



MINUTES

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

- Date: Monday, January 15th, 2001
- Place: W.H. Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
- Present: Mayor Greg Halsey-Brandt, Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Malcolm Brodie
Councillor Derek Dang
Councillor Lyn Greenhill
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai
Councillor Ken Johnston
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Harold Steves
- Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:29 p.m.

MINUTES

- 1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on Monday, December 18th, 2000, be adopted as circulated.
CARRIED

DELEGATION

- 2. **LARRY QUALE AND KASH KANG, REPRESENTING THE BC ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY, REGARDING THE YEAR 2001 ASSESSMENTS**
(File No.: 0150-20-BCAA1)

General Manager, Finance & Corporate Services, Jim Bruce, advised that Area Assessor Larry Quayle was unable to attend today's meeting. He then introduced Deputy Assessor Kash Kang.

Mr. Kang then gave a brief overview of the City's assessment roll for 2001, during which he reviewed the statistics given in the "2000 Authenticated/2001 Completed - Percentage of Total Roll by Property Class" and the "Completed Roll Comparison Report - Net Assessed Values - General Purposes" information sheets. A copy of the package of material provided by Mr. Kang is on file in the City Clerk's Office.

During the discussion, and in response to questions, information was provided on such issues as:

- the change in net assessed values between new construction/development and market movement
- the rationale for declassification of properties from 'farm class' and how these properties could be returned to that designation
- how the increased tax rates would be accommodated within the reduced classifications.

Mayor Halsey-Brandt thanked Mr. Kang for his presentation, and he then left the meeting.

FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

3. LATE NIGHT EVENT (RAVE) BYLAW CHANGES

(Report: Jan. 9/01, File No.: 8060-20-7202) (REDMS No. 257507, 260529)

The Manager, Research & Policy Planning, Lauren Melville, accompanied by the City Solicitor, Paul Kendrick, reviewed this and the following report (Item No. 4) with the Committee.

In response to questions, the following information was provided:

- a promoter must apply at least 6 weeks before a proposed rave event, and would be advised 2 weeks prior to such event on whether that event would be permitted; the RCMP were concerned that the current 10 day period did not provide sufficient time to complete their review;
- only banquet halls would be excluded as a permitted use in all Industrial zoning districts; restaurants would still be an acceptable use;
- the proposed flat rate for police services would be applied, regardless of the size of a rave event;
- the proposed \$3,000 flat rate for police services was an estimate of the actual breakdown of expenses to have police officers in attendance at a rave event; the fee of \$5,400 also took into account, the preparation of paperwork for any charges which were laid at the event, and would allow the RCMP to break even on their overtime policing costs; however, the RCMP did support the proposed \$3,000 fee;
- a majority of the youth now attending rave events were in their late teens or early 20s, as well as older clientele who arrived following the closure of licenced liquor establishments;
- there had been an increase in the use of the drug "Ecstasy" at rave and rave-like events and charges were being laid; the drug was being brought in to these events by both the younger and older aged youth; and gang-related activities had been observed taking place at these events;

- if the proposed change to the Zoning & Development Bylaw to exclude banquet hall facilities was implemented, the existing facilities would be 'grandfathered' and considered to be a legal non-conforming use; the facility could continue to function unless the business ceased operation for more than six months; and
- promoters would be required to provide a copy of their rental agreement at the time they were applying for rave event permits; the owner of the facility would have to make the decision as to which promoter the facility would be leased.

Mr. Salim Laconi, of 34 East 35th Street, Vancouver, commended staff for their efforts in working with promoters on this matter. He advised however that he had two areas of concern, the first being the requirement to have police officers in attendance at rave events and the proposed increase in the fee to the promoter to pay for this service.

Mr. Laconi stated that although promoters were not opposed to police officers attending rave events, they did not support the high cost required for this service. He then provided information on the number of officers required to be in attendance at rave events in the Vancouver, and suggested that Richmond's requirement to have 5 officers at an event was excessive and that it was unnecessary to have these officers on duty at rave events.

Mr. Laconi referred to the alleged use of drugs at rave events and he voiced the opinion that the amount of drugs being taken at these events had not increased, but rather, the police officers in attendance were now noticing that this drug use was occurring. He referred to comments made by Committee members earlier about the responsibilities of the promoters, and stated that the City had a responsibility to ensure that the holding of rave events was feasible. Mr. Laconi referred to the moratorium approved by Council on November 28th, 2000, and provided information on the financial difficulties which this had caused a promoter because of the lack of notification about the implementation of the moratorium.

In response to questions from Committee members, Mr. Laconi provided the following information and comments:

- the promoter who had suffered financial hardship as a result of the moratorium had been preparing for the rave event while awaiting approval from the City to hold the event
- promoters should be advised sooner than 2 weeks prior to a rave event as to whether the event would be permitted
- 80% of those in attendance at rave events were between the ages of 17 and 24 years
- late night entertainment for youth was lacking in Richmond.

Ms. Susan Heer, of Nautic Distributors Ltd., #107 - 11480 Blacksmith Place, noted that rave events were supposed to be venues which did not allow the use of drugs or alcohol. She stated however that these activities were taking place at these events and she expressed concern that such events would be allowed to continue. Ms. Heer then provided information on the most recent vandalism which had occurred at her business.

Ms. Heer referred to the application submitted by the Gujarati Society of British Columbia to establish a late night (rave) event location at 11460 Horseshoe Way, and questioned when the applicant would be holding the public information meeting on the proposal. She stated that the Riverside Industrial Park Business Association would be holding a meeting on January 24th, at which time a petition would be available for signing by those who opposed the holding of rave events. She also questioned (i) when the matter with the Gujarati Society would be resolved; and (ii) why rave events could not be held in community centres where they could be well supervised.

Jessie Johnson, of White Rock, advised that he was the promoter referred to by Salim Laconi, who had lost \$25,000 because of the lack of communication about the implementation of the moratorium. He provided information on a rave event which he hoped to hold in Richmond on February 3rd, and questioned whether if the moratorium was lifted, would he be able to proceed with the event even if he was unable to comply with the requirements of the new regulations. Advice was given that if the moratorium was lifted, rave events would continue to be approved under the existing regulations until the adoption of the new bylaw.

Mr. Johnson referred to the proposed requirement that applications be submitted 6 weeks prior to the date of the proposed rave event and questioned whether promoters (i) would have the flexibility of applying earlier than 6 weeks, and (ii) could receive notification earlier than proposed. He also referred to a proposal made that rave events be held in community centres and commented that industrial areas would be more suitable because the majority of community centres were located in residential areas.

Mr. Brian Bone, a teacher of art at the Richmond Cultural Centre, provided information on the stories which his students had told him about proceedings at rave events. He expressed concern that these youth were endangering their lives by attending rave events which did not provide security, potable water, a police presence, or medical assistance.

Mr. Bone expressed concern that the City did not provide late night activities for youth. He stated that the age of rave event attendees was getting younger because there were no other events available for this age group.

In response to questions about the lack of late night activities, Mr. Bone suggested that community centres should be open late on Friday and Saturday evenings and offer such activities as basketball, as well as other programs which would provide a safe environment for youth. In summary, Mr. Bone advised that he would like to see late night events provided for younger youth and smaller rave events held, rather than banning rave events from the City.

Clarence O'Neill, of 21700 River Road, referred to a suggestion made earlier in the meeting that the cost of policing be increased to \$5,400. He expressed concern that the cost, which had previously been established at \$2,600, would now be increased to cover the cost of paperwork and overtime costs for the RCMP. He suggested that the fees already paid by the promoter for policing costs should cover any time required by the RCMP to complete paperwork related to arrests made at rave events.

Mr. O'Neill referred to the youth consuming alcohol at rave events and he commented that the organizers could not control the actions of the youth before they entered the event, only during. He stated that the on-site security personnel did an excellent job of searching the youth at the time they entered the facility, to ensure that they were not carrying in any drugs or alcohol.

In concluding his presentation, Mr. O'Neill stated that he agreed with a previous suggestion that community centres should be opened late at night. He also reiterated that policing costs should not be increased to deal with events which were taking place outside the facility, including drinking and youth loitering around the perimeter of the property. Mr. O'Neill noted that a plan was in place to complete a cleanup around the exterior of the rave event facility, and commented that if this was not being carried out then the matter should be reviewed.

Moses, a representative of a production company which provided sound, lighting and other equipment to rave and other events, stated that the implementation of a 6 week period to process applications would be good. However, he added that promoters should be advised sooner than 2 weeks before a rave event as to whether such event had been approved.

Moses also referred to the increasing age of rave event attendees, and he suggested that promoters were seeking people who had a higher level of disposable income because the younger youth could not afford the high cost of the tickets. He voiced the opinion that by increasing the cost of the policing costs, the City was forcing the promoters to look for an older crowd.

Moses also questioned (i) who would be responsible for deciding which 3 rave events would be approved for each month; (ii) whether the event permit could be applied for prior to the promoter renting the facility for the event; and (iii) how promoters would be prevented from 'block booking' time at a rave event facility. In conclusion, he commented that having the City hosting rave events would ensure that such events were 'clean'.

In response to questions, Moses stated that the promoters should be advised sooner than 2 weeks as to whether their rave events were approved. In answer to the questions, advice was given that rave events would only be permitted on the first 3 Saturdays of each month unless there was a statutory holiday, in which case a rave event could be held on the subsequent Saturday; and a promoter could not apply for an event permit without first renting the hall. Moses then questioned what would happen if a promoter, after having rented a facility, was denied a permit for the event. He asked if the owner of the facility could book the facility for more than one rave event, on the chance that one of the applications might be denied.

In closing, Moses volunteered to provide assistance to the City, in the event that the City chose to host a rave event.

Mr. Ron Martin, the owner of a business at #101 - 11471 Blacksmith Place, expressed concern about businesses which permitted drug and alcohol use to take place on their premises. He also expressed concern about (i) the lack of parking provided for the patrons who attended rave events, and (ii) the requirement for additional police officers to be at these events. He questioned what would happen if a police presence was required in other areas of the City. Mr. Martin referred to the large number of youth who attend the rave events held at 11460 Horseshoe Way, and questioned whether the City could guarantee the safety of his business and employees.

A representative of Masterplan Productions, of 7566 Adanac Street, Vancouver, referred to a recommendation that promoters be advised only 2 weeks before an event as to whether such event would be approved. He voiced the opinion that promoters should be advised sooner if an event was approved because of the many preparations which were required. He also referred to the apparent use of drugs and alcohol and commented that generally, such use was not prevalent at rave events.

Reference was made to the suggestion that rave events be held at City community centres and to the need for activities for youth. He stated that the rooms in a community centre would be adequate to hold a small rave event. He also provided information on a program offered by the Vancouver Parks Department for youth called "Night Heat". He also commented that the music played at rave events was not music which would normally be played on local radio stations, and he suggested that the cancellation of rave events would force the events to go 'underground'. He also voiced the opinion that promoters should be responsible for the cost of providing police officers at rave events, but that the cost should be accountable, perhaps by establishing a fund of \$4,000 to cover policing costs, from which a refund could be issued if the costs were not as high as anticipated.

Mr. Bobby Ghirra, Administration Manager of the Riverside Banquet Hall Ltd., #230 - 14500 River Road, expressed concern about a number of the proposed changes to the rave regulations. A copy of Mr. Ghirra's submission is attached as Schedule A and forms part of these minutes.

In response to the concerns raised by Mr. Ghirra and to questions asked by Committee members, the following information was provided:

- three rave events would be permitted on the first three Saturdays of each month, and the City would accept only three applications to hold rave events
- with reference to the requirement that the applicant provide a copy of the rental agreement and to the concern about the release of personal information, the suggestion was made that the City be provided with a blank copy of the agreement to determine the information on the agreement which would be required by the City.

Discussion ensued among Committee members on the proposed recommendation, during which the request was made that Part 2 of the recommendation be dealt with separately. As a result, the following motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

- (1) ***That staff prepare an amendment to the Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300 excluding banquet halls as a permitted use in all Industrial Zoning Districts.***
- (2) ***That staff be directed to report through General Purposes Committee with a policy regarding the application process for a new rave party site including public consultation requirements.***

Prior to the question being called, staff were asked to address whether any new rave event sites should be approved.

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

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7202, which replaces the Late Night Events (Rave) Bylaw 7141, be introduced and be given first, second and third readings.

The question on the motion was not called, as the following **amendments** were introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That:

- (a) ***clause (b) of section 2.1.2 of Bylaw No. 7202, be amended by deleting the words "not more than 12 weeks and"; and***
- (b) ***section 2.1.3 of Bylaw No. 7202, be amended by deleting the words "at least two weeks before the date of"; and substituting the words "within 14 days of the date of application for the".***

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded

That clause (b) of section 2.2.1 of Bylaw No. 7202, be amended by deleting the figure "\$3,000", and by substituting "\$5,400".

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded

That clause (b) of section 2.2.1 of Bylaw No. 7202, be amended by deleting the words "within 4 weeks of applying", and by substituting the words "at the time of application".

CARRIED

The question on the main motion, as amended, was not called, as discussion continued among Committee members on the holding of rave events and whether such events should be permitted at all. The RCMP were requested during the discussion, to prepare a report (suitable for public viewing) for submission to the January 22nd, 2001 regular open Council Meeting on problems experienced by the police which have occurred at rave events over the past year or two.

During the discussion, staff were requested to ensure that only one rave event was booked for each of the permitted nights.

Concerns were expressed about the use of drugs and alcohol at these events and whether the City was condoning such activities by allowing rave events to take place; and the cost of providing police services at these events. Discussion also touched on the broader issue of the need for late night recreation activities for youth which offered a safe and inexpensive alternative to rave events.

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

OPPOSED: Cllr. Kumagai

4. **LATE NIGHT EVENTS (RAVES) MORATORIUM**

(Report: Jan. 3/01; File No. 8060-20-7141) (REDMS No. 258297)

Please see Item 3 above for discussion on this matter.

It was moved and seconded

That the moratorium on the acceptance of applications for Late Night Events (Raves) be lifted to the extent that the City will accept applications for a maximum of 3 Late Night Events for the months of February, March and April, 2001, such events are to be held on the first three Saturdays of each month, unless the Friday or Monday of the weekend is a statutory holiday, in which case the event may be held the next available Saturday.

Prior to the question being called, concerns were raised about allowing rave events to take place before the new regulations came into effect. Questions were raised about the status of a rave event proposed to be held on February 3rd, 2001, and information was provided by Mr. Kendrick that there had been no expectation that the moratorium would be lifted by that time.

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

OPPOSED: Mayor Halsey-Brandt
Cllr. Barnes
Brodie
Greenhill
Kumagai
McNulty

It was moved and seconded

That the application submitted by the Gujarati Society of British Columbia to establish a late night (rave) event location at 11460 Horseshoe Way be brought forward for consideration to the General Purposes Committee meeting scheduled for Monday, February 5th, 2001.

CARRIED

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

5. AUXILIARY POLICING

(Report: Dec. 27/00, File No.: 5350-01) (REDMS No. 241022)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That staff work with the RCMP and the Attorney General's Office to develop an agreement which outlines the roles and the responsibilities including financial and legal of all the affected stakeholders in the Auxiliary Constable Program.*
- (2) *That the agreement be forwarded to Council through General Purposes Committee.*
- (3) *That the RCMP be directed to incrementally re-initiate the Auxiliary Constable Program (as outlined in the report dated December 27, 2000, from the Manager, Policy & Research), subject to an agreement being approved by Council.*
- (4) *That \$20,000.00 from Gaming Revenues be utilized to fund the "start-up" costs of the Auxiliary Program for 10 auxiliary constables.*

Prior to the question being called, Corporal Tom Clark, the Provincial Co-ordinator of the Auxiliary Program, was introduced to the Committee. In response to questions, advice was given that 10 auxiliary constables would be recruited from those who apply. Information was provided by Cpl. Clark during the discussion that the initiatives proposed by staff were supported, and that any changes to the program would require the approval of all funding partners.

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

The Chair advised that the order of the agenda would be varied to deal with Item No. 7 at this time.

FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

7. COUNCIL RESOLUTION ON WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION'S GENERAL AGREEMENT IN TRADE AND SERVICES

(Report: Jan. 16/01, File No.: 4150-01) (REDMS No. 235345)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the position of the City of Vancouver regarding the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), be endorsed, on the understanding that the matters of public health care, education, social services and government procurement would not be included in the negotiations.*
- (2) *That the Mayor on behalf of Council write to:*
 - (a) *the FCM and the Minister of International Trade, outlining Richmond's position on the G.A.T.S.;*
 - (b) *The two Richmond MP's, to request them to pursue the exclusion of local government services and procurement from the W.T.O. negotiations on the G.A.T.S.;*

- (c) *The Director of the Services Trade Policy Division to request clarification of Canada's position regarding the procurement and delivery of local government services.*
- (3) *That a copy of this report be forwarded to the Council of Canadians Richmond Chapter, the Richmond Ten Days to Global Justice Committee, Cities of Vancouver and Burnaby and the U.B.C.M.*

CARRIED.

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting be recessed (6:58 p.m.) until the conclusion of the Regular Council Meeting for Public Hearings.

CARRIED

The Committee meeting reconvened in open session at 7:43 p.m. with all members of the Committee present.

COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION

6. **BRITANNIA HERITAGE SHIPYARD BUSINESS PLAN - RESPONSE**
(Report: Jan. 2/01, File No.: 2025-20-003) (REDMS No. 233372, 217011, 217024, 217036, 217048, 217055)

The Manager, Cultural Services, Jane Fernyhough, reviewed the staff report with the Committee.

A lengthy discussion then ensued among Committee members on (i) the advantages and disadvantages of the various options proposed, and (ii) whether the option proposed by staff would best address the operational problems at the Britannia Heritage Shipyards site. Concerns were expressed that Option 3 (Hybrid Model) (recommended by staff) would not address what the Britannia Business Plan Steering Committee was seeking, that being a model which included a Council-appointed advisory committee, a non-profit society and an as needed, Council-appointed building committee.

(Councillor Dang left the meeting during the discussion at 8:00 p.m., and did not return.)

As a result of the discussion, the following **amended** recommendation was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Council endorse the vision, principles and goals laid out in the Britannia Heritage Shipyards Business Plan (September 2000) (as presented by the Britannia Business Plan Steering Committee) to guide decisions, operations and development of the Britannia site;*
- (2) *That the priorities for capital development, site improvement and visitor services in this Plan be adopted and that the workplan and budgets be developed during the City budget process for Council approval;*

- (3) *That staff work with Tourism Richmond, other heritage sites in the Steveston area and community members to develop a marketing plan;*
- (4) *That Council adopt Option 4 – Business Plan Steering Committee Model – (as outlined in the report dated January 2nd, 2001, from the Director, Recreation & Cultural Services) as the Management operating model for Britannia, and that staff to work with the Society to implement this model and develop an operating agreement for Council approval; and,*
- (5) *That a Site Supervisor be hired on a contract basis to be reviewed after one year.*

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion continued on how any surplus funds generated from the Society's operating funds would be dealt with. Concern was also expressed about the potential conflict which might occur between the Society and the proposed advisory committee. As a result of the discussion, the request was made that Part 4 of the recommendation be dealt with separately.

The question on Parts 1, 2, 3 and 5 of the main resolution was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

The question on Part 4 of the main resolution was then called, and it was **CARRIED**.

OPPOSED: Cllr. Brodie
Greenhill
Johnston

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the following recommendation of the Britannia Business Plan Steering Committee, be endorsed:*

“That any surplus generated from operating funds of the Society be allocated first to capital projects at the site, then to a special capital reserve to be used by other City heritage projects, and that this approach be explored by staff and the Heritage Commission for implementation at all City heritage sites.”

- (2) *That staff report to Council, through Committee, on how the recommendation of the Britannia Business Plan Steering Committee would be accomplished.*

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (8:29 p.m.) and reconvene into the closed meeting.

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Monday, January 15th, 2001.

Mayor Greg Halsey-Brandt
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant

Riverside Banquet Hall

#230 - 14500 River Road, Richmond B.C. V6V 1L4 Tel: 244-7755

January 15, 2001

City of Richmond
City Hall
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC
V6Y 2C1

**SCHEDULE A TO THE MINUTES OF
THE GENERAL PURPOSES
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON
MONDAY, JANUARY 15TH, 2001.**

Mayor and Members of Council:

Dear Sirs/Madam:

Re: Rave Parties

In review of the information and staff recommendations presented, our company supports most of the proposed changes except for the following:

Proposed Bylaw No. 7202

Section 2.4 Late Night Events – Approved Dates

- The recommendation presented in the new bylaw with limiting rave parties is unfair and not reasonable.
- The new bylaw sets the following criteria for limiting rave parties:
 1. No rave party bookings on Friday.
 2. No rave party bookings on Saturday if Friday and Monday are a statutory holiday.
 3. Only rave parties on the first 3 Saturday's of the month.

Summary of Rave Parties for Year 2000

Monday to Friday	17	(15 Friday and 2 Wednesday)
Saturday	29	
Total	46	

With the proposed limit on Rave Parties, we estimate a reduction in bookings by the following based on the year 2000:

Friday	17
Saturday - Holidays	3
Saturday -- only first three Saturday's	2
Total	22

We acknowledge the problem with providing police resources for the rave events and are suggesting the following change to this section of the proposed bylaw.

Suggestion

- **Delete the clause, which relates to only rave parties on the first three Saturday's.**
- **There would be no financial impact to the City and with the proposed 6 week application process, would allow sufficient notice to the RCMP on rave party bookings.**

Section 2.1.2 (d)

- The prior bylaw 7141 and application provided the hall owner to provide a letter of reference to confirm the booking and promoter.
- Information on our rental agreement contains personal and confidential information.

Suggestion

- **Change rental agreement to confirmation booking letter.**

Section 2.1.2 (b)

- By not accepting application not more than 12 weeks before the event, our company cannot book the banquet hall for future rave parties past 12 weeks.
- We believe with advance applications the City of Richmond and RCMP will have sufficient advance notice on the rave party bookings.

Suggestion

- **Delete the clause, which relates to not more than 12 weeks.**

Our company appreciates the City of Richmond's concern regarding the hardship caused during the moratorium. We are requesting applications be accepted for February 24 and March 24, 2001 in alternative to February 3 and March 3, 2001.

We believe the above suggestions and request are fair and reasonable.

We appreciate all the time and energy the mayor and members of council, city staff and RCMP have put towards the rave issues.

Sincerely,

Riverside Banquet Hall Ltd.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bobby Ghirra".

Per: Bobby Ghirra
Administration Manager