



## Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2008

Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Harold Steves, Chair  
Councillor Bill McNulty, Vice-Chair  
Councillor Linda Barnes  
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt  
Councillor Rob Howard  
Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie (4:01 p.m.)

Also Present: Councillor Derek Dang

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m., and advised that Item No. 13 – City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) and Related Bylaws, would be the first item dealt with on the agenda.

### MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded  
*That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, June 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, **July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2008**, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

---

## PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

### 13. CITY CENTRE AREA PLAN (CCAP) AND RELATED BYLAWS

(Report: June 5, 2008, File No.: 08-4045-20-10, 12-8060-20-7100/8381/8382/8383) (REDMS No. 2452505, 2440782, 244-0090, 2454325, 2454335, 2461518)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, accompanied by Development Coordinator, Holger Burke, reviewed in detail the preparation process and development of the proposed City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) with the Committee.

(Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie entered the meeting at 4:02 p.m.)

Mr. Crowe then referred to a memorandum circulated to members of the Committee regarding recent events relating to the proposed CCAP, and which provided information on the withdrawal of support for the CCAP by Urban Development Institute (UDI). A copy of this memorandum is attached as Schedule A and forms part of these minutes. Mr. Crowe then reviewed the concerns put forward by UDI and described how these issues had been addressed in the CCAP. He then explained the 'next step' options (along with the advantages and disadvantages of each) which were available to Committee – Option 1 – proceed with the approval process as planned; or Option 2 – delay proceeding with the CCAP approval process for one month.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on the withdrawal of support by UDI as it related to the requirement in the proposed CCAP that funding for the Capstan Canada Line station should be secured prior to any rezonings in the Capstan Village area. Reference was made to the status of the proposed Pinnacle rezoning and discussion took place on the ramifications which would result if this application did not proceed. Also addressed was (i) the question of whether the approval process for the CCAP should be delayed until such time as staff determined whether or not the Pinnacle proposal would proceed, as well as the options which were available; (ii) the request of UDI that the approval process be delayed for one month; and (iii) the development and funding of the Capstan Station.

Reference was made to the changes which had been made to the original CCAP concept document as a result of public consultation, and discussion took place on how the CCAP now being discussed should be considered to be a working document, and would be subject to future change as various studies were completed and the appropriate amendments, if any, introduced in the future. During the discussion, staff spoke further about the process which would be followed once the CCAP had been approved by Council.

Discussion continued on the possibility, if any, that the Pinnacle development might not proceed and on how the issue of obtaining affordable housing units and a child care facility would be addressed with a new developer.

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

---

Also addressed during the overall discussion on the CCAP was:

- how and where within the City Centre area, density bonusing would be permitted; the rationale for changing the density from what had been proposed in the February 2007 CCAP concept to the figures now being recommended; the ability to use density bonusing for the development of community facility space rather than child care
- the need to proceed with the approval of the CCAP as quickly as possible in order to establish the new direction of this plan for the City Centre
- the rationale for holding the Public Hearing on the CCAP in July rather than waiting until September
- why developers were not being required to fund community facility and child care space
- the exclusion of the Garden City lands from the CCAP at the present time
- the amount of parkland and open space which would be available not only within the City Centre area but all of Richmond
- the question of consultation with the development community as quickly as possible about the changes which had been made to the original document, prior to proceeding with adoption of the latest CCAP proposal
- the condition that LEED Silver would be required for all rezonings of private developments over 2,000 m<sup>2</sup>
- consultation with the Board of Education of School District No. 38 (Richmond) had been undertaken many times and had been given the opportunity to provide their comments on the proposed CCAP.

During the discussion, Committee members expressed their support for the proposed CCAP.

Mr. Lawrence Lim, 7580 Lombard Road, addressed the Committee regarding the proposed CCAP. A copy of his submission is attached as Schedule B and forms part of these minutes.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members, staff and the delegation regarding the issues which he had raised. Information was provided by staff regarding the CCAP and those areas where industrial and commercial uses would be supported. Also addressed was the rationale for establishing a 200 metre radius around the Canada Line Stations within which density bonusing would be permitted; whether Minoru Boulevard should be restricted to residential development only; and whether density bonusing could be achieved in industrial and commercial areas.

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

---

Also addressed was (i) the question of whether changes to the proposed CCAP should be undertaken prior to the area plan being forwarded to Council, or in the future as amendments, once the Plan had been adopted; and (ii) the feasibility of expanding job creation opportunities beyond the current 200 metre radius.

Mr. Lim was thanked for his presentation, and he then left the table.

The Chair, Cllr. Steves, voiced his support for the plan as presented, and urged Committee to forward the proposed CCAP to the July Public Hearing. Mayor Brodie voiced his agreement to the comments made by the Chair, adding that there would be numerous future changes over the years and that the CCAP was not 'set in stone'.

Councillor Steves and Mayor Brodie then left the meeting (5:15 p.m.), and did not return. Vice Chair Councillor McNulty assumed the Chair and continued with the meeting.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members regarding the proposed City Centre Area Plan, and in particular, on:

- the need to ensure that there was meaningful way to consult with all stakeholders to ensure that their concerns were addressed
- the feasibility of requesting a six month review of the affordable housing component to determine its success or lack thereof
- "green roof" requirements and whether there was a policy relating to this requirement
- density bonusing requirements and building height restrictions
- proposed CCAP land use maps for specific areas, and how flexibility for development in these areas had been built into the CCAP.

During the discussion, Committee members commented on the impact which the proposed CCAP, when adopted, would have on the City for many years to come and how it would impact potential developers. Comments were also made about the detailed information contained in the CCAP, and it was noted that staff had shown that within strict guidelines, there would be room for flexibility and change in the future. Staff were congratulated on the preparation of such a detailed CCAP plan, and stakeholders were thanked for taking the time to meet with City staff to ensure that their comments were heard.

At the same time, reference was made to the need to meet with the development community and the community at large to ensure that any problems which arose following adoption would be addressed. Discussion ensued on this matter, with advice being given that staff would be happy to meet with UDI, the Greater Vancouver Home Builder's Association and the local group of home builders on any outstanding issues. A suggestion was made during the discussion that the CCAP should be reviewed in six months of being adopted.

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

---

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Bylaw 8381, which amends Schedule 1 of Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 by amending various maps in the Official Community Plan to include the West Bridgeport and Van Horne area into the City Centre area; to include pertinent Development Permit Guidelines from the City Centre Area Plan, and to replace the Generalized Land Use Map to ensure that it coincides with the City Centre Area Plan Land Use Maps, be introduced and given first reading;*
- (2) *That Bylaw 8382, which amends Schedule 2.12 of Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 by repealing the existing Bridgeport Area Plan and replace it with a new Bridgeport Area Plan that does not include the West Bridgeport and Van Horne area, be introduced and given first reading;*
- (3) *That Bylaw 8383, which amends Schedule 2.10 of Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 by repealing the existing City Centre Area Plan and replace it with a new City Centre Area Plan, be introduced and given first reading;*
- (4) *That Bylaws 8381, 8382 and 8383, having been considered in conjunction with:*
  - (a) *the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program;*
  - (b) *the Metro Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;**are hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3)(a) of the Local Government Act;*
- (5) *That Bylaw 8383, having been considered in conjunction with Section 882(3)(c) of the Local Government Act, be referred to the Agricultural Land Commission for comment and response by Wednesday, July 16, 2008*
- (6) *That Bylaw 8383, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, be referred to the Vancouver International Airport Authority for comment and response by Wednesday, July 16, 2008;*
- (7) *That Bylaw 8383, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, be referred to the Board of Education of School District No. 38 (Richmond) for comment and response at their regular meeting on Monday, July 7, 2008; and*
- (8) *That Bylaw 8381, 8382 and 8383, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, are hereby deemed not to require any further consultation.*

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

---

The question on the motion was not called, as Committee members agreed that the following would be added to the main motion as Part (9):

*“(9) That, after the proposed CCAP was approved, on-going consultation with participants would occur, and an updated review of the City Centre Area Plan be presented to the Planning Committee not later than June, 2009.”*

The question on the motion, as amended to read as follows:

- (1) *That Bylaw 8381, which amends Schedule 1 of Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 by amending various maps in the Official Community Plan to include the West Bridgeport and Van Horne area into the City Centre area, to include pertinent Development Permit Guidelines from the City Centre Area Plan, and to replace the Generalized Land Use Map to ensure that it coincides with the City Centre Area Plan Land Use Maps, be introduced and given first reading;*
- (2) *That Bylaw 8382, which amends Schedule 2.12 of Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 by repealing the existing Bridgeport Area Plan and replace it with a new Bridgeport Area Plan that does not include the West Bridgeport and Van Horne area, be introduced and given first reading;*
- (3) *That Bylaw 8383, which amends Schedule 2.10 of Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100 by repealing the existing City Centre Area Plan and replace it with a new City Centre Area Plan, be introduced and given first reading;*
- (4) *That Bylaws 8381, 8382 and 8383, having been considered in conjunction with:*
  - (a) *the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program;*
  - (b) *the Metro Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;**are hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3)(a) of the Local Government Act;*
- (5) *That Bylaw 8383, having been considered in conjunction with Section 882(3)(c) of the Local Government Act, be referred to the Agricultural Land Commission for comment and response by Wednesday, July 16, 2008*
- (6) *That Bylaw 8383, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, be referred to the Vancouver International Airport Authority for comment and response by Wednesday, July 16, 2008;*

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

- (7) *That Bylaw 8383, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, be referred to the Board of Education of School District No. 38 (Richmond) for comment and response at their regular meeting on Monday, July 7, 2008; and*
- (8) *That Bylaw 8381, 8382 and 8383, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, are hereby deemed not to require any further consultation.*
- (9) *That, after the proposed CCAP was approved, on-going consultation with participants would occur, and an updated review of the City Centre Area Plan be presented to the Planning Committee not later than June, 2009,*

was not called, as direction was given that any problems encountered as part of the new Area Plan be dealt with as they arose and not wait until presentation of the formal review.

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

(Cllr. Dang left the meeting at 5:45 p.m., and did not return.)

3. **APPLICATION BY CENTRO DEVELOPMENT LTD. FOR REZONING AT 10671, 10691, 10711 NO. 5 RD. FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT (R2-0.6D)**

(RZ 08-404404 - Report: June 3, 2008, File No.: 12-8060-20-8387/8394; xr: 08-4045-00) (REDMS No. 2352475, 2460564, 2243859, 2437253,)

The Director of Development, Brian Jackson, accompanied by Planner, David Brownlee, advised in response to questions, that future development would be possible both north and south of the subject properties. Further advice was given that the reference to the provision of ten tandem parking spaces no longer applied as all parking would now be provided side by side.

Reference was made to the rear yard setbacks, and advice was given that the developer would be seeking a variance at the side of the rear two-storey units.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Bylaw No. 8387, to create "Townhouse District (R2-0.6D)" that addresses the requirements of the City's Affordable Housing Strategy, be introduced and given first reading; and*
- (2) *That Bylaw No. 8394, for the rezoning of 10671, 10691, 10711 No. 5 Rd. from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Townhouse District (R2-0.6D)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

---

4. **APPLICATION BY SHINDER SAHOTA FOR REZONING AT 9211 NO. 1 ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO COACH HOUSE DISTRICT (R9)**  
(RZ 07-389580 - Report: May 28, 2008, File No.: 12-8060-20-8389) (REDMS No. 2456210, 2456556)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 8389, for the rezoning of 9211 No. 1 Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Coach House District (R9)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

5. **APPLICATION BY AVIS HOMES LTD. FOR REZONING AT 3491/3511 LOCKHART ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA B (R1/B)**  
(RZ 07-384769 - Report: May 20, 2008, File No.: 12-8060-20-8378; xr: 08-4430-00) (REDMS No. 2452060, 1081048, 2453533)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 8378, for the rezoning of 3491/3511 Lockhart Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area B (R1/B)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

6. **APPLICATION BY AWANA CONSTRUCTION LIMITED FOR REZONING AT 7371/7391 WILLIAMS ROAD FROM TWO-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R5) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1-0.6)**  
(RZ 07-397261 - Report: May 26, 2008, File No.: 12-8060-20-8379) (REDMS No. 2453781, 2455985)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 8379, for the rezoning of 7371/7391 Williams Road from "Two-Family Housing District (R5)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.*

The question on the motion was not called, as a brief discussion ensued on the size of the subject property and the creation of three properties from that parcel. Advice was given that the new lots conformed to the Single-Family Lot Size Policy adopted for that area.

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



# Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

7. **APPLICATION BY AJIT THALIWAL FOR REZONING AT 6411 BLUNDELL ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1-0.6)**

(RZ 07-394901 - Report: May 27, 2008, File No.: 12-8060-20-8333; xr: 08-4430-00) (REDMS No. 2440089, 1910680, 2456862)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 8333, for the rezoning of 6411 Blundell Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

8. **APPLICATION BY PRITPAL S. RANDHAWA FOR REZONING AT 7351 WILLIAMS ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT (R1-0.6)**

(RZ 07-390751 - Report: May 27, 2008, File No.: 12-8060-20-8375) (REDMS No. 2446753, 2457132)

Advice was provided by Mr. Jackson that the developer had played a major role in protecting the significant trees located on the subject property.

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 8375, for the rezoning of 7351 Williams Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Single-Family Housing District (R1-0.6)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

9. **APPLICATION BY ORIS DEVELOPMENT (CAMBIE) CORP. FOR REZONING AT 9340, 9360 & 9400 CAMBIE ROAD FROM "SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA F (R1/F)" AND 9420, 9460 & 9480 CAMBIE ROAD FROM "COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/137)" TO "COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/196)"**

(Report: June 4, 2008, File No.: 08-4430-20-8395; 12-8060-20-8397/7100; 10-6060-01) (REDMS No. 2452783, 2462178, 2452783, 2457131, 2460178, 1790634, 2457083, 2463375)

Mr. Jackson reported that the proposed developments, if approved, would be significant projects for the City, as they would provide both affordable housing rental and ownership units; daycare space, and indoor amenity space. He advised that the building forms were interesting and innovative; that the applicant would be providing partial green roofs over the parking areas; that the developer would be constructing the buildings to LEEDS standards, with the likely provision of Geo-exchange heating and cooling in both projects; and that the developer would be contributing approximately \$212,000 to Public Art as well as a financial contribution to assist with completion of the child care facility.

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

---

Mr. Jackson further advised that agreement had been reached between the City (Transportation Engineering) and the developer relating to Transit Oriented Development Measures (TDM), for the provision of 2-zone transit passes for 25% of the residential and affordable housing units for one year; provision of one on-site, end-of-trip facility which would include showers; etc., three car co-op vehicles and associated spaces, and the installation of two fully accessible bus shelters on both sides of Cambie Road at Stolberg Road.

In concluding his report, Mr. Jackson noted that the proposed development would help the City to achieve its objective envisioned in the West Cambie Area Plan by incorporating affordable housing, a community facility and a small commercial space within a well-designed proposal. He stated that the Development Division was recommending approval of the project.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff regarding the proposal, during which Committee members congratulating the developer on creating a development which was a good example of how partnerships and density bonusing could work for the entire community. In response to questions, information was provided that the developer would be dedicating a significant amount of land for public use.

Further discussion took place, with reference being made to the number of affordable housing units and various amenities which were being provided. Reference was made to the size of the proposed affordable housing units, and information was provided that the unit sizes did not entirely conform to the minimum unit size required under the City's Affordable Housing Strategy. Advice was given that the size of the units was within 10% of that required, however, based on the overall components of the proposed development, it was felt that the unit sizes would be acceptable and support was given to this rationale by Committee members.

Mr. Dana Westermarck, representing Oris Development advised that a representative of Co-op Cars, and Nycki Barnes of the Society of Richmond Children's Centres, were available to respond to questions.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Bylaw No. 8397, to redesignate 9340, 9360, 9400, 9420, 9460, 9480 Cambie Road from "Residential Area 1 1.5 base FAR (Max. 1.7 FAR with density bonus for affordable housing). Townhouse, Low-rise Apts. (4-storey typical)" to "Residential Area 1A 1.5 base FAR (Max. 1.75 FAR with density bonus for affordable housing). Townhouse, low-rise Apts. (6-storey maximum)" in the Alexandra Neighbourhood Land Use Map to Schedule 2.11A of Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100 (West Cambie Area Plan), be introduced and given first reading;*
- (2) *That Bylaw No. 8397, having been considered in conjunction with:*

## Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

---

- *the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program;*
- *the Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;*

*is hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3)(a) of the Local Government Act;*

- (3) *That Bylaw No. 8397, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is hereby deemed not to require further consultation; and*
- (4) *That Bylaw No. 8395, to create "Comprehensive Development District (CD/196) and to rezone 9340, 9360 & 9400 and 9420, 9460 & 9480 Cambie Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area F (R1/F)" and "Comprehensive Development District (CD/137)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/196)", be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

### 10. **DENSITY BONUS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (C7) ZONE**

(Report: May 27, 2008, File No.: 08-4430-01, 12-8060-20-8384) (REDMS No. 2452379 superceded by 2463903, 2451883)

A brief discussion took place among Committee, Mr. Jackson and Program Coordinator – Development, Wayne Craig, on the question of 'if a developer chose not to provide affordable housing, would the City require the developer to provide all of the parking or would there be an opportunity for density exchanges on parking?'

Reference was made to a report to be considered by the Committee later in the meeting relating to proposed off-street parking and loading requirements, and advice was given that existing 'C7' zoning would be excluded from that amendment. Further advice was given that this exclusion did not preclude staff from considering site-specific parking variances through the City's Development Permit Process.

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 8384, to amend the Downtown Commercial District (C7) zone to include a density bonus of 0.15 Floor Area Ratio for affordable housing, be introduced and given first reading.*

**CARRIED**

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

11. **AMENDMENTS TO ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT BYLAW 5300 – OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING REQUIREMENTS**  
(Report: May 30, 2008, File No.: 12-8060-20-8380) (REDMS No. 2440888, 2445600)

It was moved and seconded

*That Bylaw No. 8380 to amend the Off-Street Parking and Loading Section (Division 400) of the Zoning and Development Bylaw No. 5300 be introduced and given first reading.*

The question on the motion was not called, as, in response to questions, advice was given that the amount of the 'payment-in-lieu' of parking in Steveston would increase from \$10,500 to \$25,000; and that any project within the Steveston area which required major renovation and required a building permit, would trigger the new rates.

Also addressed with staff was the issue of off and on-street loading; the Steveston Off-site Parking Reserve Fund; tandem parking and whether this type of parking was successful; and the timing of the 'payment-in-lieu' charges.

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

12. **PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES ON DALLYN ROAD – FOLLOW-UP REPORT**  
(Report: May 30, 2008, File No.: 10-6450-09-01) (REDMS No. 2455132)

Discussion among Committee members and staff took place on the proposed traffic calming measures. In response to questions, the Director, Transportation, Victor Wei, advised that staff were of the opinion that the proposed locations of the traffic calming measures would effectively reduce the amount of 'short-cutting' which took place. He added that the residents had been consulted and were in agreement with the proposed locations, and that emergency response agencies were also in support of the locations. Mr. Wei further advised that the speed humps would be installed in mid-July of this year.

It was moved and seconded

*That staff proceed with the implementation of the proposed speed humps as a traffic calming measure for the Dallyn Road area, as described in the attached report, with the funding source being the 2006 Major Capital Works Program – Neighbourhood Traffic Safety Improvements (Account No. 40271).*

**CARRIED**

13. **CITY CENTRE AREA PLAN (CCAP) AND RELATED BYLAWS**  
(Report: June 5, 2008, File No.: 08-4045-20-10, 12-8060-20-7100/8381/8382/8383) (REDMS No. 2452505, 2440782, 244-0090, 2454325, 2454335, 2461518)

Please see Page 2 of these minutes for action taken on this matter.

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

---

14. **PROPOSED DCC PROGRAM AND RATES BYLAW**

(Report: June 2, 2008, File No.: 12-8060-20-8024/8396; xr: 08-4045-20-10) (REDMS No. 2455012, 2462106, 2465049)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Development Cost Charges Bylaw No. 8024, Amendment Bylaw No. 8396 which amends the 2008 Development Cost Charge (DCC) Program and is required to implement the proposed new City Centre Area Plan, be introduced and given first reading.*
- (2) *That staff be directed to obtain public input regarding the draft 2008 Development Cost Charge (DCC) Program and Bylaw (as per the report dated June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2008, from the Director, Finance), and report to Council in July 2008.*

**CARRIED**

15. **MANAGER'S REPORT**

- (1) *City Centre Area Plan*  
No report was given.
- (2) *Steveston Study*  
No report was given.
- (3) *Official Community Plan*  
No report was given.
- (4) *Liveable Region Strategic Plan Review*  
No report was given.

Councillor McNulty questioned the status of proposed developments for the north and south sides of Steveston Highway, with specific reference to the Sandhill development. Advice was given that the project would be coming forward once the remaining servicing issues had been addressed.

Reference was made to the former Fantasy Gardens property and to signs on the site that a public market would be opening on the site on July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008. Questions were raised about the future development of the site, and reference was made to a memorandum which had been circulated to Council about the redevelopment of this property.

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (6:16 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008

---

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Tuesday, June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

---

Councillor Bill McNulty  
Chair

---

Fran J. Ashton  
Recording Secretary



**City of Richmond**  
 Planning and Development Department

lum

**To:** Planning Committee  
**From:** Terry Crowe  
 Manager, Policy Planning

**Date:** June 17, 2008

**File:**

**Re: CCAP Update**

The purpose of this memo is to update Planning Committee regarding recent events concerning the proposed CCAP.

A major premise of the CCAP is that funding for all the Canada Line stations will be secured before development proceeds.

This means that, for the Capstan Station, developers need to provide funding for it. Currently, this matter is addressed in the proposed Pinnacle rezoning which is at 3<sup>rd</sup> reading. However, as the CCAP was being finalized, it became apparent that the Pinnacle development may not proceed, nor might its funding for the Capstan Station.

To address this matter, the proposed CCAP indicates that no new zoning will be put in place in the Capstan Village area, until funding for the Capstan Station has been secured to the satisfaction of the City.

Initially, UDI supported the CCAP. Upon review the draft CCAP, today UDI sent the City a letter withdrawing its support. City staff met with the UDI Chair to seek clarification. UDI's main concern is the above Capstan Station funding. Other UDI concerns include affordable housing agreements and they want more time to review the CCAP.

Next Step Options

Option 1 - Proceed

With Option 1, the CCAP would go the public hearing in July and be approved in Sept/Oct 2008/

Pros

- By the July public hearing, the City will know if Pinnacle will proceed and thus have a good sense of their ability to fund the Station.
- Enables the City to begin creating the envisioned new City Centre.
- Completes a three year process which has had much consultation, including with UDI and the GVHBA.
- Overall, provides certainty sooner.

Cons

- Some developers will not support the CCAP.
- UDI may not support the proposed DCC bylaw when it is referred to the Province for approval
- The CCAP will need to be amended after it is approved, to reflect the Pinnacle development

Option 2 - Delay The CCAP For One Month.

Pros

- Would allow more time to explore Capstan Station funding alternatives and possibly fine tune the CCAP.
- UDI supports this option.

Cons

- Would delay the public hearing from July to September with final approval Oct/ Nov. 2008

These options can be discussed at Planning Committee today.



Terry Crowe  
Manager, Policy Planning (4139)

TTC:ttc

pc:

- Joe Erceg, MCIP, General Manager, Planning and Development
- Holger Burke, MCIP, Development Coordinator
- Brian J. Jackson, MCIP, Director of Development
- Suzanne Carter-Huffman, Senior Planner/Urban Design



**Member of Planning Committee:**

My name is Lawrence Lim and I lived at 7580 Lombard Road. I am also the President of the newly formed Richmond-based company called Mayfair Commercial Real Estate Advisors, whose office is located in the Three West Centre.

I would like to thank the City Staff for their diligent effort in preparing the CCAP. The conceptual plan was adopted in 2007 and finally we have the revised CCAP that has just been presented. It is indeed a major undertaking and the City Staff has done a marvellous job in the formulation of CCAP. I am proud of my participation through the public hearing process and my involvement with UDI Liaison Committee in watching the evolution of the CCAP. Like the City Staff, I am especially impressed with their long-term vision of Richmond where we can work, live and play.

However, there are two major issues that I would like to bring to the attention of the Planning Committee today in the revised CCAP that is of special concern to many property owners in the Downtown Richmond Area.

The two major issues I am referring to involved properties that are outside of the 200 metre radius from the Skytrain Station or proposed Village Centre (properties along Minoru Blvd, Alderbridge Way, Elmbridge Way). The revised CCAP is recommending that:

- (a) Future Development be restricted to a maximum of 2.0 FAR and there will be no bonus density of any kind for non-residential development.
- (b) For those areas affected, there will also be a height restriction of 35metre to 25 metre depending on the location of the site, instead of the 45 metre for other high-rise developments in the City.

Mayfair Commercial has spoken to a number of property owners who own properties in those areas. These property owners are faced with major property tax increases that they have to pay by July 2<sup>nd</sup> based on BC assessments which relied on a recent sale that was purchased on speculation based on a 3 times density.

I would like to highlight a number of key points as to why the above recommendation should be reconsidered and I will also make a recommendation to resolve this issue:

1. If you take a bird-eye view of Downtown Richmond west of No. 3 Road and note existing developments and approved development; Ocean Walk on Elmbridge and Alderbridge; The Flo Project and Lotus Project in the same neighbourhood and moving to the still unnamed major development on the former Lansdowne Pontiac car dealership, all these projects were approved for a 3.0 FAR density for residential development. It is therefore, not unreasonable to assume that all the undeveloped areas surrounded by these few projects will also obtain a high-density development of 3.0 FAR.

The conceptual CCAP also showed those areas as T-5 with density from 2.0 FAR to 3.0 FAR. Under the revised CCAP, T-5 is now restricted to a maximum of 2.0 FAR.

I can accept that due to the Noise Management Agreement with YVR that was signed in 2002 and the limited capacity as projected by City Staff will make it unreasonable for this area to support 3.0 FAR density for residential development, but I do not comprehend the reason behind the proposal to eliminate the non-residential 1.0 FAR.

There was already two major precedents on 2 FAR residential and 1.0 FAR non-Residential in Downtown Richmond. The Suntec City Project on No. 3 Road by Pinnacle International and the Richmond Wall Centre Project by Wall Financial, which was based on 2.0 FAR residential and 1.0 FAR for non-residential.

By eliminating the 1.0 FAR non-residential density, property values in the affected area has technically dropped by 1/3. We are not talking about land speculators who bought in the last few years. We are talking about long time property owners who have been dutifully paying their property taxes for decades and hoping to benefit from the years of contribution towards the municipal treasury.

The CCAP calls for the future of Richmond to be a place to live, work and play.

If there is a viable non-residential project is proposed on those property beyond the 200 metre, the revised CCAP will not be supporting such a development, unless it is taken from the residential 2.0 FAR. Residential density are precious commodity and developers will not want to give up their residential density to build non-residential which has a lower market value.

However, non-residential developments are job-creators. They can be retail, hotel, Office, service industries, etc. They represent jobs. I would like the Planning Committee to consider this – why should we discourage such development in our City Centre? If you want Richmond to be a place to live, work and play, let us provide the work element in the CCAP. Staff may say that they will provide the non-residential development within 200 metres of skytrain station, but if are no development sites in those areas, are we going to wave goodbye to jobs in Downtown Richmond?

If the City was to apply the arbitrary 200 metre radius, most of the popular hotels along Westminster Highway would not have been build! Just think of the number of jobs that those hotels created.

## **My recommendation**

The solution to this is very simple. For those affected area, the CCAP should place a limit of 2.0 FAR for residential development, but to provide the ability to award up to 1.0 FAR if the non-residential development is justified. Developers will not build any non-residential development if there is no demand for it. If there is a demand, there will be jobs in those developments. If there are no demand, the developer will stick to the 2.0 FAR residential and the City would have not made any compromise.

2. I am not sure about you, but short and fat do not usually end up in the winner's podium in any beauty contest, male or female. By restricting the building height of those areas, you are going to get short and fat buildings, with little view corridors.

In Richmond we have a height limit of 45 metres, if we are restricting the density, the height should not be tampered with. I do not accept that the imaginary wave approach as proposed by the revised CCAP will create a better looking city Skyline. In fact, it will be an ugly short and fat skyline. Let us take advantage of the 45 metre limit and forget about short and fat. Let the street walkers and cyclist see some of the views instead of the fat buildings in our Downtown.