | 2016* | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Wages, salaries and benefits | \$147,996 | \$152,286 | \$159,576 | \$162,331 | \$177,363 |
| Public works maintenance | 15,294 | 14,368 | 14,973 | 13,405 | 15,299 |
| Contract services | 59,073 | 63,583 | 64,912 | 73,479 | 79,098 |
| Supplies and materials | 55,750 | 60,227 | 65,959 | 67,919 | 68,801 |
| Interest and finance | 21,391 | 22,602 | 23,216 | 23,149 | 26,089 |
| Transfer from (to) capital for tangible capital assets | 19,349 | 9,417 | 25,712 | 13,307 | 52,244 |
| Amortization of tangible capital assets | 53,966 | 55,960 | 58,012 | 60,542 | 64,228 |
| Loss/(gain) on disposal of tangible capital assets | 755 | 1,021 | 924 | 324 | 568 |
| Total expenses | \$373,574 | \$379,464 | \$413,284 | \$414,456 | \$483,690 |

* Amounts have been restated.

Revenue by source 2015–2019 (in \$000s)

| | 2015 | 2016* | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Taxation and levies | \$189,136 | \$198,612 | \$206,901 | \$216,908 | \$230,198 |
| User fees | 94,290 | 97,819 | 99,493 | 102,915 | 111,472 |
| Sales of services | 34,186 | 38,231 | 39,430 | 39,111 | 42,747 |
| Licences and permits | 10,747 | 12,422 | 13,011 | 13,637 | 13,030 |
| Investment income | 16,303 | 17,614 | 17,832 | 20,705 | 25,142 |
| Grants including casino revenue | 43,318 | 41,430 | 40,676 | 42,681 | 42,104 |
| Development cost charges | 17,818 | 16,632 | 15,710 | 17,432 | 13,802 |
| Capital funding | 72,575 | 34,283 | 57,570 | 95,859 | 39,028 |
| Other | 48,755 | 35,543 | 32,544 | 50,169 | 64,419 |
| Total revenue | \$527,128 | \$492,586 | \$523,167 | \$599,417 | \$581,942 |

* Amounts have been restated.

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services

Accumulated surplus 2015-2019 (in \$000s)

| | 2015 | 2016* | 2017** | 2018 | 2019 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Accumulated surplus, beginning of year | \$2,577,640 | \$2,735,306 | \$2,846,246 | \$2,956,129 | \$3,141,090 |
| Annual surplus | 153,554 | 113,122 | 109,883 | 184,961 | 98,252 |
| Accumulated surplus, end of year | \$2,731,194 | \$2,848,428 | \$2,956,129 | \$3,141,090 | \$3,239,342 |

* Amounts have been restated.

** Opening adjustment for change in accounting treatment for a government business enterprise.

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services

Changes in net financial assets 2015–2019 (in \$000s)

| | 2015 | 2016* | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Change in net financial assets | \$61,390 | (\$1,271) | \$35,351 | \$65,031 | \$42,748 |
| Net financial assets, end of year | \$664,010 | \$662,739 | \$698,090 | \$763,121 | \$805,869 |

* Amounts have been restated.

Reserves 2015–2019 (in \$000s)

| | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Affordable housing | \$24,934 | \$23,726 | \$10,168 | \$10,836 | \$11,705 |
| Arts, culture and heritage | 4,449 | 4,538 | 4,183 | 4,003 | 3,726 |
| Capital building and infrastructure | 60,412 | 63,476 | 69,731 | 81,763 | 100,686 |
| Capital reserve | 157,778 | 155,672 | 163,599 | 176,142 | 171,976 |
| Capstan Station | 9,508 | 14,957 | 19,725 | 32,332 | 32,318 |
| Child care development | 2,335 | 3,789 | 3,006 | 6,806 | 8,922 |
| Community legacy and land replacement | 16,994 | 8,413 | 8,623 | 8,852 | 1,310 |
| Drainage improvement | 52,922 | 55,903 | 56,956 | 56,132 | 55,645 |
| Equipment replacement | 16,882 | 18,571 | 22,168 | 19,600 | 20,203 |
| Hamilton area plan community amenity | - | - | 735 | 752 | 1,720 |
| Leisure facilities | 5,275 | 5,568 | 6,765 | 18,765 | 17,676 |
| Local improvements | 6,767 | 6,222 | 6,047 | 7,155 | 7,327 |
| Neighbourhood improvement | 6,975 | 6,933 | 7,100 | 7,520 | 7,860 |
| Richmond Olympic Oval | 3,191 | 4,261 | 4,749 | 6,324 | 8,856 |
| Public art program | 3,056 | 3,108 | 3,861 | 4,860 | 4,858 |
| Sanitary sewer | 41,687 | 44,527 | 42,909 | 44,107 | 47,731 |
| Steveston off-street parking | 299 | 305 | 310 | 317 | 325 |
| Steveston road ends | 458 | 407 | 211 | 155 | 150 |
| Waterfront improvement | 642 | 615 | 344 | 317 | 202 |
| Watermain replacement | 46,614 | 50,855 | 53,693 | 53,415 | 54,380 |
| Total reserves | \$461,178 | \$471,846 | \$484,883 | \$540,153 | \$557,576 |



Investment portfolio per type 2018–2019 (in \$000s)

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services

Ratio analysis indicators of financial condition

| | 2019 | 2018 |
|---|-------|-------|
| Sustainability ratios | | |
| Assets to liabilities (times) | 7.3 | 7.7 |
| Financial assets to liabilities (times) | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Net debt to total revenues | 4.8% | 5.5% |
| Net debt to the total assessment | 0.03% | 0.03% |
| Expenses to the total assessment | 0.5% | 0.4% |
| Flexibility ratios | | |
| Public debt charges to revenues | 0.3% | 0.3% |
| Net book value of capital assets to its cost | 67.8% | 68.3% |
| Own source revenue to the assessment | 0.5% | 0.5% |
| Vulnerability ratios | | |
| Government transfers to total revenues | 4.4% | 4.5% |
| Course City of Disharan I Finance and Conservate Convince | | |

2019 permissive property tax exemptions

In accordance with Section 98 (2)(b) of the Community Charter, we disclose that the following properties were provided permissive property tax exemptions by Richmond City Council in 2019. Permissive tax exemptions are those exemptions granted by bylaw in accordance with Section 224 of the Community Charter.

| Property / Organization | Address | 2019 Municipal tax exempted |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Churches and religious properties | | |
| Aga Khan Foundation Canada | 4000 May Drive | \$ 20,729 |
| BC Muslim Association | 12300 Blundell Road | 1,953 |
| Bakerview Gospel Chapel | 8991 Francis Road | 3,452 |
| Beth Tikvah Congregation | 9711 Geal Road | 20,951 |
| Bethany Baptist Church | 22680 Westminster Highway | 11,552 |
| Brighouse United Church | 8151 Bennett Road | 18,310 |
| Broadmoor Baptist Church | 8140 Saunders Road | 12,074 |
| Canadian Martyrs Parish | 5771 Granville Avenue | 28,211 |
| Christian and Missionary Alliance | 3360 Sexmith Road | 7,966 |
| Christian Reformed Church | 9280 No. 2 Road | 25,059 |
| Church in Richmond | 4460 Brown Road | 2,895 |
| Church of Latter Day Saints | 8440 Williams Road | 23,859 |
| Cornerstone Evangelical Baptist Church | 12011 Blundell Road | 646 |
| Dharma Drum Mountain Buddhist Temple | 8240 No. 5 Road | 1,050 |
| Emmanuel Christian Community | 10351 No. 1 Road | 11,491 |
| Faith Evangelical Church | 11960 Montego Street | 4,760 |
| Fraserview Mennonite Brethren Church | 11295 Mellis Drive | 7,561 |
| Fujian Evangelical Church | 12200 Blundell Road | 2,702 |
| Gilmore Park United Church | 8060 No. 1 Road | 3,721 |
| I Kuan Tao (Fayi Chungder) Association | 8866 Odlin Crescent | 5,197 |
| Immanuel Christian Reformed Church | 7600 No. 4 Road | 3,072 |
| India Cultural Centre | 8600 No. 5 Road | 2,655 |
| International Buddhist Society | 9160 Steveston Highway | 4,327 |
| Johrei Fellowship Inc. | 10380 Odlin Road | 6,170 |
| Lansdowne Congregation Jehovah's Witnesses | 11014 Westminster Highway | 2,656 |
| Larch St. Gospel Meeting Room | 8020 No. 5 Road | 2,240 |
| Ling Yen Mountain Temple | 10060 No. 5 Road | 4,576 |
| Nanaksar Gurdwara Gursikh Temple | 18691 Westminster Highway | 2,465 |
| North Richmond Alliance Church | 9140 Granville Avenue | 6,435 |
| Our Saviour Lutheran Church | 6340 No. 4 Road | 2,942 |
| Parish of St. Alban's | 7260 St. Albans Road | 18,617 |

| charches and rengious properties continued. | * * | |
|---|---------------------------|----------|
| Patterson Road Assembly | 9291 Walford Street | \$ 1,068 |
| Peace Evangelical Church | 8280 No. 5 Road | 1,058 |
| Peace Mennonite Church | 11571 Daniels Road | 16,768 |
| Richmond Alliance Church | 11371 No. 3 Road | 2,042 |
| Richmond Baptist Church | 6560 Blundell Road | 4,460 |
| Richmond Baptist Church | 6640 Blundell Road | 14,813 |
| Richmond Bethel Mennonite Church | 10160 No. 5 Road | 3,638 |
| Richmond Chinese Alliance Church | 10100 No. 1 Road | 18,485 |
| Richmond Chinese Evangelical Free Church | 8040 No. 5 Road | 2,175 |
| Richmond Emmanuel Church | 7451 Elmbridge Way | 8,618 |
| Richmond Pentecostal Church | 9300 Westminster Highway | 3,744 |
| Richmond Pentecostal Church | 9260 Westminster Highway | 2,229 |
| Richmond Presbyterian Church | 7111 No. 2 Road | 14,613 |
| Richmond Sea Island United Church | 8711 Cambie Road | 25,375 |
| Salvation Army Church | 8280 Gilbert Road | 4,633 |
| Science of Spirituality SKRM Inc. | 11011 Shell Road | 1,119 |
| Shia Muslim Community | 8580 No. 5 Road | 1,666 |
| South Arm United Church | 11051 No. 3 Road | 1,023 |
| St. Anne's Anglican Church | 4071 Francis Road | 7,748 |
| St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church | 13780 Westminster Highway | 976 |
| St. Joseph the Worker Roman Catholic Church | 4451 Williams Road | 5,640 |
| St. Monica's Roman Catholic Church | 12011 Woodhead Road | 10,190 |
| St. Paul's Roman Catholic Parish | 8251 St. Albans Road | 20,633 |
| Steveston Buddhist Temple | 4360 Garry Street | 30,535 |
| Steveston Congregation Jehovah's Witnesses | 4260 Williams Road | 13,029 |
| Steveston United Church | 3720 Broadway Street | 5,419 |
| Subramaniya Swamy Temple | 8840 No. 5 Road | 1,350 |
| Thrangu Monastery Association | 8140 No. 5 Road | 3,184 |
| Thrangu Monastery Association | 8160 No. 5 Road | 1,381 |
| Towers Baptist Church | 10311 Albion Road | 11,898 |
| Trinity Lutheran Church | 7100 Granville Avenue | 20,195 |
| Trinity Pacific Church | 10011 No. 5 Road | 9,134 |
| Ukrainian Catholic Church | 8700 Railway Avenue | 6,885 |
| Vancouver Airport Chaplaincy | 3211 Grant McConachie Way | 578 |
| Vancouver International Buddhist Progress Society | 6690 - 8181 Cambie Road | 7,728 |
| Vancouver International Buddhist Progress Society | 8271 Cambie Road | 9,554 |
| Vedic Cultural Society of BC | 8200 No. 5 Road | 3,167 |
| West Richmond Gospel Hall | 5651 Francis Road | 8,869 |
| | | |

| Atira Women's Resource Society | 650 - 5688 Hollybridge Way | \$ 5,062 |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Canadian Sport Institute Pacific Society | 2005 - 6111 River Road | 4,371 |
| Cook Road Children's Centre | 8300 Cook Road | 2,048 |
| Cranberry Children's Centre | 23591 Westminster Highway | 3,580 |
| Gardens Children's Centre | 10640 No. 5 Road | 3,909 |
| Girl Guides of Canada | 4780 Blundell Road | 6,907 |
| Girl Guides of Canada | 11551 Dyke Road | 18,982 |
| Navy League of Canada | 7411 River Road | 8,274 |
| Richmond Animal Protection Society | 12071 No. 5 Road | 11,628 |
| Richmond Caring Place | 7000 Minoru Boulevard | 122,893 |
| Richmond Centre for Disability | 100 - 5671 No. 3 Road | 26,976 |
| Richmond Family Place | 8660 Ash Street | 9,029 |
| Richmond Ice Centre | 14140 Triangle Road | 236,975 |
| Richmond Lawn Bowling Club | 6131 Bowling Green Road | 47,107 |
| Richmond Gymnastics Association | 140 - 7400 River Road | 10,192 |
| Richmond Olympic Oval | 6111 River Road | 1,214,408 |
| Richmond Public Library | 11580 Cambie Road | 2,700 |
| Richmond Public Library | 11688 Steveston Highway | 11,983 |
| Richmond Rod and Gun Club | 7760 River Road | 26,562 |
| Richmond Rod and Gun Club | 140 - 7400 River Road | 5,096 |
| Richmond Tennis Club | 6820 Gilbert Road | 55,318 |
| Richmond Winter Club | 5540 Hollybridge Way | 250,541 |
| Riverside Children's Centre | 5862 Dover Crescent | 1,052 |
| Scotch Pond Heritage | 2220 Chatham Street | 5,762 |
| Seasong Child Care Centre | 10380 No. 2 Road | 16,130 |
| Terra Nova Children's Centre | 6011 Blanchard Drive | 2,001 |
| Treehouse Learning Centre | 100 - 5500 Andrews Road | 1,960 |
| Watermania | 14300 Entertainment Boulevard | 195,975 |
| West Cambie Child Care Centre | 4033 Stolberg Street | 3,488 |

Recreation, child care and community service properties

Senior citizen housing

Richmond Legion Senior Citizen Society

7251 Langton Road

\$ 23,890

Community care facilities

| Canadian Mental Health Association | 8911 Westminster Highway | \$ 11,668 |
|---|--------------------------|-----------|
| Developmental Disabilities Association | 6531 Azure Road | 2,443 |
| Developmental Disabilities Association | 8400 Robinson Road | 3,140 |
| Developmental Disabilities Association | 7611 Langton Road | 2,758 |
| Greater Vancouver Community Service | 4811 Williams Road | 3,415 |
| Pinegrove Place, Mennonite Care Home Society | 11331 Mellis Drive | 14,816 |
| Richmond Lions Manor | 9020 Bridgeport Road | 19,863 |
| Richmond Society for Community Living | 5728 Woodwards Road | 2,463 |
| Richmond Society for Community Living | 303 - 7560 Moffatt Road | 910 |
| Richmond Society for Community Living | 4433 Francis Road | 2,449 |
| Richmond Society for Community Living | 9 - 11020 No. 1 Road | 1,110 |
| Richmond Society for Community Living | 9580 Pendleton Road | 2,983 |
| Rosewood Manor, Richmond Intermediate Care Society | 6260 Blundell Road | 40,127 |
| Western Recovery Foundation | 10411 Odlin Road | 2,416 |
| | | |

Major services provided by the City of Richmond

Administration

Includes the office of the Chief Administrative Officer who oversees the overall administration of the City's operations. Also includes the Deputy Chief Administrative Officers, Human Resources, Intergovernmental Relations and Protocol, Corporate Communications and Marketing, Corporate Planning and Organizational Development and the Corporate Programs Management Group.

Community Safety

Brings together the City's public safety providers including police, fire-rescue, emergency programs, community bylaws and business licences.

Community Services

Coordinates, supports and develops Richmond's community services including Parks Services, Recreation and Sport Services and Arts, Culture and Heritage Services.

Engineering and Public Works

The Engineering and Public Works Departments deliver public works services and utilities and engineering planning, design, construction and maintenance services for all utility and City building infrastructure.

Finance and Corporate Services

Includes Customer Service, Information Technology, Finance, Economic Development, Real Estate Services and Corporate Business Service Solutions.

Planning and Development

Includes the Policy Planning, Transportation, Development Applications, Building Approvals and Community Social Development Departments. This division provides policy directions that guide growth and change in Richmond with emphasis on land use planning, development regulations, environmental protection, heritage and livability.

Legal and Legislative Services

Includes the Law Department and the City Clerk's Office.

Other City entities

Gateway Theatre

Operates the City's performing arts theatre.

Lulu Island Energy Company

Operates the City's district energy utilities.

Richmond Olympic Oval Corporation

Operates the Richmond Olympic Oval and the Richmond Sport Hosting program.

Richmond Public Library

Operates Richmond's public library, including four branches.

City of Richmond contacts

The City of Richmond offers many civic services to the community. Additional services to the community are provided through the Richmond Olympic Oval, Richmond Public Library, Gateway Theatre and Lulu Island Energy Company. For more information on City services contact:

City of Richmond

6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1 Phone: 604-276-4000 Email: infocentre@richmond.ca www.richmond.ca

f @cityofrichmondbc

😏 @Richmond_BC

(O) @cityofrichmondbc

🔼 /CityofRichmondBC

Gateway Theatre

6500 Gilbert Road Richmond, BC V7C 3V4 Phone: 604-270-6500 Box Office: 604-270-1812 www.gatewaytheatre.com

f @GatewayThtr

😏 @GatewayThtr

O @gatewaythtr

Lulu Island Energy Company

6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1 Phone: 604-276-4011 Email: info@luluislandenergy.ca

Richmond Public Library

100-7700 Minoru Gate (Brighouse Branch) Richmond, BC V6Y 1R8 Hours: 604-231-6401 www.YourLibrary.ca

- @yourlibraryRichmond
 @RPLBC
- () @rplbc

/YourLibraryRichmond

🚳 Account: RPLYourlibrary1

Richmond Olympic Oval

6111 River Road Richmond, BC V7C 0A2 Phone: 778-296-1400 Email: info@richmondoval.ca

f @richmondoval

🍠 @RichmondOval

(C) @richmondoval

City of Richmond 2019 Annual Report



City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1 Telephone: 604-276-4000 www.richmond.ca

Contents printed on Canadian made, 100% recycled stock using environmentally friendly toners.



2019 Annual Report Highlights

For the year ended December 31, 2019



RICHMOND CITY COUNCIL



Front row, left to right: Councillor Michael Wolfe, Councillor Bill McNulty, Mayor Malcolm Brodie, Councillor Linda McPhail, Councillor Kelly Greene

Back row, left to right: Deputy Fire Chief Kevin Gray, Richmond Fire-Rescue, Councillor Harold Steves, Councillor Carol Day, Councillor Chak Au, Councillor Alexa Loo, Constable Leah Riske, Richmond RCMP

CONNECT WITH RICHMOND CITY COUNCIL

To contact Council, email mayorandcouncillors@richmond.ca or call 604-276-4000. For Council meeting agendas and minutes, visit www.richmond.ca/cityhall/council/agendas. To watch Council meetings on live streaming or view videos of past meetings, visit www.richmond.ca/watchonline.

> COVER PHOTOS: MINORU CHAPEL, WEST DYKE TRAIL AND "TOGETHER" PUBLIC ART WORK IN FRONT OF MINORU CENTRE FOR ACTIVE LIVING - THREE OF THE WINNING SUBMISSIONS IN THE CITY'S ANNUAL STREET BANNER CONTEST.



CITY OF RICHMOND, BRITISH COLUMBIA 2019 ANNUAL REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2019

CONTENTS

| Richmond City Council | 2 |
|----------------------------------|----|
| Message from the Mayor | 4 |
| Message from the Chief | |
| Administrative Officer | 6 |
| 2019 Achievement highlights | 8 |
| Richmond: safe, sustainable, | |
| culturally diverse | 12 |
| 2019 Awards | 14 |
| Report from the General Manager, | |
| Finance and Corporate Services | 18 |
| Richmond at a glance | 20 |
| Major services provided by | |
| the City of Richmond | 22 |
| City of Richmond contacts | |

This report features highlights from Richmond's 2019 Annual Report. For the detailed 2019 Annual Report that meets legislated requirements, or for an online copy of this highlights report, please visit www.richmond.ca (City Hall > Finance, Taxes & Budgets > Financial Reporting > Annual Reports).

This report was prepared by the City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Communications and Marketing Departments. Design, layout and production by the City of Richmond Production Centre. © 2020 City of Richmond.

Contents printed on 100% recycled stock, using environmentally friendly toners.

"Our vision is to be the most appealing, livable and well-managed community in Canada."

CNCL – 198

MESSAGE FROM THE MAYOR



The City of Richmond's 2019 Annual Report reflects another year of innovation and success as we move towards achieving our vision of being Canada's most livable and well-managed community.

Council entered 2019 with a fouryear strategy to guide us through the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead. To make that plan a reality, we identified eight strategic initiatives that focus on the areas essential to our growth, security and prosperity.

The City of Richmond has always provided a high quality of life and worked hard to preserve this standard far into the future. 2019 was no exception. We know safety and security is a priority so by building a strong foundation of first responders and other programs, Richmond can continue to boast one of the lowest rates of violence and property crime in the Lower Mainland.

Recognizing the impact of climate change, Richmond joined many others in declaring a climate emergency. While not a substitute for action, it reinforced the importance of the extensive environmental programs that we have undertaken for decades. As a local government leader in climate action, we are committed to implementing practices to build a sustainable and environmentally-conscious City for our 212,000 residents.



Richmond was also among the first to propose bylaws banning single-use plastics—a step that could keep around 650 tonnes of non-recyclable plastic from the waste system. At the same time, our Community Energy and Emissions Plan guides us in reducing greenhouse gas emissions by up to 50% over the next decade despite growth in density and population.

In terms of growth, City staff issued building permits for over \$980 million in construction in 2019. We are constantly working with developers and stakeholders to find new and innovative partnerships so we can create strong, connected communities that build a sense of pride, family and belonging.

The City of Richmond is one community. It is a place of resiliency, identity and belonging. Our diversity makes Richmond truly unique and the impacts are visible throughout the City. Differences in cultural heritage strengthen our sense of neighborhood and community, and our Cultural Harmony Plan—the first such municipal plan in Canada—demonstrates our leadership in building on social inclusion practices. Our City's first painted rainbow crosswalk is a lasting reminder that Richmond is a place of inclusion, respect and support. Our success is a credit to those who contribute to making Richmond a better place, including our staff, volunteers, business, and community and government partners. This Annual Report contains examples of our goals and achievements and, as always, I invite your comments and questions through my office.

Malcolm Brodie Mayor, City of Richmond



CNCL – 200

MESSAGE FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER



I am pleased to present the City of Richmond's Annual Report for 2019. It details our strong financial position, and outlines many of the initiatives we are undertaking to achieve our vision of making Richmond Canada's best managed city.

During this past year, our administration made significant progress in implementing Council's new strategic plan, which is comprised of eight initiatives. Many of those achievements are highlighted throughout this report.

Our city has long been recognized as a leader in environmental action and sustainability, while supporting development and building strong and connected communities. Our awardwinning District Energy Utility continued to expand, as did our commitment to encourage clean energy transportation through further implementation of electric vehicle charging stations.

As Richmond continued to grow, so did the need for services to support our community which is rich in both cultural and economic diversity. While Richmond was one of the few Metro Vancouver cities to exceed its annual net new home housing target in 2019, we also acted to ensure a variety of housing options were maintained. The City worked with



6 | City of Richmond 2019 Annual Report Highlights

```
CNCL – 201
```

the development community to create more affordable rental housing, securing agreements for 179 new units for low and moderate income Richmond households. We also secured over \$2.4 million cash-inlieu contributions to be applied towards future affordable housing options.

Providing support for young families remained a focus, with our award-winning five-year child care strategy continuing to be recognized as a municipal leader in fostering conditions for a comprehensive child care system.

One of the foundations for any successful organization is its ability to demonstrate strong financial stewardship.

Our City's long term financial strategy remained a hallmark of our administration and enabled us to continue to limit property tax increases, while still making significant investments in infrastructure and programs. Richmond's property taxes were again among the lowest in the region and our sound fiscal management positioned us well to address future challenges and opportunities. The City of Richmond is committed to strengthening our community and encouraging growth within a framework of diversity, sustainability and value for our taxpayers.

George Duncan Chief Administrative Officer





OF BRITISH COLUMBIA MUNICIPALITIES EXCELLENCE AWARD IN GOVERNANCE.

CNCL - 202



2019 Highlights



CNCL – 204

The City of Richmond's objectives and success indicators are expressed through the Council Strategic Plan. Soon after the new Council began its four-year term in October 2018, it undertook a strategic planning process to help it fulfill its governance role and achieve a successful term of office. Through that process, Council adopted a revised set of eight Strategic Focus areas, which provides the framework for the City's programs and services from 2018 to 2022.

For more detail, visit www.richmond.ca/cityhall/council/about/strategicplan.

The following achievements represent highlights of our work to fulfil these goals in 2019:

1. A SAFE AND RESILIENT COMMUNITY

As part of our Safe Community Priority Program, 19 new RCMP officers and 12 firefighters were added to strengthen our existing first responder resources. More recruits for each are expected over the next two years.

2. A SUSTAINABLE AND ENVIRONMENTALLY CONSCIOUS CITY

Council developed bylaws banning single-use plastics such as straws, shopping bags and foam containers, potentially removing as many as 35 million items weighing 650 tonnes from the waste stream annually.

3. ONE COMMUNITY TOGETHER

Richmond became the first community in Canada to develop a municipal Cultural Harmony Plan. The Plan demonstrates the City's leadership in building on its social inclusion practices and recognizes our unique cultural diversity.

4. AN ACTIVE AND THRIVING RICHMOND

Our first emergency shelter, temporary modular housing and a unique partnership with Richmond RCMP and Vancouver Coastal Health on a mental health car reinforced our commitment to support those in need.

> THE 40-UNIT TEMPORARY MODULAR HOUSING PROJECT ON ALDERBRIDGE WAY OPENED TO HELP THOSE WHO ARE MOST VULNERABLE IN THE COMMUNITY.

5. SOUND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The acquisition of the Richmond Ice Centre, a 155,000 square foot multi-rink facility situated on over 3.0 strategicallylocated hectares in the Riverport area, turned a highly-used leased facility into a City-owned asset and another major investment in civic infrastructure for recreation.

6. STRATEGIC AND WELL-PLANNED GROWTH

Through a unique partnership, the City forwarded \$28.1 million of developer funds to TransLink for construction of a new Canada Line transit station. This will support the rapidly-growing Capstan Village community and reflects the increasing ridership of the Canada Line.

7. A SUPPORTED ECONOMIC SECTOR

Richmond's strong business sector boasts one of the highest job-to-worker ratios in the region, reflecting its important location as a gateway for people and goods movement such as transportation, warehousing and logistics, manufacturing, wholesale and tourism.

8. AN ENGAGED AND INFORMED COMMUNITY

The City's LetsTalkRichmond.ca platform continues to connect and engage residents of all backgrounds from across our community on a diverse range of topics ranging from single-use plastics and sustainability, to cultural harmony and our Farming First strategy.



THE RICHMOND WORLD FESTIVAL BRINGS EVERYONE TOGETHER TO CELEBRATE THE CITY'S SIGNIFICANT CULTURAL DIVERSITY.

Richmond: safe, sustainable, culturally diverse

As this city grows, our commitment to its citizens grows with it.

In 2019, the City secured agreements for 179 new affordable housing units for low and moderate income Richmond households, and over \$2.4 million cashin-lieu contributions for future affordable housing options. The opening of a 36-bed emergency shelter in Ironwood, as well as a 40-unit temporary supportive housing facility on Alderbridge Way, offered support to some of the city's most vulnerable as part of our first Homelessness Strategy approved by Council in late 2019.

As an established local government leader in climate action, Richmond is committed to implementing practices to build a sustainable and environmentallyconscious city that will benefit current and future generations. From bylaws to ban single-use plastics—removing 650 tonnes from the waste stream annually—to electric vehicles and circular economy principles, our actions are the importance of the extensive environmental programs that Richmond has undertaken for decades.



ABOVE: THE CITY ENGAGED WITH THE COMMUNITY TO INFORM THE PUBLIC ABOUT THE PROPOSED BYLAW TO BAN SINGLE-USE PLASTICS.



ABOVE: THE NEW EMERGENCY SHELTER PROVIDES SAFE AND SECURE SHELTER SPACES IN A SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR UP TO 36 PEOPLE-MORE THAN TRIPLE THE NUMBER THAT EXISTED PREVIOUSLY.



ABOVE: RICHMOND'S FIRST RAINBOW CROSSWALK ON MINORU BOULEVARD.

CNCL - 207

RICHMOND'S CULTURAL HARMONY PLAN DEMONSTRATES THE CITY'S LEADERSHIP IN BUILDING ON ITS SOCIAL INCLUSION PRACTICES. IT ALSO SIGNIFIES THE CITY'S ROLE IN RESPONDING TO THE EVOLVING NEEDS OF RICHMOND'S INCREASINGLY DIVERSE POPULATION.



The diversity among our 212,000 residents is truly unique and makes us stronger as a community. We strengthened our sense of neighbourhood and community through Canada's first municipal Cultural Harmony Plan, which reinforces our leadership in building on our social inclusion practices. 2019 also saw the installation of our city's first painted rainbow crosswalk on Minoru Boulevard, a lasting reminder that Richmond is a city of inclusion, respect and support.

Our many achievements during 2019 and expectations for the future will continue to improve the lives and affairs of our residents and businesses. The City of Richmond has always been a leader with bold, innovative programs and strategies that reflect our character and reputation as a safe, sustainable and culturally diverse city—the most appealing, livable and wellmanaged community in Canada.





2019 Awards

A measurement of the City's success in achieving its goals are the honours and recognition we received from our peers and others. In 2019, Richmond again received numerous international, national and provincial awards recognizing our commitment to excellence and innovation.

CLIMATE ACTION

The City of Richmond's first-of-itskind Electric Vehicle (EV) infrastructure requirement was recognized with a Climate and Energy Action Award from the Community Energy Association. Richmond was the first municipality to enact a policy requiring that 100 per cent of new residential parking spaces be equipped with Level 2 electric vehicle charging capacity. The Climate and Energy Action Award recognizes climate leadership of BC local governments.

TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION

Richmond is the first municipality in the Lower Mainland to regulate the quality of non-storm discharge water into its sewer system and watercourses using primarily field-measurable parameters, an innovation recognized by the BC Environmental Managers Association with the 2019 Technological Innovation Award. The implementation of a simplified non-storm water discharge management program safeguards the City's sewers and strengthens environmental protections.

DISTRICT ENERGY

The recipient of over a dozen awards in the past decade, Richmond's District Energy Program continues to collect accolades for its innovation, efficiency and green sustainability. Among its honours in 2019 was an Association of Energy Engineers, Canada Region – Project of the Year Award for an innovative renewable energy project and a Canadian Association of Municipal Administrators Award of Excellence – Environment Award for the commitment of a municipality to environmentally sustainable governance, to protecting the environment and to combating climate change.

CNCL - 209

PROMOTING LOW CARBON PERSONAL VEHICLES AND SETTING REQUIREMENTS FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE HELPS THE CITY REDUCE COMMUNITY ENERGY USE AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMMISIONS.

CNCL - 210

BRITANNIA HERITAGE SHIPYARDS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

CHILD CARE

The City received the Union of British Columbia Municipalities Community Excellence Award in Governance which recognized the City's 2017–2022 Richmond Child Care Needs Assessment and Strategy. Richmond's investment in a municipal child care strategy began in 1991. The vision for this five year strategy is for the City to build on those three decades of work to continue to be a municipal leader in fostering conditions for a comprehensive child care system.

FINANCIAL REPORTING

Once again, the Government Finance Officers Association of the US and Canada presented Richmond with the Canadian Award for Financial Reporting for the 17th year in a row and the Popular Financial Reporting Award for the 10th successive year for our 2018 Annual Report.

16 | City of Richmond 2019 Annual Report Highlights

CNCL – 211

FLOOD PROTECTION

The City was given the Award of Merit by the Association of Consulting Engineering Companies BC for the Britannia Heritage Shipyard Flood Protection Improvements Project, which upgraded flood prevention infrastructure for a national historic site that is located outside of Richmond's diking network.

STOREYS HOUSING PROJECT

The Storeys affordable housing project, a unique mixed-use community housing partnership between five non-profit agencies and the City of Richmond, received an Ovation Award from the Homebuilders Association of Vancouver for the Best Multi-Family High-rise Development.



Government Finance Officers Association

Award for Outstanding Achievement in Popular Annual Financial Reporting

> Presented to City of Richmond British Columbia

For its Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended

December 31, 2018

Chintophen P. Morrill Executive Director/CEO



REPORT FROM THE GENERAL MANAGER, FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

I am pleased to submit the highlights of the Consolidated Financial Statements for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2019 for the City of Richmond, pursuant to Section 98 and 167 of the Community Charter. The consolidated financial statements have been prepared in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards as prescribed by the Public Sector Accounting Board (PSAB) of the Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada.

KPMG LLP was appointed by City Council to independently audit the City's consolidated financial statements. They have expressed an opinion that the City's consolidated financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the consolidated financial position of the City



of Richmond as at December 31, 2019 and its consolidated results of operations, its changes in net consolidated financial assets and its consolidated cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

These financial statements combine the accounts of the City of Richmond, Richmond Olympic Oval, and Richmond Public Library (collectively referred to as the "City"), as well as the City's investment in Lulu Island Energy Company, which is accounted for as a Government Business Enterprise.

| CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT | OF FINANCIA | L POSITION (I | N \$000S) |
|------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------|
| , | 2019 Actual | 2018 Actual | Change |
| Financial assets | \$1,320,747 | \$1,231,060 | \$89,687 |
| Liabilities | 514,878 | 467,939 | 46,939 |
| Net financial assets | 805,869 | 763,121 | 42,748 |
| Non-financial assets | 2,433,473 | 2,377,969 | 55,504 |
| Accumulated surplus | \$3,239,342 | \$3,141,090 | \$98,252 |

The City's overall financial position improved by \$98.3 million, with accumulated surplus totalling \$3.2 billion. A significant part of this increase is due to growth in financial assets, as well as additions to capital and statutory reserves. This is partially offset by an increase in liabilities, especially deferred revenue related to the collection of Development Cost Charges (DCCs).

The City's cash and investments have grown to \$1.2 billion while long-term debt continues to decline with an outstanding balance at the end of 2019 of \$27.9 million. Meanwhile, the City's tangible capital assets increased by \$56.1 million, which includes \$28.9 million of in-kind contributions from development as conditions of re-zoning.

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS (IN \$000S)

| | 2019 Budget | 2019 Actual | 2018 Actual |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Revenue | \$541,121 | \$581,942 | \$599,417 |
| Expenses | 463,338 | 483,690 | 414,456 |
| Annual surplus | \$77,783 | \$98,252 | \$184,961 |

The City's consolidated revenue for the year totaled \$581.9 million, a decrease of \$17.5 million from 2018 mainly due to significant development-related contributions received during 2018.

Expenses increased by \$69.2 million from prior year. 2019 expenses included an extraordinary contribution towards the Canada Line Capstan station of \$28.1 million.

The annual surplus for 2019 was \$98.3 million and represents the change in investment in tangible capital assets, reserves and other accumulated surplus.

FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

City Council's Long Term Financial Management Strategy has ensured prudent fiscal practices while maintaining the City's high service standards through balancing current and long term financial needs. The impact of this policy can be seen in the current financial health of the organization, which has placed the City in a strong position to mitigate some of the financial impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Nazareth, BEc, CPA, CGA General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services May 11, 2020





REVENUE BY SOURCE 2015–2019

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services

*Amounts have been restated

** Capital funding includes: Development Cost Charges and other capital funding sources

*** Other includes: provincial and federal grants, licences and permits and other sources



EXPENSES BY FUNCTION 2015–2019

Source: City of Richmond Finance and Corporate Services

* Amounts have been restated

** Expenses for Community Services include one-time contributions towards affordable housing of

\$12.3m in 2015 and \$17.0m in 2017

*** Expenses for Planning and Development for 2019 include a one-time \$28.1m contribution towards the Canada Line Capstan Station.



Richmond at a glance







December 3, 1990 DESIGNATED AS CITY OF RICHMOND

Fast facts

50.1 million

2019 CANADA LINE BOARDINGS

85.79 AVERAGE LIFE EXPECTANCY, LONGEST IN CANADA

\$981 million

CONSTRUCTION VALUE OF **BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED IN** 2019

26.3 million

2019 PASSENGERS PASSING THROUGH VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT IN RICHMOND, A NEW RECORD

39.1 mil

INVENTORY OF INDUSTRIAL SPACE IN SQUARE FEET, LARGEST IN THE REGION

807

HECTARES OF CRANBERRY FIELDS IN PRODUCTION

145,435 2019 REGISTRATIONS IN CITY PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE PROGRAMS

.1 million

2019 SITE VISITS TO THE RICHMOND OLYMPIC OVAL



OCCUPATIONS OF RICHMOND RESIDENTS







MAJOR SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE CITY OF RICHMOND

ADMINISTRATION

Includes the office of the Chief Administrative Officer who oversees the overall administration of the City's operations. Also includes the Deputy Chief Administrative Officers, Human Resources, Intergovernmental Relations and Protocol, Corporate Communications and Marketing, Corporate Planning and Organizational Development and the Corporate Programs Management Group.

COMMUNITY SAFETY

Brings together the City's public safety providers including police, fire-rescue, emergency programs, community bylaws and business licences.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Coordinates, supports and develops Richmond's community services including Parks Services, Recreation and Sport Services and Arts, Culture and Heritage Services.

ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Engineering and Public Works Departments deliver public works services and utilities and engineering planning, design, construction and maintenance services for all utility and City building infrastructure.

FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

Includes Customer Service, Information Technology, Finance, Economic Development, Real Estate Services and Corporate Business Service Solutions.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Includes the Policy Planning, Transportation, Development Applications, Building Approvals and Community Social Development Departments. This division provides policy directions that guide growth and change in Richmond with emphasis on land use planning, development regulations, environmental protection, heritage and livability.

LEGAL AND LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

Includes the Law Department and the City Clerk's Office.



CNCL – 217

CITY OF RICHMOND CONTACTS

The City of Richmond offers many civic services to the community. Additional services to the community are provided through the Richmond Olympic Oval, Richmond Public Library, Gateway Theatre and Lulu Island Energy Company. For more information on City services contact:

CITY OF RICHMOND

6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1 Phone: 604-276-4000 Email: infocentre@richmond.ca www.richmond.ca f @cityofrichmondbc f @Richmond_BC @ @cityofrichmondbc //CityofRichmondBC

GATEWAY THEATRE

6500 Gilbert Road Richmond, BC V7C 3V4 Phone: 604-270-6500 Box Office: 604-270-1812 www.gatewaytheatre.com @GatewayThtr @GatewayThtr @gatewaythtr

LULU ISLAND ENERGY COMPANY

6911 No. 3 Road Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1 Phone: 604-276-4011 Email: info@luluislandenergy.ca www.luluislandenergy.ca

RICHMOND PUBLIC LIBRARY

100-7700 Minoru Gate (Brighouse Branch)
Richmond, BC V6Y 1R8
Hours: 604-231-6401
www.YourLibrary.ca
@yourlibraryRichmond
@RPLBC
@rplbc
YourLibraryRichmond
Account: RPLYourlibrary1

RICHMOND OLYMPIC OVAL

6111 River Road Richmond, BC V7C 0A2 Phone: 778-296-1400 Email: info@richmondoval.ca www.richmondoval.ca @richmondoval @ @richmondOval @ @richmondoval



CNCL – 218



City of Richmond 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1 Telephone: 604-276-4000 www.richmond.ca

Contents printed on Canadian made, 100% recycled stock using environmentally friendly toners.





Development Permit Panel Wednesday, June 10, 2020

Time: 3:30 p.m.

- Place: Council Chambers Richmond City Hall
- Present: Joe Erceg, Chair Cecilia Achiam, General Manager, Community Safety Milton Chan, Director, Engineering

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes

It was moved and seconded That the minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel held on May 27, 2020 be adopted.

CARRIED

1.

1. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 19-876647 (REDMS No. 6473769)

APPLICANT: Easterbrook Milling Co. Ltd.

PROPERTY LOCATION: 17720 River Road

INTENT OF PERMIT:

- 1. Permit the construction of a single detached house at 17720 River Road on a site zoned "Agriculture (AG1)" and designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA); and
- 2. Vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to increase the maximum farm house footprint from 60% to 72% of the maximum floor area to accommodate a secondary suite on the ground floor for farm workers and immediate family.

Gallery Comments

None.

Correspondence

John Roston, 12262 Ewen Avenue (Schedule 1)

Wayne Craig, Director, Development, noted that Mr. Roston provided background information on previous Council decisions regarding house size on Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) areas and expressed his general support for the proposed variances in the applicant's original submission.

Richmond FarmWatch (Schedule 2)

Mr. Craig noted the organization's acknowledgement of the applicant as a long-term bona fide farmer in Richmond and their expression of support for the proposed variances in the applicant's original submission. He added that the organization expressed concern regarding the legal agreement that would restrict occupancy of the secondary suite to forcign farm workers. In response to this concern, he confirmed that the legal agreement that would be secured as a condition for approval of the subject application does not deal whatsoever with the immigration status of farm workers.

In reply to a query from the Panel, Mr. Craig confirmed that staff is recommending that the legal agreement allow occupancy of the secondary suite to either farm labourers working on a farm operation associated with the subject site or the immediate family of the property owner.

Panel Discussion

The Panel expressed support for the proposed changes to the applicant's original submission, noting that (i) there have been extensive discussions and debates in the community regarding farm house size where different views were expressed, and (ii) the application will move forward for Council consideration.

Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

That a Development Permit be issued which would:

- 1. permit the construction of a single detached house at 17720 River Road on a site zoned "Agriculture (AG1)" and designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA); and
- 2. vary the provisions of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to increase the maximum farm house footprint from 60% to 72% of the maximum floor area to accommodate a secondary suite on the ground floor for farm workers and immediate family.

CARRIED

2. Date of Next Meeting: June 24, 2020

3. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded *That the meeting be adjourned at 3:36 p.m.*

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Development Permit Panel of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Wednesday, June 10, 2020.

Joe Erceg Chair Rustico Agawin Committee Clerk Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on Wednesday, June 10, 2020.

| To D | velopment Permit Panel |
|------|------------------------|
| Date | JUNE 10, 2020 # 1 |
| | DP 19-876647 |

From: Sent: To: Subject: CityClerk Tuesday, 9 June 2020 09:01 Agawin,Rustico Romualdo

FW: Easterbrook Variance Application - Development Permit Panel

From: Powell, Jo Anne <<u>JPowell@richmond.ca</u>> Sent: June 9, 2020 8:37 AM To: CityClerk <<u>CityClerk@richmond.ca</u>> Subject: FW: Easterbrook Variance Application - Development Permit Panel

FYI

From: Erceg,Joe <<u>JErceg@richmond.ca</u>> Sent: June 5, 2020 12:28 PM To: Craig,Wayne <<u>WCraig@richmond.ca</u>>; O'Halloran,Matthew <<u>MOHalloran@richmond.ca</u>> Cc: Capuccinello Iraci,Tony <<u>ACapuccinelloiraci@richmond.ca</u>>; Powell, Jo Anne <<u>JPowell@richmond.ca</u>> Subject: Fwd: Easterbrook Variance Application - Development Permit Panel

FYI.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "John Roston, Mr" <john.roston@mcgill.ca> Date: June 5, 2020 at 11:50:22 AM PDT To: "Brodie, Malcolm" <<u>MBrodie@richmond.ca</u>>, "McNulty,Bill" <<u>BMcNulty@richmond.ca</u>>, "McPhail,Linda" <<u>LMcPhail@richmond.ca</u>>, "Loo,Alexa" <<u>ALoo@richmond.ca</u>>, "Steves,Harold" <<u>hsteves@richmond.ca</u>>, "Au,Chak" <<u>CAu@richmond.ca</u>>, "Day,Carol" <<u>CDay@richmond.ca</u>>, "Greene,Kelly" <<u>kgreene@richmond.ca</u>>, "Wolfe,Michael" <<u>MWolfe@richmond.ca</u>> Cc: "Erceg,Joe" <<u>JErceg@richmond.ca</u>>, "Konkin,Barry" <<u>BKonkin@richmond.ca</u>>, Steve

Easterbrook <<u>petrioche@gmail.com</u>>

Subject: Easterbrook Variance Application - Development Permit Panel

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

As you will recall, one of the commitments made to genuine farmers during the great ALR house size debate was that every effort would be made to accommodate any reasonable variances they might request for residence construction and that those requests would be expedited. Stephen Easterbrook is one of those farmers who spoke against limiting ALR house size. He has now applied for two variances and it appears that the Development Permit Panel is not taking into consideration the fact that he is a genuine farmer and the Panel is rather applying a very strict interpretation of the bylaws.

The height restrictions were intended to ensure that additional living space was not added. In this **CNCL – 223**

case, he appears to be requesting a variance for a chimney and a style of roof. The other variance is to accommodate a secondary suite, primarily for farm workers, on the ground floor which increases the ground floor ratio from 60% to 72% although the overall house size is within the 400m2 limit. Neither of these requests appears to be designed to increase the value of the property when it is sold, but rather to meet his needs while he continues farming for the foreseeable future.

While I didn't attend the Development Permit Panel meeting and can only rely on the minutes, it appears that the Panel's focus was on how to alter the house to eliminate the need for variances rather than to allow Mr. Easterbrook to build the house he wants and will best fit his needs. For instance, the Panel would like to limit use of the secondary suite to farm workers although the foreign farm workers in question are only permitted to be in the country for a maximum of eight months in the year.

If Council does not wish the Development Permit Panel to have the leeway of treating requests from genuine farmers differently than requests from developers then the Panel should suggest that the farmer take his case to Council and ask it to override the Panel's decision and grant the variances. It doesn't make sense to waste both the Panel's and Mr. Easterbrook's time on the current process.

John Roston 12262 Ewen Avenue Richmond, BC V7E 6S8 Phone: 604-274-2726



Schedule 2 to the Minutes of the Development Permit Panel meeting held on Wednesday, June 10, 2020.

| To Developn | nent Permit Panel |
|------------------|-------------------|
| Date: JUNE | 10, 2020 |
| Item # | |
| Re: <u>DP 19</u> | - 876647 |
| | |

June 5, 2020

Your Worship, Mayor Brodie and Councillors,

Farmers throughout Richmond have learned that a local, long-term bona fide farmer of 17720 River Road has been asked by the Development Permit Panel to sign a restrictive covenant.

An email from Stephen Easterbrook states that this restrictive covenant is required as a condition of building a new home with a secondary suite to house foreign farmworkers.

We have significant concerns about this request and see it as unreasonable and as over-reach on the part of the Development Permit Panel.

The farmer is requesting two minor variances which will help facilitate the functioning and viability of his farm. It's clear that he has taken extensive efforts at significant costs to comply with all City requirements including keeping his proposed home, which includes farm worker housing in the home, within the 400m2 house size limit.

The glaring concern is the covenant being required to assure that the suite within the home only be occupied by foreign farm workers. In the case they may be seasonal workers, under the Federal Seasonal Agricultural Worker program, foreign farm workers are prohibited from staying in Canada more than eight months. <u>https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/work-canada/permit/agricultural-workers-work-temporarily.html</u>

A farmer, during these months may need to use the suite for other purposes that suit the farm. In the case of longer term non-seasonal farm workers, why only foreign workers? What if extended family wishes to work on the farm, or local farm workers or farm workers from another province? Also there are any number of reasons such as aging, disabilities or extended family circumstances that a farmer, or any homeowner, may need to use a suite in their home. Secondary permanent dwellings have been conditional to farm use, but never secondary suites in the primary residence.

We are asking that you review this very concerning matter and ensure that the Development Permit Panel understands that Council promised farmers, after extensive consultation including several public hearings, that farmers would be able to build to suit their needs.

Council implemented farm house size limits to stop speculators and investors. This was never intended to cause hardship to farmers in their living and farming activities. It is your responsibility to ensure the Development Permit Panel give farmers the flexibility they might need.

Yours sincerely, Richmond FarmWatch <u>Richmondfarmwatch@gmail.com</u> 604-723-3686



Report to Council

| То: | Richmond City Council | Date: | June 10, 2020 |
|-------|---|-------|---------------|
| From: | Joe Erceg Chair, Development Permit Panel | File: | DP 16-740262 |
| Re: | Development Permit Panel Meeting Held on May 13, 2020 | | |

Staff Recommendation

That the recommendation of the Panel to authorize the approval of changes to the design of the Development Permit (DP 16-740262) issued for the property at 5333 No. 3 Road (formerly 7960 Alderbridge Way and 5333 & 5411 No. 3 Road) be endorsed, and the changes be deemed to be in General Compliance with the Permit.

Joe Erceg Chair, Development Permit Panel (604-276-4083)

SB:blg

Panel Report

The Development Permit Panel considered the following item at its meeting held on May 13, 2020.

<u>GENERAL COMPLIANCE TO DP 16-740262 – 0989705 B.C. LTD. – 5333 NO. 3 ROAD</u> (FORMERLY 7960 ALDERBRIDGE WAY AND 5333 & 5411 NO. 3 ROAD) (May 13, 2020)

The Panel considered an application for changes to cladding materials on the building elevations, as well as changes to parking, bicycle facilities and electrical service areas, to be in General Compliance with approved Development Permit (DP 16-740262).

Architect, Amela Brudar, of GBL Architects, Inc., provided a brief presentation, including:

- The proposed changes in the underground parkade were the result of design development to increase bicycle storage efficiency and create additional parking spaces.
- New bicycle storage lay-out, additional regular parking stalls and new tandem parking stalls will be incorporated in each level of the three-level underground parkade, however, the original parking structure will be retained.
- The BC Hydro Vista switch and LPT layout area will be reconfigured to accommodate the new BC Hydro equipment and revised servicing requirements.
- Architectural louvres above the storefront at ground level are proposed to be reduced in size and lowered in the north, south, east and west building elevations, with spandrel panels proposed to be installed above the louvres.
- The heavier terracotta panels are proposed to be replaced with lighter custom metal panel cladding on the six residential buildings to reduce thermal bridging and address structural concerns.
- The proposed changes in cladding materials will not change the fenestration and profile of the buildings.
- Steel framed glass canopies over top floor residential balconies facing the internal courtyard are proposed to be replaced with painted concrete canopies for consistency with the proposed materials for top floor residential balconies facing the streets.

In reply to a Panel query, Amela Brudar confirmed that a total of 115 parking spaces will be added, including 31 regular and 84 tandem parking spaces.

Staff noted that: (i) the proposed changes in parking and bicycle storage layouts were reviewed and supported by the City's Transportation Division; and (ii) proposed changes on the building's exterior elevations are in keeping with and an improvement upon the approved Development Permit.

No correspondence was submitted to the Panel regarding the General Compliance application.

The Panel recommends that the revisions be approved.