



General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, March 1st, 2004

Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Derek Dang
Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Rob Howard
Councillor Kiichi Kumagai
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Harold Steves

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m., and advised that the order of the agenda would be varied to deal with Item No. 10 immediately following Item No. 4.

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of (i) the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on Monday, February 2nd, 2004 and continued on Tuesday, February 17th, 2004, (ii) the special meeting held on Monday, February 16th, 2004, and (iii) the meeting held on Monday, February 16th, 2004, be adopted as circulated.
CARRIED

FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

2. **COUNCIL REMUNERATION AND EXPENSES FOR 2003**
(Report: Feb. 12/04, File No.: 0105-08) (REDMS No. 1120721)
It was moved and seconded
That the report (dated February 12th, 2004, from the General Manager, Finance & Corporate Services), regarding Council remuneration and expenses for 2003, be received by Council for information.

CARRIED

1.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

3. **RIGHT OF WAY FOR NAVIGATION RANGE LIGHT – 16820 DYKE ROAD**

(Report: Feb. 25/04, File No.: 2285-30-100) (REDMS No. 1127994)

It was moved and seconded

That a right of way be granted over a portion of the City land at 16820 Dyke Road for the replacement of the Tilbury Range Light LL353 (navigational aid).

CARRIED

4. **LIQUOR REGULATIONS**

(Report: Feb. 6/04, File No.: 8060-20-7576; 8060-20-7677; 8275-05) (REDMS No. 1122023, 1126573, 1122155, 1115590)

The Manager, Customer Service, Anne Stevens, briefly reviewed the report with the Committee. In response to questions, advice was given that:

- the Neighbourhood Pub District (NHP) was an existing district
- the applications received by the City for liquor primary licences which were already being processed would be ‘grandfathered’, however the two new applications, Triple 6 Bar & K and Doc Marlin’s Pub, would be processed under the new regulations (rezoning of the subject properties) if the operators wished to open a Liquor Retail Sales (LRS) outlet on-site as the operators did not possess Liquor Retail Sales licences
- the Triple 6 Bar & K and Doc Marlin’s Pub were not located in residential neighbourhoods
- as part of the rezoning process, staff were recommending that an additional four parking spaces be provided and that LRS applicants obtain a Development Permit if internal or exterior renovations were more than \$5,000
- following adoption of the proposed regulations, it was staff’s understanding that as long as the operator of a LRS facility was able to obtain a licence from the Provincial Government, that operator could locate anywhere in the City as long as the subject property was correctly zoned.

During the discussion, Ms. Stevens displayed a map of Richmond which indicated the areas within Richmond where liquor stores with retail sales would be permitted. She further advised that when the Liquor Control & Licencing Branch (LCLB) received an application, the question was asked as to whether the subject site was properly zoned for retail sales. She stated that if the answer was ‘yes’, then approval would be given to the applicant to sell liquor anywhere in the areas shown in red on the map.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

Concern was expressed about the lack of control which the City had on the location of liquor stores and neighbourhood pubs, and the suggestion was made that staff could provide the Committee with two options – a text amendment or zoning amendment bylaws.

In response to questions, advice was given that:

- Provincial liquor outlets were located in commercial zoning districts, however, these stores could be located where the LCLB chose to locate them as they were exempt from City zoning requirements; however, Provincial liquor facilities were generally located in malls and other commercial zones
- stores such as Safeway and Save-On Foods had had a window of opportunity to apply for licences to sell liquor within their facilities, however that opportunity had passed as a moratorium was now in place which prevented stores such as these from selling liquor on their premises
- the only comment required from the City by the LCLB was whether the store was located in the correct zone to sell liquor – no public consultation was required
- with respect to the Top Century Development relocation application, staff were recommending that the LCLB be responsible for obtaining public input because staff were aware that Council did not have any concerns about this particular application

Mr. Bob Ransford, 5071 Steveston Highway, thanked Committee for the proposed changes to the NPH zone. He then referred to the proposed amendment to the Official Community Plan, to require all applicants with interior and/or exterior renovations over \$5,000 to obtain a Development Permit, and asked if this would only apply to the amended zone. Advice was given that that requirement would apply to any zone.

Mr. Ransford then spoke about Licencee Retail Stores, and stated that it was important to understand that an existing licencee who applied within the time frame could own several licences and could relocate the retail portion of their business to another location within Richmond, as it is not necessary that the LRS be attached to the pub. He added that an owner of a pub could lease the LRS licence to someone else.

Mr. Ransford also stated that licenced facilities located within five kilometres of Richmond's boundaries could move into Richmond, and noted that a facility in Vancouver was planning to relocate to Lansdowne. He suggested that rather than allowing liquor stores in all commercial zones, that these facilities be restricted to the City's 'C3, C6 or C7' zones, as it was his belief that that was where a majority of the liquor stores were already located.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

Mr. Ransford was thanked for his presentation, and discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on the feasibility of restricting LRSs to specific areas. During the discussion, the suggestion was made that the report be referred to staff for information on the impact on neighbourhood traffic, etc., and concern was expressed about the City's lack of control. In response, the comment was made that the staff recommendation could be adopted and then a referral to staff to address these concerns.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Zoning Bylaw 5300 Amendment Bylaw No. 7576, which adds a new Neighbourhood Pub District (NHP) zone and parking requirements for a Licensee Retail Store, be introduced and given first reading.*
- (2) *That Council decline comment to the Liquor Control and Licensing Branch with regard to the Top Century Development relocation application.*
- (3) *That for all future Liquor Licence applications (new or amended), the following process for obtaining public input for Liquor Licences, be endorsed:*
 - (a) *Three ads placed in the local newspaper.*
 - (b) *Sign posted in front of the establishment for at least 30 days.*
 - (c) *Letters sent to the residents (commercial and residential) within 50 metres of the property named in the application.*
 - (d) *All costs associated with the collection of information from the public be born by the applicant.*
 - (e) *All input from the public would come directly to the City.*
- (4) *That Bylaw No. 7677 which amends the Development Application Fees Bylaw 7276, be introduced and given first, second and third readings.*

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded

That staff prepare bylaws which would restrict retail liquor sales to specific zones.

Prior to the question on the motion being called, staff were requested to include applications from outside the City. Discussion ensued on this matter, during which advice was given that the outside location would have to be within five kilometres of the City. Further advice was given that if there was a primary liquor licenced establishment in the City, and the owner wished to have a retail store attached to that facility, that retail store could be located anywhere in Richmond as long as it was located in the appropriate zoning.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

Staff were also requested to examine the potential proliferation of other areas, including neighbourhood shopping centres, and to comment on the movement of licences around the City.

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

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

10. **AMENDMENTS TO OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW 7100 FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD PUBLIC HOUSES AND LICENSEE RETAIL STORES**

(Report: Feb. 13/04, File No.: 8060-20-7659) (REDMS No. 1096421, 1115479, 1122191)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, advised that he had nothing further to add. In response to questions, advice was given that the requirement that exterior and interior renovation costs exceeding \$5,000 would necessitate a Development Permit, would give the City more control.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Bylaw No. 7659, which amends Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7100 to require Development Permits for renovations exceeding \$5,000 to neighbourhood public houses, be introduced and given first reading.*
- (2) *That Bylaw No. 7659, having been considered in conjunction with:*
 - (a) *the City's Financial Plan and Capital Program;*
 - (b) *the Greater Vancouver Regional District Solid Waste and Liquid Waste Management Plans;**is hereby deemed to be consistent with said program and plans, in accordance with Section 882(3)(a) of the Local Government Act.*
- (3) *That Bylaw No. 7659, having been considered in accordance with the City Policy on Consultation During OCP Development, is hereby deemed not to require further consultation.*

Prior to the question on the motion being called, the Chair commented that the situation should be monitored to determine if the requirement had an adverse effect on development.

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

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

5. 2004 GRANTS PROGRAM

(Report: Feb. 20/04, File No.: 1085-01) (REDMS No. 1125073)

Reference was made to the fact that the Richmond Therapeutic Equestrian Society had not submitted an application for a grant in 2004 because the agency had applied for funding from the City through the budget process as an additional level. Concern was expressed that the Therapeutic Equestrian Society could end up in the same predicament as the Disability Resource Centre and not have sufficient funds to continue operating until the budget process had been completed. In response to this concern, advice was given that approximately \$80,000 of the grants budget would be available to Council to deal with any agencies which come forward seeking financial assistance.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on the grants being recommended for approval, with discussion focussing on specific grant applications, including:

- the correspondence received from RADAT regarding their late grant application
- the rationale for awarding a grant in the amount of \$50,000 to the City Centre Community Association – advice was given that the City Centre Community Association administered the funding for those summer programs put on by the City which involved Youth Workers
- the Nature Park's request for funding to improve signage at the park and why an amount of only \$3,500 was being recommended when the request was for \$25,000
- the provision of funding to the Steveston Community Society to construct a new float; how this could be connected with the City's 125 Year Anniversary celebrations, and whether Tourism Richmond and the Chamber of Commerce should be involved.

During the discussion, reference was made to the large surplus of funds which existed for several agencies, and the comment was made that the amount of these surplus funds should be taken into consideration when reviewing grant applications.

Attachment 1 to the staff report was then reviewed by the Committee, and as a result of the discussion, the following motions were introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That the matter of the Steveston Community Society float be referred to staff to investigate and report to the General Purposes Committee on the question of the float in relation to the City's 125 Year Anniversary celebrations.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

Prior to the question on the motion being called, staff were requested to report on (i) the plans for, and who might be responsible for, the construction of the float, (ii) determine if Tourism Richmond and the Chamber of Commerce were willing to become involved with the project; (iii) whether the float would be a Richmond or Steveston float, and (iv) whether the Steveston Community Society would be willing to work with the City if it was a Richmond rather than a Steveston float.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the proposed grant to the Richmond Youth Services be referred to staff to obtain additional information on that organization's current activities, and on any overlaps which were occurring and for which the City was being asked to provide funding.

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded

That the City youth workers be divided amongst the City's seven community centres.

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded

That RADAT be awarded a grant in the amount of \$7,500.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the main motion be amended by deleting the figure "\$7,500", and by substituting the figure, "\$8,500".

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion ensued on the appropriateness of approving a grant when the application had been submitted late.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED** with Mayor Brodie and Councillor Kumagai opposed.

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

It was moved and seconded

That staff examine the role of RADAT and the services which that organization provides to the community with respect to alcohol and drug addictions, to

- (1) determine how far reaching the programs offered by RADAT were within the community; and*
- (2) provide information on the cost of involved in running the programs and staff implications.*

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

Prior to the question on the motion being called, staff provided information on a report currently being prepared in consultation with RADAT on the gaming issue. Discussion ensued, with staff being requested to provide information on whether RADAT (i) was the only agency to provide this type of service in Richmond, and (ii) had applied for funding from the BC Lottery Corporation.

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

It was moved and seconded

That the proposed grant to the Richmond Nature Park be referred to staff to obtain information on (i) the purpose for the funding being requested, and (ii) the nature of the surplus.

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded

(1) *That the grants be awarded (as identified in Attachment 1 to the report dated February 20th, 2004, from the Manager, Customer Services, and as amended to reflect a grant to RADAT in the amount of \$8,500):*

(a) *for Health and Social Services, and the cheques disbursed for a total of \$170,500; and*

(b) *Cultural, Community Promotions and Summer Programs, and the cheques disbursed for a total of \$61,700;*

and that grants to the Richmond Youth Service Agency and the Nature Park be deferred until the outcome of the referral motions to staff.

CARRIED

6. **DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES IMPOSITION BYLAW NO. 7676**
(Report: Feb. 20/04, File No.: 8060-20-7676) (REDMS No. 1127073, 1126858)

It was moved and seconded

That Development Cost Charges Imposition Bylaw No. 7676 be introduced and given first, second and third readings.

The question on the motion was not called, as the Manager, Special Projects, Graham Willis, explained that the proposed bylaw represented the third step in a process to increase Development Cost Charges for all types of development.

Discussion then took place among Committee members and staff on whether 'grandfathering' had previously been approved by the Committee for those development applications which had been in process at the time of implementation of the new rates.

In response to questions regarding the implementation of the new rates, advice was given that:

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

- developers were being advised that they should submit their applications for proposed developments as quickly as possible if they wished to take advantage of the existing rates
- Development Cost Charges were collected at the building permit stage; subdivision developments were given a one year exemption and developers were required to sign a waiver at the time of subdivision; however, building permits did not have such a condition
- in 2003, 85% of the DCC revenue collected by the City was as a result of building permits being issued; only 15% of the revenue came from subdivision development.

During the discussion, questions were asked about whether staff had consulted with the Urban Development Institute (UDI) on this proposal. Advice was given in response, that UDI had been consulted at the time of the implementation of step one of the process, and had supported phasing in of the new rates.

Questions were also raised, and information provided, about the timing of the application of the new rates based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and whether this application was to have been applied to the first year of the increase.

Mr. Bob Ransford, Chair of the UDI Liaison Committee, expressed surprised that UDI had not been advised of the implementation of the proposed new rates. He also addressed the CPI issue, stating that UDI had requested the City to implement the increased rates over a two year period, and that the CPI adjustment would take place at the time of the implementation of the full increase. Mr. Ransford added that it was his understanding that those projects which had been in process at the time of the implementation of the new rates would be 'grandfathered' and that the increase would be spread over two years.

A brief discussion ensued, during which comments were made that clarification was needed on the issues of 'grandfathering' and CPI adjustments.

As a result of the discussion, the following **referral** motion was introduced:

It was moved and seconded

That Development Cost Charges Bylaw No. 7676 be referred to staff for clarification of (i) CPI, (ii) waivers, and (iii) 'grandfathering'.

CARRIED

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

7. **COUNCIL PROCEDURE BYLAW CHANGES – COMMUNITY CHARTER**

(Report: Feb. 6/04, File No.: 8060-20-7662) (REDMS No. 1119988, 1120293)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That staff proceed with the public notification required by the Community Charter, for Bylaw No. 7662.*
- (2) *That Bylaw No. 7662, which effects several minor changes to the Council Procedure Bylaw, required by the Community Charter, be presented to council for introduction and first, second and third readings on March 22nd, 2004.*
- (3) *That the Council policy (adopted in February of 1990) which established the rotating appointment process for Acting Mayors be rescinded, effective on the date of the adoption of Bylaw No. 7662.*

CARRIED

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

8. **IMPROVING COMMUNICATIONS WITH VANCOUVER COASTAL HEALTH AND RICHMOND HEALTH SERVICES**

(Report: Jan. 8/04, File No.: 0151-01) (REDMS No. 1111261)

Discussion ensued, as opposition was expressed by several Councillors about the proposed recommendations. Cllr. McNulty stated that he would rather talk directly with Richmond MLAs on a regular basis to keep the lines of communication open. Cllr. Steves stated that much more needed to be undertaken than was being proposed by Recommendations 2, 3 and 4. He added that monthly meetings should be held rather than on a bi-annual basis.

Discussion ensued among Committee members on the recommendations, during which the following information was provided in response to questions:

- staff were meeting with Richmond Health Services staff once a month, and more often as the need arose
- a presentation would be made to Council twice a year, however, more frequent meetings could be held, and copies of a proposed monthly newsletter would be circulated.

Concerns were then expressed about:

- Council having to go through staff with their concerns and the lack of communication
- the information being given to Council during presentations by health care representatives
- with reference to the formation of a standing committee of Council, whether anything could be accomplished by having that committee

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

- the proposal that meetings only be held twice a year as it was felt that the City's concerns could not be addressed in a timely manner.

A comment was made that if a standing committee of Council was formed, recommendations could be made on action to take. The belief was also expressed that the relationship should not be entirely with staff.

During the discussion, the suggestion was made that the proposed recommendations be put in place for a period of six months and then a report submitted on whether the City's needs were being met. If not, consideration could be given at that time to establishing a committee to address the City's concerns. However, not all members of the Committee supported the formation of a committee as the City would have no jurisdiction.

Support for the recommendations was offered by several Committee members, but only if there was a response back in six months' time. The comment was also made that ways had to be found to be more effective and that meeting twice a year was not sufficient. The suggestion was also made that a portion of the Workers' Compensation Board building could be utilized for health services.

Discussion continued, with the comment being made that Richmond was in the health care business and that dialogue was needed with the appropriate stakeholders.

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

It was moved and seconded

That:

- (1) *no further action be taken at this time to form a dedicated Committee of Council to review activities related to Health Care in Richmond;*
- (2) *staff meet with Richmond Health Services staff on an ongoing basis, to share information of mutual interest, and to ensure Council is not "surprised" by actions and announcements that affect the Richmond community;*
- (3) *staff arrange a presentation from Richmond Health Services, on a bi-annual basis, to keep Council up to date on the plans and actions that will affect the Richmond community;*
- (4) *staff prepare a regular "Intergovernmental Relations" newsletter, to keep Council informed of the related programs, issues, and initiatives; and*
- (5) *the minutes of the Local Governance Liaison Committee be included as part of the agendas for the Community Safety Committee, and that staff report to the General Purposes Committee in six months' time on the results of this arrangement.*

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Cllr. McNulty

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

ENGINEERING & PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

9. **RESIDENTIAL WATER METERING PROGRAM – ADDITION TO THE 2004 CAPITAL PROGRAM**

(Report: Feb. 23/04, File No.: 6650-02) (REDMS No. 1126824)

It was moved and seconded

That the Residential Water Metering Program be added to the 2004 Capital Program with a budget of \$2,000,000 funded from the Water Meter Program Provision.

CARRIED

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

11. **IMPERIAL LANDING REFERRAL OF DECEMBER 15, 2004**

(Report: Feb. 20/04, File No.: 4060-05-03) (REDMS No. 1119982)

Mr. Crowe, accompanied by the Acting Manager – Development Applications, Holger Burke, reviewed with Committee, the charts which were on display, to explain the modified development proposal for the Imperial Landing Maritime Mixed Use (MMU) area and the north-east corner of Bayview Street and No. 1 Road.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on

- the increase in the square footage of residential development and the impact which this would have on the adjacent area
- the amendments which would be required to the Official Community Plan and Zoning & Development Bylaw if the modified development package was approved, and the process to be followed (i.e. Public Hearing)
- the recommendation that staff work with Onni Development on the development of a modified proposal, and whether, by approving this recommendation, Committee would be prejudging the process
- possible uses for the MMU area
- the size of the specialty grocery store proposed north of Bayview Street, near No. 1 Road.

Advice was given during the discussion, that approval of the staff recommendation would allow staff to clarify a number of issues with Onni Development, after which the new proposal would be submitted to Council through the usual public process.

Acting Mayor Derek Dang assumed the Chair, as Mayor Brodie left the meeting at 6:18 p.m., during the above discussion.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

Discussion ensued on the lack of green space on the site, and on the public input received regarding the current proposal.

Mayor Brodie returned at 6:20 p.m. and resumed the Chair.

Discussion continued among Committee members and staff on:

- the three options available to Committee, the advantages and disadvantages of each, and the impact which these options would have on the surrounding neighbourhood
- what the developer could build within the current proposal
- the MMU area and what would be permitted within that area and whether the use would be altered to permit retain commercial uses
- the impact which Option 3 would have on the view corridors for those developments located north of Bayview Street
- whether the site should be left as it was
- whether area residents would support the increased residential component
- the feasibility of locating the higher density component closer to No. 1 Road and Bayview Street
- the impact of having another public consultation process as it was felt that new residents would not be willing to compromise on the proposed increase in density
- the feasibility of using City assets, such as the City-owned property at 4320 Moncton Street, as part of the negotiations
- the industrial park at Moncton Street and No. 2 Road.

With reference to the discussion on the industrial park at Moncton Street and No. 2 Road, Councillor Howard declared that he had a conflict of interest as he had an interest in an application in the area, and he then left the meeting (6:40 p.m.)

Concern was expressed that the MMU area could become commercial, and the comment was made that the MMU area was created to allow businesses in the industrial park on Moncton Street to relocate when this industrial park was redeveloped. A further comment was made that these businesses had to have somewhere to which to relocate.

Councillor Howard re-entered the meeting – 6:46 p.m.

Mr. Bob Ransford, 5071 Steveston Highway, questioned why the proposed modification was even being considered after three years of public consultation on the redevelopment of the former BC Packers site. He noted that none of the consultation had been on the area now being considered by the Committee.

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

Mr. Ransford commented at length on the proposal, expressing concern about the change in the ground floor use in the MMU area and the proposed increase in residential density. He stated that if the proposal was being considered because of the potential \$1.7 Million contribution for community amenities, then the community should be given the opportunity to comment on the proposal.

Mr. Ransford commented on the feasibility of using City assets as part of the negotiations, suggesting that the Moncton Street property was not as valuable. He also stated that if additional open space was being sought, then the public should be consulted on not only that issue, but also on (i) the proposal to lift the restrictions on the ground floor use in the MMU zone for commercial use, (ii) how this would benefit the City, and (iii) the waterfront open space. Mr. Ransford concluded his presentation by questioning what it was that the City was trying to achieve.

Discussion then ensued among Committee and Mr. Ransford on:

- the proposed modified concept and the need to consult with the public on the proposal
- the need for more active uses on the waterfront, such as a pleasure boat marina
- the proposed increase in residential density and how it could be accommodated and at the same time, improving the view corridors for the residents to the north.

Mr. Ransford was thanked for his presentation.

Staff then provided additional information on the modified proposal, and discussion took place on the need to involve the community in the redevelopment proposal, and on the information which should be presented to the public as part of the consultation process.

Also addressed were the issues of:

- whether the inclusion of a grocery store should be encouraged, and Onni's rationale for proposing the 20,000 sq. ft. facility
- whether increased open space and access to the waterfront, along with increased activity on the waterfront, could be achieved
- how the public would be notified that City Council was contemplating a change to the current development proposal and of the fact that the City did not own the property located south of Bayview Street, but only the walkway and water lots
- whether the Onni concept could be set back an additional 30 feet
- the time frame faced by Onni and whether the developer would be willing to negotiate with the City.

As a result of the discussion, the following motion was introduced:

General Purposes Committee

Monday, March 1st, 2004

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That staff cease efforts to complete the December 15th, 2003, referral from the General Purposes Committee.*
- (2) *That staff report to Committee with visions for the Imperial Landing Maritime Mixed Use (MMU) area and the north-east corner of Bayview Street and No. 1 Road, without pre-commitment, on alternatives for the site, including:*
 - (a) *an examination of the additional space for the grocery store on No. 1 Road;*
 - (b) *additional density increases to be located towards No. 1 Road;*
 - (c) *provision of green space and open space in significant areas of the Maritime Mixed Use (MMU) area;*
 - (d) *public and private parking to be highlighted and addressed;*
 - (e) *the consideration of the City's .9 acre parcel at 4320 Moncton Street in the negotiations;*
 - (f) *the provision of pedestrian and vehicular access across the MMU area to the dyke; and*

that staff provide information on(i) the timing of a presentation to the public for discussion on the alternate visions, and (ii) how the public consultation process would be undertaken.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

That the meeting adjourn (7:24 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, March 1st, 2004.

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant, City Clerk's Office