General Purposes Committee

Date:	Monday, November 18th, 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
Absent:	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, November 4th, 2002, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

It was moved and seconded
That the report (dated November 15th, 2002, from the Manager, Policy Planning), regarding the Imperial Landing Development Management Strategy, be referred to the next meeting of the General Purposes Committee.

CARRIED

FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION

2. 2002 DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGE PROGRAM AND BYLAW

(Report: Nov. 12/02, File No.: 1070-04-01) (REDMS No. 902713, 707605,)

The Manager, Special Projects, Finance & Corporate Services, Graham Willis, briefly reviewed the report with the Committee.

Discussion then ensued on the timing of the implementation of the new rates, and whether any consideration had been given to the phasing-in of these rates to give the development industry time to adjust to the increase. Concern was expressed during the discussion that immediate implementation of these rates would result in even higher construction costs for residential development, which in turn, would be passed on to new home purchasers.

Also discussed was the rationale for increasing the development cost charge rates for 'Commercial/Light Industrial' at a time when light industry was being encouraged to relocate to Richmond.

Ms. Renata Bublick, Associate Executive Director, Urban Development Institute (UDI), referred to correspondence (dated September 11th, 2002, from the President, UDI), and spoke further on the proposed increase in Development Cost Charges (DCCs), especially with respect to residential development. She stated that if Richmond wished to pursue the provision of affordable housing, then the City should not be endorsing policies which resulted in increased costs and which made it increasingly difficult to build such housing.

Ms. Bublick stated that, while UDI appreciated the efforts of staff, the proposed increase to the DCC rates to single-family, townhouse and low rise residential developments were still too high. She spoke about other costs being faced by the development and construction industry, and suggested that any increase should be phased-in over a period of time.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members, staff and the delegation on the proposed DCC rates. Clarification was provided in response to a statement made by Ms. Bublick about Richmond having the highest DCC rates for residential development, that Surrey and Langley's rates would still be considerably higher than those being recommended by staff.

Discussion continued, during which, in response to questions, advice was given that any projects completed in 2002 would not be affected by the proposed new rates. It was noted however, that those projects which were not completed and continued into 2003 would be subject to payment of the new rates.

Also discussed further was the request of UDI that the implementation of the proposed DCC rates be phased-in over a two year period, and the impact which such a delay could have on future revenue generation for the City.

It was moved and seconded
That staff bring forward a Development Cost Charges Imposition Bylaw to Council for introduction and first, second and third readings, (to give effect to the development cost charge rates outlined in the report dated November 12th, 2002, from the Manager, Special Projects, Finance & Corporate Services), subject to a 120 day grace period.

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 adding the following, "and a two year phase-in period."

The question on the motion was not called, as discussion ensued on the rationale for approving the phasing-in of the new rates.

The question on the motion was then called, and it was **DEFEATED ON A TIED VOTE** with Cllrs. Barnes, Greenhill, Kumagai, and McNulty opposed.

The question on the main motion was then called, and it was **DEFEATED ON A TIED VOTE** with Cllrs. Barnes, Howard, Kumagai and McNulty opposed.

It was moved and seconded
That staff bring forward a Development Cost Charges Imposition Bylaw to Council for introduction and first, second and third readings, (to give effect to the development cost charge rates outlined in the report dated November 12th, 2002, from the Manager, Special Projects, Finance & Corporate Services), with implementation of the new fees phased in over a two year period.

DEFEATED ON A TIED VOTE

OPPOSED: Cllr. Greenhill
Howard
Kumagai
McNulty

3. **2003 UTILITY BUDGETS AND RATES BYLAWS**
(Report: Nov. 13/02, File No.: 8060-20-7551/7552/7553) (REDMS No. 876141, 903043, 660303, 889915)

The General Managers of Finance & Corporate Services and Engineering & Public Works, Jim Bruce and Jeff Day respectively, advised that they were present to respond to questions from the Committee.

Reference was made to correspondence from the Richmond School Board (dated November 12th, 2002), in which the City was requested to exempt School Board properties from the new drainage utility fees. Advice was given that due to a change in the manner in which the fees would be calculated, the School Board would now be charged approximately $760 rather than the original estimate of $40,000.

It was moved and seconded

(1) That the 2003 Utility Expenditure Budgets (as presented in the staff report dated November 13, 2002 from the Managers of Water, Sewer & Environmental Programs) be approved as the basis for establishing the 2003 Utility Rates.

(2) That the following bylaws, which bring into effect the above 2003 Utility Rates, be introduced and given first, second and third readings:

(a) Sanitary Sewer System and Drainage System Bylaw No. 7551;

(b) Waterworks and Water Rates Bylaw No. 5637, Amendment Bylaw No. 7552; and

(c) The Solid Waste and Recycling Regulation Bylaw 6803, Amendment Bylaw No. 7553 .

Prior to the question on the motion being called, a brief discussion ensued on how the increased amounts for GVRD water purchases would be reflected on the 2003 property tax notice.

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

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (5:07 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, November 18th, 2002.

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Chair

Fran J. Ashton
Executive Assistant