General Purposes Committee

Date:	Tuesday, April 18th, 2006
Place:	Anderson Room Richmond City Hall
Present:	Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair Councillor Linda Barnes Councillor Cynthia Chen Councillor Derek Dang Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt Councillor Rob Howard Councillor Bill McNulty Councillor Harold Steves (4:04 p.m.)
Absent:	Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt
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 General Purposes Committee held on Monday, April 3rd, 2006, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

DELEGATION

2. ***Josh O'Connor, Chair and Craig Jones, Executive Director, Richmond Chamber of Commerce; Nicki Roberts, New Image Studies, Task Force Co-Chair; Simon Johnston, Gateway Theatre, Task Force Co-Chair; and Rob Fleming, Kwantlen University College, Task Force Member, representing the Richmond Chamber of Commerce Arts and Cultural Task Force, to present their report: Benefits, Opportunities and Recommendations for Linkages between Business, Arts and Culture in Richmond.***
(File No.: 7000-01; xr 4105-01)

Simon Johnston, a Director of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, provided information on the rationale for the creation of the Chamber's Arts and Culture Task Force; the focus of the Task Force on linkages between business, arts and culture in the City; the benefits and opportunities which could result from this proposal, and the recommendation of the Task Force that the Chamber of Commerce create a standing committee for business, arts and culture.

Nicki Roberts then talked about the recommendations of the Task Force, and discussed the areas of investigation and the benefits and opportunities which could be achieved through the mandate of the proposed standing committee, which was to focus on advocacy for, and development of, linkages between City businesses and the arts and culture community.

Discussion then took place among Committee members and the delegation on:

- the expectations of the Chamber of Commerce that the City become a partner; participation of the City in terms of a letter of support and information to the Chamber on how to strengthen their application for funding to "Arts Now"
- the vision of the proposal; whether Richmond would become a destination for the performing arts, and when and how this might be achieved
- the status of this project with the Arts Coalition, and how the Chamber standing committee would function with the Arts Coalition
- the need for a unifying body to organize arts and culture in the community
- whether the study would be completed in time to prepare a vision with an international focus for the upcoming Winter Olympic Games in 2010 on why visitors would want to come to Richmond
- whether there would be an integration of the different factions of arts and cultural organizations within the City
- the need to keep the City's Economic Development Committee apprised of the action being taken by the Chamber of Commerce, as well as involving the City's Economic Development office

During the discussion, the delegation was congratulated on the preparation of an excellent report.

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

It was moved and seconded

(1) That the report entitled "Benefits, Opportunities and Recommendations for Linkages between Business, Arts and Culture in Richmond", (as prepared by the Richmond Chamber of Commerce Arts and Cultural Task Force), be received for information; and

(2) That City Council confirm its support for the Richmond Chamber of Commerce standing committee for Business, Arts and Culture, and the joint application to "Arts Now".

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded

That the question of staffing implications, including the Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services Division and the Economic Development Office, be referred to staff for review.

CARRIED

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

3. GREATER VANCOUVER SEWERAGE & DRAINAGE DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES

(Report: Apr. 6/06, File No.: 03-0920-02-01) (REDMS No. 1776265)

The Manager, Special Projects, Graham Willis, in response to questions, provided information on why the decision had been made to fund the regional sewer Development Cost Charges through the sewer utility's rate stabilization account.

It was moved and seconded

That the GVS&DD sewer DCC currently being funded by the Richmond sewer utility be charged to developers at subdivision or building permit approval, as appropriate, effective July 1, 2006, and that the GVS&DD be given written notice immediately of the City's intentions to terminate the existing contract.

CARRIED

4. PROPOSED DCC PROGRAM AND RATES BYLAW

(Report: Mar. 3/06, File No.: 12-8060-20-8049) (REDMS No. 1782055, 1789644)

Mr. Willis briefly reviewed his report with the Committee. He then introduced Mr. Fraser Smith, representing Urban Systems Limited, who helped the City to complete a comprehensive review of the City's Development Cost Charges.

(Cllr. Dang left the meeting – 4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Smith then gave a PowerPoint presentation to fully explain the proposed Development Cost Charges rates. A copy of this presentation is on file in the City Clerk's Office.

(Cllr. Dang returned to the meeting at 4:51 p.m., during the above presentation.)

At the conclusion of the presentation, discussion took place among Committee members and staff on:

- parks development cost charges, and the rationale for including parks in the Development Cost Charges bylaw
- the impact which adoption of the new City-wide rates would have on the recently approved West Cambie Area Development Cost Charges
- capital program costs, i.e. components, such as transportation costs, which relate to Development Cost Charges
- how in-stream development applications would be protected from the proposed increase in Development Cost Charges
- the timing on implementation of the new rates for single-family developments in relation to commercial developments
- the status of the concept of voluntary contributions.

It was moved and seconded
That staff:

(1) obtain public input regarding the draft 2006 Development Cost Charge (DCC) Program and Bylaw (as per the report dated March 3, 2006 from the Manager, Special Projects), and

(2) report to the General Purposes Committee in early May, 2006.

CARRIED

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

5. **UPDATE: AIRCRAFT NOISE AND AIRPORT PLANNING MANAGEMENT**
(Report: Apr. 7/06, File No.: 10-6125-03-02) (REDMS No. 1801505)

Discussion ensued among Committee members, the General Manager, Urban Development, Joe Erceg, and Development Coordinator – Development Applications, Holger Burke, on the rationale for staff recommending the deferral of the establishment of a City Airport Committee.

Advice was given that since the referral to staff in March of 2005, regarding the establishment of a City airport committee, the Vancouver International Airport Authority (VIAA) had agreed to hold public meetings in 2006 which would allow residents to address aircraft noise and planning issues with the Authority. Further advice was given that staff were of the opinion that a City airport committee would be a duplication of the service being offered by the VIAA.

Reference was made to an open house held earlier this year and to concerns expressed by individuals who had attended the meeting about the lack of dialogue and opportunity to ask questions at that meeting. Questions were raised about whether any recommendations would result from these public meetings; and how one would ensure that progress was being made and that problems were being resolved.

During the discussion, support was given for a City airport committee, but at the same time, concern was voiced about obtaining effective results if there were too many committees. The suggestion was made that volunteers should be located throughout the City to document and provide information to the airport on low flying small aircraft and helicopters, in an effort to keep these aircraft away from residential areas.

Ms. Anne Murray, Vice President, Community and Environmental Affairs, VIAA, noted that the VIAA had a Noise Management Committee in place, with two City appointed representatives sitting on that Committee, as well as a staff representative. She also indicated that the VIAA had developed a 5 Year Noise Management Plan to implement a number of initiatives to address public concerns about airport noise.

Ms. Murray further advised that the terms of reference for the Noise Management Committee were to be strengthened with respect to the accountability of the appointees to ensure that they were reporting to their respective cities on actions being taken by the VIAA. She added that based on concerns expressed about the open house format, that a public meeting would be held in June, with VIAA staff being in attendance to respond to questions during a question and answer period to be held after a VIAA presentation.

Ms. Murray then spoke about the increase in the number of aircraft at the Airport; the inability of the airport to establish 'no fly' zones because of the complexity of air traffic management; and the staffing of the 24 hour Noise Information Line. During Ms. Murray's presentation, questions were raised about whether the City's views had been made known to the Noise Management Committee, and whether the City had received reports or feedback from its representatives on the Committee.

Questions were raised about whether the flight paths for small aircraft had changed as it was pointed out that these aircraft no longer approached the airport from the west side of Sturgeon Banks and the West Dyke, but instead used No. 3 Road and No. 6 Road to make their approaches. Also addressed was:

- the issue of revving jet engines;
- the need for action to address the City's concerns;
- the action being taken by the VIAA to address complaints received from the public on the 24 hour hot line;
- the proposed format of the upcoming public meeting, and the need to improve communication.

(Cllr. Barnes left the meeting at 5:50 p.m., and returned at 5:53 p.m., during the above discussion.)

The request was made during the discussion that the City be provided with the airport regulations relating to, and information on, the current flight paths for small aircraft and helicopters.

Mr. Doug Louth addressed Committee on the need for a City airport committee. A copy of his submission is attached as Schedule A and forms part of these minutes.

It was moved and seconded

(1) ***That, (as per Option 1 in the report dated April 7th, 2006 from the Manager, Policy Planning, entitled: Update: Aircraft Noise and Airport Planning Management), as the Vancouver International Airport Authority [VIAA] has agreed to hold a public meeting soon in 2006, to enable aircraft noise and airport planning issues to be discussed, the City not establish a City Airport Committee and await the VIAA to brief them on the findings of the public meeting.***

(2) ***That staff speak to the City's YVR Noise Management Committee members regarding their role in communicating issues relating to airport noise complaints, and seek an up-to-date status report.***

(3) ***That the VIAA be asked to report to Council as soon as possible regarding flight paths over the City and the related regulations.***

(4) ***That these matters be reviewed in six months.***

(5) ***That City Council recommend to the YVR that the public be allowed to attend the Airport Noise Management Committee meetings.***

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Cllr. McNulty
Steves

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (6:16 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 Tuesday, April 18th, 2006

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Chair

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

MR. MAYOR, I FIRST APPROACHED YOU ON THIS SUBJECT FOUR AND HALF YEARS AGO WHEN YOU WERE ELECTED AS MAYOR OF RICHMOND.

I WILL REMIND YOU DURING OUR DISCUSSION AT THE RECEPTION PARTY YOU THOUGHT THERE WERE NO FLIGHTS AFTER 11PM. AS A PREVIOUS COUNCILLIOR BEFORE COMING MAYOR, YOU WERE NOT AWARE THAT THE AIRPORT CHANGED ITS FLIGHT ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES, NOR DID ANY OTHER MEMBER OF COUNCIL.

ONCE AGAIN, STAFF IS BRINGING BACK TO YOU A REPORT WITH A RECOMMENDATION TO DEFER THE ADOPTION OF THE CITY AIRPORT COMMITTEE THROUGH THE GPC.

YOU DID NOT AGREE WITH THE REPORT THEN, AND YOU SAID SO AT A COUNCIL MEETING IN MARCH 2005. IF I AM CORRECT, IT WAS COUNCILLOR MCNUTLY WHO MOVED THE MOTION TO ESTABLISH THIS COMMITTEE AND TO REPORT TO GPC IN TWO MONTHS.

SO WHAT HAS HAPPENED OVER THE LAST TWELVE MONTHS NECESSITATING YOUR STAFF TO RECOMMEND ONCE AGAIN THE DEFFERAL OF THIS COMMITTEE?

I CAN ONLY GUESS THE AMOUNT OF PRESSURE THAT YVR APPLIED TO YOUR STAFF OVER THE LAST TWELVE MONTHS. ON THE OTHER HAND, WHY DID STAFF CONCUR WITH YVR?

THERE ARE FLAWS IN STAFFS REPORT ON PAGE 4 OPTION 1. FIRST, YVR DID HOLD AN OPEN HOUSE IN FEBRUARY (IT WAS NOT A PUBLIC MEETING). SECOND, YVR IS NOT PLANNING TO HOLD A MEETING UNTIL JUNE OR SEPTEMBER OF THIS YEAR. AT THIS RATE, WE WILL BE DISCUSSING THIS ISSUE IN 2010. ALLOWING YVR TO CONTROL AND DETERMINE THE PROGRAM IS LIKE ALLOWING THE FOX TO GUARD THE HEN HOUSE.

IN ADDITION, THEY WILL NOT ALLOW YOU OR ME TO HAVE ANY WRITTEN INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THEM BY THE RESIDENTS WHO ATTEND THIS MEETING. THEY WILL CLAIM THE PRIVACY ACT AS THEY DID WHEN THEY HELD AN OPEN HOUSE IN THE CAMBIE AREA. THIRD, FOR THE LIFE OF ME, I CANNOT UNDERSTAND WHY STAFF IS COGITATING $10,000.00 FOR A PART TIME LIAISON PERSON. IN MY OPINION, WE WILL ONLY NEED STAFF TIME WHEN MEETINGS ARE SCHEDULED. I PERSONALLY DO NOT THINK THEIR TIME WILL ADD UP TO THAT ESTIMATED DOLLAR FIGURE, PROJECTED FOR THIS COMMITTEE.

IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT THIS COMMITTEE WOULD ONLY BE OPERATING FOR A VERY SHORT PERIOD. THERE IS NO NEED TO KEEP THIS COMMITTEE TO GO ON IN PERPETUITY. IF YOU ALLOW YVR TO HAVE CONTROL OVER THE DESTINY OF THE RESIDENTS WHO LIVE UNDER THE FLIGHT PATH, THEN IT WILL OBVIOUSLY LAST FOR YEARS. THAT IS PRECISELY WHAT THEY WANT. IF YVR CAN DELAY THE APPOINTMENT OF THIS COMMITTEE, FOR WHATEVER REASON, THEY WILL PREVAIL ON THEIR OWN TIME TABLE.

IN OCTOBER 2005, YVR ADVERTISED IN THE LOCAL NEWSPAPERS "WHAT IS YOUR VISION FOR NOISE MANAGEMENT". TO DATE, I HAVE NOT HEARD ANYTHING FROM YVR ON THEIR VISION OR OUR VISION, AND I BELIEVE THIS COMMITTEE HAS NOT HEARD A WORD OR A REPORT FROM YVR OR ITS APPOINTED REPRESENTATIVES.

I PROVIDED THEM WITH SIX RECOMMENDATIONS AND A COUPLE OF COMMENTS.

I WANT TO REMIND YOU THAT AS TAXPAYERS, YOU AND I OWN THE AIRPORTS ACROSS THIS COUNTRY. TRANSPORT CANADA HAS INCORPORATED ALL AIRPORTS AS (NPC) NON PROFIT CORPORATIONS IN THE CANADA CORPORATION ACT.

THIS MEANS THEY ARE REQUIRED TO BE MORE ACCOUNTABLE IN ALL AREAS OF THEIR OPERATION TO THE TAXPAYERS OF CANADA. YVR HAS NOT BEEN UP FRONT WITH THE RESIDENTS AND THIS COUNCIL, AND AS A RESULT, THEY LACK TRANSPARENCY IN DEALING WITH THE CITY AND RESIDENTS WHO LIVE UNDER THE FLIGHT PATH.

REMEMBER THAT FOR US RESIDENTS WHO ARE LIVING IN OLDER ESTABLISHED NEIGHBOURHOODS, WE NEED SOME KIND OF PROTECTION FROM OVER AGGRESSIVE EXECUTIVES WHO SEE PROFIT OVER THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF THE RESIDENTS.

IN 2015, VIAA IS ASSUMING 459,900 FLIGHTS ANNUALLY. OF THOSE 459,900 MOVEMENTS, APPROXIMATELY 61,225 FLIGHTS WILL BE BETWEEN 10PM AND 7AM; OR 167 FLIGHTS DURING THOSE HOURS; OR 18 FLIGHTS PER HOUR; THAT IS A 93% INCREASE IN NIGHT MOVEMENTS FROM 2002.

IN CLOSING, I WANT TO REMIND YOU AS I HAVE DONE IN THE PAST, IT IS NOT OUR INTENTION TO SHUT THE AIRPORT DOWN.

FURTHERMORE, FOR THOSE PEOPLE WHO WANT TO MAKE THE CLAIM THAT THE AIRPORT WAS HERE FIRST, SO MOVE ON.

I GUESS WE NEED TO ASK THE QUESTION AS TO WHY PREVIOUS COUNCILS ALLOWED DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE FLIGHT PATH, WHEN THEY KNEW THE AIRPORT WAS ALLOWING FLIGHTS AFTER MIDNIGHT, OR DID THOSE FOLKS ON COUNCIL KNOW ABOUT YVR INTENTION.

THIS COUNCIL HAS ALWAYS ADVISED YVR ON ITS INTENTION TO DEVELOPED PROPERTY UNDER THE FLIGHT PATH. HOWEVER, YVR HAS NOT RECIPROCATED IN ADVISING COUNCIL OF ITS INTENTION TO CHANGE ITS FLIGHT OPERATION.

ON THE OTHER HAND, DID THE NON PROFIT CORPORATION SURPRISE MOST CITY COUNCILS AND RESIDENTS ACROSS THIS COUNTRY BY IMPLEMENTING FLIGHTS DURING THOSE HOURS, JUST TO IMPROVE THEIR BOTTOM LINE AND TO IMPROVE OUR SLEEP DISTURBANCE?

YOU NEED TO REJECT STAFFS REPORT AND TO PUT INTO ACTION, THE SAME MOTION YOU ADOPTED AT YOUR REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING BACK IN MARCH 2005, WHICH WAS TO CONSTITUTE A COMMITTEE OF RESIDENTS UNDER THE FLIGHT PATH AND TO HOLD REGULAR MEETING WITH YVR.

IF YOU AGREE WITH ME, I THINK I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT YVR WILL HAVE NO CHOICE BUT TO BE ACCOUNTABLE TO ALL OF US UNDER THE TERMS OF THE CANADA CORPORATION ACT. THEY ARE OBLIGATED TO MEET WITH THE STAKEHOLDERS. I CERTAINLY CANNOT DETERMINE WHAT THE POLITICAL FALL OUT WILL BE WITHIN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR THE BUREAUCRAT WITHIN TRANSPORT CANADA. THE ONE THING I CAN GUARANTEE YOU IS THAT ONE OF OUR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT AGREES THERE SHOULD BE NO FLIGHTS AFTER 11PM, JUST LIKE THEY DO IN TORONTO.

THEY EVEN WRITE IN ONE OF THEIR BROCHURE "YOUR AIRPORT, YOUR NEIGHBOUR" THIS INCLUDES BEING A GOOD NEIGHBOUR – BALANCING YOUR NEEDS – HIGH QUALITY OF LIFE –WITH LITTLE NOISE – COMMITMENT INCLUDES INFORMING OUR COMMUNITIES OF OUR PLANS AND INVOLVING YOU IN THE PROCESS. NONE OF THIS WAS DONE.

ONCE AGAIN, DO NOT DEFER THIS COMMITTEE AS STAFF IS RECOMMENDING TO YOU, BUT GIVE THEM DIRECTION WITH NO LOOPHOLES TO CREATE A COMMITTEE FOR YOUR APPROVAL WITHIN THE NEXT MONTH.

Doug Louth