



General Purposes Committee

Date: Tuesday, May 21st, 2002
Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall
Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Lyn Greenhill
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.

MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on Monday, May 6th, 2002, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

2. **MANAGING 7-10 SIZED GROUP HOMES IN RICHMOND**
(Report: May 16/02, File No.: 8060-20-7340) (REDMS No. 711520, 654166, 660736, 660735, 657064, 670851, 629965, 594165)

The Manager, Policy Planning, Terry Crowe, indicated that he was available to respond to any questions which the Committee might have. Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on:

- the requirements for licenced and unlicenced groups

General Purposes Committee

Tuesday, May 21st, 2002

- the process to be followed when an application for a licenced group home facility was received, or when an unlicenced facility was brought to the attention of the City
- whether there were any zoning and licencing requirements for 7 to 10 person group homes over and above single family residential building requirements, and the action which would be taken if a group home facility was found to be within 200 metres of another facility.

During the discussion, advice was given that the Ministry of Health Planning had not yet responded to Council's request that licencing requirements for group homes be re-instated.

Mr. John Wong, 3858 McKay Drive, a member of the Group Home Task Force, expressed concern about the lack of notification that the group home issue would be on the agenda for today's meeting. In referring to the Group Home Task Force report, he stated that attention should be given to the statements of the Task Force, and asked that consideration be given to the wishes of a majority of residents in East Richmond who supported the use of zoning bylaws to control the location of drug and alcohol recovery homes in the City. Mr. Wong, in concluding his presentation, voiced concern that the process ultimately returned to the Richmond/Vancouver Health Board for a decision.

Mr. Alexander Kostjuk, a member of the Group Home Task Force, expressed the belief that the recommendations put forward by staff were the best under the circumstances. He then reviewed the proposed Protocol Agreement, during which he offered a number of comments and amendments: (i) under "City's First Notification", include a time period; (ii) under "Notification to also include", clarify 'Group Homes in Richmond' publication; (iii) regarding issuance of a 'one year temporary permit by Richmond Health Services', he questioned whether the agency had agreed in principle to this action; (iv) under "Dispute Resolution", the word 'may' should be amended to read 'will'; (v) also under "Dispute Resolution", questioned whether 'area resident(s)' would mean a resident located within a five home radius of the group home facility or anyone within the community; and (vi) with regard to the "Cancellation Clause", he expressed concern that such a clause did not offer a perception of a good working relationship between the City and Richmond Health Services, as the whole point of the exercise was to ensure that people in the community were comfortable with the process.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and Mr. Kostjuk on the amendments which he had proposed to the Protocol Agreement, during which he suggested that the timeline could be 30 days in duration; and that every effort should be made to make the Protocol Agreement a working document.

General Purposes Committee

Tuesday, May 21st, 2002

Mr. Brian Wardley, of 3091 Pleasant Street, a member of the Group Home Task Force, expressed concern that a previous speaker, John Wong, seemed concerned with only one meeting in East Richmond, even though he had urged the Committee to consider statements made by the Group Home Task Force. Mr. Wardley stated that the Task Force had received a great deal of correspondence in support of group homes. He urged Committee to adopt the recommendations put forward by staff, which basically represented the recommendations of the Task Force, and to consider the amendments proposed by Mr. Kostjuk.

It was moved and seconded

That:

- (1) *The staff revisions to the October 31, 2001 Richmond Group Home Task Force Final Report and Recommendations (Attachment 1) be approved.*
- (2) *Staff be directed to finalize the proposed Protocol Agreement (Attachment 2) with the Richmond Health Services.*
- (3) *Zoning Bylaw No.7340 to require all 7 to 10 sized licensed and unlicensed group home operations to be located a minimum of 200 metres, lot to lot, from any other Residential Care Facility, Residential Group Home, or Special Care Residential Facility be given first reading.*
- (4) *A two year monitoring period be established for any further changes to the City's 7-10 sized group home management approach to allow the City, Richmond Health Services, and community to determine its practicality, unless Council determines that an alternative approach would be better due to changes to provincial legislation (e.g. Community Care Facilities Act, new Provincial Community Charter legislation, etc.).*

The question on the motion was not called, as Committee members expressed their views about the proposed recommendations.

Concerns were expressed that the City did not have control over the establishment of unlicensed drug and alcohol group homes, and that the proposed recommendations, if adopted, would implement even more rules and regulations for licensed group homes, especially those facilities which did not cause concern to the community. Further concern was expressed that adoption of the recommendations would introduce a situation which would not apply to a majority of the group homes in Richmond, and which would not address the current problem. It was noted that since the excellent work of the Group Home Task Force, the Provincial Government had eliminated the licensing requirements which had resulted in the removal of the effectiveness of the Task Force recommendations.

General Purposes Committee

Tuesday, May 21st, 2002

Concerns were expressed about the proposed Protocol Agreement, and the request was made that the recommendations be dealt with separately. With further reference to the Protocol Agreement, the opinion was voiced that the notification area should be wider, certain components of the agreement, such as 'Dispute Resolution' required better definition and clarification, the 'Cancellation Clause' should be eliminated, and while the parameters of the agreement were satisfactory, better assurance was required for the City and the community.

It was noted during the discussion, that the City did not have the ability to control the establishment of drug and alcohol recovery facilities through the Zoning & Development Bylaw, and that the Provincial Government had removed the licencing requirements for those facilities. Comments were also made that it was time to resolve the issue.

Discussion ensued among Committee members and staff on the suggested amendments to the proposed Protocol Agreement, and whether the proposed changes could be reviewed and the amendments made prior to the May 27th, 2002 Council Meeting.

The question on Part (1) of the motion was then called, and it was **CARRIED** with Mayor Brodie and Cllr. McNulty opposed.

The question on Part (2) of the motion was called, and it was **CARRIED** with Mayor Brodie, Cllrs. Greenhill, E. Halsey-Brandt, and McNulty opposed.

The question on Part (3) of the motion was called, and it was **CARRIED** with Mayor Brodie opposed.

The question on Part (4) of the motion was called, and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. E. Halsey-Brandt and McNulty opposed.

FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

3. TOWING SERVICE CONTRACT

(Report: May 3/02, File No.: 0775-20-T.1441B) (REDMS No. 706785)

It was moved and seconded

That staff be authorized to renew Tender T.1441"B", Towing Services Contract to Rusty's Auto Towing Ltd. for the period July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2007.

CARRIED

General Purposes Committee

Tuesday, May 21st, 2002

4. **FIRE AND SECURITY ALARM SYSTEM REGULATION BYLAW NO. 7362**

(Report: May 6/02; File No.: 8060-20-7362) (REDMS No. 707619, 668854)

It was moved and seconded

That Fire and Security Alarm System Regulation Bylaw No. 7362 be introduced and given first, second and third readings.

CARRIED

COMMUNITY SAFETY DIVISION

5. **PARKING REVENUE**

(Report: May 7/02, File No.: 6455-05-01) (REDMS No. 702020, 707044, 699525)

The Manager, Community Bylaws, Sandra Tokarczyk, briefly reviewed the report with the Committee, during which she provided Committee members with (i) a map outlining those areas in which metered parking would be introduced, and (ii) photographs of the proposed ticket dispensing equipment. Copies of this material are on file in the City Clerk's Office.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and staff on:

- those areas which would be introduced to timed parking
- the provision of parking to employees, and the cost of such provision to those employees
- the assumptions prepared by staff on the amount of revenue to be generated and the difference between the estimates given by the City and the vendor
- the use of City bylaw enforcement officers as ambassadors of the City
- whether a grace period would be given to allow time to adjust to the new parking regulations; whether signs would be erected in the affected areas to advise the public of the implementation of pay parking effective August 1st
- the proposal of the vendor to allow the City to use the equipment for one year at no risk, and the impact to revenue generation if the City chose to purchase rather than lease the equipment at the end of the first year
- the differences between block and stall meters and the distance which motorists would be expected to walk to obtain parking tickets from the meters; the communication plan being developed to alert motorists parking in a metered parking area that new regulations were in effect
- whether any consideration had been given to developing a comprehensive parking plan for the City Centre area

General Purposes Committee

Tuesday, May 21st, 2002

- whether the downtown business community had been consulted about the proposed implementation of pay parking
- the rationale for providing less expensive off-street parking than on-street, and whether rates for off-street parking would be reviewed in the future
- how the impact of timed parking areas located adjacent to recreational areas would be addressed
- the impact which the establishment of timed parking areas could have on adjacent residential streets which did not have such restrictions, and whether enforcement would be increased to ensure that such streets did not become 'parking lots'.

Mr. Gary Cohen, Chair, Transportation Committee, Richmond Chamber of Commerce, addressed the Committee on the City's proposal to increase revenues from on and off street parking. A copy of his submission is attached as Schedule A and forms part of these minutes.

During the discussion which ensued, Mr. Cohen provided the following comments:

- the Chamber of Commerce did not have the funds to establish a Downtown Parking Association
- the average rate charged to employees for parking was \$35 to \$40 per month
- solutions would have to be found to resolve transit and parking problems in the City.

Lorraine Bissett, President, accompanied by Bob Gilchrist, Vice President, CUPE Local 718, spoke about the productive relationship between the City and the Union in dealing with contentious issues, and stated that this relationship was paramount to the City achieving its objectives, especially with regard to cost cutting and revenue generation. She stated that the work being proposed for the outside contractor was work which could be undertaken by experienced City staff. Ms. Bissett indicated that the Union had only obtained a copy of the staff report late the previous week, and therefore, requested that a decision on this matter be postponed for a period of sixty days, and that the Union be permitted to submit a proposal which would benefit the employees, the City, and most importantly the residents of Richmond.

General Purposes Committee

Tuesday, May 21st, 2002

Mr. Gilchrist spoke further on the matter, stating that the Local was of the belief that the staff report dealt with the contracting out of services already performed by Union members. He stated that although bylaw enforcement officers had not undertaken enforcement of time limited parking for some time, the issue had been raised at previous Labour/Management Committee meetings where advice had been given that the work would not be contracted to outside personnel. Mr. Gilchrist also referred to the proposal to establish a 'store front' to deal with complaints and stated that again, this work was already handled by City staff. He stated that the Union was not opposed to the City implementing pay parking, however, it was adverse to work traditionally completed by Union members being contracted out. Mr. Gilchrist urged the Committee to give the Local sufficient time to present its case in full.

Considerable discussion then ensued among Committee members, the delegation, and staff on matters related to:

- the wish of the Local that Union employees be responsible for the management of the timed parking proposal and collection of revenue from the equipment
- the posting and subsequent removal of the four temporary fulltime 'bylaw enforcement officer', and information provided to the Union at previous Labour/Management Committee meetings that enforcement duties would not be contracted out
- the purpose and timing of the report proposed by the Union
- the impact which a delay in making a decision could have on the City
- the benefits of using EasyPark to manage the timed parking contract
- the duties performed previously and currently by the existing City bylaw enforcement officers, and whether any existing responsibilities would be removed
- the rationale for not charging City employees for parking
- whether the enforcement component could be separated from the contract, and the resulting impact which this action could have on the budget
- why the Union had not submitted a plan when the proposal call was sent out
- why staff were no longer enforcing existing timed pay parking regulations
- the goal of the department to find ways to generate increased revenue for the City.

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

General Purposes Committee

Tuesday, May 21st, 2002

It was moved and seconded

That the report (dated May 7th, 2002, from the Manager, Community Bylaws), regarding Parking Revenue, be referred to staff for report to the June 7th, 2002 meeting of the General Purposes Committee on:

- a) *the outcome of the discussions with the vendor on the feasibility of eliminating certain components from the proposal call, which could be undertaken by Union members in conjunction with the vendor;*
- b) *the ability of the City to undertake the work;*
- c) *how a change in the proposal could affect the provision of the equipment to the City;*
- d) *various options which might be available, including costs and based on the discussions with the vendor, whereby the vendor would be responsible for parking meter installations and the City would be responsible for enforcement; and*
- e) *the impact to the budget if the City was required to employ eight bylaw enforcement officers.*

Prior to the question on the motion being called, direction was given that the Union be provided with the opportunity to discuss the matter further with staff.

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 date "June 7th, 2002", and by substituting "June 17th, 2002".

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Mayor Brodie
Cllr. Greenhill
Howard
Kumagai

The question on the main motion, as amended, was then called, and it was **CARRIED** with Mayor Brodie, and Cllrs. Greenhill, Howard and Kumagai opposed.

It was moved and seconded

That staff report on (i) the feasibility of implementing a City Centre parking association, and (ii) the parameters which would be involved in establishing such an association.

Prior to the question on the motion being called, staff were asked to also address the issue of the provision of staff parking, and to include the Steveston area.

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

General Purposes Committee

Tuesday, May 21st, 2002

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (6:57.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, May 21st, 2002.

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant



RICHMOND
CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE

RICHMOND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

SCHEDULE A TO THE MINUTES OF
THE GENERAL PURPOSES
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON
TUESDAY, MAY 21ST, 2002.

RESPONSE TO THE CITY OF RICHMOND PROPOSALS FOR INCREASE REVENUES FROM ON STREET AND OFF STREET PARKING

City of Richmond General Purposes Committee, May 21, 2002

The Richmond Chamber of Commerce appreciates that free parking in the high traffic areas of Richmond is soon to be a historical fact. The Report of the Manager, Community Bylaws, states, in part, that the City's objective is primarily to generate revenue, and secondarily to encourage parking space turnover which will provide parking availability for the customers of the businesses. The Chamber supports these objectives.

The Chamber recently completed a Survey of its members in which there were several questions on transportation. In response to the question whether pay parking would hinder or benefit their business, 80% of the responses stated that parking meters would hinder their business. The business in our City have the following concerns:

1. Employers and the employees will have to pay for all day parking on the street which until now have been free of charge;
2. Commercial property owners will increase monthly parking rates to match the City's monthly street parking rates;
3. Parking will shift to mall parking lots and residential neighborhoods;
4. The pay parking program will increase business operating costs;
5. There are inadequate public parking lots in areas to service the areas in which there are high numbers of employees and inadequate or no public transportation.

The Chamber raises these concerns to sensitize the City to the issue that its pay parking policies can have negative impacts. Employers must attract employees from throughout the GVRD. Out of necessity many employees travel to work by car. The addition of a parking cost of \$40 per month, or \$480 per year per employee is a significant cost to the employee or to the employer. We do note that the recommended monthly parking rate has been reduced from \$75 to \$40 per month.

Each business area in Richmond has differing abilities to deal with pay parking. The Chamber encourages the City to consult with the business and property owners in the various sectors of Richmond, as you have in Steveston, and the Minoru recreational area, to obtain their input and develop solutions to the problems that pay parking may create. Until then, we request that the City not implement street pay parking in areas where there are no public parking alternatives. People appreciate having options and opportunities to compare parking and commuting costs.

The Report also identifies the challenges of enforcement, in particular the costs versus the revenue. We encourage the City to have an effective enforcement and collection policy to and we quote the Report "control the habits of abusers".

The City should ensure that public parking lot operators and on street parking have ticket machines that accept credit cards, that are easily accessible, and are maintained in good working order. The City has maintained a balance between the effectiveness of towing companies and ticketing. The objective to raise revenue should not jeopardize this City policy. There should be standard distinctive signage that directs drivers to parking facilities.

The Chamber wants Richmond to remain an inviting place to shop, to visit and to work. The Chamber is confident that the City will work with the community to make its pay parking bylaws fair and effective.

Gary Cohen, Chairman
Transportation Committee