



## General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2006

Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall

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

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

It was moved and seconded  
*That the agenda for the Monday, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2006 General Purposes Committee meeting be adopted with the deletion of Item No. 5 – Richmond Oval Paddling Centre, and the addition of a presentation by staff on the proposed Oval Program.*

**CARRIED**

### MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded  
*That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on Monday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2006

---

## BUSINESS & FINANCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

2. **2007 PERMISSIVE EXEMPTIONS – BYLAW NO. 8114**  
(Report: Aug. 30/06, File No.: 12-8060-20-8114) (REDMS No. 2022294, 2022281)

Discussion ensued among Committee members and staff on the rationale for allowing the Peace Evangelical Church and the Dharma Drum Mountain Buddhist Association to be approved for permissive exemptions when these organizations were not yet farming their backlands. In response, advice was given that both organizations had filed farm plans; and that because these organizations were working on their plans, the applications for permissive exemptions had been approved.

The criteria for the development of a farm plan was then addressed, during which questions were raised about whether clearer instructions were needed on the City's requirements for such a plan. During the discussion, reference was made to documentation relating to the No. 5 Road backlands and a decision made at that time that the property had to be farmed and that a farm plan would not be accepted. A suggestion was made as a result of this discussion that staff should review the progress of the two organizations in question in six months time so that Committee could judge the progress of the organizations and give them ample warning if changes were required.

Reference was made to Council Policy 3561, and questions were raised as to why a particular organization would not qualify for permissive exemption. As a result of the discussion, staff were requested to provide a memo to Council prior to the October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2006 Council Meeting, accompanied by a copy of Property Tax Exemptions Policy No. 3561, with information on:

- (1) the history of the No. 5 Road backlands and farming requirements for that area;
- (2) the two applications (Sant Nirankari Mission Canada Inc. and the Science of Spirituality SKRM Inc.) which had been denied permissive exemptions;
- (3) the criteria and substance for a farm plan; and
- (4) the number of organizations which were successfully farming their properties on No. 5 Road and in other areas.

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

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That Property Tax Exemption Bylaw No. 8114 be introduced and given first, second and third readings.*
- (2) *That staff review the situation in six months time in relation to the properties added to the permissive exemption list.*

**CARRIED**

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2006

---

3. **ELIMINATION OF THE SINGLE RATE FOR WATER AND SEWER SERVICES**

(Report: Sept. 18/06, File No.: 03-0930-03-01) (REDMS No. 1965264)

Ms. Shirley Morris, of 9611 Alexandra Road, questioned the impact which the elimination of the single rate for water and sewer services could have on her. She indicated that she lived in half of a duplex, with her son and his family residing in the other half, and stated that she did not use the same amount of water as her son's family. Ms. Morris also sought clarification on 'drainage dyking' and whether this referred to the frontage of her property.

In response to Ms. Morris's questions regarding the metering of a duplex, information was provided that a master meter could be installed on the water line which lead into the duplex and that it would be necessary to pro-rate the amount of water used by the residents.

With reference to the item 'drainage dyking', information was provide that this reference applied to the City's perimeter dyking and not to individual property frontage. Advice was given that the revenue generated from this tax was intended to fund the replacement and maintenance of drainage infrastructure throughout the City. Advice was also given that sewerage charges were intended to fund maintenance and upgrades to the overall sewer system, as well as to fund upgrades to the GVRD's Lulu Island Sewage Treatment Plant.

During the discussion, information was provided on the history of the water and sewer single rate charges. As well, concern was voiced about the impact of the proposed elimination of the single rates, and staff were requested to provide information on the number of residents who would be affected by the elimination of these rates. Staff referred to a report dealt with by the Public Works & Transportation Committee on September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2006, regarding the City's Volunteer Water Metering Program, which identified savings of approximately \$50, and information was provided on steps being taken by staff to advise all Richmond taxpayers about the water metering program.

Concern was expressed during the discussion that senior citizens may not be aware of the water metering program, and staff were requested to send notices specifically to the City's senior population. Also addressed was the question of whether a policy was needed to deal with the water and sewer rates, during which information was provided by staff on a long term strategy currently being prepared relating to the City's aging infrastructure, which would also address this issue.

Discussion continued, with information being provided in response to questions, that the owners of homes containing secondary suites could enter the volunteer water metering program.

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2006

---

Questions were raised about the feasibility of notifying Richmond residents about the elimination of the single rate and providing them with information about the volunteer water metering program. In response, staff confirmed that letters could be sent out to provide information (i) that the City would be eliminating the single water and sewer rates, and (ii) on the volunteer water metering program. The comment was made that it was important to clarify that townhouses would not be able to have individual water meters.

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

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the water and sewer utility single rate be eliminated, effective January 1, 2007; and*
- (2) *That staff advise single rate users of this change and the options available.*

**CARRIED**

## ENGINEERING & PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

### 4. **FIRE HALL ALTERATIONS**

(Report: September 29, 2006, File No.: 06-2045-01; xr: 05-1400-20-02) (REDMS No. 2024607, 2023956) (Referral from the September 25<sup>th</sup>, 2006 Council Meeting)

Discussion took place among Committee members and the Manager, Facility Planning & Construction, David Naysmith, Deputy Fire Chief Ron Beaman, and the Manager, Fire-Rescue, Sandra Pearson, on the cost of the proposed alterations. Reference was made to the costs incurred for the new Sea Island and Hamilton fire halls, and advice was given that this cost was for work which was outside of the original scope of the construction program. Further information was provided that the cost estimates given for the additional costs for the Steveston, Bridgeport and Shellmont fire halls were based on the actual costs of the changes made to the Sea Island and Hamilton fire halls.

Reference was made to the figures shown for the Bridgeport fire hall, and advice was given that the figure of \$80,000 comprised two components - \$35,000 to undertake a preliminary program which would meet the recommendations contained in the Ready report within the next 90 days, and an additional \$45,000 which represented the cost of incorporating changes into the design for the new facility. It was noted that the funds for the City Centre fire hall and the Bridgeport fire hall were being submitted for consideration as part of the 2007 Minor Building Capital program.

Discussion continued, with it being noted that a number of the proposed changes were dependent upon approval of the 2007 budget. Advice was given that all parties were in agreement to the deferral of these particular changes until approval of the 2007 budget had been obtained.

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2006

---

Further advice was given that staff, over the next two or three months, would be developing short term solutions specifically for Fire Hall No. 3 (Bridgeport) and possibly Fire Hall No. 1 (City Centre).

During the discussion, it was noted that the approximate cost of the renovations would be \$255,000 and not \$500,000 has had been reported previously.

A question was raised as to the timing of the approval of the 2007 Minor Building Capital program, and advice was given that this component of the budget should be approved prior to the end of 2006. Further advice was given that staff would be completing pre-design work relating to some of the simpler issues, and that as soon as the budget had been approved, tenders would be called almost immediately with all the work being completed concurrently at the fire halls soon after. With reference to the new Bridgeport fire hall, advice was given that construction should be completed in approximately fifteen months, and that the \$80,000 shown would be part of the replacement cost.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the report (dated September 29th, 2006, from Fire Chief Jim Hancock) regarding fire hall alterations, be received for information.*
- (2) *That staff report to the Community Safety Committee within six months on the progress of the alteration plan.*

**CARRIED**

## 5. RICHMOND OVAL UPDATE

(Oral Report)

The Manager, Oval Sport & Business, Gerry DeCicco, accompanied by the Director, Recreation & Cultural Services, Kate Sparrow, and Fitness and Wellness Coordinator Alison Dennis, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed layout of the Richmond Oval as it related to potential programming. A copy of the presentation is on file in the City Clerk's Office.

Following the presentation, discussion ensued among Committee members and staff on:

- how the separation of events on the main floor of the Oval would occur; the types of curtaining and barriers which were being considered
- how access would be provided to the various components which comprised the activity area
- the ability of the facility to accommodate trade shows and other events, and the number of people which could be accommodated at these events; whether the holding of trade shows would have an impact on the legacy funding
- whether arts and cultural uses could be accommodated within the Oval facility in place of high performance sports

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2006

---

- the width of the proposed walking track
- the width between the basketball courts and the walkways
- whether a childminding area had been included in the facility
- the proposed location of the paddling centre
- high performance sports
- whether lawn bowling would be an appropriate activity for the facility
- whether a sports art gallery could be accommodated along the interior walls of the Oval.
- the amount of space provided in the infield of the walking track
- the location of the entrances and the reception/admission area
- whether passive activities, such as Tai Chi, could be accommodated
- the need to improve communication to ensure that Richmond residents were aware of the accessibility of the building to the public
- the need for more community events and community usage
- how security in and around the facility would be addressed; how those portions of the building which were not in operation at any particular time would be secured
- how sound control would be managed
- the feasibility of holding nutrition classes in the area set aside for 'Program Space to support events – Catering Facility; Nutrition Programs, etc.'
- the amount of square footage which would be (i) leased space, and (ii) available to the community for meeting rooms
- whether the walls between the various meeting and other rooms were 'fixed' or could be moved to accommodate larger meetings and events
- how the athlete development centre would be utilized by high performance sports and other athletes
- whether an artificial turf surface would be installed on the running track
- how persons with disabilities would have access to the various programs and equipment proposed for the facility
- the potential legacy funding which might be received by the City for the Oval.

During the discussion, advice was given that the majority of the Oval facility had been reserved for community use, with 10 to 15% being dedicated for high performance sport.

The discussion ended with the Chair thanking staff for their informative presentation.

# General Purposes Committee

Monday, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2006

---

## PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

### 6. OFFICE SPACE AT BC SECRETARIAT'S AND VANOC HEADQUARTERS

(Report: Sept. 25/06, File No.: 01-0135-20-VAN01) (REDMS No. 2023665)

It was moved and seconded

*That a designated office space for Richmond staff be approved at the BC Secretariat's and VANOC offices, 3585 Graveley Street, Vancouver, (as outlined in a report dated September 28, 2006, from the Manager, Oval Sport & Business).*

The question on the motion was not called, as information was provided about the need for City staff to be part of the discussions leading up to the formal decisions being made by the BC Secretariat and VANOC. Information was also provided that the minor IT costs related to the provision of computer equipment and associated connections.

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

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (6:10 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, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2006.

---

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie  
Chair

---

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