



**Regular Council**

**Monday, June 12, 2017**

Place: Council Chambers  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Councillor Chak Au  
Councillor Derek Dang  
Councillor Carol Day  
Councillor Ken Johnston  
Councillor Alexa Loo  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Linda McPhail  
Councillor Harold Steves

Corporate Officer – David Weber

Call to Order: Mayor Brodie called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

RES NO. ITEM

**MINUTES**

R17/11-1 1. It was moved and seconded

***That:***

- (1) the minutes of the Regular Council meeting held on May 23, 2017, be adopted as circulated; and***
- (2) the Metro Vancouver ‘Board in Brief’ dated May 26, 2017, be received for information.***

**CARRIED**



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

**AGENDA ADDITIONS & DELETIONS**

R17/11-2

It was moved and seconded

***That:***

- (1) ***Item No. 17 be revised to include Part (1) (e) as part of Part 1 as follows:***

*Provided that the City of Richmond be given a copy of the final comprehensive YVR 2037 Master Plan document for comment, before it is submitted to the Minister of Transport for approval, the Vancouver International Airport Authority (YVR) be advised that the City of Richmond supports YVR's 2037 Master Plan Highlights document outlining YVR's plans to grow to an estimated 35 million passengers by 2037 and that YVR:*

- (2) ***a staff presentation on Item No. 11 – Economic Impact Assessment of Richmond Olympic Oval be added to the Agenda; and***
- (3) ***a staff presentation on Item No. 22 – New Sign Regulation Bylaw be added to the Agenda.***

**CARRIED**

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

R17/11-3

2. It was moved and seconded

***That Council resolve into Committee of the Whole to hear delegations on agenda items (7:02 p.m.).***

**CARRIED**

3. Delegations from the floor on Agenda items.

Item No. 22 – New Sign Regulation Bylaw

Richard Watson, Richmond resident, was pleased to see the matter of language on signs being discussed and was of the opinion that Council should take action in addressing the disharmony that currently exists in the city.

2.



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

Item No. 22 – New Sign Regulation Bylaw

Tung Chan, Richmond resident, spoke in opposition to the proposed new Sign Regulation Bylaw as it relates to the provision that all future signage include a minimum 50% of one of Canada's official languages. Mr. Chan read from the staff report, noting that staff's recommendation did not include a language provision. Mr. Chan then urged Council to reconsider the inclusion of a language provision to the proposed new Sign Regulation Bylaw.

Item No. 22 – New Sign Regulation Bylaw

Vinnie Yuen, Richmond resident, expressed grave concern regarding the proposed new Sign Regulation Bylaw as it relates to the provision that all future signage include a minimum 50% of one of Canada's official languages. Ms. Yuen stated that new immigrants are no less Canadian than other citizens. She noted that Canadians speak a number of different languages and the public consultation comments are unsettling. Ms. Yuen stated that she does not support the proposed bylaw as-is and remarked that should it be approved, she would like to see all languages regulated.

Item No. 22 – New Sign Regulation Bylaw

Randolf Richardson, Richmond resident, spoke in opposition to the proposed new Sign Regulation Bylaw, stating that it unjustly restricts and violates Canadians' fundamental rights, which are protected under the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Mr. Richardson read from his submission, attached to and forming part of these Minutes as Schedule 1.

Item No. 22 – New Sign Regulation Bylaw

Minghui Yu, Richmond resident, spoke in opposition to the proposed new Sign Regulation Bylaw. He noted that most signs are currently multilingual and only a few are solely in one language; thus, Mr. Yu was of the opinion that the proposed language provision was an overreaction. He queried how other print materials such as brochures would be regulated and spoke of the difference in sign sizing as a result of the use of letters versus characters.



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

Item No. 22 – New Sign Regulation Bylaw

With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation (copy on file, City Clerk's Office), Kerry Starchuk and Ann Merdinyan, Richmond residents, provided background information regarding her campaign on the use of non-official Canadian languages throughout the city. She spoke of the City's bus shelter advertisement requirements, noting that she was pleased to see that ads must be 50% in English. Ms. Starchuk stated that other materials like magazines, private advertisements, cars with promotional messages and so forth remain unregulated and queried whether a City policy would address them. Ms. Starchuk then requested that a language bylaw or policy be implemented to ensure that all residents feel welcome.

Item No. 22 – New Sign Regulation Bylaw

Kathryn McCreary, 7560 Glacier Crescent, requested that Council look at the proposed new Sign Regulation Bylaw from a practical perspective, noting that a vote in favour of the proposed bylaw would be a vote for change and may alleviate frustration in the community.

Item No. 22 – New Sign Regulation Bylaw

Robert Ingves, Richmond resident, queried whether the City was aware that other cities in Canada currently have regulations whereby signage must include 50% of one of Canada's official languages and whether these cities' bylaws have been challenged in the courts.

- R17/11-4 4. It was moved and seconded  
*That Committee rise and report (7:56 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

**PRESENTATION**

With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation (copy on file, City Clerk's Office), Neonila Lilova, Manager, Economic Development, reviewed the economic impact assessment of the Richmond Olympic Oval and the following information was highlighted:

- KPMG utilized the BC Input-Output Model and the Sport Tourism Economic Assessment Model to conduct the study;
- one-time benefits include \$234 million in GDP and 3,076 jobs; and
- annual ongoing benefits include \$19 million in GDP and 400 jobs.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

R17/11-5 5.

It was moved and seconded

***That Items No. 6 through No. 21 be adopted by general consent.***

The question on the motion was not called as materials regarding the Proposed Steveston Area Plan Village Conservation and Long-Term Streetscape Visions for Bayview, Moncton and Chatham Streets was distributed by Councillor Steves (attached to and forming part of these Minutes as Schedule 2). Councillor Steves requested that the information be considered along with the Steveston Area Plan report.

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

6. **COMMITTEE MINUTES**

***That the minutes of:***

- (1) ***the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Committee meeting held on May 24, 2017;***
- (2) ***the General Purposes Committee meeting held on June 5, 2017;***
- (3) ***the Finance Committee meeting held on June 5, 2017; and***



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

- (4) *the Planning Committee meeting held on June 6, 2017;  
be received for information.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

**7. STEVESTON COMMUNITY PARK PLAYGROUND RENEWAL  
PREFERRED CONCEPT PLAN**

(File Ref. No. 06-2345-20-STEVE2) (REDMS No. 5379983 v. 7, 5388632)

*That the Steveston Community Park Playground Renewal Preferred Concept Plan as detailed in the staff report titled "Steveston Community Park Playground Renewal Preferred Concept Plan," dated May 9, 2017, from the Senior Manager, Parks, be coordinated with the planning for the Steveston Community Facility Replacement Project and at the conclusion of that planning process, staff bring forward a report outlining the next steps for renewal of the playground.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

**8. PROTECTION OF ATAGI AND YAMANAKA BOATWORKS  
BUILDINGS**

(File Ref. No. 08-4200-01) (REDMS No. 5387150)

- (1) *That the report titled, "Protection of Atagi and Yamanaka Boatworks Buildings," dated May 8, 2017, from the Director of Arts, Culture and Heritage Services, be received for information; and*
- (2) *That copies of the Historical Research Analysis for Paramount Cannery Complex Buildings 33 and 34 be sent to Richmond Members of Parliament, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and Heritage Canada.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, June 12, 2017**

**9. CANADA 150 PUBLIC ART MODULAR SEATING CONCEPT PROPOSAL**

(File Ref. No. 11-7000-09-20-234) (REDMS No. 5372654, 5278823)

*That the concept proposal and fabrication for the Canada 150 Artist Designed Modular Seating public artwork by artists and designers Becki Chan and Milos Bergovic, as presented in the staff report titled "Canada 150 Public Art Modular Seating Concept Proposal," dated May 10, 2017, from the Director, Arts, Culture and Heritage Services, be endorsed.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

**10. BUSINESS LICENCE BYLAW NO. 7360, AMENDMENT BYLAW NO. 9722**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009722, 12-8275-02) (REDMS No. 5389421, 5389467)

*(1) That Business Licence Bylaw No. 7360, Amendment Bylaw No. 9722, which increases the maximum number of Class A Taxicabs to 124 and Class N Taxicabs to 48, be given first, second and third readings; and*

*(2) That staff report back with criteria upon which taxicab licences may be issued by staff.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

**11. ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF RICHMOND OLYMPIC OVAL**

(File Ref. No. 08-4150-01, 11-7140-20-ROOV1-01) (REDMS No. 5394278)

*(1) That the staff report titled "Economic Impact Assessment of Richmond Olympic Oval", dated May 16, 2017 from the General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services, be received for information; and*

*(2) That the proposed communications campaign in the above staff report, highlighting the economic impacts and benefits of the Richmond Olympic Oval to the community, be implemented.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

**12. 2018-2022 BUDGET PROCESS**

(File Ref. No. 03-0970-25-25-2018-01) (REDMS No. 5355131)

- (1) *That the staff report titled "2018-2022 Budget Process" dated May 4, 2017 from the Director, Finance be received for information, and*
- (2) *That the services as presented in Attachment 2 of the staff report be approved as the base for the 2018 budget.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

**13. HOUSING AGREEMENT BYLAW NO. 9728 TO PERMIT THE CITY OF RICHMOND TO SECURE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS AT 9491, 9511, 9531, 9551, 9591 ALEXANDRA ROAD (POLYGON TRAFALGAR SQUARE DEVELOPMENTS LTD.)**

(File Ref. No. 08-4057-05, 12-8060-20-009728) (REDMS No. 5405184 v. 2, 5405609 v. 2, 5399284)

*That the Housing Agreement (Polygon Trafalgar Square Development Ltd.) Bylaw No. 9728 be introduced and given first, second and third readings to permit the City to enter into a Housing Agreement substantially in the form attached hereto, in accordance with the requirements of Section 483 of the Local Government Act, to secure Affordable Housing Units required by Rezoning Application 16-734204.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

**14. APPLICATION BY NEW CONTINENTAL PROPERTIES INC. AND AFFILIATES FOR REZONING OF THE PROPERTIES AT 8320, 8340, 8360 & 8440 BRIDGEPORT ROAD FROM "LAND USE CONTRACT 126"; AT 8351 SEA ISLAND WAY FROM "LAND USE CONTRACT 126"; AND, AT 8311 SEA ISLAND WAY FROM "AUTO-ORIENTED COMMERCIAL (CA)" AND "LAND USE CONTRACT 126" TO "HIGH RISE COMMERCIAL (ZC39) – BRIDGEPORT GATEWAY"**

(File Ref. No. RZ 13-628557, 12-8060-20-009628/9629) (REDMS No. 5180246, 5362906, 5338752, 5345261, 5346590)

- (1) *That Richmond Official Community Plan Bylaw 7100, Amendment Bylaw 9628, to amend the Bridgeport Village Specific Land Use Map - Detailed Transect Descriptions in Schedule 2.10 (City Centre Area Plan) by:*



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, June 12, 2017**

- (a) adding commercial education and university education uses (excluding dormitory and child care uses) to the list of uses permitted on a limited range of properties located south of Bridgeport Road and west of No. 3 Road; and*
  - (b) or the above-noted properties, providing for up to 50% of the 1.0 FAR Village Centre Bonus floor area to be allocated to education uses,*
- be introduced and given first reading;*
- (2) That Bylaw 9628, having been considered in conjunction with:**
  - (a) the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program;*
  - (b) the Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;*
- is hereby found to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882 (3) (a) of the Local Government Act.*
- (3) That Bylaw 9628, having been considered in accordance with OCP Bylaw Preparation Consultation Policy 5043, is hereby found not to require further consultation; and**
- (4) That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9629, to create the "High Rise Commercial (ZC39) – Bridgeport Gateway" zone and to rezone the properties at 8320, 8340, 8360 & 8440 Bridgeport Road from "Land Use Contract 126", the property at 8351 Sea Island Way from "Land Use Contract 126", and the property at 8311 Sea Island Way from "Auto-Oriented Commercial (CA)" and "Land Use Contract 126" to a new site-specific zone, "High Rise Commercial (ZC39) – Bridgeport Gateway" and to discharge "Land Use Contract 126", entered into pursuant to "Beldee Holdings/ CTS Developments Limited Land Use Contract Bylaw No. 3612, 1979", (RD85571 as modified by RD150271, RD 154654, RD 156206 and BV268786), be discharged for the properties at 8320, 8340, 8360 & 8440 Bridgeport Road and 8311 & 8351 Sea Island Way be introduced and given first reading.**

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

15. **APPLICATION BY MAXIMR ENTERPRISES LTD. FOR REZONING AT 7591 WILLIAMS ROAD FROM SINGLE DETACHED (RS1/E) TO COACH HOUSES (RCH1)**

(File Ref. No. RZ 16-724066, 12-8060-20-009724) (REDMS No. 5397986, 1195062, 5399068)

*That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9724, for the rezoning of 7591 Williams Road from the "Single Detached (RS1/E)" zone to the "Coach Houses (RCH1)" zone, be introduced and given first reading.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

16. **APPLICATION BY KANARIS DEMETRE LAZOS FOR A HERITAGE ALTERATION PERMIT AT 12111 3RD AVENUE (STEVESTON HOTEL)**

(File Ref. No. HA 17-766440) (REDMS No. 5394773)

*That a Heritage Alteration Permit to authorize the removal of a window from the front (east) elevation and to replace it with a new entry and door to match an existing door in the front (east) elevation of the heritage-protected property at 12111 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue be issued.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

17. **RICHMOND RESPONSE: THE VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY (YVR) 2037 MASTER PLAN HIGHLIGHTS DOCUMENT**

(File Ref. No. 01-0153-01) (REDMS No. 5390227 v. 2, 2017182, 1990009)

*(1) Provided that the City of Richmond be given a copy of the final comprehensive YVR 2037 Master Plan document for comment, before it is submitted to the Minister of Transport for approval, the Vancouver International Airport Authority (YVR) be advised that the City of Richmond supports YVR's 2037 Master Plan Highlights document outlining YVR's plans to grow to an estimated 35 million passengers by 2037 and that YVR:*

*(a) maximize the capacity of all existing runways, justify the need for any future runway and work with the City to protect the City's interests prior to pursuing any new runway;*



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

- (b) maintain existing transportation capacity on Sea Island for non-airport users, including the preservation of the existing lanes on the Arthur Laing Bridge, Moray Channel Swing Bridge, the Airport Connector Bridge, and Russ Baker Way for both airport and non-airport traffic;*
  - (c) explore alternatives to the proposed extension of Templeton Road which may include widening existing corridors, a more effective use of Cessna Drive and encouraging alternate modes of travel; and*
  - (d) continue to minimize and mitigate noise, light and other impacts on Richmond residents that may result from airport-related activities;*
- (2) That the City and the Vancouver International Airport Authority (YVR) continue to work together to coordinate land use, transportation, transit, servicing, amenity and environmental planning;*
  - (3) That the Vancouver International Airport Authority (YVR), in conjunction with other regional airports and stakeholders (e.g., NAV CANADA), be encouraged to prepare a Regional Airport Strategy; and*
  - (4) That a copy of this report be forwarded to the Vancouver International Airport Authority (YVR).*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

**18. RICHMOND HERITAGE COMMISSION 2016 ANNUAL REPORT AND 2017 WORK PROGRAM**

(File Ref. No. 01-0100-30-HCOM1-01) (REDMS No. 5387270)

- (1) That the staff report, "Richmond Heritage Commission 2016 Annual Report and 2017 Work Program", dated May 15, 2017, from the General Manager, Planning and Development, be received for information; and*
- (2) That the Richmond Heritage Commission 2017 Work Program, as presented in this staff report, be approved.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

**19. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT 2016 ANNUAL REPORT AND 2017 WORK PROGRAM**

(File Ref. No. 01-0100-30-ACEN1-01) (REDMS No. 5384842)

- (1) *That the staff report titled "Advisory Committee on the Environment 2016 Annual Report and 2017 Work Program", dated May 3, 2017 from the General Manager, Planning and Development, be received for information; and*
- (2) *That the Advisory Committee on the Environment 2017 Work Program, as presented in this staff report, be approved.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

**20. UPDATE: PROPOSED STEVESTON AREA PLAN VILLAGE CONSERVATION AND LONG-TERM STREETScape VISIONS FOR BAYVIEW, MONCTON AND CHATHAM STREETS**

(File Ref. No. 08-4045-20-04) (REDMS No. 5346627, 4977638, 4572245, 4573262)

*That Council direct staff to undertake public consultations regarding the proposed Steveston Area Plan Village Conservation changes and the proposed long-term streetscape vision for Bayview Street, Moncton Street and Chatham Street, to be completed by July 31, 2017 as outlined in the report, and report back to Planning Committee in October 2017 on the feedback and recommendations.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**

**21. NON-FARM USE APPLICATION FOR FORMER MYLORA SITE**

(File Ref. No. 08-4105-04-04)

*That staff write a letter to the Agricultural Land Commission seeking clarification on the recent denial of the Mylora non-farm use application and the implication to the City's No. 5 Road Backlands Policy.*

**ADOPTED ON CONSENT**



**Regular Council**  
**Monday, June 12, 2017**

**NON-CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

**GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE**

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair

22. **NEW SIGN REGULATION BYLAW**

(File Ref. No. 12-8060-20-009700/9719/9720/9721, 12-8000-03, 12-8060-02-63) (REDMS No. 5337264 v. 4, 5413918, 5414400, 4384413, 4548429, 4556939, 4584872, 4397495, 4403117, 5195144, 5165807, 5144978, 5293139, 5296715, 5337264, 5405303, 4892426, 5383708, 5383704, 5405127)

Cecilia Achiam, General Manager, Community Safety, spoke of the materials presented to Council, noting that the proposed new Sign Regulation Bylaw is purely technical in nature as it (i) addresses areas that the current bylaw does not like real estate signs and (ii) provides clarity in regulating other signs.

Ms. Achiam requested that Council move forward with the proposed new Sign Regulation Bylaw, stating that doing so would not impede Council's ability to introduce a language provision; however, staff require additional time to fully research the inclusion of a language provision in the Sign Regulation Bylaw.

Carli Edwards, Manager, Customer Services and Licencing, advised that should Council wish to include a language provision in the proposed new Sign Regulation Bylaw, staff require direction on (i) whether a language requirement is to apply to all signs or only those that require a permit, (ii) whether the proposed language provision would be enforced by means of ticketing or by prosecution, and (iii) whether public notification would follow standard requirements as set out in the *Community Charter* or a separate public consultation.



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

Also, Ms. Edwards spoke of technical issues with the inclusion of a language provision in the proposed new Sign Regulation Bylaw, noting that staff are unclear as to (i) how 50% would be measured – by the size of the text or content, (ii) whether two signs – one in a non-official language and the other in an official-language would constitute 50%, (iii) how image logos like Nike or Lululemon would be treated, and (iii) how non-official language company names like IKEA or Acura would be treated. She then commented on potential financial implications and a timeframe to report back on the matter, noting that further analysis is needed.

R17/11-6

It was moved and seconded

***In respect to implementing de-cluttering, and modernizing the regulations in the existing Sign Bylaw No. 5560, that:***

- (1) each of the following Bylaws be introduced and given first, second and third readings:***
  - (a) Sign Regulation Bylaw 9700, as revised to include provisions that all future signage require a minimum of 50% of one of Canada's official languages;***
  - (b) Notice of Bylaw Violation Dispute Adjudication Bylaw 8122, Amendment Bylaw 9719;***
  - (c) Municipal Ticket Information Bylaw 7321, Amendment Bylaw 9720; and***
  - (d) Consolidated Fees Bylaw 8636, Amendment Bylaw 9721;***
- (2) a Full Time Sign Inspector position and the associated costs, to provide outreach and enforcement of the Sign Regulations, be considered during the 2018 budget process;***
- (3) Richmond Zoning Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw 9723 to make housekeeping adjustments that align with the new Sign Regulation Bylaw be introduced and given first reading; and***
- (4) That Sign Regulation Bylaw 9700 be reviewed in one year.***

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued and Council expressed their views with regard to including or excluding a language provision in the proposed new Sign Regulation Bylaw. As a result of the discussion, the following **referral** motion was introduced:



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

R17/11-7 It was moved and seconded  
*That provisions for all future signage to require a minimum of 50% of one of Canada's official languages be referred to staff.*

**DEFEATED**

Opposed: Mayor Brodie  
Cllrs. Au  
Dang  
Johnston  
McNulty  
McPhail

R17/11-8 It was moved and seconded  
*That staff propose policy options encouraging the cooperative use of the English language on all signage, including an analysis of the current policy and report back.*

The question on the referral motion was not called as discussion took place and staff was directed to also include a legal opinion on the difference between a bylaw and a policy.

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

The Chair remarked that the language provision clause in Part (1) (a) has been addressed with a referral and thus should be deleted from the main motion. As a result, the following **amendment** to the main motion was introduced:

R17/11-9 It was moved and seconded  
*That “, as revised to include provisions that all future signage require a minimum of 50% of one of Canada's official languages” be deleted from Part (1) (a).*

**CARRIED**

Opposed: Cllrs. Day  
Loo  
Steves



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

The question on the main motion, which now reads:

*In respect to implementing de-cluttering, and modernizing the regulations in the existing Sign Bylaw No. 5560, that:*

- (1) *each of the following Bylaws be introduced and given first, second and third readings:*
  - (a) *Sign Regulation Bylaw 9700;*
  - (b) *Notice of Bylaw Violation Dispute Adjudication Bylaw 8122, Amendment Bylaw 9719;*
  - (c) *Municipal Ticket Information Bylaw 7321, Amendment Bylaw 9720; and*
  - (d) *Consolidated Fees Bylaw 8636, Amendment Bylaw 9721;*
- (2) *a Full Time Sign Inspector position and the associated costs, to provide outreach and enforcement of the Sign Regulations, be considered during the 2018 budget process;*
- (3) *Richmond Zoning Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw 9723 to make housekeeping adjustments that align with the new Sign Regulation Bylaw be introduced and given first reading; and*
- (4) *That Sign Regulation Bylaw 9700 be reviewed in one year.*

was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Day, Loo, and Steves opposed.

**BYLAWS FOR ADOPTION**

R17/11-10

It was moved and seconded

***That the following bylaws be adopted:***

***Water Use Restriction Bylaw No. 7784, Amendment Bylaw No. 9704***

***Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 8783***

***(Portion of 7531 and 7551 Bridge Street, RZ 10-539727)***



**Regular Council  
Monday, June 12, 2017**

*Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 9260  
(23200, 23241, 23281, 23301, 23321, 23361 and 23381 Gilley Road, 23000,  
23060, 23066, Part of 23080 and Part of 23100 Westminster Highway, and  
Part of 4651, 4671, 4691 Smith Crescent, RZ 14-660662)*

*Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 9261  
(Parts of 23241 and 23281 Gilley Road, Part of 23060, 23066, 23080 and  
Part of 23100 Westminster Highway, RZ 14-660662)*

*Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 9262  
(23241, 23281 and Part of 23301 Gilley Road, Part of 23060 and 23000  
Westminster Highway, RZ 14-660663)*

*Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 9599  
(7531 Williams Road, RZ 15-712649)*

*Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 9600  
(7511 Williams Road, RZ 15-712653)*

*Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, Amendment Bylaw No. 9635  
(4780 Steveston Highway, RZ 16-737903)*

**CARRIED**

**ADJOURNMENT**

R17/11-11

It was moved and seconded  
*That the meeting adjourn (9:55 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 12, 2017.

---

Mayor (Malcolm D. Brodie)

---

Corporate Officer (David Weber)

RANDOLF RICHARDSON - ITEM 22, BYLAW AMENDMENT

2017-JUN-12

The bylaw proposed is illegal because it unjustly restricts and violates our fundamental rights which are protected under our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, particularly freedom of expression and the freedom to use signage in so doing. As is the case with any city in any confederated Province, the City of Richmond does not possess the authority to merely dismiss our rights using bylaws or otherwise.

To make matters worse, any bylaw that compels someone to present their business using a particular language is also forcing them to risk violating the Competition Act, particularly sections 52 and 74 which proscribe against the practice of misleading the public about services provided. There is also a serious element of danger because violating these sections has the potential to yield fines of up to \$200,000 or a prison sentence as long as 14 years.

One of the many roles of a city councillor is to ensure that bylaws and other regulations are not illegal, and community harmony is stifled when freedom of expression is inhibited, regardless of whether censorship or compulsion is the form in which a community is oppressed. Here in Canada we have a long-standing history of freedom and inclusiveness, and rejecting the proposed bylaw is a necessary means of continuing to support this wonderful character of diversity of which our national identity is comprised.


PLEASE REMOVE THE AMENDMENT THAT VIOLATES OUR CHARTER RIGHTS.

Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the Regular meeting of Richmond City Council held on Monday, June 12, 2017.

Alternative to Curb Bulges  
proposed by Steveston Historical Society and Steveston Businesses

1979

Schedule 2 to the Minutes of the  
Regular meeting of Richmond  
City Council held on Monday,  
June 12, 2017.



# ATTACHMENT 1

## STEVESTON DOWNTOWN DESIGN CONCEPT

The design concept plan is intended to lend cohesiveness to the Revitalization Area criteria. The concept plan illustrates the important relationships between present and future buildings, streets, parking and access lanes.


The design concept shows the extent of street improvements for the foreseeable future. Number One Road, Bayview Street, Third Avenue and Chatham Street function primarily to move traffic into and out of the area. Motorists will also use Moncton to gain access, but its main function is as a shopping street with space for short term customer parking. First and Second Avenue and most lanes have extensive parking and loading and provide the main access to parking lots and loading zones.

The design concept also shows the approximate location and massing of new buildings. This plan is not intended to be fixed in stone, but shows the preferred street setbacks and land expected to be developed for parking. Because the concept encourages a filling-in of empty spaces and requires a continuous commercial frontage along shopping streets, the area will become more attractive to window shoppers.

Existing buildings which have heritage potential are shown on the design concept. These are the buildings where some relaxation of Zoning and Screening regulations will be considered.

MAP 2

STEVESTON DOWNTOWN DESIGN CONCEPT



STEVESTON DOWNTOWN DESIGN CONCEPT

-  PROPOSED BUILDING MASSING
-  POTENTIAL HERITAGE BUILDINGS - SEE APPENDIX
-  "BUILD-TO" LINE
-  P PARKING / ACCESS
-  PROPOSED SPECIAL TREATMENT WALK

MAP 2


MAP 3

NOTE CHANGE

CHARACTER AREAS

CHATHAM ST. CHARACTER AREA :

- CONVENTIONAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS WITH PARKING IN REAR FRONT (ON CHATHAM)
- NEW BUILDINGS TO HAVE SIMILAR SETBACK AND CHARACTER AS EXISTING (ADJACENT) COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS. BUT THREE STOREYS MAY.



MONCTON ST.

• SMALL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS, MAXIMUM TWO STOREYS

- BUILT TO THE STREET LINE NO MORE THAN 2m SETBACK
- FALSE FRONT, GABLE END OR FLAT ROOFS
- CONTINUOUS RETAIL OR COMMERCIAL FRONTAGE

BAYVIEW ST.

- MIXTURE OF SMALL SHOPS AND FISHING INDUSTRY BUILDINGS
- VIEWS OF THE WATER
- STEP DOWN 2 STOREY HUMAN-SCALE BUILDINGS TO THE NORTH.
- SPECIAL TREATMENT OF 5m SETBACK FROM BAYVIEW ST.

## DESIGN GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA

1. *The distinctive character of the original buildings should be preserved and restored in keeping with the styles of the era.*

New buildings should be similar in character and scale to existing buildings in the three character areas of Moncton Street, Bayview Street and Chatham Street as shown on Map 3.

### 1.1 Moncton Street (C4 Zoning District) character area: *includes EIRd*

New buildings should be small scale and continue the rhythm of a series of store fronts of 10 to 20 metres wide. Long "strip mall" shopfronts are not acceptable.

New buildings in the Moncton Street character area should be a fairly simple commercial style having false fronts with the gable end of the roof toward the street (i.e. side sloping roofs). Flat roofs are acceptable provided there is a decorative parapet or cornice.

Storefront windows on the street level should be larger than upper storey windows. Doorways should be recessed from the sidewalk at least one metre. Cornice lines or canopies should be carefully designed in order to bring the scale of the building down to the pedestrian level.

Exceptions to the criterion of small retail shopping buildings would be existing larger buildings.

- SIMPLE COMMERCIAL BUILDING BUILT TO THE STREET LINE.
- FALSE FRONT, GABLE END, SIDE-SLOPED OR FLAT ROOF.
- RECESS DOORWAYS



◦ NEW BUILDINGS  
SAME SCALE  
AS NEIGHBORING  
BUILDINGS

◦ CANOPY

◦ LARGE STOREFRONT  
WINDOWS FACING THE  
SIDEWALK.

◦ PARKING, LOADING AND  
GARAGE AT THE SIDE OR REAR.


◦ PARTY WALLS OF BRICK, 4" BLOCK,  
SPLIT-FACE BLOCK, STUCCO, WOOD  
VENEER OR STRUCTURAL MATERIALS  
NOT PAINTED 8" CONCRETE BLOCKS.

**1.2 Bayview Street (C4 Zoning District) character area:**

Buildings on Bayview Street should be a mixture of larger industrial "cannery" style buildings and smaller retail buildings designed to take advantage of dyke-top views.

Buildings will have a 5m (15') setback from Bayview Street because of a culvert right-of-way, but should be built to the street line on side streets (First, Second and Third Avenue and Number One Road).

Parking and loading should be at the rear or in the case of industrial buildings loading will be permitted from Bayview Street. On Bayview Street the 5m right-of-way and boulevard should be terraced in front of commercial buildings in order to provide a level area where pedestrian-oriented activities such as outdoor cafes can take place. These areas should have special treatment and be paved with exposed aggregate concrete or Holland paving stones to match the City sidewalk. Building owners may provide a wooden "porch" boardwalk. Small growing trees may be permitted provided they do not interfere with underground utilities. The Landscape Architect should refer to the list of recommended species published by the City.



Bayview Street Character Area

### **1.3 Chatham Street (C5 Zoning District) character area:**

The character of new buildings in the Chatham Street area will vary, depending on which street the building fronts on. Buildings fronting on First, Second or Third Avenues should be similar in character to existing (adjacent) buildings as described in the section on the Moncton Street character area.


Buildings fronting on Chatham Street should be set back from the street line approximately the same distance as the adjacent (existing) buildings, about 19m on the south side and 11m on the north side. An exception may be made for difficult-to-develop corner lots where it is not practical to have such a large setback from Chatham Street. The character of buildings on Chatham Street should be similar to existing buildings - namely small to medium-width shop fronts of a more contemporary style.

**2. The continuity of the commercial frontage should be maintained by having a minimum street setback, consistent with older commercial streets.**

The intent of this guideline is to make it easier and more interesting for shoppers to move from store to store. The natural flow of pedestrians along the public sidewalk makes this an appropriate location for buildings. Extensive landscaping, parking, loading or storage should not be located next to sidewalks on commercial properties. (See the *Design Concept for recommended commercial frontages.*)

For details of appropriate building setbacks from various streets, refer to the section on character areas.

Shops should have recessed entries, as was common in older buildings in Steveston. Recessed entries increase the amount of window display area, add to the interest of the facade, and allow shop doors to open outward safely without obstructing the sidewalk.



Sketch of recessed entry

**2.1 Store fronts should have windows facing commercial streets wherever possible, for the interest of passers-by.**

Because this is a shopping area and the guidelines encourage continuity of commercial frontage, it is important that all shops present an interesting facade to the street. Windows allow merchants to create displays which communicate the nature of the business to potential customers passing by on the sidewalk. Windows make a visual transition from the sidewalk to the interior of stores.



A dyke-front store in Steveston c. 1900 had windows and open-air counter to display and sell "groceries".


**2.2 Canopies or awnings should be provided, to protect people on the sidewalks from rain and snow.**

Given our climate, sidewalks should be sheltered as much as possible. The traditional method in Steveston was canopies supported on posts, or projecting canvass awnings.

Canopies or awnings should be carefully designed so as to be in character with Steveston. The style should be sloped, three point with valence or four point with fascia of not more than 15cm (6 inches). Canopies should be high enough to permit marquee signs or lighting underneath but should not obscure building details such as corner boards, trim, or cornices. Styles which are unacceptable include curved, quarter barrel, half dome and quarter sphere.


Canopies or awnings may be finished in cedar shingles or durable fabric such as acrylic coated 100% polyester or canvas. Vinyl, plastic, or backlit awnings are not acceptable. Neon and fluorescent lighting of canopies is not acceptable. See also Section 8 regarding lighting.

Canopies projecting over public sidewalks are a special case. Canopies supported on posts should have the posts located on private property. Canopies should be at least 1.2m (4') wide in order to adequately protect pedestrians from rain and snow. Canopies which project over public property must conform to all codes and the owner must sign an agreement indemnifying the City from liability.



3. *New buildings should be compatible in height with adjacent buildings.*


Buildings in Steveston have traditionally been one to three storeys in height. This situation was partly the result of wood frame building technology of the day, but coincidentally resulted in a pleasing relationship between buildings and the street.



Human eyes can normally perceive a vertical field of vision of about 27°, or 18° above the horizon. This means that a person will feel most comfortable viewing a two storey building across a typical street. Some image of the whole remains up to 45° from the horizon. A building is considered to be of a human scale if it can be comfortably viewed at a glance. Therefore, new buildings should have a setback such that there is a height: distance ratio, taken from the opposite side of a street or park, of between 1:1 and 1:2.

Conversely, in some cases spacing between buildings is too great, and there is no feeling of enclosure on the street. This is the opposite extreme of the "boxed in" feeling, and just as undesirable.

The C4 Steveston Commercial District limits heights to 9m (29'-5") and the C5 District height limit is 12m (39'-4"). This effectively limits buildings to two and three-storeys respectively. These limits should be adhered to generally, with the added stipulation that changes in building heights from lot to lot should be gradual, as shown in the sketch.



Buildings should be designed to be the same height as neighbouring buildings, or to change height gradually (maximum one-storey difference between adjacent lots)

4. *Exterior finish of buildings facing commercial streets should utilize traditional materials, or materials which are compatible with existing natural finishes.*

Older buildings in the Steveston Commercial District were finished with wood. The newer buildings are generally stucco or, more recently painted concrete block. Only a few buildings survived the 1918 fire, one being the brick "Hepworth block". Other buildings of the period generally had painted shiplap or wooden shingle siding.

Finish materials for new or renovated buildings should be compatible with traditional materials, for example, wood or brick. The hand-made character of finish and decoration could be carried on with careful detailing, and some modern and machine-made materials can be successfully incorporated. Finish materials, windows, doors, hand rails and decorative elements can take up the form, character or rhythm of nearby older buildings without imitating them.

See Appendix 2 for examples of building finish and details.

Acceptable new finish materials include: red or painted 4" high brick, horizontal bevelled or shiplapped cedar siding (maximum 6" exposed), wood panel, cedar board and batten (on selected areas), smooth stucco, cedar shingles, and on Bayview Street, industrial ribbed metal roofing.

Unacceptable finish materials include vinyl, aluminum siding, shakes, imitation stone or brick, duroid, ceramic tiles, asbestos and plywood (other than decorative plywood infill panels.)

Doors and windows should utilize traditional finish and form. Wood or painted aluminum frames are acceptable. Doors should have glass panels. Glass in windows or doors should be clear or grey tinted. Mirror finish bronze or solid metal are not acceptable.

Colours used on new buildings should be compatible with traditional colours used on older buildings in Steveston. Paint colours should be selected from the "heritage series" produced by several commercial paint companies. These colours are generally strong but muted colour, not pastels. Trim should be painted a colour which contrasts with the siding. White or bright (intense) colours should be used sparingly, if at all.

End walls (party walls) which are exposed to view should be finished with stucco, wood cladding, brick, split-faced concrete block, 4" concrete block with horizontal raked joints, or similar suitable finish. Care should be taken with corner details so that the party walls appear consistent with front and rear walls. The use of decorative cornices, reveals, or projections should be considered.

Painted or raw 8" concrete block party walls are not acceptable as a finish material.



?? no brick

No 4" blocks where they will show is required where buildings built side by side only.

**5. *Parking should be located at the rear of buildings, or in communal lots.***

This guideline dovetails with other guidelines aimed at maintaining the vitality of the commercial street, while at the same time providing adequate customer and employee parking. There are three aspects to municipal parking policy for Steveston:

1. *spaces should be provided on the street immediately in front of shops for short term customer parking, including loading zones for fishermen.*
2. *communal parking and loading should be provided off of lanes, at the rear of commercial buildings and on municipal parking lot(s) for long term parking, employee parking, and fishermen's parking.*
3. *parking lots should not be located within 15m of the street within the Moncton Street character area in front of shops because they would inhibit pedestrian access.*

A proposed parking layout for Steveston is shown on Map 2.

**6. *Signs for identification of businesses and activities should be in keeping with the historic nature of the town.***

Signs in the early 1900's were usually painted on wood, either directly on the siding or on boards fastened to the fascia or suspended under a canopy. Occasionally a larger establishment, such as the Sockeye Hotel, would display a roof sign.

Signs should be integrated with the architecture and should be clearly drawn and dimensioned on the plans.



Roof sign on the Sockeye Hotel (now the Steveston Hotel).  
Source: Vancouver Public Library Collection.

Applicants should refer to the Richmond Sign By-Law as well as these guidelines. A sign permit will be required prior to actually installing signs on the completed building. Only signs which are indicated on the Development Permit drawings for the site will be permitted. Sign Permit application forms are obtained from the Permits and Licences Department.

Acceptable materials for signs in Steveston include:

- wood: *painted, stained, natural, sandblasted or carved.*
- metal: *painted, enameled, embossed, or cast.*
- fabric or other natural material.
- paint on glass (on windows or doors - no permit required).

Unacceptable materials for signs:

- plastic or other internally illuminated materials.
- backlit canopy or awning signs.

Signs should be made to be viewed mainly from the sidewalk. In some cases signs may also be designed to be viewed from the water, or from slow moving vehicles.

Signs directed toward the water should not be brightly lighted, so as to keeping glare to a minimum. Sign lighting which causes navigational hazards is not acceptable.

The following types of signs are recommended: **MARQUEE SIGNS**



Are easily seen by persons walking on the sidewalk, especially under canopies. It is expected that these will replace projecting signs as new canopies are built.

Maximum total sign area is 8 sq. ft. per each property.

Maximum size 8" deep with maximum 6" letters.

Minimum 8' clearance from the sidewalk.




#### **FASCIA SIGNS**

Are traditional signs in Steveston and are usually made of painted wood or metal. External illumination by spot light is most appropriate.

Fascia signs should be located so as not to obscure building details. For example, fascia signs should be located below the cornice, as shown in the sketch.

Maximum size 1/2 sq. ft. of sign per foot of wall length.



### FREESTANDING SIGNS

These will need to be specially designed for Steveston since modern "standard" signs are generally not appropriate in form, materials, or size.

### CANOPY SIGNS

These are also an effective replacement for the old projecting signs. They may be incorporated into a balcony or porch style sidewalk covering.

Maximum 1/2 sq. ft. of sign for each foot of wall length.

Minimum clearance 8' from the sidewalk.

### PROJECTING SIGNS


Are permitted on private property only. New signs will probably not be permitted to project over public sidewalks or lanes. Some existing projecting signs may remain, as long as they are in safe condition.

Maximum 1 sq. ft. of sign area per each foot of wall length.

Minimum clearance 10-6" from the ground.

### ROOF SIGNS

These signs are only recommended for industrial uses or hotels, as was the custom in the past in Steveston.



Before deciding on types and details of signs, applicants should consult the Richmond Sign By-law. For example, certain signs will not be permitted. These include: readograph, third party advertising and other signs specifically prohibited by the Sign By-Law.

7. *Development and redevelopment should include new pedestrian amenities, landscaping, site improvements and screening, where appropriate. This criterion refers to improvements on private property, since the City will be responsible for improving street furniture as part of the Downtown Revitalization Program.*

Although many buildings will have virtually no setback from the street, there may still be room for improvements at the rear of buildings, in parking areas, in window boxes, in entry recesses or in small front setbacks.

New pedestrian amenities could include benches, cafe tables and chairs, handrails, fountains, sculpture, porches and bicycle racks.

Landscaping could include wooden window boxes, wooden or clay pots, barrels with flowers or hanging flower baskets. Developers of every new building or renovation are encouraged to include some plants as described here. Perennial flowers generally require little maintenance and annual flowers can be changed with the season. Examples of annuals are: pansies, daisies, nasturtiums or kale. A list of perennials is provided in Appendix 2.

No large trees or shrubs should be planted on the street frontage for two reasons. Firstly there is not enough room for large growing plants. Secondly, for approximately the last 60 years, there have been very few trees in the Steveston Downtown area, and people have accepted this as a tradition.

Extensive landscaping, tree planting and screening are encouraged at the rear of buildings. The Screening By-law requires screening of parking lots from the public street. Curbs, bumpers or bollards should be provided to separate parked cars from pedestrians.

## 8. *A Note on Lighting*

Signs, building facades or entranceways should be illuminated by concealed incandescent lighting. Light fixtures which are visible should be nautical or industrial type.

Fluorescent, high pressure sodium, neon architectural or mercury vapour lighting is not acceptable.

Building Lighting which causes a navigational hazard in the harbour is not acceptable. Lights should generally be low level and directed away from the waterfront.



To: Planning Committee

Date: September 27, 2004

From: Terry Crowe  
Manager, Policy Planning

File:

Re: Enhanced Development Permit Guidelines- Steveston Area Plan

**Staff Recommendation**

1. That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 7816, which amends Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100, Schedule 2.4, Steveston Area Plan, Section 8.0, "Development Permit Guidelines", by deleting Section 8.0 in its entirety and, pursuant to Sections 919.1 (1) (d) and 919.1 (1) (f) of the *Local Government Act*, substituting a new Section 8.0, "Development Permit Guidelines", as Schedule 1, be introduced and given first reading.

2. That Bylaw No. 7816, having been considered in conjunction with:

- 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. 7816, having been considered in accordance with the City Policy on Consultation During OCP Development, is hereby deemed not to require further consultation.

*T. Crowe*  
Terry Crowe  
Manager, Policy Planning

TC/RA:blg  
Att. 2

*Heritage Commission thinks it is not before the house - Steveston has changed. Address issue of the character defining elements of Steveston - 1-2 story? porch/pubs? how deep sidewalk to sidewalk? Hold a design shovelle with the various historical groups & development community.*

FOR ORIGINATING DIVISION USE ONLY					
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE		CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER		
Law .....	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Paul O</i>		
REVIEWED BY TAG	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	REVIEWED BY CAO	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

*open up lanes to parking behind Club Capital etc.*  
55

## Staff Report

### Origin

On September 24, 2003, several referrals were directed to staff regarding development guidelines for the Steveston Business District. This report will address these referral requests as follows (*Staff Action*).

### Summary of Referral:

*For the area located south of Chatham Street between No. 1 Road and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue, that staff provide a report that addresses the following issues:*

- 1. Outline Development Permit guidelines that are currently applicable to this area; (See Staff Response Section).*
- 2. Include a copy of the "Sakamoto" guidelines; (Attachments 1 & 2).*
- 3. Investigate whether more stringent guidelines can be implemented for the Steveston Village area (See Staff Response Section); and*
- 4. Provide an update regarding the review of the Maritime Mixed-Use area.*

*A further review of the Maritime Mixed-Use area is being held in abeyance as Onni Development Corp. is considering submitting a rezoning application to rezone the designated Maritime Mixed-Use area in Imperial Landing. The urban design issues will be addressed as part of the rezoning.*

### Staff Response

This report recommends immediate changes that will strengthen the current Steveston Area Plan Development Permit Guidelines. In general, wholesale changes to the Steveston Area Plan are not contemplated as most of the referrals by Council relate specifically to the Steveston Downtown Node and in general, the Policies and Development Permit Guidelines are working reasonably well in guiding development in Steveston.

### Referral Items


#### 1. Official Community Plan Development Permit Guidelines

In September, 1998, the Steveston Area Plan was amended (Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 6916). The revitalization area was removed and replaced by a slightly larger Steveston Downtown Node (Business Centre) and several Steveston Village Character Sub-Areas (i.e. Moncton Street, Bayview Street and BC Packers Waterfront, and Chatham Street.). Development Permit Guidelines for these areas are shown in the attached OCP Bylaw.

The Development Permit Guidelines that are currently applicable to the area between No. 1 Road and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue are contained within the Steveston Area Plan (originally adopted April 22, 1985 / Plan Adoption: October 21, 2002). The relevant guidelines consist of two parts:

- Section 8.0 contains General Development Permit Guidelines for all of Steveston – including the subject area;
- Section 8.3.1 contains Additional Development Permit Guidelines for Area A: Steveston Village.


### Area A: Steveston Village Character Area Map



## 2. The "Sakamoto Guidelines"

### Applicable Area

The "Sakamoto Guidelines" originally applied to an area slightly smaller than the current Steveston Business District – notably excluding the north side of Chatham Street and the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans property on the east side of No. 1 Road.



"Sakamoto Guidelines Applicable Area  
Steveston Revitalization Area"

The Documents:

The "Sakamoto Guidelines" were actually two sets of documents that were referred to in the 1989 version of the Steveston Area Plan (Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw 5400):

- (1) *Design Criteria for the Steveston Revitalization Area (1987)*
  - They provided a Steveston downtown design concept and illustrated urban design guidelines and written criteria regarding the following topics: character of buildings, continuity of commercial frontage, building height, exterior finish, parking location and type, signs, and landscaping.
- (2) Steveston Downtown Revitalization: Façade Guidelines (1989)
  - They provided an explanation of the Provincial Store Front Façade Grants Program and specific design guidelines for heritage storefront restoration in the Steveston Revitalization Area.

Copies of the above documents appear in Attachments 1 and 2.

Background:

The Sakamoto Guidelines were commissioned as supplements to the Development Permit Guidelines in Steveston Area Plan to guide the revitalization efforts in Steveston Downtown Revitalization area at the time in concert with the heritage designation initiatives by the City and Provincially funded Façade Improvement Grants Program active at the time.

The intent of the original Sakamoto Guidelines was to encourage the authentic restoration of "heritage" storefronts in the Steveston Downtown Revitalization area. As such, the design specifications tended to be very detailed and specific to the faithful recreation of building facades around 1900's. Theoretically, if the entire Sakamoto Guidelines document had been incorporated into the Steveston Sub-Area Plan for the Steveston Downtown Node, the replication of historic building form and character of a specific time period (circa 1900) would eventually emerge over time.

Note:

Replicating the historic character of a specific time period to achieve compatibility with the:

- existing eclectic developments, and
  - future development and business trends,
- will require further investigation.

Document Focus:

Both Sakamoto documents focused heavily upon encouraging owners to take advantage of the Façade Improvement Grants provided by the BC Downtown Revitalization Program, which was then in place and administered by the City. When the Revitalization Program and its funding were terminated by the Province, the revitalization area program for Steveston Village subsequently ceased.

**3. Investigate whether more stringent guidelines can be implemented for the Steveston Village area**

General

More stringent measures can be implemented. Currently, some key aspects of both the Sakamoto Guidelines are incorporated into the Steveston Area Plan urban design guidelines, such as the massing guidelines to limit the height of building to three-stories.

A review of the Steveston Area Plan guidelines indicate that some aspects of the Sakamoto Guidelines were not incorporated including:

- the more detailed guidelines with respect to the architectural detailing and building façade articulation;
- the graphic illustrations, character sketches and photographs which provided historically accurate architectural details; and
- streetscape elements including lighting standards, boulevard design, parking layout and historic sidewalk treatment/materials.

The current design guidelines provide general directions to achieve some of the original community goals and objectives envisioned in 1985 and reaffirmed in 2002. Significant redevelopments in some of the sub areas are near completion or well underway, such as the Garry Point/Scotch Pond Node, the Gulf of Georgia Node, BC Packers Node, Britannia Node, the Trites Node, and the London/Princess Node. Other areas, such as the Steveston Downtown Node and Steveston Park Node, will continue to evolve in response to the changing development context and community needs.

Accordingly, significant changes to the existing guidelines are not practical or necessary.

Effectiveness of the Urban Design Guidelines in Achieving the Steveston Vision:

Steveston Vision:

The formal Steveston Area Plan Vision is as a “homeport” where people can live work and play.

Challenges:

For Steveston Village, as redevelopment occurs, the challenges include:

- ensuring that the “home port” Vision is achieved,
- retaining an appropriate mix of land uses to ensure viability,
- protecting the desired heritage and non-heritage elements,
- accommodating redevelopment on both:
  - existing small properties, and
  - larger assembled sites which are large enough for “profitable” redevelopment due to constraints in achieving the required parking and loading requirement.

Visual Quality:

- The current Design Guidelines do not clearly articulate a complete urban design vision for the Village. In particular, they do not provide specific guidance for the streetscape including boulevard treatment and parking arrangement.

Heritage:

- Heritage can be better addressed. Of the 90 buildings in the village, only 12 have retained sufficient heritage merits to be considered for heritage “designation”. The other 78 buildings do not have sufficient merits for consideration for heritage designation, but their unique character should be protected.

This report does not address true heritage preservation, which is a significant consideration in Steveston Village. Heritage issues, including the preservation and protection of buildings and landmarks with significant heritage merits by establishing comprehensive heritage strategies will be addressed in a separate staff report at a future date.

**Better Define the Valued Urban Design Character:**

- The implicitly valued heritage and non-heritage village characters should be better defined to ensure their protection.
- As most agree that it is important to protect the design flavour of the Steveston Village, it is difficult to achieve this goal without better defining these design "characters".
- This can be achieved over time by providing additional graphic illustrations and written descriptions of the desired architectural detailing, materials and streetscape profiles.

**Analysis and Recommendations:**

The following steps are recommended to protect the existing character of Steveston:

**1. Sakamoto Guidelines**

Instead of including the Sakamoto Guidelines in its entirety into the Steveston Area Plan, the Sakamoto Guidelines should be used as a reference by staff in conjunction with the Steveston Design Guidelines, when dealing with restoration of buildings with significant heritage merits identified in the City's on line inventory. Council will be apprised of how each development proposal meets the Guidelines.

**2. Explanation of Development Permit Controls**

The existing guidelines can be made more effective by making two changes described below. These changes will better protect the existing exterior building characters:

**(1) Exterior Renovations to Storefronts:**

Currently, in the Steveston, the following occurs:

- Interior Renovations - all are exempt from Development Permits
- Exterior Renovations:
  - in Steveston Village - exterior renovations are exempt, if less than \$15,000, and
  - elsewhere in Steveston - exterior renovations if less than \$50,000 outside.

In Steveston Village, the current minimum threshold (\$15,000) for exterior renovations which can be undertaken without a Development Permit may lead to incremental changes to the exterior of existing building facades that, over time, might result in undesirable or uncharacteristic alterations to the storefronts and a loss of neighbourhood/heritage character.

Staff propose that, in Steveston Village, Development Permits for exterior renovations for all commercial, industrial and mixed-use developments with a minimum construction value of \$1,000 be applied, to better address mitigate the situation:

**Table 1: Comparison of Current and Proposed Exterior Renovations Exemptions:**

<b>Current DP Guideline Exemptions</b>	<b>Proposed DP Guideline Exemptions</b>
1. Renovations to interiors	1. No change
2. Exterior renovations of less than \$15,000 in Steveston Village"	2. All exterior renovations in the "Steveston Village" less than \$1000 construction value (Steveston Downtown Node)
3. Exterior renovations of less than \$50,000 outside "Steveston Village"	3. No change

**Implementation**

The above changes are incorporated into the proposed OCP Bylaw in this report.

**Benefits**

- The Development Permit process will enable staff to review exterior renovations, other than very minor alterations, to ensure that the proposed design is compatible with the existing Design Guidelines, adjacent buildings and where appropriate, to encourage accurate historic restorations.
- Staff will also have the discretion to refer to the Sakamoto Guidelines for appropriate restoration detailing as an interim measure until a further review of the heritage guidelines.

**(2) Increased Scope and Effectiveness of Development Permit Guidelines:**

The current Development Permit Guidelines were adopted under older legislation, which limits their scope and effectiveness. To increase their scope and effectiveness, it is proposed that the amended Guidelines be adopted using newer Local Government Act Sections 919.1 (1) (d) and (f). Readopting the guidelines under the updated legislation will expand the requirements of Development Permit beyond the "general character of the development" to include "landscaping, and the siting, form, exterior design and finish of buildings and other structures".

It is of note that under the former 1989 Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw 5400, there were no Development Permit exemptions for exterior renovations within the Steveston Village. The increased scope to include all buildings regardless of heritage status enables the City to prevent the cumulative loss of the Steveston Village character through uncharacteristic or in compatible storefront renovations.

**Pros:**

- Immediate implementation possible,
- All storefront renovations will undergo design review.

**Cons:**

- Increased review time and requirements for small renovation projects,
- Assumes that the current vision in the Steveston Area Plan will adequately address the changing economic and development context.

**Implementation:**

The above change is incorporated into the proposed OCP Bylaw in this report.

### Current Initiatives Underway

#### Build Out Implication:

While the current zoning in the Village (Steveston Commercial 2-Storey (C4) and Steveston Commercial 3-storey (C5) allows for much higher density than the existing development patterns (1.0 floor area ratio (F.A.R.) and between 9 m and 12 m height), the multiple ownership of small parcels of land in Steveston Village presents development challenges in this area.

Staff need to review the built-out implications in Steveston based on the developments achievable under the current zonings including, but not limited to:

- parking, infrastructure and services requirements, and
- the interface between residential and commercial uses at grade in the transitional areas radiating outwards from the village core business district.

#### Parking Review:

- The Transportation Department is currently undertaking a comprehensive review of the parking and loading needs and transportation strategies to address the development conditions at maximum "built-out" permissible under the uses permitted under current zoning. Transportation staff will prepare a separate report to Council by December, 2004.

#### Steveston Commercial (C4 and C5) Zone Districts:

- Staff are preparing a separate report to better manage retail and residential uses in mixed-use (commercial/residential) development on C4 and C5 zoned sites.

#### Ongoing work:

- Over time it is desirable to improve the existing urban design guidelines, as work priorities permit, by:
  1. improving clarity the Village character vision,
  2. providing specific design guidelines for streetscape and landscaping;
  3. simplifying and consolidating the existing guidelines for additional clarity; and
  4. including graphic illustrations to demonstrate the design intent, materials, and façade treatment envisioned.

### **Conclusion**

- The Steveston Area Plan Urban Design Guidelines are effective.
- Two immediate changes are proposed.
- Parking and zoning improvements are underway and will be brought forward separately.
- Overtime, other improvements are contemplated, as work priorities permit.

  
Cecilia Achiam, MCIP,  
Urban Design Planner, (Local 4122)  
CA:blg

Attachment 1: Design Criteria for the Steveston Revitalization Area (1987)  
Attachment 2: Steveston Downtown Revitalization: Façade Guidelines (1989)

# 9  
"IN CAMERA"

CITY OF RICHMOND  
REPORT TO COMMITTEE

DATE: February 13, 1991  
TO: Planning and Development Services Committee  
FROM: Ron Mann  
Director of Planning  
RE: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE STEVESTON DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION  
COMMITTEE  
FILE: 1019

(032)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That:

1. The Steveston Downtown Revitalization Committee be re-named the Steveston Design Committee;
2. The operating procedures, as shown on Attachment 1 to the report dated February 8, 1991 from the Director of Planning, be adopted as policy; and
3. The following names be submitted to open Council meeting for appointment to the Steveston Design Committee for a two year term effective January 1991:

Bill Carnegie  
Richard Creed  
Irene Fox  
John Horton  
Ron Kemp  
Bud Sakamoto  
Dave Scott

## STAFF REPORT

February 13, 1991

- 2 -

1019

### BACKGROUND

On January 23, 1989, Council resolved that all Development Permits in Steveston be referred to the Steveston Downtown Revitalization Committee for comments (see attached map of the area).

A new group has been nominated to fill vacancies on the Committee for a term from January 1991 to January 1993.

### ANALYSIS

The original function of the Steveston Downtown Revitalization Committee was to oversee the Downtown Revitalization Program. When the street improvements were completed, the main function of the Committee became the review of Development Permit applications. The Committee has been functioning for over a year-and-a-half now, and has helped to elevate the quality of design by serving as a source of feedback for the local community.

The Committee, on February 16, 1989, agreed to operate according to the attached procedure guidelines. It is suggested that Council recognize these procedures. There are two aspects of the procedures worth highlighting:

1. In addition to reviewing Development Permits, the Committee would like to review all Sign Permits in the area, and have been doing so thus far with the co-operation of the Permits and Licences Department. This should be an interim procedure until the Sign Bylaw is amended to create a special sign control area.
2. The Committee suggests that seven nominees to the Committee be appointed for two year terms.

The Steveston Business Association and the Steveston Community Association have nominated seven members to the Committee (see attached letters). The nominees are:

- . Bill Carnegie
- . John Horton
- . Richard Creed
- . Dave Scott
- . Bud Sakamoto
- . Irene Fox
- . Ron Kemp

It should be noted that the purpose of the Committee is purely advisory. Individual Committee members may wish to liaise with their parent organizations, but should not attempt to take on a regulatory or policing role.

Finally, to reflect the current function, it is suggested that the Committee be renamed THE STEVESTON DESIGN COMMITTEE (SDC).

... 3

CONCLUSIONS

1. Council has been referring Development Permits to the Steveston Revitalization Committee for over two years.
2. The Committee needs to be reappointed as per the attached procedure guidelines.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The Committee operates as unpaid volunteers. Municipal staff provide administrative assistance.



Ron Mann  
Director of Planning

AJ/tw / Attachments

4254K



# City of Richmond Steveston Interurban Tram Feasibility Study




Photo: Steveston Interurban Restoration Society

Staff Report  
City of Richmond

Interviews and discussions also took place with individuals from the following regional and provincial attractions:

Museum of Anthropology

Vancouver Aquarium

Capilano Suspension Bridge

Nelson Electric Tramway Society

City of Vancouver, Engineering Department staff (operators of the Vancouver Tram)

Support for the complete restoration and operation of Tram #1220 was unanimous. All individuals interviewed felt that it was a viable attraction for the City of Richmond but that it needed to be marketed as an added value to the Village of Steveston and existing attractions and businesses. Packaging the product of Steveston and marketing this multi-faceted destination to families, seniors and "train buffs" particularly those in the Lower Mainland and B.C. is critical to the success of the Tram. This would entail community groups, businesses, Tourism Richmond and the City of Richmond to commit to a concerted effort to present this "product" as a whole in the tourism market. It was felt that a "ride only" experience or static display would not be sufficient to attract enough visitors to make the Tram a viable attraction.


Opinions about building locations varied somewhat. Steveston Park was believed to be inappropriate for a tourist attraction as it is a community based, neighbourhood park. Garry Point Park and Britannia Heritage Shipyard were thought to be viable although Garry Point was somewhat preferred as it is more easily visible to the public. One interviewee believed the west side of Britannia was appropriate only if the Phoenix Net Loft was demolished. Another individual believed the building should be located at the London/Princess area and that the track should extend the whole distance from there to Garry Point Park.

Opinions about route options were also varied although the main consistent points raised were to make sure the Tram actually operated, the track was long enough to have some impact and be visible and provide transportation for locals and was near existing B.C. Transit service. Over half the interviewees preferred a route as close to the water as possible although others were concerned about safety on the dyke. Visibility of the Tram in operation was thought critical.

### **3.2 Public Opinion Survey Summary**

The Steveston Interurban Tram Feasibility Study Public Opinion Survey was conducted from July 21 to 26, 2002 to help gauge public opinion about the possibility of operating Interurban Tram Car #1220 in the Steveston area. Over 190 surveys were completed, 65% by Richmond residents and 35% by visitors. Ages ranged from under 20 years to over 65 years old.

99.5% of Richmond residents surveyed supported the idea of an interurban tram operating in the Steveston area. 100% of visitors to Richmond supported the idea.



# Possible Tram Routes to be Evaluated

## 7.0 Financial Implications

### Capital Costs

Preliminary capital costs listed below could be substantially reduced if government grant and sponsorship efforts are successful. See Appendix B and C for cost estimates.

Estimated Cost			Breakdown of Estimated Cost			
Route Option – see attached map	Location - Steveston Village to Britannia Heritage Shipyard	Total Cost	Track, Electrical Requirements & Crossings	Building & Stations	Tram Relocation & Restoration	Design & Contingency (25%)
1a	Bayview St. east	\$3,272,000	1,655,000	630,000	332,000	655,000
1b	Bayview St. east (around bldgs)	\$3,236,000	1,627,000	630,000	332,000	647,000
2	Dyke	\$4,400,000	2,558,000	630,000	332,000	880,000
3a	Moncton St. east	\$3,825,000	2,098,000	630,000	332,000	765,000
3b	Moncton St. east (around bldgs.)	\$3,788,000	2,068,000	630,000	332,000	758,000
Route Option	Location – Steveston Village to Garry Point Park	Total Cost	Track, Electrical Requirements & Crossings	Building & Stations	Tram Relocation & Restoration	Design & Contingency (25%)
4	Gulf of Georgia Cannery via 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ave. and Chatham St. to Garry Point Park	\$3,386,000	1,747,000	630,000	332,000	677,000
Route Option	Location – Steveston Village Extension	Total Cost	Track, Electrical Requirements & Crossings	Building & Stations	Tram Relocation & Restoration	Design & Contingency (25%)
Moncton St.	Moncton St.	\$1,564,000	1,218,000	33,000	-	313,000
Bayview St.	Bayview St.	\$1,811,000	1,416,000	33,000	-	362,000
<b>Complete Route</b>	Garry Point Park to Britannia Heritage Shipyard	\$6,783,000 to \$7,912,000	4,398,000 to 5,301,000	696,000	332,000	1,357,000 to 1,583,000
<b>Tram as Museum Display</b>	Stevston area location	\$ 929,000		Building only – 581,000	Move and restore tram body only - 162,000	186,000

