



To: Planning Committee **Date:** October 11, 2006
From: Terry Crowe **File:** 08-4050-00/Vol 01
 Manager, Policy Planning
Re: **City Centre Area Plan Update – Study Progress & Preliminary Public
 Consultation Findings**

Staff Recommendation

That, as described in the Manager, Policy Planning report: “City Centre Area Plan Update – Study Progress & Preliminary Public Consultation Findings”, dated October 11, 2006, staff proceed with the public consultation process for the City Centre Area Plan Update.

Terry Crowe
 Manager, Policy Planning

TTC:spc

Att. 6

| FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| ROUTED TO: | CONCURRENCE | | CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER | | |
| Engineering..... | Y <input type="checkbox"/> | N <input type="checkbox"/> | | | |
| Parks Design, Construction & Programs . | Y <input type="checkbox"/> | N <input type="checkbox"/> | | | |
| Recreation & Cultural Services | Y <input type="checkbox"/> | N <input type="checkbox"/> | | | |
| Transportation..... | Y <input type="checkbox"/> | N <input type="checkbox"/> | | | |
| REVIEWED BY TAG | YES | NO | REVIEWED BY CAO | YES | NO |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Staff Report

Origin

A strategic update of Richmond's City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) commenced in May 2006 and is currently underway, the purpose of which is to prepare a "capacity based framework for development" for the downtown, including:

- Expanding the City Centre to include West Bridgeport and adjacent lands in order that this area may be better integrated with the downtown and the downtown may be better integrated with the Canada Line and the airport;
- Reflecting the changes that Richmond and its downtown have undergone since the Area Plan's original adoption in 1995; and
- Better guiding the downtown's growth in line with an enhanced vision, goals, principles, and policies aimed at supporting the area's development as Richmond's urban centrepiece.

The CCAP Update is envisioned as a two part process involving:

- 2006 - Preparation of an Area Plan Concept (for endorsement by Council in Jan 2007); and
- 2007 – Preparation and adoption of the Area Plan Bylaw and Implementation Strategy (including any required financial/Development Cost Charge bylaws).

The purpose of this report is to:

- Report back on public input received through a public consultation process held in July 2006;
- Provide an overview of the directions being pursued for the draft Concept;
- Outline the progress of parallel City studies; and
- Receive Council input regarding the next stage of public consultation proposed for November 4 to 17, 2006.

Findings

1. Public Input – July 2006

The CCAP Update process (**Attachment 1**) provides for a variety of public consultation opportunities, including individual and group stakeholder meetings (**Attachment 2**), the posting of information on the City's website, and two week-long public open house/presentation sessions in 2006, the first of which was held in July. Public input from the July public consultation session was collected in the form of surveys and letters, the results of which are briefly described below.

1.1 July Public Consultation - Attendance & Questionnaire Submissions

| Event | Date | Attendees (Signed In) | No. of Questionnaires |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Presentation | July 18, 2006 | 63 | 22 |
| Stakeholder Meeting | July 19, 2006 | 20 | 8 |
| Staffed Open House | July 22, 2006 | 52 | 40 |
| Sub-Total | | 135 | 70 |
| Email | | - | 1 |
| Mail-In/Drop-Off | | - | 20 |
| Sub-Total | | - | 21 |
| TOTAL | | 135 | 91 |

In addition to the events listed above, individual group presentations were made to:

- School District No. 38 (Richmond) – School Board & Staff (July 20, 2006)
- Richmond Library Board (July 26, 2006)
- Vancouver International Airport Authority (VIAA) (August 9, 2006)
- Urban Development Institute (UDI) (August 15, 2006)
- Richmond Committee on Disability (August 17, 2006)
- Agricultural Land Commission staff (September 21, 2006)

1.2 Survey Responses, July 2006 (**Attachment 3**)

| PRELIMINARY STUDY FINDINGS – JULY 2006 | |
|--|--|
| Proposed Plan Features | Degree of Public Support as per Survey Results |
| Vision, goals, principles, transit-oriented development, village attributes & “Build Green” objectives | 74-78% support |
| Population scenarios of 120,000 & 156,000 residents | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 64% favoured 120,000 versus 32% for 156,000 • 61% preferred to <u>give up jobs rather than park</u> space if required to make a choice • General agreement that the <u>proposed amenities would support 120,000</u>, but probably not 156,000 |
| 20% Affordable Housing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 43% support • <u>Strong recognition of the need</u> for affordable housing, especially in light of low paying jobs and high market housing costs • <u>Concern over the cost</u> of achieving this goal, especially in light of the cost of providing adequate public amenities, park, and services |
| Top three preferred public amenities to provide | #1 Parks #2 Community Centres #3 Libraries |
| Top three preferred business opportunities/programs to pursue | #1 Office & Live/Work #2 Retail #3 Light industry |
| Preference regarding the type of “Centre of Excellence” the City Centre should become | #1 “Sports & Wellness” and “Arts & Culture” #2 “Heritage” and “Sustainability” |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the survey results indicate solid support for most features, concern over the cost of achieving the plan (e.g., parks, affordable housing, amenities, etc.) was regularly expressed and requires attention. |

1.3 Stakeholder Letters (**Attachment 4, 5 & 6**)

School District No. 38 (Richmond) – The School Board requests that adequate time is allotted to the planning process and wishes to ensure that:

- Schools are better reflected in the plan and are an integral part of the village concept;
- Adequate open space is provided; and
- The City and School District continue their successful record of collaborating in the acquisition of joint school/park sites.

Vancouver International Airport Authority (VIAA) – VIAA recognizes the pressing need for coordination in the planning of the City Centre and Sea Island to address competing ground transportation needs, noise issues, and mutually advantageous development opportunities and specifically would like to see:

- The number of residents minimized in high noise areas;
- Richmond’s Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development (ANSD) Policy fully implemented; and
- Monitoring of the ANSD Policy.

Urban Development Institute (UDI) – UDI is supportive of the City’s comprehensive approach to planning the downtown and wishes to ensure that:

- The cost of providing parks, infrastructure, and amenities are sustainable over the long term and to do not unfairly penalize new development;
- Developer costs are identified quickly; and
- Incentives are considered with regard to “green” initiatives and mid-rise buildings.

2. Study Directions

2.1 Proposed Planning Directions

In July 2006, the CCAP Update study presented a range of materials to the public and Council including background information, draft vision/goals/principles, alternative ultimate growth scenarios (e.g., 120,000 versus 156,000 residents), and a variety of features thought to be key to creating a livable, viable, and sustainable downtown (e.g., village network and attributes, community amenities, affordable housing, etc.).

Based on the results of that public consultation process, work undertaken since that time has concluded that the CCAP Update should support:

- The draft vision, goals, principles, transit-oriented development, village attributes, and “Build Green” objectives;
- An ultimate population of 120,000 residents, together with a range and amount of park, public amenities, and affordable housing as was generally described;
- The downtown as a “centre of excellence” for “sports & wellness” and “arts & culture”;
- New downtown office and live/work development; and
- Strategies aimed at:
 - Ensuring a high level of accessibility (e.g., mobility, affordability, cultural, etc.);
 - Coordinating the efforts of the City with those of key stakeholders (e.g., schools, airport, developers, health, etc.); and
 - Ensuring that the plan will be both affordable and achievable without compromise.

2.2 Preliminary “Framework for Development”

Based on the directions identified above, the study has looked at more detail into what it could mean for Richmond’s downtown to house 120,000 residents and how that should be accomplished. This next stage of work involves the preparation of a preliminary “framework for development” and includes:

- A. Transect Mapping – Proposed definitions and corresponding mapping describing a hierarchy of features and forms (e.g., building height, road width, park size, etc.) ranging in scale and intensity of use (e.g., from low density to high density, from low-rise to high-rise, etc.) based on their proximity to transit and other nodes (e.g., riverfront, etc.) for:
- Land uses;
 - Public open spaces and amenities;
 - Streets, transit, and cycling networks; and
 - Built form.
- B. Village Plans – Proposed preliminary composite mapping for each of the downtown’s 10 proposed village centres (e.g., 5 Canada Line villages and 5 “buslink” villages, such as that around the Oval), each of which will have a radius of roughly 400 m (1/4 mile or a 5 minute walk) and incorporate +/- 50 ha (124 acres) (e.g., similar in size to the Alexandra Sub-Area of West Cambie). This preliminary mapping will illustrate a coordinated approach to land use, built form, streets, open space, and key features (e.g., retail “high streets”, etc.).
- C. Big Ideas – A proposed set of key urban design initiatives and major infrastructure projects fundamental to achieving the City’s and community’s objectives for a “world class” downtown with a distinctly Richmond character (e.g., riverfront uses and treatments, “gateway” development, etc.).
- D. Concurrent/Supportive Studies – A summary of preliminary recommendations arising through work currently underway regarding jobs and business, public amenities, etc.

3. Progress on Parallel City Studies

3.1. Concurrent Study Status

| | Study | Who | Status | Estimated Completion |
|----|---|-----------------------|--|---|
| 1 | Economic Market Positioning Study | Policy Planning [PPD] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proceeding hand-in-hand with the CCAP Update | January 2007 |
| 2 | Update - City Centre Transportation Plan | Transportation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1: Vision Development - Start in September 2006 | Phase 1: Jan. 2007 |
| | | Transportation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 2: Implementation Strategy - Start in November 2006 | Phase 2: April 2007 |
| 3 | City Centre Servicing Plan | Engineering | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1: Preliminary Recommendations • Phase 2: Final Recommendations | Phase 1: Feb. 2007 Phase 2: April 2007 |
| 4 | No. 3 Road Streetscape Study | Major Projects | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual Design: Complete • Preliminary Design: Underway • Detailed Design: Start 2007 | Current phase: December 2006 |
| 5 | “PRCS City Centre Places & Spaces Strategy” | PRCS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Centre Concept Plan: Draft Plan complete in October 2006 | City-Wide Study (including City Centre): Dec 2006 |
| | | PRCS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation Strategy | April 2007 |
| 6 | Affordable Housing Strategy | PPD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft recommendation preparation | December 2006 |
| 7 | Geotechnical Practices Study | BAD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start: September 2006 | Tentative: December 2006 |
| 8 | Middle Arm Open Space Master Plan Concept | Parks /PPD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Plan Concept: October 2006 | December 2006 |
| 9 | Build Green Initiatives | Eng/Env | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start: October 2006 | March 2007 |
| 10 | School Community Connections Program (Joint City/School District) | PRCS/PPD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant hired | Current phase: January 2007 |
| 11 | Building Height Study | PPD/BAD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact initiated with Transport Canada | TBD |

3.2. Additional Work in 2007

In addition to the concurrent studies listed above, as part of the CCAP Update process the following work will be undertaken in support of the plan, with completion in spring 2007:

- A. Rate of Growth: The rate of growth, including the identification of key trends and influences affecting population, employment, housing units, etc.;
- B. Locational Phasing: The identification of where and when growth should occur, and how that growth will be coordinated with the provision of services, infrastructure, parks, etc.;
- C. Demographic Profile –The composition of the population.
- D. Development Triggers, Incentives & Mechanisms: The identification of tools and how to apply them in support of the City’s effective management of growth (e.g., rate, form, and location), cost-effective provision of amenities, and coordination of CCAP objectives with existing zoning, Building Code, soil conditions, etc., including:
 - Triggers
 - Measures incorporated in the CCAP bylaw, designed to restrict growth until such time as the features necessary to support that growth (e.g., parks, roads, amenities, schools, affordable housing, child care, etc.) are in place or secured to the City’s satisfaction.
 - For example, neighbourhood boundaries may be defined (perhaps a small as one-quarter of a ¼-Section in size) within which a park of a specific size must be secured prior to development proceeding in that area.
 - Incentives
 - Measures identified within the CCAP bylaw and its implementation strategy aimed at encouraging developers to provide the features noted above in exchange for some form of benefit or compensation.
 - “Density Bonussing” – Richmond currently provides for benefit or compensation for the provision of community amenities, infrastructure, etc. through means such as Development Cost Charge credits and rezoning to higher and better uses/densities. Another approach, “density bonussing”, could be applied where the City wishes to specify amenity requirements and corresponding density “bonuses” within a zoning bylaw to facilitate easy implementation and make the process as transparent as possible. This might be applied, for example, in areas:
 - a) Near the Canada Line stations, thus, giving developers in those key areas clearly set out incentives to provide special amenities at the Development Permit stage, rather than rezoning; and
 - b) Currently zoned Downtown Commercial District (C7), where high land costs may make the conventional provision of amenities by the City cost prohibitive. In this case, securing amenities in exchange for additional density may be the City’s only practical approach to satisfying CCAP objectives. Making this approach work will, however, require that the

City puts various mechanisms in place to ensure that high-density C7 sites are able to take advantage of that extra density. (See below)

- Mechanisms

- Measures aimed at facilitating practical opportunities for developments to take advantage of the incentives noted above. Such mechanisms could include, among other things:
 - a) Additional building height – This is of particular importance in the area zoned C7 (where Transport Canada has indicated that it may be possible for buildings to extend past the current 47 m geodetic limit), where additional height may be necessary to effectively implement “density bonussing” and/or to achieve possible CCAP objectives for sculpting of the downtown skyline.
 - b) Parking relaxations – With Richmond’s high water table, structured parking is typically built above grade, resulting in considerable bulk on development sites. However, with increasing land prices, better transit, more transit-oriented residents/workers, and various Parking Demand Management measures, it is becoming increasingly reasonable to encourage or require significant parking relaxations, which can translate into decreased parking bulk and, in turn, the capacity for increased residential and/or commercial uses.
 - c) Regulating parking density – In addition to parking relaxations, it is becoming increasingly practical as a result of technology and land costs to consider reducing parking bulk by locating more of it below grade. To promote this and the use of parking relaxations/Parking Demand Management measures, the City could revise current zoning practices to discourage excessive parking above grade by regulating its floor area through zoning as is done for all other uses.

3.3. Garden City Lands Status

Background

Preliminary CCAP Update planning presented to Council and the public in July 2006 proposed that the “Garden City Lands” – the Federal lands bounded by Garden City Road, Alderbridge Way, No. 4 Road, and Westminster Highway (Section 03-4-6) – should be developed as park, recreation, and various urban uses and amenities, thus, requiring its removal from the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). This proposal is generally consistent with:

- The existing Area Plan, which designates this area for park and directs that it be developed with “major athletic facilities”;
- The City’s need for a minimum of 50% of this area for park and public amenities to meet the needs of downtown and city-wide residents; and
- A memorandum of understanding between the Canada Lands Company (CLC), the Musqueam First Nation, and the City of Richmond.

Application Status

In September 2006, the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) denied CLC’s application to remove the Garden City Lands from the ALR. In light of the importance of this land to the three stakeholder groups and the ALC, discussions are underway regarding how to achieve a win-win resolution to this situation.

CCAP Consultation with ALC

On September 21, 2006, City staff met with ALC staff to review the planning underway for Richmond’s City Centre. ALC staff appreciated the thoroughness of the CCAP process as it applies to the downtown’s urban uses and welcomed the invitation to work with the City over the coming months to identify a:

- Mutually supportive strategy for the future of Richmond’s downtown and the Garden City Lands; and
- Definition of “community need” as it might apply to the Garden City Lands (and possibly to other situations and/or other communities).

CCAP Process

Given the timing of the ALC’s decision and the uncertainty surrounding the future of the Garden City Lands, this stage of the CCAP Update’s process maintains the proposed land uses for this area as per the materials presented to Council and the public in July 2006.

Following this stage, staff will investigate how best to reflect the future of the Garden City Lands in the CCAP Update and prepare specific recommendations as part of the CCAP Concept for Council consideration in January 2007.

4. Next Stage of Public Consultation - November 2006

4.1 Proposed Public Consultation Schedule

| Event | Location | Date |
|--|------------------------------|--|
| Advertising | Local Newspapers | 2 Weekends October 28th & November 4th |
| Open House Display | City Hall - Galleria | Saturday, Nov. 4th to Friday, Nov. 17 th |
| Staffed Open House | City Hall - Galleria | Saturday, Nov. 4 th 10 am – 2 pm |
| Presentation | City Hall - Council Chambers | Open House: 6 pm – 9 pm: Tuesday, November 7th @ 7 pm |
| Multi-Stakeholder Meeting (by invitation)* | City Hall – Meeting House | Thursday, November 9th 4 pm – 5:30 pm |
| Meetings with Individual Stakeholder Groups* | As requested | Monday, November 6th to Friday, November 17th |

* As was undertaken as part of the July 2006 public consultation process.

4.2 Purpose

Since the project's first round of public consultation in July 2006, the CCAP Update has focussed on evaluating and refining the study's preliminary findings, which has led to, among other things, the selection of the "120,000 resident scenario" as the preferred direction to pursue.

The purpose of the project's second round of public consultation proposed for November 2006 will be to:

- Present a more detailed picture of the potential future of the downtown and the principles and ideas fundamental to the definition of its form, land uses, streets, parks, amenities, etc. based on an ultimate population of 120,000 residents; and
- Invite public feedback and input.

Based on the information received through the November 2006 process, further evaluation and refinement will be undertaken in order that a Concept may be prepared for consideration and approval by Council in January 2007.

4.3 Timing & Process

Staff propose that the second round of public consultation on the CCAP update be held in November 2006, as described above.

The draft open house/presentation materials will be presented to Planning Committee on October 17, 2006 and Council on October 23, 2006, following which they will be refined, as directed by Council, prior to the start of the proposed public open house/presentation on November 4, 2006.

This approach will allow a CCAP Concept to be presented to Council in January 2007.

| |
|--|
| Note: The revised CCAP Presentation boards will be presented at Planning Committee, on Oct 17, 2006. |
|--|

Financial Impact - None.

Conclusion

The City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) Update and Implementation Strategy involves two stages, the first of which is focussed on the preparation of an Area Plan Concept and is targeted for completion by January 31, 2007.

Public consultation conducted in July 2006 provided valuable information, contributing towards preparations for a second public process proposed for November 4 to 17, 2006.

Suzanne Carter-Huffman, Senior Planner/Urban Design (4228)
SCH:cas

CITY CENTRE AREA PLAN (CCAP) UPDATE PROCESS

| PART 1: - CITY CENTRE CONCEPT PREPARATION | ESTIMATES | STATUS |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1.1 Option Identification | April – July 2006 | Complete |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #1: Public Information Meeting, Open House & Survey | July 18 – 22, 2006 | Complete |
| 1.2 Option Evaluation | July – November 2006 | Substantially Complete |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #2: Public Information Meeting, Open House & Survey | November 4 - 17, 2006 | Proposed |
| 1.3 Area Plan Concept Approval | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Committee Review • Council Review | January 2007 | Proposed |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #3: Public Information Meeting, Open House & Survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirmation of the planning concept and implementation priorities supporting tasks in "Part 2" | February 2007 | Proposed |

| PART 2: - BYLAW & IMPLEMENTATION PREPARATION | | | ACTIVITY | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------|-------------------------------------|-----|---------|---------------|-----|---------|
| DATE | BASIC ANALYSIS | PARTS | City | Stakeholders | TAG | Council | | | |
| Feb Mar April | <input type="checkbox"/> Finalize AP Elements: - infrastructure, roads, - transit, parks, services, - amenities, - affordable housing, - sustainability, other <input type="checkbox"/> Quantify Elements <input type="checkbox"/> Cost Elements | <input type="checkbox"/> Part 1 - Analysis: - Demographics, Rate of growth, Phasing of Growth, GVRD services - Market studies - GVRD capacities - Other | Co-ordination | | TAG | Council | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Order of Magnitude | <input type="checkbox"/> Part 2 Options/Analysis - Integrate Options | | | | | Co-ordination | TAG | Council |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Complete | <input type="checkbox"/> Part 3: - Refinement | | | | | Co-ordination | TAG | Council |
| May June July | - How To Pay: - Taxes - DCCs - Density Bonusing - Amenity Fee - Grants - Other | - Draft 1 | Co-ordination | - UDI - School Board - Others | TAG | Council | | | |
| | | - Draft 2 | Co-ordination | - UDI - School Board - Others | TAG | Council | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Prepare City Centre Area Plan Bylaw <input type="checkbox"/> Prepare the Implementation Strategy | | | | | | | | |
| Aug | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff reviews and concurrences | | | | | | | | |
| Aug | <input type="checkbox"/> Area Plan Bylaw Review: - Planning Committee - Council (1st and 2nd reading) | | | | | | | | |
| Sept | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing (3rd reading) | | | | | | | | |
| Oct | <input type="checkbox"/> Financial (DCC) Bylaws (1 st and 2 nd reading) | | | | | | | | |
| Nov | <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Approval of Financial Bylaws (6-8 weeks) | | | | | | | | |
| Nov | <input type="checkbox"/> Council Approval: - Area Plan Bylaw - Implementation Strategy - Financial (DCC) Bylaws | | | | | | | | |

Dates are estimates

CCAP UPDATE STAKEHOLDER MEETING

List of Invitees/Attendees, July 19, 2006

| | Invited Stakeholder Groups* | Attendance |
|----|---|-------------|
| 1 | Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee | |
| 2 | Richmond Disability Committee | YES |
| 3 | Seniors Advisory Committee | YES |
| 4 | Child Care Development Board | |
| 5 | Advisory Committee on the Environment | |
| 6 | Advisory Design Panel | |
| 7 | Public Art Commission | YES |
| 8 | Touchstone Family Association (RCSAC) | |
| 9 | City Centre Community Association | YES |
| 10 | Sea Island Community Association | |
| 11 | Richmond Sports Council | YES |
| 12 | BC Sports Council (Richmond) | |
| 13 | Richmond Aquatics Services Board | |
| 14 | Minoru Seniors' Society | YES |
| 15 | Richmond Fitness & Wellness Society | |
| 16 | Richmond Nature Park Society | |
| 17 | RACA | |
| 18 | Richmond Art Gallery Association | YES |
| 19 | Richmond Family Place Society (RCSAC) | YES |
| 20 | Volunteer Richmond Information services | |
| 21 | Richmond Society for Community Living | YES |
| 22 | Richmond Children First | |
| 23 | Richmond Chinese Community Society | YES |
| 24 | Vancouver Coastal Health | YES |
| 25 | Tourism Richmond | YES |
| 26 | Richmond Chamber of Commerce | YES |
| 27 | North Fraser Port Authority | YES |
| 28 | Urban Development Institute | YES |
| 29 | Canada Line Company | YES |
| 30 | Workers Compensation Board | YES |
| 31 | SUCCESS | |
| 32 | Strait of Georgia Marine Rescue Society | |
| 33 | Richmond Business Liaison & Communications Com. | |
| 34 | Richmond Economic Advisory Committee | YES |
| 35 | Canada Lands Company | |
| 36 | Musqueam First Nation | |
| | TOTAL Stakeholder Groups Represented | 18** |

* Future stakeholder meetings will be made available to additional stakeholder groups based on expressions of interest received by the City including, for example, the Metro Vancouver Planning Coalition represented by Richard Balfour.

** Total attendees (e.g., number of stakeholder group representatives) = 20 people

What are your comments regarding:

1. The proposed City Centre Area Vision?

(Board 2)

| 1 | 1 = Approve 5 = Disapprove | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------------|----|----|---|---|
| Rankings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Responses | 39 | 20 | 11 | 3 | 6 |
| | 75% | | | | |

Comments

- Excellent
- The proposed vision does not ___ address issues of diversity and accessibility to the extent it needs to.
- Like the long wide green space along the Fraser River Foreshore. Like more people walking - Less cars.
- We would like to see accessibility spelled and more clearly defined in the goals and methodology.
- Exciting & challenging. Density with amenities - Now we just have density.
- There needs to be a focus on accessible development at all buildings and spaces.
- Approve.
- Good plan – however outdoor terraces for relaxing with a drink should be incorporated in low traffic areas.
- Lots of bike lanes please.
- Seems like the right way to go.
- Northeast corner of Alderbridge and Garden City – why is this not included?
- No low rent or low cost housing. Please stop competing with Vancouver.
- In general, the maps were hard to read and not even oriented North. Hard to get the message!
- It looks good
- I support “smart” growth.
- This is not “smart” growth – where are the smaller (1 to 4 unit structures? Too much density and high structures).
- It's good, but it should have a reasonable budget.
- I am in full agreement with this vision.
- Too dense.
- Excellent use of village concept

2. The proposed Guiding Principles?

(Board 3)

| 2 | 1 = Approve 5 = Disapprove | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------------|----|---|---|---|
| Rankings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Responses | 39 | 19 | 8 | 3 | 5 |
| | 78% | | | | |

Comments

- Promote culture of walking and cycling
- Walking. Less car use – Excellent
- Excellent.
- All good – smart/sustainable growth- workable, all great.
- The building models address residential, commercial, transit, park, etc., but appear to be missing health and social services.
- Need to include accessibility, green developments, inclusiveness to be defined.
- 3 Road does not work as it is. Points 3 and 4 are very important.
- Richmond Council not financially responsible now. Are you expecting a miracle? Board 3 is all hype – no substance.
- Agree with principles.
- Agree with the principles.
- No sign of any child care (urgent) social community services in what is built already. Where are the fire rangers for high rises? Have you not learnt your lesson?
- I agree with all principles. I hope I live long enough to see them developed (I am 61).
- No. 3 Road is already too congested; people are not going to walk 10 m to catch the Canada Line; need villages in OUTLYING areas with reliable transit connection to No. 3 Road and Canada Line.

What are your comments regarding:

- Full agreement.
- Should add "Gard (sic) or maintain flow and access for existing businesses".
- Silly.

3. The creation of Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Urban Villages? (Board 8)

| | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 3 | 1 = Approve 5 = Disapprove | | | | |
| Rankings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Responses | 43 | 15 | 9 | 2 | 9 |
| | 74% | | | | |

Comments

- Excellent
- The creation of the Capstan Urban Village will be delayed by Canada Line decision not to build the Capstan Station immediately
- We should take full advantage of the new Canada Line
- Sounds good on paper- after all downtown awfully spread apart - TOD is always good - but hard to overcome ugly downsizing concrete fill as of overhead skytrains.
- Transit shuttle buses are needed from outlying areas to Canada Line ___ at close regular intervals.
- Very much [want] it, but of course you need short wait time for transit.
- Will the Canada Line be able to handle the volume with a population of 156,000?
- Transit has been forced on us without thought for the people living in Richmond. It is concentrated in "retail" areas only bringing people to "shop". Nothing to move residents to and from work. Where it was possible to take one bus to downtown Vancouver, it will take 2-3 buses plus rapid transit – 2-3 times longer????
- No low cost housing.
- Cambie station to be in place before major development
- Yes, plan so that services and facilities available by public transit and by walking on foot.
- See above – villages needed away from downtown and better transit service travelling east and west.
- It is very convenient.
- All residents should live within 5 mins. of a transit stop. It is also important that the bust runs more frequently.
- Fully agree!
- Excellent proposition.
- Won't work
- Make sure the buses are there on the day.
- Consideration should be given to outdoor terraces. Bus shuttle services from outlying areas are critical.

4. The proposed list and priority of Village Attributes? (Board 8)

| | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 4 | 1 = Approve 5 = Disapprove | | | | |
| Rankings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Responses | 39 | 16 | 7 | 3 | 9 |
| | 74% | | | | |

Comments

- Excellent
- We are a union. Our hall could readily serve other community purposes- Daycare, Public Meetings, Cultural Events, Education Centres, Etc.
- Attributes are okay but keep in mind not all nudges will be able to provide all the items required. - Most people will use facilities located elsewhere.
- Big lack of performing art venues - theatres, drama, dance all types of music, galleries etc for musical arts.
- Need to expand thinking around access to health care services to have this in most village areas.
- Seems like too much segregation of certain villages. One area seemed like strictly entertainment and less housing. I am not for a strictly entertainment district.

What are your comments regarding:

- Village residents “yes”. Richmond residents “no”. Nothing for the home owner “tax payer”. – Village and retail only.
- Please work out where low cost housing is going to be.
- I got lost on the concept.
- Provide more public transit so all else will be possible. We can’t afford constant gridlock that will occur as the population rises.
- All the ideas cover everything, but is it realistic?
- Stupid.
- Can this be achieved?
- People gathering places are critical to a vibrant community.

5. The following population scenarios:

5a. 120,000 downtown residents?

| | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|----|---|-----|----|
| 5a | 1 = Approve 5 = Disapprove | | | | |
| Rankings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Responses | 27 | 15 | 9 | 4 | 11 |
| | 64% | | | 23% | |

5b. 156,000 downtown residents?

| | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|---|-----|----|
| 5b | 1 = Approve 5 = Disapprove | | | | |
| Rankings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Responses | 16 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 28 |
| | 32% | | | 55% | |

Under 5b, would you prefer:

- **More Parks, Less Jobs** (Board 19)
- **More Jobs, Less Parks** (Board 20)

| | | |
|------------------|----|------|
| Responses | 27 | 61 % |
| | 17 | 39 % |

Comments

- Not sure what is appropriate. Earthquake issue still worry me a great deal.
- No, don't go here [e.g., “156,000 residents”]. Even 120,000 is too much. 85,000 would be better.
- Open space park underneath the flight path is not a good idea.
- What about jobs for those who come in from outside the centre?
- Push for trees - foliage and small garden spaces and green roofs for all developments.
- More parks, more jobs. Greater building height. I would prefer to see Richmond develop a 28-storey height limit to allow higher density with parks and jobs.
- This is a stupid question. Jobs in balance with amenities including parks. Who doesn't like park and needs a job?
- Let's face it, the population will go beyond 156,000, so plan for more density now and keep the ALR out of harm's way.
- More people do not make it more livable.
- We need people to make the RAV line operational. Why split hairs over a variance of 36,000 more people. We need green space. They are the “lungs” of community and a place to play and relax and socialize.
- “Minimum wage jobs”. People working here won't be able to live here. Plan defeats its own purpose.
- 156,000 is too crowded.
- Too many people.
- If we have to have that many residents there let's plan the infrastructure and implement in parallel.
- As density increases, more parks are needed.
- Jobs and the job market create themselves – Parks and Open spaces do not.
- More density, more parkland; Current downtown has much underutilized space.
- Need to consider traffic congestion and parking (whole day parking lot)
- More building (high and low rise) = less liveable “urban jungle”.
- If it's too crowded with jobs, it's not so good.
- I strongly agree that higher density requires more parkland (better use of the dyke as public space) and transit nodes VIP.

What are your comments regarding:

- No parks in Richmond only a few scruffy baseball fields.
- More jobs away from city centre with easy transit.
- Find the balance

6. Do you think that a target of 20% affordable housing as defined is realistic and desirable?
(Board 21)

| 6 | | | |
|-----------|-----|-----|------------|
| Rankings | Yes | No | Don't Know |
| | 34 | 26 | 19 |
| Responses | 43% | 33% | 24% |

Comments

- Should be 30%
- Will be fortunate if 12%-15% achieved. This already critical; situation will only become worse.
- Target is good, but historically nothing will be done. No monetary incentive.
- What is affordable? House/home under \$150,000? Size of home?
- If we can afford it! 5% is probably more economically viable. Who is going to pay for it?
- It is necessary, not just desirable
- The greater height limit would allow more housing, and thus increase supply and make housing more affordable
- I'm not sure [of] the formula. I feel that senior housing is important but in the core not 20% affordable (or aka subsidized)
- What is the ratio of seniors and low-income earners?
- Affordable Housing a Long Standing Community issue that needs to be addressed.
- I don't think 20 % is achievable. The City should not be interfering with the marketplace. - Some affordable housing is required for those who really need it (5-8%).
- Would like to see a lot more affordable/accessible housing. Whatever you've planned for I are sure we need more.
- Seems a common percent for other cities. - Maybe higher - 20% for Social Housing 80% for Affordable. (Does Richmond meet this?)
- Define affordable housing. Is affordable housing not the units on the second floor overlooking the lane?
- We need to raise this to 25-30% to ensure we have enough affordable housing to allow people to live where they work.
- 20% too high – Try 15%. People can be subsidized. Developers and investors still need to make a profit.
- Too idealistic and socialistic.
- Seems like good starting number, but with current housing prices and government not helping, there will likely be more need than your projections.
- People who don't make a large income cannot afford to work here because of high cost of housing.
- What does affordable housing mean i.e. for whom? – The rich and famous? The average Joe? The hands ____? The seniors?
- 20% is not enough.
- Not good enough. – Annual income at \$37,000 is the national rate for poverty living. BC has the highest number of people having income less than \$37,000.
- Not enough.
- Is it enough?
- No such thing as affordable housing! Unless some government intervention through bonus density, subsidies, etc.
- Alberta oil fields do not require affordable housing. How do you plan so many jobs into a development with on people as a resource?
- And it is essential for a healthy diverse City of Richmond.
- City needs to enforce strongly as developer will get around by loophole.
- Because it's not the whole population and there are choices.
- There should be more than 20%. Perhaps 30% would be more appropriate.

What are your comments regarding:

- We will need more affordable housing – to attract families.
- 20% may be a little bit unreasonable. 10 – 20% more realistic.
- We need some more.
- Depends on existing supply total = 20%
- It sounds reasonable.

7. Do the amenities and proposed locations meet the needs of a City Centre population of:

a. 120,000? (Board 22)

b. 156,000? (Board 22)

| 7 | Preference | Yes | No | Don't Know |
|---|------------|-----|----|------------|
| a | Response | 40 | 7 | 18 |
| b | | 19 | 25 | 16 |

Comments

- Maybe?
- Unrealistic; can not expect
- Need to study brochure
- Missing a clearly articulated vision for social and health services.
- Higher population will mean long waits for some amenities
- Schools, social houses, centres, cultural venues.
- Health services, social services, [and] schools need to be included.
- Yes [to 120,000 resident scenario and “no” to 156,000 resident scenario] unless health, schools are included.
- Not enough fire engines. Infant day care.
- Keep public facilities public – no private partnerships. Keep private development away from parks and waterfront!!
- If there are less people, I think it's better.
- Using Vancouver as an example this appears reasonable.
- Not enough for existing.
- Too much development in tight pockets.

8. What are your priorities for parks recreation and cultural amenities in the City Centre?

(Board 23)

| 8 | Priority |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Parks | 1 st |
| Community Centres | 2 nd |
| Libraries | 3 rd |
| Cultural Amenities | 4 th |
| Older Adult & Youth Centres | |
| Sports Amenities | |
| Village Amenities | |
| Others | - |

Comments

- Parks and recreation only
- Some, not much room
- Other: Outdoor exercise space & rental garden space
- Not sure what will be most needed but I like the idea of relaxing park space adjacent to places we work, shop and commute.
- (1) Cultural, (2) Parks, (3) Recreation (enough already)
- The existing swimming pools at Minoru Road are obsolete and too small in size. We should assign priority to the new Aquatic Centre.

What are your comments regarding:

- For north city centre put the amenities, such as ____, community centre, by the waterfront so everyone can enjoy the view of the waterfront, planes, and mountains.
- Build a large museum in city centre – large enough to display substantial collection at one time – Keep parkland public!
- You need all of it.

9. What do you think about the proposed Build Green strategies?

(Board 24)

| 9 | 1 = Approve 5 = Disapprove | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------------|----|----|---|---|
| | Rankings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Responses | 39 | 13 | 12 | 3 | 3 |
| | 74% | | | | |

Comments:

- Excellent, if it can be done
- No need for Build Green strategy since more [than] ½ of Richmond is open green space.
- Combing small parks into big parks (more open and enjoyable)
- We are using up this planet at a rate that will require 2 more in the near future – but Build Green should “Build Green Value”.
- Add encouraging developers to build to minimize waste – encourage recycling of building materials.
- Be careful.
- It is essential.
- Green trees, plants, etc. help to improve air we breathe.
- Consider “Green Buildings- i.e. solar powered, uses rainwater for building uses.
- It 's great. We must do this
- Dreams.
- Right on! Agree with protecting Fraser River and providing greenways; green buildings (see UBC – Green Buildings).
- Of course – you're ????? the city centre area by 6 times!
- Concern with green roofs are potential moisture problems (re: Building Code related issues).
- Won't work.
- Yes. I want the community to be enjoyable in 30 years.

10. What types of business opportunities / programs would you like to see created in City Centre?

(Board 25)

| 10 | Priority |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Offices | 1 st |
| Live / Work | 1 st |
| Retail Space | 2 nd |
| Light Industry | 3 rd |
| Others | - |

Comments

- Entertainment – theatre, concert hall (small), bowling, arcades; on-street lounges & cafes, library, galleries, museum, industry on the periphery, religious, cultural & educational centres
- Brighthouse Estates evolving to high-density industrial – vertical industrial – like QLT, Radical Software, EA, etc.
- ____ value industry – biotech, software, art, movies
- Wireless internet connections to draw business.
- Richmond still needs light industry to provide employment. With people's work [further] from their homes, not as many office buildings needed.
- Something that will create jobs paying enough for people to survive and be able to live here – over \$37,000/year.

What are your comments regarding:

- Other: All City, Provincial and Federal services/authorities in one core area of City Centre.
- Good to try to attract some better paying jobs.
- Unique shops and boutiques, more like "main street". More 1 of a kind "mom and pop" shops and businesses.
- More live/work; offices; Why not establish a city-wide wireless internet service by 2010 – Toronto is doing this!
- Commercial street level rent will be a good investment.
- Live/work small business (arts, design, etc.). Retail – cafes, small boutique stores, light furniture manufacturing (artistic, small infrastructures)
- Provide assistance for existing business to retool to meet the needs of the village concept. (Consider tax reduction to cover costs of redevelopment of existing sites).
- Drug dealers brought in by RAV.
- Again, balance...

11. What does a Sustainable, Cultural or Wellness "Centre of Excellence" mean to you? (Board 25)

| 11 | Priority |
|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Sports and Wellness | 1 st |
| Arts and Culture | 1 st |
| Heritage | 2 nd |
| Sustainability Centre | 2 nd |
| Others | - |

Comments

- Not much
- Cultural / Health centre
- To expect fully utilizing travelling on Canada Line; I hope park & ride facilities can be worked in.
- A combination of all.
- What are you telling us? We don't need all this ___ especially concerning the Oval extravaganza.
- Cultural – whose?
- Other: Trade Union Centre & Retirees Resource Centre
- Richmond needs to attract more high quality arts events.
- Too much for the "body" in Richmond, not enough for the "mind".
- Sports/wellness "COFE" – training facility for future Olympians. Cultural "COFE" – Advertising Richmond's heritage. Sustainability "COFE" – promote sustainable planning/environment practices.
- What does it mean to you?
- Fulfilling the cultural needs of the people spiritually (no religion) mentally, physically.
- To provide an opportunity for citizens to participate in Arts, other Cultural activities, sports, etc.

12. Please provide any additional comments regarding the City Centre Area Plan Update Study process.

- North of Lansdowne (presently older homes) ideal for modest medium to low rental housing; proximity to Aberdeen & Lansdowne, Canada Line stations (& Vancouver). Huge mistake to be non-residential. (Also airplanes not so bad).
- Quite effective presentation.
- Since aircraft noise is the major issue in Richmond, why is City planning to keep expand downtown core?
- Keep up the good planning & reach your goal as the most desirable city to live in Canada.
- More people will be living in Richmond. Some of them will take transit train to Vancouver; others will drive. Is there any plan to build more bridges linking Richmond to Vancouver? Under emergency situations (why Sky Train will probably stop or be jammed), how will people be moved to other area?

What are your comments regarding:

- Looks like a good plan.
- Build City Centre towards the river. Get rid of River Road. Connect No. 3 Road to north loop road (CPR line).
- Don't close River Road so that new residents can have exclusive access to the river. A lot of other people live in this City and they have a claim to the views as well.
- Travel is not just north/south (Canada Line). You must go side east to west and southwest to northeast as well.
- We must have sustainable dyking around Richmond. Trees will hold the soil together. Community centres like Minoru (1986) should triple in size. No. 9 Rd. dyke.
- I would like to see a boulevard connecting Lansdowne/No. 3 Road diagonally to the riverfront and a Beach Avenue type development on both sides of the Fraser.
- I reckon the Canada Line stations along No. 3 Road can be reduced to only 2-3 stops as the distance is too close. By reducing the stops we can save and minimize over spending. Our tax money should be well spent.
- I feel that the residents of Richmond should consider themselves very lucky that so much time and attention is being taken by City Planners to create an incredible place to live.
- RAV line to Granville Island not Saba Road? More hospitals and medical care area? More parking? School and play areas? High rises like _____. (This is not Hong Kong.) – People like views.
- Congratulations on having a vision to plan and promote a well thought out “plan”. This approach to include public and stakeholders will hopefully promote positive support.
- Where will the displaced traditional industrial development be replicated – elsewhere. There is no industrial land left in Richmond – where are new or additional port related, good handling, transshipment – going to go?
- Good plan so far. Implementing is a challenge.
- How to ensure “Aberdeen” is truly “international shopping and arts” instead of only a “Chinese only” centre.
- When putting boards up for the public, mark road names. (Preferably on the first board.)
- Good work staff.
- Theoretically it sounds good – Hopefully it will develop as planned.
- To promote Canadian culture.
- I like these proposals. Do not take away housing from livable areas (Steveston, etc.). Libraries needed there also. Heritage buildings that need up-keep as that is our culture too.
- Please get going and make north city centre alive again. It will be a phoenix arising from the ashes.
- It's a good plan. Concern about the funding. We do not want the property tax to be higher.
- We need a higher ratio of long term care beds – much higher! Concern for more rentals and low cost housing – hourly rates for lower end jobs do not allow for a small family unit at the market cost.
- We are a Trade Union. About ½ our membership lives in Richmond. We see ourselves redeveloping our property for joint union and community use. We welcome the chance to work with the City.
- Would like to Challenge the City on this issue of inclusion and disabled access. When has there ever been an opportunity for a City to rebuild a large proportion of its downtown centre in such positive circumstances with such a wealth of resources at hand. Richmond has the potential to become a model for accessibility standards and to achieve a level of inclusion never experienced before in any other City.
- The City should incorporate this as a major component in the vision for this change. The City should take tangible action to ensure this opportunity is not missed. To do this right a specialist has to be brought on staff to oversee the transition and growth and assist in the coordination of events and communication that would have to occur to fully achieve this goal. A specialized advisory group has to be formed with a collection of skills suited to the task. A new consultation formula has to be arrived at to avoid pitfalls of the past. So often in the past efforts have fallen short of the mark. Make a commitment to ensure this does not happen in the redevelopment process for Richmond.
- Still light in culture and the arts.
- Is it realistic for the City to be looking at adding 390 acres of Parkland- How can we afford to do this? Look at lower park ratio 2.0/1000 people_____.
- As I said, many of the messages were observed by hard-to-read diagram.
- I do not want Richmond city centre becomes second Vancouver downtown because UD has too many people, too many traffic (UD).

What are your comments regarding:

- To make a “liveable region” more jobs of office space to minimize commuting. City of Richmond can provide “tax” (i.e. reduce tax for 5 yr/10) for **new** office space or light industry space.
- Richmond grew from fishing, farming and light industry, parks, green space and social programs evolved. I don't see how you can build job numbers into a proposed development.
- Let us start now! Ensure sidewalks on all downtown streets (Lansdowne is not surrounded by sidewalks). Develop boardwalks on all sidewalks damaged by construction (e.g. No. 3 Road near the Bank of Montreal).
- The impossible will take 50 years to complete. Good luck!
- Although I don't agree to put the city centre area into that high density (not comfortable and people will get mad and unhappy), but eventually will get into this kind of population in the future. Just that traffic congestion and parking space availability need to consider for any changes to this area. Cars will grow up as well from going into this area and out of this area. The only good thing is this high number of new high rises will help to bring down the real estate and rent value, but cost to the investors who bought them at first built at the beginning.
- Too much traffic in area. Too many apartments, condos, multiple dwellings.
- Health care facilities – e.g. Extended care seems very limited as we already have a shortage. It's hard to imagine this kind of growth but it is good to see this kind of long term planning.
- It seems there are too many high-rise buildings, looks like Vancouver downtown. We don't see “typical” Richmond any more. But we prefer Richmond remains unique and special. We don't expect Richmond to be a crowded and noisy modern city.
- Good to solicit public opinion. We need to plan for our future generations.
- Canada Line south of Granville, needs more setback.
- Affordable housing – should not be in most desirable and potentially most expensive land – e.g. near skating oval. Why should I pay taxes so the “poor” can live there and middle class hard working families can't afford it. If I have rental property to hold for future development I can no longer redevelop. I must “keep” it and it stays rental? I can't even sell to a family who wants to move in?
- Vibrant. City with pride.
- Diverse
- Make sure there are enough buses to handle the volume.
- Found the boards to be somewhat confusing and difficult to relate to the ____ thoroughfare should be identified.
- Create a pedestrian friendly waterfront from No. 2 Road to Bridgeport – remove/relocate road. Use ROW (CN) as non-road with boulevard – interconnect waterfront (many principles used in presentation along the same ideas I have).
- Hope most of it is successful.
- Many businesses are being hurt by current development (No. 3 Road) land value tax should take this into account. Business on 3 Road is down 8 – 15%, City should help as this will continue for YEARS and many businesses may fail without help.
- Richmond is not Vancouver. Comparable to Haney, Whalley, Newton – just series to strip malls and traffic jams.
- City should consider allow developer to build more high-density residential apartment building within city centre.
- Bridgeport area too vague.
- Less high-rise residential building. More low-level one more high-rise office building.
- Should prepare for high-density plan to adopt more population.

ATTACHMENT 4
Stakeholder Letters – School District No. 38 (Richmond)



School District No. 38 (Richmond)
7811 Granville Avenue, Richmond, BC V6Y 3E3

Tel: (604) 668-6000

July 21, 2006

Mr. Terry Crowe,
Policy Planning Manager
Mr. Holger Burke,
Development Coordinator
City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, B.C. V6Y 2C1

Dear Terry and Holger:

Re: Draft City Centre Area Plan

On behalf of the Richmond School District, I would like to thank you for an informative meeting yesterday concerning the draft City Centre Area Plan for Richmond.

At the meeting you invited any and all suggestions and comments from interested stakeholders and indicated that the Board's concerns would be reported to City Council. You also indicated that the plan is in draft form and will be changing over the next few months.

With respect, the short time frame allotted for feedback regarding the proposed changes to the City Centre that are being planned for the next 100 years is quite simply too short and is being rushed through to Council without careful and considerate input from all stakeholder groups. In order for the Board to give Council the necessary advice it requires to make fully informed decisions regarding the future direction of the City Centre adequate time should be provided. Without adequate time being provided to the Board and other stakeholders it would call into question the integrity of the entire process.

After carefully reading through the outline you provided, the uppermost concern was that 'school' was only mentioned once in the report, on page 8 of 26 as follows:

Some of the Villages may provide:

- 1 Branch Library
- 2 Community Centre
- 3 Community Park & Greenways
- 4 Community School**
- 5 Community Police Office

The report does not provide a definition of what is intended by a 'community school'. Is it a public school, a parochial school, private school, a public school with a community centre attached, or any combination thereof?

In order to sustain your five-village plan we believe that public schools should be an integral part in that plan.

The report does not provide any demographic information or the rate of development that would allow the Board of School Trustees (Richmond) to comment on the need to provide public schools in a timely manner. The Board requires this information in order to make the necessary representations to the Ministry of Education.

Another concern that was raised at the meeting was the amount of park space being required by the City of Richmond as the City Centre becomes higher density. It is our understanding the Richmond City Council and City staff intends to reduce significantly the park requirements for the City Centre by over 50% compared with other areas of Richmond. As you are aware, the City of Richmond and the Richmond School District have an enviable record of working together collaboratively to acquire joint school/park sites that have been situated contiguously one to another. Unfortunately, the City of Richmond has recently chosen to break from this historic practice by planning to acquire parkland in the West Cambie across the street from Tomsett Elementary School rather than acquire it contiguous to the school site. If this practice were to continue then the open spaces that residents of Richmond have come to expect would no longer be available.


In the meeting it was acknowledged that School Districts do not have the mandate or statutory requirement to provide parkland and that, in this case, the City of Richmond has the responsibility to provide the necessary parkland for the City Centre. Reducing the parkland requirement by over 50% will not make the City Centre any more liveable.

In summary:

- The Board requires more time to consider the draft City Centre Area Plan.
- In order to respond fully regarding the need for public schools, the Board requires full and complete demographic data and timelines for the densification of the City Centre area.
- The Board would appreciate receiving a copy of the final City Centre Area Plan as soon as it is complete. It is difficult to comment on a draft report when there are substantive changes yet to be made.

In closing, thank you again for meeting with us and I expect that the school district will take you up on your offer to make another presentation soon after the final report is finished.

Yours truly


K. L. Morris
Secretary Treasurer

Pc: Trustees
Superintendent of Schools
Assistant Superintendent(s)
Manager of Facilities

ATTACHMENT 5

Stakeholder Letters – Vancouver International Airport Authority (VIAA)



Vancouver International Airport Authority
Administration de l'aéroport international de Vancouver
P.O. Box 23750
Airport Postal Outlet
Richmond, B.C. Canada V7B 1Y7
Website: www.yvr.ca

September 7, 2006

Mr. Joe Erceg,
General Manager
Planning and Development
City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Dear Mr. Erceg

Vancouver International Airport Authority
Comments on Richmond City Centre Area Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the City Centre Area Plan (CCAP). I commend the City of Richmond on engaging stakeholders in the process, your desire to create a vibrant, compact city centre and the high quality of work evident in the draft CCAP.

The City Centre Area Plan contemplates over 100,000 new residents in the area. The airport's growth potential as a premier gateway between North America and Asia and as a portal to British Columbia is set out in our draft 2027 Master Plan which forecasts a doubling of YVR passenger traffic over the next twenty years. Clearly the days of the Authority and City undertaking planning in isolation from each other are over. As we both grow, the challenges increase and the need for co-ordination becomes more pressing.

As you know, YVR is an asset of strategic importance to the nation, province, region and to the City itself. Our concerns over the CCAP are significant in that we believe, if fully implemented, it could seriously impair the future success of YVR, and thus the success of Richmond, by:

- adding additional vehicle traffic to already congested Sea Island roads and bridges; and
- increasing the number of residents living in areas impacted by aircraft noise.

A very rough estimate is that 100,000 new residents could conceivably generate an additional 41,000 daily vehicle trips over the North Arm bridges, many of which would use the Arthur Laing Bridge. A key conclusion of our Master Plan analysis is that the limited bridge capacity to and from Sea Island will increasingly be required to serve airport-related traffic.

One recommendation is that the City develop an integrated land-use and transportation plan for the City Centre incorporating the concept of "carrying capacity". That is, based on the existing and probable future availability of transportation infrastructure, identify a reasonable set of population and employment projections for Richmond City Centre.

The Airport Authority's forecast growth brings significant benefits to the City of Richmond however it will mean more aircraft operations and noise. You should be commended for identifying aircraft noise issues in the CCAP and the progress you have made to address those issues. In particular we were pleased to see the support for the City's existing Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development Policy.

Transport Canada recommends against residential development within areas of +30 NEF, as individual complaints may be vigorous and possible group action and appeals to authorities may occur. The Airport Authority agrees with this recommendation. The majority of the City Centre Area is within the +30 NEF. As such, the Airport Authority does not support the increased residential development proposed in the City Centre Area Plan. If the City is going to allow, and indeed encourage, new residential development contrary to the Transport Canada standard the Airport Authority would clearly prefer fewer new residents in high noise areas rather than more.

We also recommend that the City:

- ensure that all the noise mitigation and awareness measures identified in the City's Aircraft Noise Sensitive Development Policy are implemented, prior to any new residential developments in this area; and
- undertake a study to evaluate the effectiveness of the noise mitigation and awareness measures.

The Airport Authority would be pleased to continue to work with City staff on these initiatives.

The City Centre Area Plan and accompanying maps should not give the reader the false understanding and illusion that some areas in the City Centre are exposed to aircraft noise while some are not. The majority of the area is exposed to aircraft noise and subject to over-flights.

There are about 26,000 jobs on Sea Island but only about 23% of employees are residents of the City of Richmond. We hope the CCAP looks at a residential development mix that is attractive to airport workers with the attendant benefits of reduced commuting times and potentially greater patronage of the Canada Line.

We would be pleased to work with the City on joint planning around the Middle Arm including opportunities to improve trail connections.

The draft 20-year Master Plan proposes a south parallel runway as an option for the future. Aeronautical zoning should be put in place to protect for a south parallel runway and this may impact elements of the CCAP. We anticipate there may be other aeronautical zoning issues to be addressed.

Please contact me at 604-276-6357 if you wish to discuss further.

Yours truly,



Anne Murray
Vice President, Community and Environmental Affairs
ACM;caw

ATTACHMENT 6
Stakeholder Letters – Urban Development Institute (UDI)



URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE – PACIFIC REGION
3rd Floor, 717 West Pender Street
Vancouver BC V6C 1G9 Canada
T. 604.669.9585 F. 604.689.8691
info@udi.org
www.udi.bc.ca

September 8, 2006

Terry Crowe
Manager, Policy Planning
City Of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC
V6Y 2C1

Dear Mr. Crowe:

Re: City Centre Area Plan Concept Plan

I would like to thank you for involving the Urban Development Institute (UDI) in the development of Richmond's City Centre Area Plan (CCAP), and for organizing the meeting with our members on August 15, 2006.

Although we are in the very early stages of the CCAP, the Concept Plan is being finalized and this will set the direction of the overall Area Plan. At this time UDI would like to raise the following issues for your consideration.

The amenities that the City is proposing that are detailed on the CCAP Open House Boards (panels 21 to 25) are quite extensive. We also understand that additional amenities may be proposed. Staff have noted that a significant portion of the costs for these amenities will be borne by new development. What this portion will be is a key issue as the CCAP process moves forward. We note these new amenities and facilities will be used by current Richmond residents because the City Centre is intended to be a focal point. New homebuyers and businesses should not be fully responsible for these costs

The plan is also intended to be in place for decades – in fact, until the City Centre is built out. Charges on new development will therefore have to be sustainable over time – not just during strong market periods, but weaker ones as well. The City may have to prioritize its amenity package for the area or assume more of the costs.

In terms of the ongoing process, it is important that developers have an understanding of what the magnitude of the DCCs, amenity levies and all of other charges will be in the area as soon as possible. Many are actively identifying and purchasing potential sites. To avoid future surprises it is important for them to know what the potential costs will be to develop in the City Centre.

One of the amenities discussed at our August 15th meeting was the "Build Green" proposal (CCAP Board Panel #24). UDI would like to work with the City on how to encourage sustainability in projects – as opposed to developing prescriptive regulations. We would also be interested in discussing the Green Building standards or guidelines that the City might adopt.

Another amenity that was discussed on August 15th was parks. We understand that the City is reviewing the park standard for the City Centre area and will possibly be reducing it to 3.25 acres per 1000 residents. This standard should be reviewed and evaluated to determine if it may be further reduced. The City Centre area is intended to become a significant, densified, urban area in the region. On CCAP Board Panel #4, the City Centre is compared to downtown Vancouver. The area, as currently proposed, will have extensive recreational/cultural facilities, retail areas and "Great Streets" that are oriented to pedestrians and cyclists. The area will also be linked to several significant parks in the City, and people in the Centre will have access to regional facilities through the Canada Line. Even with a reduced park standard for the area, there will be numerous recreational and cultural opportunities for residents and workers in the City Centre, and as a result the 2.5 acres per 1000 residents suggested in CCAP Board Panel #20 should be seriously considered.

Another matter that was discussed at our August 15th meeting was the difficulty developing in mid-rise residential zones. Mid-rise projects are rarely economical because of code requirements. Wood frame construction is limited to four stories, and due to the efficiency of construction, concrete buildings only become cost effective above 11 stories. Perhaps the City could develop incentives (e.g. lowering fees/charges or providing bonusing) in those areas targeted for mid-rise development to encourage the building form that is desired.

Finally, in terms of the process for the CCAP, it was suggested at the August 15th meeting that Richmond develop the whole Area Plan for the City Centre. This would be better than doing detailed plans in a few precincts at a time (while delaying development in other areas) as has been done in other municipalities.

I would like to thank you again for involving UDI in this process. The City Centre will be the main growth area of the City and one of the most important growth nodes in the region. We appreciate staff's efforts in consulting with the development industry on this key Area Plan.

Yours truly,

Original signed by:

Jeff Fisher
Director of Municipal Affairs and Research