



General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, February 18th, 2002

Place: Council Chambers
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm Brodie, Chair
Councillor Lyn Greenhill
Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Rob Howard
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Harold Steves

Absent: Councillor Linda Barnes

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meetings of the General Purposes Committee held on Monday, February 4th, 2002, and on Thursday, February 14th, 2002, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded
That the agenda for the meeting be adopted with the following amendments to:

- (1) *delete Item No. 2, "Richmond Economic Development Strategic Plan – Draft Report", from the agenda and referred to the March 4th, 2002 General Purposes Committee meeting; and*
- (2) *add the following matters to the agenda as additional items:*
 - (a) *a report from Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt on Pay Parking (to be considered in conjunction with Item 4 of the agenda); and*

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 18th, 2002

(b) a report from Councillor Kiichi Kumagai on Use of Casino Gaming Revenue to Reduce Property Taxes.

CARRIED

FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

6

2. **RICHMOND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIC PLAN – DRAFT REPORT**

(Report: Feb. 10/02, File No.: 4150-04-01) (REDMS No. 628431) (Strategic Plan distributed separately.)

See Page 1 of these minutes for action taken on this matter.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **RICHMOND GROUP HOME TASK FORCE FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

(Report: Feb. 7/92, File No.: 0100-20-GHOM1-01) (REDMS No. 594165)

Senior Planner Kari Huhtala, accompanied by the Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, reviewed the report with the Committee.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on such issues as:

- the recent changes to Provincial regulations regarding the licencing of all group homes including drug and alcohol recovery homes, and whether there were any mechanisms in place which would require these facilities to be licenced, and who would be responsible for determining if such a licence was required
- the feasibility of implementing a rezoning bylaw only for 7 to 10 person care homes and establishing separate criteria for support homes based on location, and whether this rezoning process and criteria would be deemed to be discriminatory
- whether the City would have an increase in the number of unlicenced group homes as a result of the new legislation
- the criteria and guidelines to be followed to determine whether a care or recovery home would require licencing
- whether the additional options to establish a 200 metre requirement from schools and parks, and/or to limit future group homes along major arterial routes should be considered as part of the location requirements, and why the Group Home Task Force had not included these possible requirements in their recommendations
- whether the Turning Point Group Home would continue to require a licence to operate

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 18th, 2002

- the changes implemented by the Provincial Government with regard to the licencing of drug and alcohol recovery facilities and whether these changes would have an impact on the location of future facilities in the City.

Mr. Everett McKenzie, 9691 Gilbert Road, a member of the Group Home Task Force, referred to the suggestion in the staff report that Council could consider adding a 200 metre requirement from schools and parks, and/or limit future group homes to be located along a major arterial route. He advised that the Task Force had considered and subsequently rejected that proposal, noting that Surrey and New Westminster were the only cities which controlled the location of group homes. Mr. McKenzie added that it could be dangerous to require that group homes be located on major arterial roads, as one issue may be the unsafe situation created by such companies as HandiDart having to stop on these roads while picking up and dropping off clients.

A brief discussion then ensued among Committee members and the delegation, during which Mr. McKenzie advised that the decision of the Task Force not to support the requirement that drug and alcohol recovery homes be located 200 metres from schools and parks and on major arterial roads, was based on information which the Task Force had received from experts in this field.

Mr. John Wong, of 3858 McKay Drive, a member of the Group Home Task Force, stated that he had concerns with a number of the proposed Group Home Task Force recommendations. He noted that the Task Force had considered the question of separating drug and alcohol recovery homes, however, the advice of the City's Legal Department had been that that this could not be undertaken. Mr. Wong pointed out that other municipalities had now undertaken this very action and questioned why Richmond could not do the same.

Mr. Wong spoke further on the recommendations, suggesting that (i) the issuance of one year interim permits home would result in lobbying from the operators of those homes to be issued full licences at the expiration of their interim permits; (ii) the views of 160 residents who attended a public information meeting in East Richmond and supported the establishment of a rezoning bylaw for drug and alcohol recovery homes, were not being considered; and (iii) the change in Provincial regulations to exempt recovery homes from being licenced would mean that residents would no longer be aware of such facilities being located within their neighbourhoods. In concluding his statements, Mr. Wong urged the Committee to use the zoning process to separate drug and alcohol recovery homes from other types of group homes.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 18th, 2002

Mr. Alexander Kostjuk, a member of the Group Home Task Force, noted that the Group Home Task Force had been created as a result of public outcry from residents about the lack of consultation regarding the location of a recovery home within their neighbourhood. He expressed concern about the recommendations from the Task Force in light of the recent changes to Provincial legislation with regard to 7 to 10 person care homes, and suggested that the matter should have been referred to the Task Force for further review based on these changes.

Mr. Kostjuk spoke on the issue of separating 7 to 10 person recovery homes, reiterating that the Task Force did not support the location of these homes on major arterial roads, or 200 metres from school and park areas, and he questioned why these proposals had been included in the staff report. He also questioned whether the suggestion to require a rezoning bylaw was the correct way to proceed.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and Mr. Kostjuk on the location of support recovery homes through zoning, during which Mr. Kostjuk stated that there was a large population in Richmond which felt that such a requirement would not be the best solution.

It was moved and seconded

That the report (dated February 7th, 2002, from the Manager, Policy Planning, regarding the Richmond Group Home Task Force Final Report and Recommendations, be referred to staff for a report to Committee on whether drug and alcohol recovery homes could be managed by a rezoning bylaw and process.

The question on the motion was not called, as staff were directed to

- (1) include in the report, if a rezoning bylaw process was supported, a determination on whether drug and alcohol recovery homes should only be located on major arterial roads and at least 200 metres from schools and park sites; and
- (2) review the proposed protocol agreement with Richmond Health Services to better clarify the initial application process.

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

COMMUNITY SAFETY DIVISION

4. **PARKING REVENUE**

(Report: Feb. 8/02, File No.:) (REDMS No. 628071)

It was moved and seconded

That the report (dated February 8th, 2002, from the Manager, Community Bylaws), regarding Parking Revenue, be received for information .

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 18th, 2002

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion ensued among Committee and staff on:

- the impact, if any, which the delay in the implementation of pay parking in Minoru Park and Garry Point Park, might have on both the 2002 and future anticipated revenue projections and the proposed 2002 property tax increase
- anticipated revenue generation resulting from the implementation of on-street pay parking in Richmond Centre
- management problems relating to the implementation of pay parking in portions of Minoru Park.

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

4A. PAY PARKING IN MINORU PARK

(Report: Feb. 14/02; File No.: 6455-05-01)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That those parts of the Parking Revenue recommendations in Resolution No. R02/1-18 (adopted on January 14th, 2002), that add the balance of the Minoru parking lots to the pay-parking inventory, be abandoned.*
- (2) *That pay parking not be introduced into public parks or public recreational areas without first holding a public meeting to give the residents of Richmond an opportunity to have their opinion heard.*

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion ensued among Committee members on the proposed recommendations, during which reference was made to the concerns expressed by many Richmond residents and park users about the proposed implementation of pay parking in Minoru Park.

Although Committee members supported Part (1) of the recommendation, concern was expressed by several Committee members about the intent of Part (2), and as a result, the request was made that the recommendations be dealt with separately.

The question on Part (1) of the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED** with Councillor Howard opposed.

The question on Part (2) of the motion was then called, and it was **DEFEATED ON A TIED VOTE** with Mayor Brodie and Cllrs. Howard, Kumagai and McNulty opposed.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 18th, 2002

5. **PROPOSED RICHMOND INTERCULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

(Report: Feb. 7/02, File No.: 4056-01) (REDMS No. 619980)

Social Planner Lesley Sherlock, accompanied by Mr. Crowe, briefly reviewed the report with the Committee.

Discussion then took place among Committee members and staff on the proposed committee, during which the following matters were addressed:

- whether the Council liaison representative should be a voting member of the proposed Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee (RIAC)
- how the proposed committee differed from the previous committee which had been abandoned due to lack of interest
- the impact which the creation of the proposed committee could have on the City's operating budget.

It was moved and seconded

That (as outlined in the report dated February 7th, 2002, from the Manager, Policy Planning):

- (1) *the Terms of Reference for the Richmond Intercultural Advisory Committee (RIAC) be approved, on the understanding that the Terms of Reference would be amended to delete the Council liaison from the 'voting members';*
- (2) *staff advertise for RIAC nominations;*
- (3) *the 2002 RIAC Work Program be approved; and*
- (4) *a Council liaison be appointed to the RIAC.*

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion ensued on the possible budget implications of approving the proposed committee. Advice was given that the \$15,000 referred to by the General Manager, Urban Development in his memorandum (attached to the staff report) were the City costs for each advisory committee established by the City. These costs include overtime, meeting preparation and attendance. Further advice was given that the \$2,000 being requested would provide the start-up funds (e.g. holding public consultations) for the RIAC.

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

6. **IMPORT OF CONTAMINATED SOILS TO RICHMOND**

(Report: February 14/02, File No.: 6175-06) (REDMS No. 625515)

It was moved and seconded

That:

- (1) *staff implement Options 1, 2 and 4 (as presented in the report dated February 14, 2002 from the Manager of Environmental and Emergency Programs); and*

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 18th, 2002

- (2) *a press release of this decision be made immediately, for the benefit of concerned City residents.*

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion took place on (i) the lack of options to deal with the cross border shipment of contaminated soil; (ii) whether the City should be holding a public forum on this issue; (iii) whether any hazardous material should be accepted within City boundaries; (iv) whether the site operator could be asked to not accept the contaminated soil because of the public reaction to the proposal; (v) the need to lobby the Federal and Provincial governments to ensure that the interests of the City were being protected; and (vi) whether the regulations contained in the City's former contaminated soil bylaw were stronger than current Provincial regulations.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the report (dated February 14th, 2002, from the General Manager, Community Safety), regarding the import of contaminated soil to Richmond, be referred to staff:

- (1) *for review and comment by the Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE) as quickly as possible; and that ACE also comment on the current Provincial regulations dealing with the import of contaminated soil and how these regulations compare with the City's former 'Prohibition of Certain Fill Materials Bylaw No. 5712';*
- (2) *for a further report from the City Solicitor on "Option 5 – Zoning Bylaw";*
- (3) *for further information on the feasibility of prohibiting all importing and exporting of contaminated soil; and*
- (4) *on how and when a public forum on the issue of contaminated soil could be held, and the structure under which this forum would be conducted.*

CARRIED

(Cllr. Sue Halsey-Brandt left the meeting at 6:30 p.m., and did not return.)

FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

7. **FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PLAN – 2002 - 2006**
(Report: Feb. 12/02, File No.: 0970-01) (REDMS No. 631948)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *The 2002 to 2006 Capital Plan (attached to the report dated February 12th, 2002, from the General Manager, Finance & Corporate Services and the Chair, Land and Capital Team), be adopted for inclusion in the 2002 Five Year Financial Plan (2002 to 2006) Bylaw; and*

General Purposes Committee

Monday, February 18th, 2002

- (2) *That staff be authorized to commence construction of the 2002 projects.*

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion ensued on the rationale for (i) removing the 'Minoru Park Fieldhouse and Caretaker Suite' from the 2002 "Recommended" list; the status of the existing washrooms and the cost of maintaining these facilities; and (ii) including in the 2002 "Recommended" list, the proposed renovations to the Seine Net Loft and Cannery Office at the Britannia Heritage site.

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

8. **USE OF CASINO GAMING REVENUE TO REDUCE PROPERTY TAXES**

(Report: Feb. 15/02, File No.: 0970-01) (REDMS No. 635513)

Councillor Kumagai briefly reviewed his report with the Committee.

It was moved and seconded

That \$1.0 million from the 2002 Casino Gaming Revenue be allocated to offset substantial policing costs incurred by the City and to reduce the impact on the municipal tax draw for 2002 on the understanding that it will be a one-time contribution.

The question on the motion was not called, as the General Manager, Community Safety, Chuck Gale, addressed the Chief Administrative Officer's concerns about using the casino gaming revenue to offset policing costs, and the impact which this action could have on the 2003 operating budget. A brief discussion then ensued among Committee members on the proposed recommendation and its ramifications.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED** with Mayor Brodie and Cllrs. Greenhill and Evelina Halsey-Brandt opposed.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (6:50 p.m.).

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Monday, February 18th, 2002.

Mayor Malcolm Brodie
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant