



## General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001  
Place: Anderson Room  
Richmond City Hall  
Present: Mayor Malcolm 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 4:08 p.m.

### MINUTES

1. It was moved and seconded  
*That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on Monday, November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2001, be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

### GROUP HOME TASK FORCE

2. **GROUP HOME TASK FORCE – FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

(Memo: Oct. 31/01, File No.: 0100-20-GHOM1-01) (REDMS No. 550616, 529965)

Mr. Everett McKenzie, spokesperson for the Group Home Task Force, provided information on the Task Force and public information meetings held; the presentations received as part of the consultation process; and the major issues dealt with by the Task Force.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001

---

A lengthy discussion then ensued among Committee members and Mr. Mackenzie on such matters as:

- the process to be followed in the event that an issue could not be resolved
- whether the proposed process with Richmond Health Services had been agreed to by that agency
- whether the operator of a future care facility would be able to obtain an agreement for sale, based on a one year interim permit
- the rationale for not requiring the holding of a public hearing for all future 7 – 10 person group home facilities, as had been sought by residents opposed to the location of a group home within their neighbourhood
- the rationale for only contacting those residents within a '5 house radius' of a group home location and seeking comments and feedback related to the operation of the facility from those individuals
- the process which would be followed and how it would be interpreted, when applications for the establishment of a group home facility were submitted to the City; and whether this process would be successful
- the recommendations made by the Group Home Task Force, and the modelling of these recommendations on the process currently in place in the City of Vancouver
- the need for communication and consultation with the community on issues of concern
- the use of the word 'informal' as opposed to 'formal' when inviting the residents to attend neighbourhood meetings
- whether the criteria for the location of drug and alcohol rehabilitation centres within a neighbourhood should be different than the criteria for other types of group homes.

Mr. John Wong, President of the Association of Richmond Homeowners, and a member of the Group Home Task Force, advised that he did not sign the report because he did not believe that the recommendations addressed the concerns of the public relating to group homes and the need for input from citizens; as well as the separation of space between schools, libraries and other facilities. He also expressed concern about the proposed one year interim permit, as he felt that it did not address the needs of the public and was unacceptable. Mr. Wong urged the Committee to give citizens the opportunity to be heard and to have their vote counted.

In response to a question, Mr. Wong advised that the main issue of concern in his neighbourhood had been the threat to residents posed by drug and alcohol recovery centres. He stated that other types of group homes were not an issue.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001

---

Alexander Kostjuk, a member of the Group Home Task Force, provided background information on the establishment of the Task Force; the mandate of the Task Force and how it could be pursued. He spoke about the recommendations, and commented on the intent of specific issues, such as requiring a one year interim permit for residential care facilities; and how the task force could address drug and alcohol related group home issues. Mr. Kostjuk advised that the Task Force had endeavoured to maintain the 'group home' tradition which existed in the City, and at the same time, develop a process which would be satisfactory to the majority of Richmond residents.

Discussion then ensued among Committee members and Mr. Kostjuk on the development of the new process and whether drug and alcohol facilities should be separated from other group homes.

Mr. Brian Wardley, a member of the Group Home Task Force, provided clarification on one year interim process. He also spoke about the criteria for location of group homes; and addressed the question of separating drug and alcohol group homes from other facilities. Mr. Wardley further advised that the Task Force did talk about defining the relationship of Richmond Health Services and the City; and stated that although the agency would issue the permit, the City made the decision on whether to approve a residential home facility application.

Discussion then took place among Committee members and Mr. Wardley on such issues as whether drug and alcohol facilities whose clients were predominately adult should have specific criteria which was not necessary for other types of group homes. Also discussed were the concerns of residents about having drug and alcohol recovery facilities within their neighbourhoods, and about the issue of location criteria and safeguarding children and the neighbourhood, especially when some clients were in a facility for only a few days rather than long term.

Mr. Bob Ransford, 5071 Steveston Highway, commended the Group Home Task Force for its work; and the fact that it had undertaken a rational debate over an important issue. However, he suggested that Council was failing to recognize that the Task Force had recommended that Richmond's tradition continue without rezoning being required, and that a process be implemented which would give residents the opportunity to come forward and make their views known. Mr. Ransford stated that the Task Force had recognized that people need to be treated in their own residential neighbourhoods.

A brief discussion ensued with Mr. Ransford on such issues as transient clients and security of the area; and how clients could be integrated into a neighbourhood if they were only in a group home facility for a few days.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001

---

Virginia Soronow commended Task Force for their hard work in dealing with a difficult subject. She spoke on the proposed location criteria; questioning how a neighbourhood could be monitored, and commented that clients in a group home were there to be rehabilitated, while others who moved into a neighbourhood could be dangerous. A brief discussion ensued between Cllr. Evelina Halsey-Brandt and the delegation on this issue.

Janet Corbet, a member of the Group Home Task Force, addressed why the Task Force had not chosen the 'rezoning application' option; and commented on 'informal' meetings as opposed to 'formal'.

Cecelia Lanne, a member of the Group Home Task Force, spoke about the need for group homes in the City; and commented on the need for communication to address fears.

Sally Wong spoke about the importance of the group home issue and the need to have a safe and secure neighbourhood.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That the report (dated October 31<sup>st</sup>, 2001, from the Group Home Task Force), entitled "Final Report and Recommendations" be received for information, and referred to staff for review and report to the General Purposes Committee at the earliest opportunity.*
- (2) *That the members of the Group Home Task Force, including the alternates and the consultants, be thanked for their hard work.*

Prior to the question on the motion being called, staff were directed to:

- (a) respond to the question about whether public hearings, with or without a rezoning, could be held for all drug and alcohol group home applications;
- (b) consider the holding of a formal neighbourhood meeting in the Oaks and Odlin Road/No. 4 Road areas, and to request the Group Home Task Force to explain their findings to the residents attending this meeting;
- (c) report on the process to be followed upon receipt of a residential group home facility application by the City, based on the recommendations proposed by the Group Home Task Force, and specifically, the action which would be undertaken by the City and by other governing bodies; also, to provide timelines as to when the recommendations of the Group Home Task Force would be implemented;
- (d) in addition to undertaking the analysis on the process to be followed, report on the proposed protocol agreement between Richmond Health Services and the City;
- (e) examine the location issue from a 'needs' point of view, as different types of group homes may have different needs;
- (f) provide an analysis of the difference between a 'hearing in public' and a formal public hearing;

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001

---

- (g) report on the feasibility of allowing facility care operators to rent buildings for proposed group homes with an option to purchase after six months, as currently permitted under the *Community Care Facilities Act*, and
- (h) report on the feasibility of separating those group home facilities with predominately adult clients by establishing different criteria in connection with location of these facilities in relation to neighbourhood amenities.

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

### PARKS, RECREATION & CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION

#### 3. **RICHMOND TALL SHIPS 2002**

(Report: Nov. 13/01, File No.: 7400-20-TALL1) (REDMS No. 557553, 559001, 557800, ) (Delegation: Richmond Tall Ships Coordinating Committee)

The General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services, Cathy Volkering Carlile, reviewed the report and its recommendations with the Committee. Considerable discussion ensued among Committee members and staff on the proposed event, during which, in response to questions, the following information and comments were provided:

- the proposed cash exposure amount of \$1.256 Million was based on a worst case scenario, i.e. no ticket sales, no sponsorships or financial contributions; no visitors
- the \$45,000 being requested would allow the completion of required specific tasks before funding was available to offset these costs
- the City had already committed funds to the project, as well, City staff were active in promoting the event; as well, a systematic process was in place to obtain corporate donations and sponsorships
- the dredging work proposed for the Steveston Harbour area would be a benefit to the City and to Steveston in particular, even if the Tall Ships event did not take place
- promoting the Tall Ships event without having the project confirmed would become more difficult the longer the City proceeded without making a decision
- with reference to the funds currently being collected for the event, advice was given that donations could be made to the City in the name of the project, with tax receipts issued by the City; if event did not proceed, the monies received would be returned

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001

---

- with regard to the proposed \$45,000 expenditure, the funds would allow the completion of certain work in 2001 to meet deadlines for dredging and construction; included in the work was the preparation of an infrastructure program for Garry Point; the completion of marine engineering designs for submission to FREMP, and the undertaking of an environmental assessment to determine if land disposal of the dredged material at Garry Point Park could be an option
- if the event was cancelled, there would still be some residual value to the monies already spent, as the proposed survey of Garry Point and the testing of dredging materials would still benefit the Small Craft Harbours Branch and the Steveston community; the engineering drawings, once approved by FREMP, could be used for future float projects
- adoption of the proposed recommendations should help allay public perception that Council did not support the event.

During the discussion, the importance of challenging Richmond residents to make a financial contribution was stressed. As well, concern was expressed about proposed expenditures and the December 30<sup>th</sup> deadline; and whether sponsorship targets and government funding targets could be achieved by that date.

Questions were raised about (i) whether the December 30<sup>th</sup> deadline was being tied to the obtaining of government funding, and (ii) if the event could still be held if government contributions were not forthcoming. Discussion ensued among Committee members and staff on these issues, during which it was noted that the amount of funding received would determine the size of the Tall Ships event would be.

Also discussed among Committee and staff were such matters as:

- (a) whether information on corporate donors would be announced to the public;
- (b) the time available to organize a world-class event and the many critical issues which had to be addressed and achieved to hold this event in August, 2002;
- (c) the proposed budget and whether there were options available to reduce the budget even more;
- (d) the proposal that the City underwrite certain components of the budget;
- (e) the proposal to use Garry Point Park as a possible site for dredging material;
- (f) the proposed budget and whether the projected cost of 'detail' items had been confirmed;
- (g) the proposed expenditure of \$446,000 'in-kind' for Event Infrastructure – City service and what this expense would entail;

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001

---

- (h) the amount of dredging proposed and the impact which it would have on Steveston Harbour;
- (i) the percentage of funds which the Tall Ships Society hoped to have raised by December 30<sup>th</sup>;
- (j) the proposed cost estimates and whether these figures could be expected to increase;
- (k) who would control the disbursement of funds received.

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting of the General Purposes Committee be adjourned until the conclusion of the Regular Council Meeting for Public Hearings (7:04 p.m.).*

**CARRIED**

The meeting reconvened at 7:25 p.m., with all members of the Committee present.

Janice Podmore, accompanied by Bryan Johnstone, representing the Tall Ship Society, advised that since the previous General Purposes Committee meeting, budgets had been reviewed in detail. She stated that the Society was confident that it would be able to present a first class event, based on proposed budget. She added that the Society was also confident that the in-kind donations target would be reached by December 30<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Podmore further advised that the Society was now pursuing major corporate sponsorships.

Mr. Johnstone elaborated on corporate sponsorship, advising that \$40,000 had been committed by two local manufacturers. He also reported on ship recruitment, stating that in all likelihood, there would be 25 to 30 ships visiting Richmond during the event.

Ms. Podmore referred to the need for authority to sign contracts, and asked that the appropriate mechanism be put in place. She explained that once a contract was signed, a 20% deposit would be required, and at the present time, there was no authority given to accept deposits.

Discussion ensued among Committee members and the delegation on::

- whether Richmond was giving the impression that it was supportive of the project, and whether this support would have a positive impact on obtaining corporate and private support;
- the fleet recruitment fee and what this entailed and whether ships should be invited if appearance fees were required to be paid
- whether public information meetings had been held to obtain the views of the public on holding the proposed event;
- the public support being shown for the event, both locally and outside of Richmond, corporately, and internationally;

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001

---

➤ when the event would take place.

Ms. Nikki Roberts, expressed support as a resident of Steveston for the event. She spoke about the need to boost tourism which was suffering because of recent international events, and suggested that six months was not an unreasonable amount of time to organize the event. She stated that corporate sponsors would want to control and be given responsibility for specific components of the project. Ms. Roberts voiced the opinion that the Tall Ships event would not be a waste of money; and suggested that the City needed to capitalize on its marine community. She urged the Committee to make a decision; as the undercurrent of lack of City support was damaging to potential corporate sponsorship.

Alexander Kostjuk spoke in support of holding the Tall Ships event, and about the need to make Richmond a destination for tourists. He questioned whether the event would be local, national or international; and suggested that if the event was to be an international event, advertising must be initiated very quickly.

Mr. Rob Tivy, Director, Tourism Richmond, spoke about the positive impact which the Tall Ships event could have on the community. He stated that Council had to make a decision at some point on whether to proceed with the event, and he spoke highly of the efforts of Cathy Volkering Carlile to present the project to Council. Mr. Tivy stressed the importance of making a definitive decision, and he urged the Committee to make a decision quickly.

A brief discussion ensued among Committee members and Mr. Tivy, during which Mr. Tivy confirmed that a decision made this evening would help to show the City's support. Reference was made to a decision by the Federal Government to provide revenue to promote tourism in Canada, and Mr. Tithe was encouraged to help promote the tall ship event.

Mr. Adrian Lee advised that he had been developing marine special events for the past fifteen years, both locally and internationally, and he provided information on the events which he had organized. He spoke about the economic spin-offs, legacies and the enrichment which these events provided to their various communities. Mr. Lee encouraged the City to proceed full speed ahead.

Mr. Les Patterson, a Richmond resident, spoke in support of the project. He stated that potential contributors needed a commitment from Council to determine their involvement in the project, and were concerned that Council was taking the 'wind out of their sails'. Mr. Patterson urged the Committee to support the event.

In response to questions, Mr. Patterson stated that the December 30<sup>th</sup> deadline would frustrate organizers. He added that the opportunities offered by the event were almost endless and suggested that the event could be scaled back later in the process if financial targets were not being met.

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001

---

Mr. Gordie Bell, Director, Richmond Maritime Society, expressed concern about the proposed deadline, and suggested that that recommendation not be adopted. He also spoke about fund raising which he had undertaken on behalf of the event.

Mr. Gerry Biggar, a long time Richmond resident and businessman in Steveston, stated that Council needed to make a decision now to take a risk and show leadership. He stated that he would be disappointed if the event was cancelled to a lack of funding. Mr. Biggar spoke about legacy for the future if the event was approved.

The Mayor expressed concern about the impact to the City if revenue projections failed, and he questioned whether it would be appropriate to use an increase in property taxes to fund the event. In response, Mr. Biggar advised that he would not complain if he had to pay increased taxes to support the event.

Discussion took place among Committee members and the delegation on the fact that this was a new project with many unknown factors, and on the risks which Council was being asked to take; whether there was wide-ranging support for a property tax increase to support the Tall Ships event; and whether the public would support the event.

Mr. Daniel Gordon, a Steveston resident, urged Committee to support the event.

Mr. Gordon Kibble, 11171 Fourth Avenue, provided information on the number of volunteers who were members of the Tall Ships Society, and who supported the event. He urged the Committee to make a decision to support the event.

Mr. Les Patterson (supplementary presentation) commented that there had been a commitment in principle made previously to support the event, and that it was now time to proceed to the next step. He also commented that a property tax increase was unrealistic because that figure was based on no tickets being sold and no financial support being received by the City. He expressed the opinion that that would not happen.

It was moved and seconded

- (1) *That City Council approve the Richmond Tall Ships 2002 budget projected at \$2.526 million; and*
- (2) *That City Council approve the city cash exposure at \$1.256 million and the City underwrite any deficits related to the event; and*
- (3) *That the City approve \$45,000 in 2001 for maritime engineering, surveying of Garry Point and an environmental assessment of the materials at the Gulf of Georgia site.*

## General Purposes Committee

Monday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001

---

The question on the motion was not called, as Committee members spoke in support of the proposed event; the positive impact which the event could have on Richmond for the future; and the improvements which would be completed in the area of Steveston Harbour. At the same time, concern was expressed about the potential for revenue shortfall; the timelines faced by the event organizers with respect to infrastructure improvements; and the financial risk to the City in the event that fund-raising activities were unsuccessful.

As a result of the discussion, the following **amendments** were introduced:

It was moved and seconded

*That the main motion be amended by adding the following as Part (4),*

*"That the matter of a contract with the Richmond Tall Ship Society be referred to staff for review; and that staff review the proposed budget to reconfirm the budget figures as presented."*

**CARRIED**

It was moved and seconded

*That the main motion be amended by adding the following as Part (5),*

*"In the event that sponsorship targets and government-funding targets are not secured by December 30, 2001, that City Council review the event."*

**CARRIED**

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

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting adjourn (9:15 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 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001.

---

Mayor Malcolm Brodie  
Chair

---

Fran J. Ashton  
Executive Assistant