



MINUTES

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: Tuesday, April 18th, 2001

Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall

Present: Councillor Malcolm Brodie, Chair
Councillor Bill McNulty, Vice-Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Lyn Greenhill
Councillor Harold Steves

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 meeting of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday, April 3rd, 2001, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

2. Tuesday, **May 8, 2001**, at 4:00 p.m. in the Anderson Room.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3. **APPLICATION BY LAWRENCE CONSTRUCTION LTD. FOR REZONING AT 7860 BENNETT ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DISTRICT, SUBDIVISION AREA E (R1/E) TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (CD/28)**
(RZ 01-115083 - Report: March 26/01, File No.: RZ 01-115083) (REDMS No. 325206)

The Manager, Development Applications, Joe Erceg briefly reviewed the report with Committee members. In response to questions from the Chair, Mr. Erceg confirmed that if a property was developed with three or more units on each new lot, an applicant would be required to apply for a Development Permit.

It was moved and seconded

That Bylaw No. 7221, for the rezoning of 7860 Bennett Road from "Single-Family Housing District, Subdivision Area E (R1/E)" to "Comprehensive Development District (CD/28)", be introduced and given first reading.

CARRIED

4. **2000 ANNUAL REPORT & 2001 - 2002 WORK PROGRAM
CHILD CARE DEVELOPMENT BOARD**

(Report: April 6/01, File No.: 0100-20-CCDE1-01) (REDMS No. 279740)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, briefly reviewed the report with the Committee, during which he expressed support for the undertaking of a needs assessment. He then introduced Ms. Kathy Stoessl and Ms. Nicky Byres, Co-Chairs of the Child Care Development Board.

The Chair referred to the recommendation of the General Purposes Committee that the Child Care Development Board be given a grant of \$50,000 of casino revenue. He indicated that if necessary, any decision made on the recommendation now being considered by the Planning Committee which impacted the recommendation adopted by the General Purposes Committee, could be modified at the April 23rd, 2001 Council Meeting.

Ms. Kathy Stoessl, of 5380 Hummingbird Drive, accompanied by Ms. Nicky Byres, of Springfield Drive, introduced members of the Board to the Committee.

Ms. Stoessl then provided Committee members with an overview of the Board's work during the past year, and spoke about the proposed 2001-2002 work plan for the Board. Following Ms. Stoessl's report, Ms. Byres spoke about the proposed needs assessment. A copy of Ms. Stoessl's and Ms. Buyer's submission is attached as Schedule A and forms part of these minutes.

Discussion ensued among Committee members, the delegation and staff on the rationale for undertaking a needs assessment, even though one had been completed just 5 years ago. Information was provided that the intent of the assessment was to provide to the Board, detailed information on such matters as (i) possible child care models which might be available in other cities and municipalities; (ii) what other committees had done; and (iii) the types of child care services which are now and will be required for the next five years. Advice was given that the requested amount of \$25,000 would allow the Board to hire a consultant to assist in undertaking the assessment.

In response to further questions about the proposed needs assessment and whether this assessment could be included with 3 other similar City studies currently being undertaken, advice was given that:

- needs assessments would be required every 5 years approximately because of changing child care needs

- including the child care needs assessment with other studies would not provide all the information needed by the Board; however, the Board was of the view that undertaking their assessment at the same time as the other studies could enhance these other studies
- the Board was hopeful that their assessment would provide information on how to manage many child care issues.

Advice was also given that the first child care study undertaken 5 years ago had identified kindercare and school age child care as an issue, however the Board did not know what the parents wanted in the way of child care. The statement was made that with the implementation of the Provincial funding plan for child care, the demand for this type of service would be even higher and more affordable.

Questions were raised about whether other means might be available to undertake the assessment rather than hiring a consultant. Advice was given that it was felt that the Child Care Development Board did not have the capacity to undertake such a study. Further advice was given that City staff did not have the time to commit to such an undertaking because of their current workload. However, Mr. Crowe indicated that the assessment would be a collaboration of the Board, associates, parents, and other affected parties, and added that methods were available to obtain the needed information.

Reference was made to the Board's request for \$100,000 to be deposited from the Casino Revenue Fund into the Child Care Development Statutory Reserve Fund, and to the feasibility of approving an amount of \$50,000 in 2001 and a similar amount in 2002. In response to questions about future expenditures from the Child Care Statutory Reserve Fund, advice was given that the revenue from that fund would be used for 'one-time' capital costs and that the needs assessment would help the Board to ensure that the funds were correctly used.

A question was raised as to whether the consulting costs to complete the assessment had been included in the City's consulting budget, as well as being recommended in the staff report now being considered, and staff were asked to confirm that that amount had been deleted from the consulting budget.

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

It was moved and seconded

- (1) ***That the 2001 - 2002 Work Program of the Child Care Development Board be approved.***
- (2) ***That the proposed child care needs assessment be referred to staff to determine:***
 - (a) ***what support could be provided by staff;***
 - (b) ***the options which were available to conduct the needs assessment; and***
 - (c) ***the anticipated costs to complete the assessment.***

- (3) (a) ***That \$50,000 of casino funding be immediately placed into the Child Care Development Statutory Reserve Fund, and***
- (b) ***That consideration be given in the next Casino Fund allocation (Fall, 2001) to place an additional \$50,000 into the Child Care Development Statutory Reserve Fund.***

CARRIED

Reference was made to the Casino Revenue Fund, and staff were requested to provide to the April 23rd, 2001 Council Meeting, information on a 'rolling total', disbursements, etc., for this fund.

5. PROPOSED CONVERTIBLE HOUSE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

(Report: February 15/01, File No.: 4057-07) (REDMS No. 329598)

Terry Crowe commented briefly on the proposal. Planner Rob Innes then reviewed the options available, as well as the advantages and disadvantages of each option.

Discussion then took place among Committee members and staff on the project and the profit which the City could expect to earn. Advice was given that a project value had not been established but would be determined when the proposals were received from interested builders. In response to further questions the following information was provided:

- plans and design guidelines would be prepared by the builder for which ever option was chosen
- the longer that the City remained involved in the project, the more revenue which would be generated to the City
- Option 1 would allow the City to remain involved in the project for a longer period of time while Option 2 would have the City selling only the property to a builder in a quicker timeframe
- the property improvement costs would be part of the 2001 Land Acquisition Reserve bylaw and would come from the Industrial Reserve

Concern was expressed about the previous failed attempt to undertake a convertible housing project, and staff were cautioned about ensuring that the project now being considered was not over-managed or overpriced.

Concern was also voiced by the Chair that selection of Option 1 would result in any profit earned by the City being taken up with administrative costs. He suggested that the City could achieve its goals for the project through the private sector and still have control over design plans, administrative costs, etc. as long as the property was sold with those conditions attached.

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

It was moved and seconded

- (1) ***That the convertible house demonstration project (as per Option 2 in the report dated February 15, 2001, from the Manager, Policy Planning) be approved.***

- (2) *That staff:*
- (a) *take the necessary steps to subdivide into two 33 ft. (10.05 m) lots, the City owned lot at 3860 Regent Street to facilitate this development;*
 - (b) *seek proposals from qualified builders, as per Option 2, to develop a convertible house demonstration project, and;*
 - (c) *review the proposals, select a preferred builder and manage the process through to completion.*
- (3) *That no further action to be taken to apply the CD/44 zone in other parts of the City until this demonstration project and criteria to apply this zone elsewhere in Richmond, are prepared and approved.*

Prior to the question being called, a brief discussion ensued, during which Councillor Barnes suggested that the City would have a difficult time in finding a builder who would be willing to make exceptions. At the request of the Chair, City Solicitor Paul Kendrick provided information on the development of the Odlinwood project.

The question on the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. Barnes and Steves opposed.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Jan Knapp, a resident of Odlinwood Road, came forward to speak on the issue of convertible housing. He questioned whether the 'CD/44' zone, which was already part of the Zoning & Development Bylaw would be available to individuals who submitted applications for rezoning their properties to this designation. He referred to the previous Committee meeting held on this matter, at which time staff had been directed to comment on his request to rezone his and his son's property to CD/44, and stated that he had not yet received a response.

At the request of the Chair, City Solicitor Paul Kendrick provided his opinion on the matter, advising that the City could not say no to an application being made, however, the City did have the right to determine if and where rezonings would occur. This included taking no action taken until the demonstration project had been completed, and the appropriate criteria approved for the development of similar projects in other areas of the City.

Mr. Knapp expressed his dissatisfaction with the answer, noting that he had applied to the City for the rezoning of his property to the CD/44 zoning district prior to the recommendation now being made.

6. **PARKING ISSUES IN STEVESTON TOWN CENTRE**
(Report: March 15/01, File No.: 6455-01) (REDMS No. 311763)

Joe Erceg commented briefly on the report. Development Coordinator Holger Burke elaborated on the report, during which he reviewed the five issues which had been referred to staff for comment at the November 7th, 2000 Planning Committee meeting, as well as the recommendations now being made by staff.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on the proposal, during which the suggestion was made that a Steveston citizens' advisory committee be asked to provide their comments on parking issues generally and on the staff report. The comment was also made that additional research should be completed prior to taking any action to register notices on title, because many of the buildings adjacent to First, Second and Third Avenues may actually be sitting in the road right-of-way because of a surveying error made many years ago.

At the request of the Chair, Paul Kendrick provided information on the issues surrounding the proposed recommendation and the ramifications which could result, especially if portions of buildings were located in road rights-of-way. Discussion then continued on what action the City should be taking, if any, during which the General Manager, Urban Development, David McLellan indicated that although he had signed as concurring with the recommendations, he no longer agreed with Part 1. The suggestion was made by Mr. Kendrick that perhaps the staff report should be referred to a citizens' advisory committee for their comment. However, concern was expressed about the safety issues regarding material being stored in lanes, and advice was given that that process could be implemented.

Also discussed by Committee members and staff was the situation created at Steveston Station where a security gate had been installed which denied the public free and clear access to the parking area.

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

It was moved and seconded

- (1) ***That the question of initiating a process to file notices on the title of properties in the Steveston Town Centre which encroach into lanes, be referred to the Manager, Building Approvals for further review.***
- (2) ***That the Community Bylaws Department enforce the removal of any material stored in a lane to ensure public safety and fire access within the Steveston town centre.***
- (3) ***That the Transportation and Community Bylaws Departments take steps to form a citizens' advisory committee to examine parking issues in the Steveston Town Centre area, which would make and submit recommendations to the Planning Committee, with a progress report being made to the Committee in one month's time.***
- (4) ***That the Steveston Station situation be referred to the Law Department to examine (i) the security gate issue specifically, and (ii) the issue of accessibility in general.***

Prior to the question being called, the suggestion was made that staff include on the citizens' advisory committee, individuals who were opposed to the establishment of pay parking in the Steveston area.

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

7. **MANAGER'S REPORT**

- (a) Joe Erceg provided information on the development application received for the redevelopment of the Aberdeen Centre, which had been reviewed by the Advisory Design Panel and would now be submitted to the Development Permit Panel. He briefly reviewed the parking variance being sought by the applicant.
- (b) David McLellan referred to the Greater Vancouver Regional District's Liveable Region Strategic Plan which was currently under review, and advised that staff were of the opinion that a more comprehensive review was needed than that being proposed by the GVRD. He stated that the plan should be more realistic with respect to Richmond's employment, population growth and concentration in the City, as well as housing, compact community initiatives and social issues, which must be addressed. A brief discussion ensued on this matter, during which the Planning Committee agreed with the points made by Mr. McLellan.

Reference was to the transportation issue, and a brief discussion ensued on the need for a light rail transportation system to the City, during which Mr. McLellan provided information on a report being presented to an upcoming TransLink meeting on transportation.

Councillor McNulty referred to the Public Hearing held April 17th, 2001, and advised that he had requested information on what property taxes would be for commercially zoned properties as compared to those with an "I/4" designation. The Manager, Zoning Allan Clark then provided a brief summary of the information which he had gathered on the request. He indicated that he would provide a memo to Council once he had completed his review.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (6:00 p.m.).

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Wednesday, April 18th, 2001.

Councillor Malcolm Brodie
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant

Presentation to Planning Committee
On behalf of the Child Care Development Board
City of Richmond
April 18, 2001

Presented by: Co-chairs, Kathy Stoessl (5380 Hummingbird Dr.) and Nicky Byres (31-3171 Springfield Dr.)

Kathy will begin by introducing the Board members and then will give a brief overview of the past year and speak to the proposed 2001/2002 working plan.

Nicki will speak to the second item on the agenda, which is in part a) the request that \$25,000 of casino revenues be allocated as special project funding to update the child care needs assessment. Part b) is the request for \$100,000 to be allocated to the Child Care Statutory Reserve Fund.

Introductions:

Would the committee members who are here please stand when their names are read. Other members are unable to be here because they are caring for children.

Debra Dixon, Director, Out of School Care, West Richmond Community Centre

Susan Graf, Supervisor, Treehouse Preschool, Richmond Society for Community Living

Karen Iddins, Parent, Lawyer

Maria Ressel, Co-ordinator, Child Care Resource and Referral Service, a program of Volunteer Richmond

Agnes Thompson, retired Preschool Teacher

Penny West, President Richmond Family Child Care Association

Candice Wood, Preschool Teacher

Nicki Byres, Manager, Society of Richmond Children's Centres, parent using family child care

Kathy Stoessl, parent, Instructor in the Department of Early Childhood Education at Langara College

Thanks expressed to Councilor Steves who has been our Council Representative for several years.

Acknowledge Trustee, Chak Au who is our new School Board representative. We are looking forward to working with him.

Thanks expressed to Marg Picard who recently took on our group as part of her portfolio. We appreciate her strong commitment to quality child care.

Overview of the past year:

The Board has experienced a year of transition. Following the completion of the last city built child care facility; there was a turnover in the membership of the Board. Carolyn Morrison, who was our Staff Liaison, retired and we were without a Staff Liaison until recently. For much of the year the Board was comprised of a small core working group. We continued to support child care initiatives within the community.

a) A letter of support was sent to the Richmond Colts Teen Mom program, which was in danger of closing. We are pleased to say that it remained open.

b) A letter was also sent to support the opening of a new kindercare program at De Beck Elementary. That program is now open and at full enrolment.

Early in the year 2000, a presentation was made to inform City Council of the Community Consultation that was held the previous November. It was entitled, "Think Tank: Identifying Current Child Care Issues in Richmond". The "Think Tank" provided a quick snap shot of emerging trends and issues for families and service providers. The discussion was within the context of the Provincial Discussion Paper, "Building Better Futures for British Columbia's Kids". The Child Care Development Board's response to the Provincial Discussion Paper was presented to Planning Committee and City Council.

The "Think Tank" session together with a review of the Boards goals and objectives, lead the way to a new vision and our subsequent working plan.

The year ended with a new vision for the work of the Board. We have actively recruited new members who participated in the development of the 2001/02 working plan. The energy and commitment of the Board was strong as we reflected upon how to support children and families in our community.

Working Plan 2001/02

We are not the only ones who have been reflecting upon early childhood care and education. A lot has happened in this past year. I would like to highlight some of the initiatives that have shaped our working plan.

National Children's Agenda: a project of the Federal Government to examine the values, which we hold in common across Canada, as a society who cares for children. It also articulates a vision for the education, health and well being of Canada's children.

"Building Better Futures for British Columbia's Kids": the Provincial government in October 1999 released this discussion paper. The paper recognizes that the quality of care we give our children early in their lives is absolutely critical to their success in school and as adults. It acknowledges that parents are the primary caregivers but that they do not bear this responsibility alone. The Province invited people to comment on a variety of strategies and options to support child care. The response to this paper was overwhelming – 10,000 responses – a clear call for action!

Recent poverty reports: National, Provincial and local. These reports tell us that we need to address child poverty. Nearly one third of all children in Richmond live in poverty. We know that lack of access to quality child care is one of the biggest barriers to employment.

Research on Early Brain Development: This tells us that the early years are a critical time in which children lay down the developmental foundations for later learning.

Lastly, the BC Child Care Funding Initiative also referred to as "Child Care BC": This is a five-year provincial plan to address the affordability of quality child care. The first step in this plan was implemented in January, 2001 and addressed the cost of centre based school age child care. This has had a significant impact on our community already.

The timing is right for child care initiatives. The City of Richmond has an opportunity now to build a comprehensive child care system. More opportunities are right around the corner. We need to be prepared and ready to respond. The focus of our working plan for 2001 is therefor, to update the needs assessment. Nicki will speak to this in more detail.

You will also see that the fifth item on our working plan is to connect with other community groups. I am pleased to report that we have had two guests to our Board meetings this year. Annie McKitrick (RCSAC) came to discuss the Poverty Report and last month Kate Sparrow discussed the work of the Recreation and Community Services. Discussion with Kate Sparrow focused on the emerging needs in East Richmond. We hope that by building partnerships with

other community groups we may be able look collectively at a range of options when responding to identified needs within neighbourhoods.

Our plan also indicates that each year, the Board would like to conduct a public awareness project in celebration of Child Care month. On May 23, 7:30 –9:00 p.m. we will be hosting a reception at city hall. The public is invited to drop in and tour some different child care sites in the city from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. The reception will follow the open house tours. We would also like to extend an invitation to all Councilors.

The other items on the working plan are self-explanatory. Nicki will proceed with the presentation related to the application for casino funding.

**Presentation to Planning Committee
City of Richmond
April 18, 2001**

As you will have seen in your package, the Child Care Development Board has made application for \$25, 000 to update the City of Richmond's Needs Assessment on Child Care and for \$100,000 to be placed in the Statutory Reserve Fund for Child Care. These 2 requests are integrally linked and reflect the renewed vision of the Board. The last needs assessment was done in 1995. Since then, the City of Richmond has undertaken several important initiatives and the four city-owned centres are open, full and serving a diverse population of children and families across the City. However, as you well know, the City has seen remarkable change in these intervening years. Anecdotal information suggests that the child care needs have grown in most areas. Particularly waitlists for infant/toddler and school age child care have increased and we know some of these waitlists to exceed 100 families.

This lack of child care spaces creates a significant barrier for parents who wish to return to work or school. Those that do find space can often not afford to work on a full-time basis because of the prohibitive cost of infant child care or the cost of child care for more than one child. Statistical information indicates that 70% of women with children under the age of six are, by necessity, in the workforce. It is to the benefit of the community and society at large that children are in nurturing and stimulating environments in these crucial early years. Recent Canadian economic studies on the cost and benefits of early childhood care and education for all children indicate that the economic return for investing in the early years is two to one. Spend one dollar now and you will save

two by later productivity of these citizens and in potential problems averted.

An updated child care needs assessment will enable us to do evidence-based planning for child care service development and delivery in Richmond for the next five years. An opportunity to enhance the lives of children and their families and secure a livable and productive future for all citizens of this City.

We are at a unique moment in our history in the child care movement. We have a National Children's Agenda with a national commitment to early childhood development. We have Provincial commitment to child care through the newly proclaimed Child Care BC Act which commits the provincial government to rolling out a universal child care program over the next 5 years. Some Municipal Governments, such as Richmond's, led the way in committing public resources to the development of child care services. Now, governments, at all levels, are finally acting to provide the child care services and supports families need desperately.

To be able to advise City Council on current child care and family issues, needs, trends etc. of this community, the Child Care Development Board needs to have accurate, meaningful and up-to-date data. A child care needs assessment is the tool to facilitate this.

The allocation of \$100,000 to the Child Care Development Statutory Reserve will allow us to be responsive to the needs identified in the new Needs Assessment as well as take advantage of the Provincial Initiative on Universal Child Care. Right now, a local Parents Advisory Council has 42 children needing before and after school care. If they could secure a space, they would still need approximately \$20,000

for start-up for equipment. Parents on the West Side of Richmond recently slept outside overnight to secure the minimal number of spaces available for school-age care for the next school year. A new school age program provisionally set to open in September is already full and has an extensive waitlist.

We believe that these examples are directly linked to the first step of the Provincial Plan that went into effect January 1, 2001. Now that Out of School Care is affordable, the barrier for parents is the shortage of spaces. Child Care Operators would be willing to expand their services if they could secure one time capital start-up funds. The City could immediately assist in these situations if adequate funds were available in the Statutory Reserve Fund. The fund is currently empty and the \$100,000 would help to begin to address the urgent child care needs of the community. There is already a process for screening applications that could easily be reviewed. We believe we could respond to the community applications before the end of the year.

The needs assessment will further highlight the areas and circumstances where a grant from the Statutory Reserve could make a lasting impact in the community. The City of Richmond can again lead the way in progressively responding to the child care needs of its families.

The City acknowledged in its child care policy that child care is an essential service in our community for residents, employers and employees. We ask you to continue to back up that commendable statement with action.

We thank you for your time. We would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.