



## General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

Present: Acting Mayor Sue Halsey-Brandt, Chair  
Councillor Derek Dang  
Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt  
Councillor Rob Howard  
Councillor Bill McNulty  
Councillor Harold Steves

Absent: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Councillor Linda Barnes  
Councillor Cynthia Chen

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 Tuesday, September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2006, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

The Chair advised that the following matters would be added to the agenda as additional items:

- (1) lane safety;
- (2) the Women's Resource Centre; and
- (3) the DFO lands.

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

---

## COUNCILLOR EVELINA HALSEY-BRANDT

### 2. **UPDATE – STATUS OF APPLICATION TO RELOCATE A LIQUOR LICENCE FROM DELTA TO RICHMOND, AND THE CITY'S OPTIONS IN LIGHT OF THE RECENT LICENCE SUSPENSION HANDED DOWN TO THE LICENCE HOLDER**

Cllr. Evelina Halsey-Brandt referred to an application to relocate a liquor licence from Delta (Ladner Village Inn) to Richmond (the new Ironwood pub), and requested an update from staff on:

- (1) the charges which had been laid against the licensee with respect to infractions at the Ladner Village Inn;
- (2) whether the newspaper articles were accurate in reporting that the Liquor Control & Licencing Branch (LCLB) had indicated that the licensee had accepted a series of penalties and had agreed to forego an enforcement hearing; and
- (3) whether the City could request the LCLB to withhold issuance of a liquor licence to the operator of the Ironwood pub.

Cllr. Halsey-Brandt then referred to a memorandum from the Manager, Business Liaison, Amarjeet Rattan, and in response to further questions, information was provided that:

- staff had not been able to obtain any additional information on the charges which had laid, but it was their understanding that the charges had been laid against a number of patrons and employees, not the owner
- Delta Council would be addressing the matter at their Council Meeting later this evening
- the LCLB had issued a suspension for the restaurant and nightclub components of the Ladner Village Inn
- staff were waiting to hear from the LCLB as to whether the City would have the ability to rescind its approval for the Ironwood pub
- staff would be reporting to Council as soon as additional information was available.

Discussion then took place among Committee members and staff on the importance of having all available information in front of Committee before making a decision. In response to further questions, information was provided that the liquor licences which applied to the nightclub and the restaurant had been suspended, and that only the pub was still in operation. Further information was provided that the suspensions would be in effect until October 28<sup>th</sup>, 2006.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

---

During the discussion, the request was made that Council be kept informed of all developments through a memorandum. A suggestion was also made that the Richmond RCMP Detachment be requested to contact the Delta police department to obtain copies of the relevant police reports on this matter.

Reference was made to the status of the application for a liquor licence at the Ironwood pub, and information was given that the application was still being processed by the LCLB. In addition, information was provided that the LCLB had the ability to delay a liquor licence application if enforcement action against a licensee for another establishment was taking place at the same time.

In concluding the discussion, Cllr. Evelina Halsey-Brandt spoke about the need (i) for information on the liquor licence suspensions, (ii) to determine if the City had the ability to withdraw its approval of the licence for the Ironwood pub; and (iii) for clarification of the statements made in recent newspaper articles about this matter.

It was moved and seconded

*That the matter of status of application to relocate a liquor licence from Delta to Richmond, and the City's options in light of the recent licence suspension handed down to the licence holder be referred to staff for information on:*

- (1) the charges which had been laid against the licensee with respect to infractions at the Ladner Village Inn;*
- (2) whether the newspaper articles were accurate in reporting that the Liquor Control & Licencing Branch (LCLB) had indicated that the licensee had accepted a series of penalties and had agreed to forego an enforcement hearing;*
- (3) whether the City could request the LCLB to withhold issuance of a liquor licence to the operator of the Ironwood pub; and*
- (4) the jurisdiction of the City and the LCLB in this matter.*

**CARRIED**

### 3. **UPDATE – POSSIBILITY OF INTRODUCING A BYLAW TO REGULATE MINIMUM HOUSING STANDARDS FOR RENTAL HOUSING**

Mr. David Reay, #25 – 4340 Steveston Highway, referred to a rally held over the weekend in support of the tenants at Richmond Gardens who had been having difficulties with their landlord for the past year, and advised that the rally included representatives of mental health organizations and the community and not just ‘the usual suspects’ as had been reported.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

---

Mr. Reay noted that standards of maintenance had been established through the Provincial Government and that a sample bylaw was available on their website. He expressed concern that comments had been made that this bylaw might not be worthwhile and stated that the current situation was not acceptable.

Reference was made to the situation at Richmond Gardens with respect to the tenants and Amacon, and comments were made by Cllr. Evelina Halsey-Brandt that while it was important to understand that there were jurisdictions to deal with these issues, it was her belief that the City had the ability to introduce minimum standards for rental units. She stated that she wanted staff to prepare a bylaw which would state that any landlord would not disconnect heat, light and water from any rental unit where these utilities were included in the cost of the rent.

Discussion ensued among Committee members and staff on whether a discussion paper on issues and responsibilities and action which could be taken, should be considered by Committee prior to instructing staff to prepare the appropriate bylaw. Information was provided that staff could identify (i) some of the issues which had arisen; (ii) the appropriate jurisdictions; and (iii) who would be responsible.

A request was also made during the discussion that the subject matter be expanded to include minimum standards for houses which had been slated for demolition to ensure that these houses would be demolished within a certain period of time, rather than allowing these buildings to become the target of illegal activities and causing problems for the surrounding neighbourhoods. However, opposition was expressed to this proposal as it was felt that the proposed bylaw should deal only with the disconnection of heat, light and water in rental apartment buildings.

During the discussion, information was requested on whether an inspection process would be put into place as part of the bylaw regulations, to ensure that buildings were healthy and liveable.

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

It was moved and seconded

*That staff be instructed to prepare a bylaw to establish minimum housing standards for rental housing, which would prohibit a landlord from disconnecting heat, light and water from those units which include these utilities as part of the monthly rental payment.*

**CARRIED**

It was moved and seconded

*That staff prepare a discussion paper for report to the Planning Committee on whether the City needed any additional tools to control the physical condition of those houses and properties which had been slated for demolition.*

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

---

Prior to the question on the motion being called, a brief discussion ensued on the need for such a bylaw to deal with these homes. A suggestion was made that the demolition of these houses should be required within a certain period of time.

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

## BUSINESS & FINANCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

### 4. **DCC REVIEW - DCC PROGRAM AND DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES RATES BYLAW NO. 8024, AMENDMENT BYLAW NO. 8049**

(Report: Sept. 11/06, File No.: 12-8060-20-8049) (REDMS No. 2016076, 2017268, 1789644, 1781612)

The Manager, Special Projects, Graham Willis, briefly reviewed his report with the Committee.

Fraser Smith, of Urban Systems Limited, then gave a PowerPoint presentation, regarding the proposed City-wide DCC bylaw, a copy of which is on file in the City Clerk's Office. During the presentation, Mr. Willis reviewed the results of the public review. He also provided information on when the new rates would come into effect – immediately following adoption for multi-family, commercial and residential developments, and July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007 for all new subdivision applications and building permits received after that date. Mr. Willis added that in-stream residential subdivisions with complete applications would have a one year grace period.

During the presentation, staff responded to questions relating to:

- the impact of the new DCC rates on new commercial, industrial and residential growth
- whether increasing DCC rates in conjunction with the Consumer Price Index (CPI) would take place on an annual basis
- the amount of additional revenue which would be generated as a result of the increased rates
- whether the increased DCC rates for commercial and light industrial development would be seen as a deterrent to potential new businesses thinking about relocating to Richmond; and whether DCC rates was the biggest factor in determining whether a business would relocate to, or remain, in the City
- the parkland development/acquisition ratio; the amount of acreage required for parkland in the City, and whether there would be sufficient funds available to acquire the acreage required
- whether the City had the ability to 'grandfather' certain developments

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

---

- the rationale for the increase in DCC rates for commercial and light industrial developments
- the concern of the Urban Development Institute that park development costs may consist of overhead charges included in the City's capital project costing
- the intention of staff to review the DCC rates every three years; whether this period of time was appropriate or whether the rates could be reviewed on an annual basis.

Discussion then took place among Committee members, the delegation and staff on the proposed DCC rates, during which Committee members spoke in support of the July 1, 2007 implementation date for in-stream residential subdivisions, and the compromise with UDI with respect to parkland. However, concern was voiced about the increase in the industrial rates; the amount of acreage required for parkland and whether this figure was realistic based on projected future population growth.

During the discussion Mr. Willis and Mr. Smith were congratulated for their hard work and the fair process which they had followed in developing the new rates.

(Cllr. Howard left the meeting at 5:10 p.m.)

It was moved and seconded

*That Development Cost Charges Rates Bylaw No. 8024, Amendment Bylaw No. 8049 be introduced and given first, second and third readings.*

**CARRIED**

5. **OLYMPIC OVAL AND OLYMPIC BUSINESS RESOURCE ALLOCATION FOR THE 2<sup>ND</sup> QUARTER ENDED JUNE 30, 2006**

(Report: Aug. 10/06, File No.: 01-0370-03-01) (REDMS No. 2008694)

Discussion ensued among Committee members and the General Manager, Business & Financial Services, Andrew Nazareth, accompanied by the Manager, Finance & Administration, Olympic Business Office, Tom Andersson, on travel expenses during the second quarter to meet with various national sports organizations.

In response to questions about when Council would be given the opportunity to make a decision on the sports which would utilize the Oval facility following the 2010 Winter Games, information was provided that several national sports organizations were interested in the Oval facility, and were currently assessing whether or not they would be interested in relocating their training centres to Richmond. Further information was provided that a definitive timeline had not been established, and in response, comments were made about the need for Council to have sufficient time to review any proposals.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

---

Discussion continued on this issue, with information being provided that a decision on potential sports organizations would be proposed in conjunction with the presentation of the business plan. Reference was made to an upcoming workshop, and advice was given that Council could be provided with information at that time on those organizations which had shown an interest in the Oval facility.

Reference was made to the allocation of regular and dedicated staff time for the Oval project in 2005, and in response to questions about funding, information was provided that 2005 funding for the dedicated staff had been taken from the 2004 surplus appropriation, and that each year a portion would be transferred to fund dedicated staff in that particular year. Further information was provided that funding was available up to 2010 for dedicated staff

(Cllr. Howard returned to the meeting at 5:20 p.m., during the above discussion.)

Reference was made to 'travel expenses – year to date', and discussion ensued on how much of the \$165,380 total was attributable to Torino, Italy, and how much was the responsibility of VANOC. Further information was provided that the figures shown also included travel expenses associated with the development of a post-Games community facility and efforts were being made to separate those costs out.

Discussion also ensued briefly on the benefits which the City could receive as a result of hosting an Olympic event, during which reference was made to a Provincial Government report which indicated that the benefits to British Columbia would be \$9 Million. Advice was given that staff were already endeavouring to assess the amount of economic benefit which could accrue to Richmond, especially with a primary venue being located in the City.

Reference was made to the Legacy funding, and information was provided by Chief Administrative Officer George Duncan on a possible course of action being proposed to determine the allocation of the legacy funding.

During the discussion, staff were congratulated on the preparation of an excellent report.

It was moved and seconded

*That the report (dated August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2006, from the Manager, Finance & Administration, Olympic Business Office), regarding resource allocation relating to the Olympic Oval and Olympic business for the 2nd Quarter ended June 30, 2006 be received for information.*

**CARRIED**

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

---

6. **ELIGIBILITY FOR 2007 PERMISSIVE EXEMPTIONS – INDIA CULTURAL CENTRE**

(Report: Sept. 13/06, File No.: 03-0925-02-04/2006-Vol 01) (REDMS No. 2019117)

Mr. Avtar Gosal, President of the India Cultural Centre, accompanied by Mr. Balwant Sanghera, indicated that he was aware of the content of the staff report on this matter. He then spoke about the on-going cooperation between the India Cultural Centre and the City since the location of the Centre on No. 5 Road in 1985, and suggested that there had been a breakdown in communication for which he accepted responsibility. Mr. Gosal indicated that he had contacted Revenue Manager Ivy Wong, as soon as he became aware of the problems relating to the permissive exemption and the turf farm, the result of which was an on-site meeting between Ms. Wong, a representative of Herb's Landscaping and himself to address the situation. Mr. Gosal indicated that he had been under the impression following that meeting, that the permissive exemption would remain in place for 2007 and be reviewed again next year.

Mr. Gosal indicated that discussion did take place with the landscaping contractor regarding the condition of the turf, and that advice was given that special topsoil was required which the landscaper could not obtain at the present time. He stated that he was surprised at the staff recommendation as it was contrary to his understanding that the everything would remain the same for another year.

In response to questions from Committee, Mr. Gosal provided the following information:

- the current topsoil on the property contained rocks which was not conducive to growing turf
- the estimated cost to replace the topsoil was \$10,000
- the landscape contractor proposed to replace the topsoil and then reseed
- everyone at the August meeting had agreed that the situation would be reviewed on one year's time
- the India Cultural Centre would be very appreciative if the permissive exemption could remain in place for another year

Discussion then took place among Committee members and the delegation on whether (i) Herb's Landscaping had been the original company employed by the India Cultural Centre to develop the turf farm, and (ii) the City had obtained a copy of the lease agreement between the India Cultural Centre and Herb's Landscaping. (Advice was given by Ms. Wong that the City had yet to receive a copy of the lease agreement.)



## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

---

Also addressed was whether the Cultural Centre was serious in its intent to continue with the development of the turf farm, and the commitment initially made to the City that the backlands of the property would be farmed. Questions were also raised about the practicality of installing an in-ground sprinkling system when the turf would always be removed. Mr. Gosal, in responding to the questions, stated that he, as President, would be responsible for ensuring that the property would be developed as a turf farm and gave his pledge that the required work would be completed to the City's satisfaction.

Discussion continued, with comments being made about the problems faced by the India Cultural Centre and the current soil conditions. Questions were also raised about whether the landscaper had had any experience in developing a turf farm.

(Cllr. E. Halsey-Brandt left the meeting at 5:46 p.m., and returned at 5:48 p.m., during the above discussion.)

Mr. Sanghera added his comments, stating that the India Cultural Centre had good intentions and would like to have a working farm, and that the organization was endeavouring to resolve the current problems. He also spoke about the communication problems which had occurred.

Mr. Jawanda, Executive Director of the India Cultural Centre, came forward and provided information on the history of the turf farm and the original landscaper. In making his comments, Mr. Jawanda indicated that the Cultural Centre was not attempting to avoid the commitment made to the City to farm the backlands.

Discussion then ensued on the feasibility of seeking the assistance of a professional farmer to provide advice to the Cultural Centre as to how the backlands could be farmed in the future. Also addressed with the delegation was the question of whether the India Cultural Centre was prepared to proceed with the development of the turf farm or begin paying taxes on that portion of the property.

Also discussed briefly was the question of whether the permissive tax exemption should be approved, and support was offered for approval of the exemption for one year to give the Cultural Centre the opportunity to live up to the promise made to the City to farm the backlands.

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

It was moved and seconded

***That the India Cultural Centre be granted a permissive tax exemption for 2007.***

The question on the motion was not called, as the suggestion was made that the India Cultural Centre should employ an agriculturalist to determine the suitability of the soil, obtain professional advice and consider all of the options which were available. A comment was made that the simplest solution would be to grow hay on the property.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

---

Discussion continued, with committee members speaking in support of the motion for 2007. The delegation was requested to keep City staff informed on the action being taken so that, in turn, staff could advise Council of their plans. A further suggestion was made also that the Cultural Centre develop a business plan.

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

### ENGINEERING & PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

7. **RICHMOND OLYMPIC OVAL – INTERIOR DESIGN PLAN AND EXTERIOR GABLE END INFILL WALLS (MATERIAL CHOICE)**

(Report: Sept. 6/06, File No.: 06-2052-50-05) (REDMS No. 2010626)

The Director, Major Projects, Greg Scott, provided Committee with colour copies of the Interior Design Presentation prepared by Cannon Design.

Patricia Roy, of Cannon Design, reviewed the artists renderings which were on display to explain the proposed colour scheme for the interior of the Olympic Oval facility.

During the discussion which ensued reference was made to the use of 'site harvested wood' and questions were raised about whether interpretive signs would be erected to provide an explanation on the use of the different materials. Advice was given that the request would be taken into consideration. Further advice was given that a three dimensional graph was being prepared which would provide a better rendition of the colour scheme.

Larry Podhora, of Cannon Design, then reviewed the exterior colour scheme and provided a sample of the proposed colour and construction proposal for the aluminum panel. Questions were raised about potential maintenance problems with dust collecting in the corners of the horizontal lines and potential rain water runoff staining the exterior. Discussion ensued on this issue, with the delegation commenting that there could be increased maintenance for horizontal rather than vertical lines, however, the designers had wanted to retain the overall visual horizontal appearance.

Further information was provided during the discussion that the aluminium panel would be pre-finished prior to installation, and that the water runoff from the exterior would be retained and collected in a pool located at ground level.

It was moved and seconded

***That:***

- (1) the interior design plan for the Richmond Olympic Oval, be endorsed; and***

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

---

- (2) *the exterior gable end infill wall material be endorsed as a profiled pre-finished Metal panel (Option 1) for the Richmond Olympic Oval.*

CARRIED

### PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

#### 8. SECONDARY SUITES

(Report: July 11/06, File No.: 12-8060-20-8106; xr 08-4057-12, 10-6650-00) (REDMS No. 1794703)

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Bylaw 8106, which amend the Richmond Zoning and Development Bylaw 5300 with regard to secondary suites, be introduced and given first reading.*

- (2) *That the following "Secondary Suites Water Metering Policy" be adopted:*

*"It is Council policy that:*

*A single-family dwelling property identified by the Manager of Community Bylaws as having a secondary suite, shall have their water service metered at the direction of the General Manager, Engineering & Public Works, and that the water meter shall remain regardless of any future decommissioning or vacation of the secondary suite. The cost of the water meter installation is to be borne by the property owner."*

- (3) *That staff prepare bylaw amendments and implementation options for the legalization of secondary suites.*
- (4) *That \$20,000 be allocated from the Council contingency fund to cover legal counsel and public consultation costs associated with development of the secondary suite legalization options program noted in recommendation 3.*
- (5) *That this report be referred to the Richmond School District Board for their information and comment.*

CARRIED

### STANDING ITEM

#### 9. OVAL UPDATE AND SUMMARY

(Report: Sept. 11/06, File No.: 01-0370-03-01/2006-V01 01) (REDMS No. 2014623)

It was moved and seconded

*That the report (dated September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006, from the Director, Major Projects), regarding the Richmond Oval – Monthly Status Report, August, 2006, be received for information.*

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

---

Prior to the question on the motion being called, the Manager, Special Projects, Greg Scott, advised that an amendment was required to the Executive Summary, fourth bullet, to indicate the anticipated completion of construction of River Road in January, 2007 and not November, 2006.

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

## 10. LANE SAFETY

It was moved and seconded

*That staff prepare for discussion at a future Planning Committee meeting, a report on the impact of prohibiting parking, and requiring the installation of speed bumps and other traffic calming measures as part of lane development in all new subdivisions.*

Prior to the question on the motion being called, Cllr. McNulty commented on the complaints being received about parking and 'rat running' in local lanes, and the need for lane safety.

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

## 11. WOMEN'S RESOURCE CENTRE

Cllr. McNulty referred to correspondence which he had received from the Women's Resource Centre, which indicated that due to financial difficulties, the organization did not feel that it could continue to operate at Caring Place, and asked if the City had property which could be utilized.

It was moved and seconded

*That staff meet with representatives of the Women's Resource Centre to determine if there was a suitable facility available within existing homes and properties owned by the City for use by the Centre, and report to the General Purposes Committee on the outcome.*

**CARRIED**

## 12. DFO PROPERTY

Cllr. McNulty referred to a recent newspaper article (Thursday, September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2006 issue of the *Richmond Review*) regarding the recent decision of the Agricultural Land Commission not to approve the removal of the DFO property from the Agricultural Land Reserve, which indicated that Tourism Richmond, which had hoped to use a portion of the land for a new trade and exhibition centre, had other parcels of land to consider for the new facility.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

---

It was moved and seconded

*That staff review the newspaper article in question to determine if the statements in this article would have a negative impact on the City's efforts with respect to appealing the decision of the Agricultural Land Commission regarding the DFO property, and that a meeting be held with representatives of Tourism Richmond on this matter, and report to the General Purposes Committee on the outcome.*

**CARRIED**

### ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (6:30 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, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006.

---

Acting Mayor Sue Halsey-Brandt  
Chair

---

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